

SPECTRAL PROPERTIES OF SYMMETRIZED AMV OPERATORS

MANUEL DIAS AND DAVID TEWODROSE

November 18, 2024

ABSTRACT. The symmetrized Asymptotic Mean Value Laplacian $\tilde{\Delta}$, obtained as limit of approximating operators $\tilde{\Delta}_r$, is an extension of the classical Euclidean Laplace operator to the realm of metric measure spaces. We show that, as $r \downarrow 0$, the operators $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ eventually admit isolated eigenvalues defined via min-max procedure on any compact locally Ahlfors regular metric measure space. Then we prove L^2 and spectral convergence of $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ to the Laplace–Beltrami operator of a compact Riemannian manifold, imposing Neumann conditions when the manifold has a non-empty boundary.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Averaging-like operators	3
3.	Symmetrized AMV operators	6
4.	First eigenvalue of torus and hypercubes	12
5.	L^2 convergence	18
6.	Spectral convergence	29
	References	34

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past thirty years, much research has been carried out to extend the classical Euclidean Laplace operator to metric measure spaces: see e.g. [CC00, KMS01, Gig15, AB18]. This paper deals with such an extension, namely the symmetrized Asymptotic Mean Value (AMV) Laplacian, proposed in [MT23], see also [Kok06, MT20, AKS22, AKS23]. The symmetrized AMV Laplacian is set as

$$\tilde{\Delta} := \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \tilde{\Delta}_r \tag{1}$$

where for μ -a.e. $x \in X$,

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r f(x) := \frac{1}{2r^2} \int_{B_r(x)} \left(1 + \frac{V(x,r)}{V(y,r)} \right) (f(y) - f(x)) \, d\mu(y).$$

Here f is a locally integrable function defined on a metric measure space (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) . Throughout the paper, $B_r(z)$ denotes the metric open ball centered at $z \in X$ with radius $r > 0$, the notation $V(z, r)$ stands for $\mu(B_r(z))$, and $\int_{B_r(z)}$ is shorthand for $V(z, r)^{-1} \int_{B_r(z)}$.

Part of the study on the symmetrized AMV Laplacian consists in finding a relevant meaning to the limit in (1). If this is intended in the L^2 sense, then the

associated spectral convergence can be investigated. This is the goal of the present paper. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} := \inf_{V \in \mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(X, \mu))} \sup_{f \in V} \frac{\tilde{E}_r(f)}{\|f\|_2},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(X, \mu))$ is the $(k+1)$ -th Grassmannian of $L^2(X, \mu)$, and $\tilde{E}_r(f)$ is the energy functional naturally associated with $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ (Definition 3.4). These form a non-decreasing sequence of non-negative numbers. Our first main result states that these numbers eventually correspond to isolated eigenvalues of $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ when (X, d, μ) is compact and locally Ahlfors regular (Definition 2.2).

Theorem 1. *Let (X, d, μ) be a compact locally Ahlfors regular metric measure space. For any integer $k \geq 2$, there exists $r_k > 0$ such that for any $r \in (0, r_k)$, the operator $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ admits $k+1$ eigenvalues*

$$0 = \lambda_0(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) < \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$$

such that $\lambda_i(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \tilde{\lambda}_{i,r}$ for any $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$.

Our second main result deals with a smooth manifold M endowed with a smooth Riemannian metric g . We write Δ_g for the (negative) Laplace–Beltrami operator of (M, g) . We let $m \geq 2$ be the dimension of M , and we set

$$C_m := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_1^m(0)} \xi_1^2 d\xi = \frac{1}{2(m+2)} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{B}_1^m(0)$ is the unit Euclidean ball of \mathbb{R}^m . If $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, we write $\partial_\nu f \in C^\infty(\partial M)$ for the normal derivative of a smooth function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and we define

$$C_\nu^\infty(M) := \{f \in C^\infty(M) : \partial_\nu f = 0\}. \quad (3)$$

We see (M, g) as a metric measure space (M, d_g, vol_g) where d_g and vol_g are the Riemannian distance and volume measure on M associated with g . Then our statement reads as follows.

Theorem 2. *Let (M^m, g) be a compact, connected, smooth Riemannian manifold. If $\partial M = \emptyset$ (resp. $\partial M \neq \emptyset$), then for any $f \in C^\infty(M)$ (resp. $C_\nu^\infty(M)$), as $r \downarrow 0$,*

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r f \xrightarrow{L^2} C_m \Delta_g f.$$

After the previous L^2 -convergence result, we address the question of spectral convergence, that is to say, the convergence of the associated eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. In this regard we show that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $r \mapsto \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r}$ is bounded in a neighborhood of 0, (which holds true on any compact locally Ahlfors regular metric measure space) proved in the course of Theorem 1. This ensures that the eigenvalue $\lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ exists for small enough r , and that it coincides with $\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r}$. Let $f_{k,r}$ be an associated L^2 -normalized eigenfunction. Recall that if $\partial M = \emptyset$ (resp. $\partial M \neq \emptyset$), a Laplace (resp. Neumann) eigenvalue of (M, g) is a number $\lambda \geq 0$ for which there exists an associated eigenfunction $f \in C^\infty(M)$ (resp. $C_\nu^\infty(M)$) of $-\Delta_g$, i.e. $-\lambda f = \Delta_g f$.

Theorem 3. *Let (M^m, g) be a compact, connected, smooth Riemannian manifold. Assume that $\partial M = \emptyset$ (resp. $\partial M \neq \emptyset$). For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(r_n) \subset (0, +\infty)$ such that $r_n \rightarrow 0$, there exist a Laplace (resp. Neumann) eigenvalue of (M, g) and a corresponding L^2 -normalized eigenfunction $f \in C^\infty(M)$ (resp. $C_\nu^\infty(M)$) such that, up to a subsequence,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n}) &\rightarrow C_m \lambda, \\ f_{k,r_n} &\xrightarrow{L^2} f, \end{aligned}$$

and λ is the k -th Neumann eigenvalue.

We point out that the question of spectral convergence for the Gaussian approximation of the Laplace–Beltrami operator of a compact Euclidean submanifold with boundary was raised in [BQWZ12]. This has been one motivation for the present work: to study this convergence with the intrinsic approximation provided by the symmetrized AMV operators $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ instead of the extrinsic Gaussian one.

Acknowledgments. Both authors are funded by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) via the Odysseus II programme no. G0DBZ23N.

2. AVERAGING-LIKE OPERATORS

In this section, we consider a fixed metric measure space, that is to say, a triple (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) where (X, \mathbf{d}) is a metric space and μ is a fully supported Borel measure on (X, \mathbf{d}) such that

$$0 < V(x, r) := \mu(B_r(x)) < +\infty$$

for any $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, where $B_r(x)$ denotes the open ball $\{y \in X : \mathbf{d}(x, y) < r\}$. We set

$$0 \leq m(r) := \inf_{x \in X} V(x, r) \leq M(r) := \sup_{x \in X} V(x, r) \leq +\infty.$$

2.1. Averaging operator. For any $x, y \in X$ and $r > 0$, set

$$a_r(x, y) := \frac{\mathbf{1}_{B_r(x)}(y)}{V(x, r)}.$$

Consider $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(X, \mu)$. For any $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ such that u is μ -integrable on $B_r(x)$, set

$$A_r u(x) := \int_{B_r(x)} u \, d\mu = \int_X a_r(x, y) u(y) \, d\mu(y).$$

Notice that, since u is locally integrable, for any $x \in X$ there exists $r_x > 0$ such that $A_{r_x} u(x)$ is well-defined. However, there may be no $r > 0$ such that for any $x \in X$ the integral $A_r u(x)$ converges.

In the next lemma, we provide a mild condition under which A_r defines a bounded linear operator between Lebesgue spaces, and show that, under local compactness of the space, A_r is compact as an operator acting on L^2 .

Lemma 2.1. Assume that there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$V(\cdot, r)^{-1} \in L^1(X, \mu). \tag{A_r}$$

Then for any $p \in [1, +\infty]$ the linear operator $A_r : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^p(X, \mu)$ is well-defined and bounded with

$$\|A_r\|_{p \rightarrow p} \leq \|V(\cdot, r)^{-1}\|_1^{1/p}.$$

Moreover, if (X, \mathbf{d}) is locally compact, then $A_r : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ is compact.

Proof. For 1., let $u \in L^p(X, \mu)$. The case $p = +\infty$ is obvious, hence we assume $p < +\infty$. By Jensen's inequality, for any $x \in X$,

$$|A_r u(x)|^p \leq \left(\int_{B_r(x)} |u|^p \, d\mu \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_r u\|_p^p &\leq \int_X \frac{1}{V(x, r)} \int_{B_r(x)} |u(y)|^p \, d\mu(y) \, d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \left(\int_X \frac{1}{V(x, r)} \, d\mu(x) \right) \|u\|_p^p. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired result. If (X, \mathbf{d}) is locally compact, we notice that

$$\int_X \int_X a_r^2(x, y) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(y) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) = \int_X \frac{1}{V(x, r)} \int_{B_r(x)} \mathrm{d}\mu(y) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x) = \int_X \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu(x)}{V(x, r)}.$$

Then A_r is a Hilbert-Schmidt integral operator. In particular, it is compact. \square

The next lemma provides an additional regularization property of A_r under natural assumptions.

Lemma 2.2. Assume that (X, \mathbf{d}) is locally compact, and that there exists $r > 0$ such that (A_r) holds and

$$V(\cdot, r) \in \mathcal{C}(X), \quad (\text{C}_r)$$

$$\sup_{x \in X} \mu(\partial B_r(x)) = 0. \quad (\text{S}_r)$$

Then $A_r : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X)$ is compact¹ and satisfies

$$\|A_r\|_{2 \rightarrow \infty} \leq \frac{1}{m(r)^{1/2}}. \quad (4)$$

Proof. We start by noticing that if $u \in L^2(X, \mu)$, then $A_r(u)$ is continuous. This follows from $V(\cdot, r)^{-1}$ and $\int_{B_r(x)} u(y) \mathrm{d}\mu(y)$ being continuous. The former holds by assumption. To prove the latter, assume that $\|u\|_{L^2(X)} = 1$. Then for any $x, z \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{B_r(x)} u(y) \mathrm{d}\mu(y) - \int_{B_r(z)} u(y) \mathrm{d}\mu(y) \right| &\leq \|1_{B_r(x)} - 1_{B_r(z)}\|_{L^2(X)} \|u\|_{L^2(X)} \\ &\leq \mu(B_{r+d(x,z)}(x) - B_{r-d(x,z)}(x))^{1/2}, \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

and $\mu(B_{r+d(x,z)}(x) - B_{r-d(x,z)}(x)) \rightarrow 0$ as $\mathbf{d}(x, z) \rightarrow 0$ due to (S_r) . Moreover, the bound (4) is obtained via Hölder's inequality: for any $x \in X$,

$$|A_r u(x)| \leq \left(\int_{B_r(x)} u^2 \mathrm{d}\mu \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{m(r)^{1/2}}.$$

To prove compactness, consider $\{f_n\} \subset L^2(X, \mu)$ such that $\sup_n \|f_n\|_2 \leq 1$. Uniform boundedness of $\{A_r(f_n)\}$ follows from (4), and equicontinuity can be obtained by using the inequality (5) applied to the sequence. By the Ascoli-Arzelà Theorem, we can extract from $\{A_r(f_n)\}$ a subsequence which converges in $\mathcal{C}(X)$, concluding the proof. \square

2.2. Adjoint. For any $x, y \in X$ and $r > 0$, set

$$a_r^*(x, y) := a_r(y, x) = \frac{1_{B_r(x)}(y)}{V(y, r)}.$$

Consider $u \in L^0(X, \mu)$ such that $v(\cdot) := u(\cdot)/V(\cdot, r) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(X, \mu)$. For any $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ such that v is μ -integrable on $B_r(x)$, set

$$A_r^* u(x) := \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{u(y) \mathrm{d}\mu(y)}{V(y, r)} = \int_X a_r^*(x, y) \mathrm{d}\mu(y).$$

Notice that, just like $A_r u(x)$ in the previous subsection, $A_r^* u(x)$ may not make sense uniformly with respect to $x \in X$.

The next lemma gives a mild sufficient condition ensuring the well-posedness and boundedness of the linear operator A_r^* between Lebesgue spaces; it also provides natural additional properties of A_r^* .

¹if (X, \mathbf{d}) is compact, we endow $\mathcal{C}(X)$ with the norm of uniform convergence, otherwise we endow it with the compact-open topology

Lemma 2.3. Assume that there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} V(\cdot, r)^{-1} &\in L^\infty(B_r(x), \mu) \quad \forall x \in X, \\ c(r) &:= \sup_{x \in X} \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{d\mu(y)}{V(y, r)} < +\infty. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (\text{A}_r^*)$$

Then for any $p \in [1, +\infty]$, the linear operator $A_r^* : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^p(X, \mu)$ is well-defined and bounded with

$$\|A_r^*\|_{p \rightarrow p} \leq c(r)^{(p-1)/p}.$$

Moreover, for any $p, q \in [1, +\infty]$ satisfying $1/p + 1/q = 1$, for any $f \in L^p(X, \mu)$ and $g \in L^q(X, \mu)$,

$$\int_X [A_r f] g \, d\mu = \int_X f [A_r^* g] \, d\mu. \quad (6)$$

Lastly, if (X, \mathbf{d}) is locally compact, then the operator $A_r^* : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ is compact.

Proof. For 1., consider $u \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$. Then for any $x \in X$,

$$|A_r^* u|(x) \leq \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|u(y)|}{V(y, r)} \, d\mu(y) \leq \|u\|_\infty \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{d\mu(y)}{V(y, r)} \leq c(r) \|u\|_\infty.$$

Thus $A_r^* : L^\infty(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^\infty(X, \mu)$ is bounded with $\|A_r^*\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq c(r)$. The conclusion for $p \in (1, +\infty)$ follows from the Riesz-Thorin theorem and the boundedness of $A_r^* : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$ which satisfies $\|A_r^*\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leq 1$ (see Remark 2.4 below). We skip the proof of (6) which follows from a simple computation using the Fubini theorem. As for 2. and 3., the result is a direct consequence of the Schauder theorem for compact operators which can be applied thanks to 2. in Lemma 1.1. \square

Note that (6) means that $A_r^* : L^q(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^q(X, \mu)$ is the adjoint of $A_r : L^p(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^p(X, \mu)$.

Assumption (A_r^*) implies that $A_r^* 1 \in L^\infty(X, \mu)$ with $c(r) = \|A_r^* 1\|_\infty$. It can be seen as a weak variant of the comparability conditions introduced in [Ald18, MT23].

Remark 2.4. The operator $A_r^* : L^1(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^1(X, \mu)$ is always bounded, with $\|A_r^*\|_{1 \rightarrow 1} \leq 1$, even when (A_r^*) does not hold. Indeed, for any $u \in L^1(X, \mu)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |A_r^* u|(x) \, d\mu(x) &\leq \int_X \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{|u(y)|}{V(y, r)} \, d\mu(y) \, d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \int_X 1_{B_r(x)}(y) \frac{|u(y)|}{V(y, r)} \, d\mu(y) \, d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_X \left(\int_X 1_{B_r(y)}(x) \, d\mu(x) \right) \frac{|u(y)|}{V(y, r)} \, d\mu(y) = \int_X |u(y)| \, d\mu(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.2, the Schauder theorem for compact operators immediately implies the following.

Lemma 2.5. Assume that (X, \mathbf{d}) is locally compact, and that there exists $r > 0$ such that (A_r) , (C_r) , (S_r) and (A_r^*) hold. Then the operator $A_r^* : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X)$ is a continuous and compact operator.

2.3. Symmetrization. For any $x, y \in X$ and $r > 0$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_r(x, y) &= \frac{1}{2} (a_r(x, y) + a_r^*(x, y)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, r)} + \frac{1}{V(y, r)} \right) 1_{B_r(x)}(y) \end{aligned}$$

Consider $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(X, \mu)$ such that $v(\cdot) := u(\cdot)/V(\cdot, r) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(X, \mu)$. For any $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ such that u and v are μ -integrable on $B_r(x)$, set

$$\tilde{A}_r u(x) := \frac{1}{2}(A_r u(x) + A_r^* u(x)) = \int_X \tilde{a}_r(x, y) u(y) \, d\mu(y).$$

Then the next lemma is an obvious consequence of Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3.

Lemma 2.6. Assume that (X, \mathbf{d}) is locally compact, and that there exists $r > 0$ such that (A_r) and (A_r^*) hold. Then the operator $\tilde{A}_r : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ is a compact self-adjoint operator such that

$$\|\tilde{A}_r\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \leq \frac{\|V(\cdot, r)^{-1}\|_1^{1/2} + c(r)^{1/2}}{2}$$

2.4. Discussion on the assumptions. For a metric measure space (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) and a radius $r > 0$, consider the assumptions:

$$\lim_{\mathbf{d}(x, y) \rightarrow 0} \mu(B_r(x) \Delta B_r(y)) = 0 \quad \forall x \in X, \quad (\mathbf{D}_r)$$

$$\exists C \geq 1, \exists Q > 0 : \quad C^{-1} r^Q \leq V(x, r) \leq C r^Q \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (\mathbf{Q}_r)$$

The first one goes back to [Gór09] at least. The next definition is due to [GG09], while the subsequent one is classical in analysis of metric measure spaces.

Definition 2.1. The measure μ is called (locally) continuous with respect to \mathbf{d} if (\mathbf{D}_r) holds for any $r > 0$ (for any $r \in (0, R)$ for some $R > 0$).

Definition 2.2. The space (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) is called (locally) Q -Ahlfors regular if (\mathbf{Q}_r) holds for any $r > 0$ (for any $r \in (0, R)$ for some $R > 0$) with C and Q independent of r .

The following lemma collects several results relating the various conditions considered in this section.

Lemma 2.7. Let (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) be a metric measure space, and $r > 0$.

- (1) $(\mathbf{S}_r) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{D}_r) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{C}_r)$.
- (2) If (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) is Ahlfors regular, then μ is continuous with respect to \mathbf{d} .
- (3) If (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) is compact, then (\mathbf{C}_r) implies (A_r) and (A_r^*) .
- (4) If (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) is compact, then (\mathbf{Q}_r) implies (A_r) and (A_r^*) with $c(r) \leq C^2$.

Proof. For (1) we refer to [GG09, Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.1]. For (2) we point out that Ahlfors regularity trivially implies the well-known doubling property, and we refer to [AGG19, p. 147]. For (3), the continuity of $V(\cdot, r)$ on the compact set X implies that $m(r) > 0$ and $M(r) < +\infty$. Thus $V(\cdot, r)^{-1} \leq m(r)^{-1} \in L^1 \cap L^\infty(X, \mu)$ so that (A_r) holds, and $c(r) \leq M(r)/m(r) < +\infty$ so that (A_r^*) holds. Property (4) is proved in a similar way. \square

3. SYMMETRIZED AMV OPERATORS

In this section, we provide our working definition of the symmetrized AMV r -Laplace operator $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ and we derive several spectral properties in a general setting.

3.1. Definitions. For this subsection, we consider a locally compact metric measure space (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) satisfying (A_r) and (A_r^*) for some fixed $r > 0$.

Definition 3.1. The symmetrized AMV r -Laplace operator of (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) is

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r := \frac{1}{r^2}(\tilde{A}_r - [\tilde{A}_r 1]\mathbf{I}).$$

Remark 3.1. We may use the notation $\tilde{\Delta}_{r, \mathfrak{X}}$ to specify that we work on the metric measure space $\mathfrak{X} = (X, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$.

Lemma 3.2. $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is a bounded, self-adjoint operator acting on $L^2(X, \mu)$ with

$$\|\tilde{\Delta}_r\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \leq \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\|V(\cdot, r)^{-1}\|_1^{1/2} + c(r)^{1/2} + c(r) + 1 \right). \quad (7)$$

Proof. The self-adjointness of $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is obvious because \tilde{A}_r and $[\tilde{A}_r 1]I$ are self-adjoint too. The boundedness is a consequence of Lemma 2.6. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\Delta}_r\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} &\leq \frac{1}{r^2} (\|\tilde{A}_r\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} + \|[\tilde{A}_r 1]I\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{\|V(\cdot, r)^{-1}\|_1^{1/2} + c(r)^{1/2}}{2} + \|\tilde{A}_r 1\|_\infty \underbrace{\|I\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}}_{=1} \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{\|V(\cdot, r)^{-1}\|_1^{1/2} + c(r)^{1/2}}{2} + \frac{\|A_r 1\|_\infty + \|A_r^* 1\|_\infty}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r^2} \left(\frac{\|V(\cdot, r)^{-1}\|_1^{1/2} + c(r)^{1/2}}{2} + \frac{1 + c(r)}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

hence $\tilde{\Delta}_r : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ is bounded and (7) holds. \square

Definition 3.2. The energy functional \tilde{E}_r of (X, \mathbf{d}, μ) is the quadratic form on $L^2(X, \mu)$ defined by

$$\tilde{E}_r(f) := \frac{1}{4} \int_X \int_X 1_{B_r(x)}(y) \left(\frac{1}{V(x, r)} + \frac{1}{V(y, r)} \right) \left(\frac{f(x) - f(y)}{r} \right)^2 d\mu(y) d\mu(x).$$

The associated bilinear form, which we still denote by \tilde{E}_r , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_r(f, \psi) &:= \frac{1}{4} \int_X \int_X 1_{B_r(x)}(y) \left(\frac{1}{V(x, r)} + \frac{1}{V(y, r)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{(f(x) - f(y))(\psi(x) - \psi(y))}{r^2} d\mu(y) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.3. We may also use the notation $\tilde{E}_{r, \mathfrak{X}}$ to specify the metric measure space $\mathfrak{X} = (X, \mathbf{d}, \mu)$.

Lemma 3.4. For any $f, \psi \in L^2(X, \mu)$,

$$\tilde{E}_r(f, \psi) = \langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r f, \psi \rangle_{L^2}. \quad (8)$$

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_r(f, \psi) &= \frac{1}{4} \int_X \int_{B_r(x)} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, r)} + \frac{1}{V(y, r)} \right) \frac{(f(x) - f(y))\psi(x)}{r^2} d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4} \int_X \int_X 1_{B_r(x)}(y) \left(\frac{1}{V(x, r)} + \frac{1}{V(y, r)} \right) \frac{(f(x) - f(y))\psi(y)}{r^2} d\mu(y) d\mu(x). \end{aligned}$$

Using $1_{B_r(x)}(y) = 1_{B_r(y)}(x)$ and then the Fubini theorem, we can rewrite the second term as the opposite of the first one, so that we eventually get (8). \square

Remark 3.5. Observe that (8) implies that $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is a non-negative operator, since for any $f \in L^2(X, \mu)$,

$$\langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r f, f \rangle_{L^2} = \tilde{E}_r(f) \geq 0$$

Let us recall the definition of spectrum.

Definition 3.3. We let $\sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ denote the spectrum of $\tilde{\Delta}_r$, that is to say, the set of elements $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I : L^2(X, \mu) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mu)$ is no bijection.

It is well-known from classical functional analysis that the spectrum $\sigma(T)$ of a bounded operator T acting on a Banach space E can be decomposed as

$$\sigma(T) = \sigma_p(T) \cup \sigma_c(T) \cup \sigma_a(T)$$

where:

- $\sigma_p(T)$ is the point spectrum, that is to say, the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^+$ such that $(T - \lambda I)f = 0$ for some non-zero $f \in E$, in which case λ is called an eigenvalue and f an eigenvector of T ,
- $\sigma_p(T)$ is the compression spectrum, that is to say, the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^+$ whose conjugate $\bar{\lambda}$ is an eigenvalue of the adjoint T^* ,
- $\sigma_a(T)$ is the approximate point spectrum, that is to say, the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for which there exists $(f_n) \subset E$ with $\|f_n\| = 1$ for any n such that $\|(T - \lambda I)f_n\| \rightarrow 0$.

Since $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is self-adjoint and non-negative, we know that

$$\sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \subset [0, +\infty].$$

This implies that $\sigma_p(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \sigma_c(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$, so that

$$\sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \sigma_p(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \cup \sigma_a(-\tilde{\Delta}_r). \quad (9)$$

Definition 3.4. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} := \inf_{V \in \mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(X, \mu))} \sup_{f \in V} \frac{\tilde{E}_r(f)}{\|f\|_2},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(X, \mu))$ is the $(k+1)$ -th Grassmannian of $L^2(X, \mu)$.

Remark 3.6. Let $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ denote the essential spectrum of $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$, i.e. the closed subset of $\sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ made of those λ such that $-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I$ is no Fredholm operator. Since $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is self-adjoint, the Courant–Fischer–Weyl min-max principle asserts that if there exists a positive integer N such that the operator $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ admits eigenvalues $\lambda_0(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) < \min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ and no other eigenvalues less than $\min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} &= \lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) & \forall k \in \{0, \dots, N\}, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} &= \min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) & \forall k > N, \end{aligned}$$

and for any $k \in \{0, \dots, N\}$ the value $\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r}$ is attained, in the sense that

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} = \min_{V \in \mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(X, \mu))} \max_{f \in V} \frac{\tilde{E}_r(f)}{\|f\|_2}.$$

3.2. Spectral properties. Our first spectral result on $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is the following.

Proposition 3.7. Let (X, d, μ) be a locally compact metric measure space. satisfying (A_r) and (A_r^*) for some fixed $r > 0$. Assume that $\lambda \in \sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ satisfies

$$\lambda < \inf_{y \in X} [\tilde{A}_r 1](y)/r^2.$$

Then λ is an isolated eigenvalue of $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ which does not belong to $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$.

Proof. Let us first show that λ is an eigenvalue, that is to say, that λ belongs to the point spectrum. According to (9), it is enough to show that if λ is in the approximate point spectrum, then it is in the point spectrum. If this is the case, then there exists a sequence $(f_n) \in L^2(X, \mu)$ such that $\|f_n\|_{L^2(X)} = 1$ and

$$\|-\tilde{\Delta}_r f_n - \lambda I\|_{L^2(X)} = \left\| \left(\frac{[\tilde{A}_r 1]}{r^2} - \lambda \right) f_n - \frac{\tilde{A}_r f_n}{r^2} \right\|_{L^2(X)} \rightarrow 0. \quad (10)$$

Since \tilde{A}_r is compact, we have that $\tilde{A}_r f_n$ converges up to a subsequence, and as such by equation (10) so does $([\tilde{A}_r 1] - r^2 \lambda) f_n$, with limit $g \in L^2(X)$. Consider $\delta > 0$ such that $0 \leq \lambda + \delta/r^2 < \inf_{y \in X} [\tilde{A}_r 1](y)/r^2$ and define

$$b_r(x) := [\tilde{A}_r 1] - r^2 \lambda \geq \delta.$$

Thus we have that $f := g/b_r \in L^2(X, \mu)$, and as such we have that

$$\delta \|f_n - \frac{g}{b_r}\|_{L^2(X)} \leq \|b_r f_n - g\|_{L^2(X)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus f_n converges in $L^2(X, \mu)$ to the limit function f . Using continuity of $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ we conclude that

$$-\tilde{\Delta}_r f = \lambda f,$$

and thus λ is in the point spectrum.

To prove that λ is an isolated point, we suppose by contradiction that there exists an infinite sequence $(\lambda_n) \subset \sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ of distinct values such that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any high enough n ,

$$\lambda_n + \delta/r^2 < \inf_{y \in X} [\tilde{A}_r 1](y)/r^2, \quad \lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda.$$

From the previous paragraph, we know that λ_n is in the point spectrum, thus there exists $f_n \in L^2(X, \mu)$ satisfying $\|f_n\|_{L^2(X)} = 1$, such that

$$-\tilde{\Delta}_r f_n = \lambda_n f_n.$$

This can be written as

$$-\frac{\tilde{A}_r}{r^2} f_n = \left(\lambda_n - \frac{[\tilde{A}_r 1]}{r^2}\right) f_n.$$

Using compactness of \tilde{A}_r , we know that $\tilde{A}_r f_n$ converges up to a subsequence. This implies that $(r^2 \lambda_n - [\tilde{A}_r 1]) f_n$ converges up to a subsequence to some $g \in L^2(X, \mu)$. Define

$$b_{r,n}(x) := [\tilde{A}_r 1] - r^2 \lambda_n.$$

With this we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \left\| f_n - \frac{g}{b_r} \right\|_{L^2(X)} &\leq \delta \left(\left\| f_n - \frac{g}{b_{r,n}} \right\|_{L^2(X)} + \left\| \frac{g}{b_{r,n}} - \frac{g}{b_r} \right\|_{L^2(X)} \right) \\ &\leq \|b_{r,n} f_n - g\|_{L^2(X)} + \delta \left\| \frac{g}{b_{r,n}} - \frac{g}{b_r} \right\|_{L^2(X)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have that $\|b_{r,n} f_n - g\|_{L^2(X)} \rightarrow 0$ and also $\left\| \frac{g}{b_{r,n}} - \frac{g}{b_r} \right\|_{L^2(X)} \rightarrow 0$ since $0 < \delta \leq b_{r,n}, b_r$ and $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda$. Thus f_n converges. However since all the eigenvalues are different, we know that $\langle f_n, f_j \rangle = \delta_{n,j}$, and so the sequence cannot converge up to a subsequence, achieving contradiction. This shows that λ is an isolated point of $\sigma(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ finishing the first part of the proof.

Let us now prove that $-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I$ is a Fredholm operator.

To show that $\ker(-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I)$ is finite dimensional we proceed by contradiction. Assume that there exists an infinite sequence $(f_n) \subset \ker(-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I)$ such that $\langle f_n, f_j \rangle = \delta_{n,j}$. Thus

$$-\frac{\tilde{A}_r f_n}{r^2} = \left(\lambda - \frac{[\tilde{A}_r 1]}{r^2} \right) f_n.$$

Similar to before we can use compactness of \tilde{A}_r and the condition on λ to conclude that f_n converges in $L^2(X, \mu)$ up to a subsequence. However, this is prevented by $\langle f_n, f_j \rangle = \delta_{n,j}$.

To show that the image of $-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I$ is closed, consider a sequence $g_n := (-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I)(f_n)$ such that $g_n \rightarrow g$. Similarly to before, we can conclude that since g_n converges, then f_n converges to some f , and thus $g = (-\tilde{\Delta}_r - \lambda I)(f)$. \square

Corollary 3.8. Let (X, d, μ) be a locally compact metric measure space. such that for some $r_0 > 0$ both (A_r) and (A_r^*) hold for any $r \in (0, r_0)$. Then

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} (\min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)) = +\infty.$$

Proof. Proposition 3.7 implies that

$$\inf_{y \in X} [\tilde{A}_r 1](y)/r^2 \leq \min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r). \quad (11)$$

But for any $r > 0$,

$$\tilde{A}_r 1 = \frac{1}{2} (A_r 1 + A_r^* 1) \geq \frac{1}{2} A_r 1 = \frac{1}{2}$$

hence (11) implies that

$$\min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \geq \frac{1}{2r^2} \xrightarrow{r \downarrow 0} +\infty. \quad \square$$

Let us provide our second spectral result on $\tilde{\Delta}_r$.

Proposition 3.9. Let (X, d, μ) be a connected, locally compact metric measure space satisfying (A_r) , (A_r^*) , and (D_r) for some fixed $r > 0$. Then the kernel of $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ contains constant functions only,

$$\lambda_0(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = 0, \quad (12)$$

and \tilde{E}_r defines a scalar product on

$$\Pi(X, \mu) := \left\{ f \in L^2(X, \mu) : \int_X f \, d\mu = 0 \right\}. \quad (13)$$

Proof. Consider $f \in L^2(X, \mu) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\tilde{\Delta}_r f = 0$. Then $\tilde{E}_r(f) = 0$. This implies that for μ -a.e. $x \in X$,

$$\int_X 1_{B_r(x)}(y) \left(\frac{1}{V(x, r)} + \frac{1}{V(y, r)} \right) \left(\frac{f(x) - f(y)}{r} \right)^2 d\mu(y) = 0$$

which implies, in turn,

$$\mu(\{y \in B_r(x) : f(y) = f(x)\}) = \mu(B_r(x)). \quad (14)$$

Now given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we consider the function

$$g_\alpha : X \ni z \mapsto \mu(B_r(z) \cap \{y \in X : f(y) = \alpha\}).$$

This is a continuous function as can be easily proved from (D_r) . Let E be the set of points $x \in X$ such that (14) holds, and let x be such a point. Then for any $z \in E$, one has:

$$g_{f(x)}(z) = V(x, r) \Leftrightarrow f(z) = f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad g_{f(x)}(z) = 0 \Leftrightarrow f(z) \neq f(x). \quad (15)$$

Since μ is Borel, E is also dense in X , thus $g_{f(x)}(X) = \{0, V(x, r)\}$. Since X is connected, g is continuous and $g_{f(x)}(x) = V(x, r)$, we deduce that $g_{f(x)}$ is constantly equal to $V(x, r)$ on X . From (15), we get that f is constantly equal to $f(x)$ on E .

Then (12) and the property on (13) is a direct consequence of the fact that $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is non-negative (Remark 3.5) and has a non-trivial kernel consisting of the constant functions only. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1. We recall that the context of this statement is a compact locally Ahlfors regular metric measure space (X, d, μ) .

Proof. For $k \geq 1$ integer, let $x_0, \dots, x_k \in X$ be distinct points. Set

$$\bar{r}_k := \min_{0 \leq i \neq j \leq k} \frac{d(x_i, x_j)}{4}.$$

For any $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $y \in X$, define

$$\tilde{f}_i(y) := \left(1 - \frac{d(x_i, y)}{\bar{r}_k}\right)^+ \quad \text{and} \quad f_i(y) := \frac{\tilde{f}_i(y)}{\|\tilde{f}_i\|_2}.$$

Note that each f_i is an L^2 -normalized Lipschitz function supported in $B_{\bar{r}_k}(x_i)$, and that (f_0, \dots, f_k) is an orthonormal family of $L^2(X, \mu)$. Set

$$V := \text{Span}(f_0, \dots, f_k) \in \mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(X, \mu))$$

and observe that for any $r > 0$,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} \leq \max_{\substack{f \in V \\ \|f\|_2=1}} \tilde{E}_r(f).$$

Consider $r \in (0, \bar{r}_k)$ and $i \neq j$ in $\{0, \dots, k\}$. If $x \in B_{2\bar{r}_k}(x_i)$, then $f_j(y) = 0$ for any $y \in B_r(x)$, while if $x \notin B_{2\bar{r}_k}(x_i)$, then $f_i(y) = 0$ for any $y \in B_r(x)$. In both cases,

$$(f_i(x) - f_i(y))(f_j(x) - f_j(y)) = 0$$

for any $y \in B_r(x)$. Thus

$$\tilde{E}_r(f_i, f_j) = 0. \tag{16}$$

Consider $f \in V$ such that $\|f\|_2 = 1$. Then $f = \sum_{i=0}^k a_i f_i$ for some $a_0, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^k a_i^2 = 1$. By (16), we get

$$\tilde{E}_r(f) = \sum_{i=0}^k a_i^2 \tilde{E}_r(f_i) \leq \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \tilde{E}_r(f_i).$$

Let R, C, Q be the parameters of the local Ahlfors regularity property of (X, d, μ) , see Definition 2.2. Then for any $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $r < R$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_r(f_i) &\leq \frac{\text{Lip}(f_i)}{4} \int_X \int_{B_r(x)} \underbrace{\left(1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)}\right)}_{\leq 1+C^2} \underbrace{\frac{d^2(x, y)}{r^2}}_{\leq 1} d\mu(y) d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Lip}(f_i)(1+C^2)\mu(X)}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $r < \tilde{r}_k := \min(\bar{r}_k, R)$, we get

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} \leq \tilde{C} := \frac{(1+C^2)\mu(X)}{4} \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \text{Lip}(f_i). \tag{17}$$

By Corollary 3.8, there exists $r_k \in (0, \tilde{r}_k)$ such that $\tilde{C} < \min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ for any $r \in (0, r_k)$. Then Remark 3.6 implies that for such an r the operator $-\tilde{\Delta}_r$ admits $k+1$ eigenvalues $\lambda_0(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \leq \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$ such that $\lambda_i(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = \tilde{\lambda}_{i,r}$ for any $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. That $\lambda_0(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) = 0$ follows from Proposition 3.9. Moreover, by Remark 3.6 and Proposition 3.9, we know that

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{1,r} = \min_{f \in \Pi(X, \mu)} \frac{\tilde{E}_r(f)}{\|f\|_2}$$

where $\Pi(X, \mu)$ is as in (13). Since $-\Delta_r$ has a kernel which is L^2 -orthogonal to $\Pi(X, \mu)$ (Proposition 3.9), we have $\tilde{E}_r(f) > 0$ for any $f \in \Pi(X, \mu)$, hence we get

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{1,r} > 0.$$

□

4. FIRST EIGENVALUE OF TORUS AND HYPERCUBES

In this section, we derive some results which will be applied in Section 6. We let m be a positive integer kept fixed throughout the section.

4.1. A preliminary lemma. We begin with a result where we use the normalized sinc function, namely

$$\text{sinc}(\rho) := \begin{cases} \frac{\sin(\pi\rho)}{\pi\rho} & \rho \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \\ 1 & \rho = 0, \end{cases}$$

and the following notation: for any $p = (p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$,

$$J(p) := \{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} : p_i \neq 0\}, \quad j(p) := \#J(p).$$

Lemma 4.1.

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \inf_{0 \neq p \in \mathbb{Z}^m} \left| \frac{1}{r^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r) \right) \right| > 0. \quad (18)$$

Proof. We start by pointing out that for any $r > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}^m \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r) \neq 1,$$

so that

$$\left| \frac{1}{r^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r) \right) \right| > 0.$$

Moreover, for any $r > 0$, if $|p|_\infty := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |p_i| \rightarrow +\infty$, then

$$\left| \frac{1}{r^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r) \right) \right| \rightarrow \frac{1}{r^2} > 0,$$

hence there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{0 \neq p \in \mathbb{Z}^m} \left| \frac{1}{r^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r) \right) \right| = \min_{\substack{0 \neq p \in \mathbb{Z}^m \\ |p|_\infty < R}} \left| \frac{1}{r^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r) \right) \right| > 0.$$

If (18) were to fail, due to the previous line, there would exist sequences $(r_n) \subset (0, +\infty)$ and $(p^{(n)}) \subset \mathbb{Z}^m \setminus \{0\}$ such that $r_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\lim_n \left| \frac{1}{r_n^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i^{(n)} r_n) \right) \right| = 0. \quad (19)$$

We have two cases.

- There exists $\alpha > 0$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\liminf_n p_j^{(n)} r_n > \alpha$.
- For any $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, one has $\liminf_n p_j^{(n)} r_n = 0$.

If the first one were true, then we would have

$$\liminf_n \left| 1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i^{(n)} r) \right| > |1 - \alpha|,$$

and so (19) couldn't hold. On the contrary, if the second case were true, up to extracting a subsequence we would have $p_j^{(n)} r_n \rightarrow 0$ for any $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. For any $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, set

$$G(y) := 1 - \prod_{j=1}^m \operatorname{sinc}(y_j).$$

Then G is smooth on \mathbb{R}^m and satisfies

$$G(y) = \frac{1}{2}|y|^2 + o(|y|^3), \quad |y| \rightarrow 0.$$

As a consequence, for $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $|y|$ is small enough,

$$|G(y)| \geq \frac{1}{4}|y|^2.$$

Then, for large enough n ,

$$\left| 1 - \prod_{i \in I(p^{(n)})} \operatorname{sinc}(p_i^{(n)} r_n) \right| = G(r_n p^{(n)}) \geq \frac{1}{4} |r_n p^{(n)}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} r_n^2,$$

because $p^{(n)} \neq 0$ implies that there exists at least one i such that $|p_i^{(n)}| \geq 1$. Thus we obtain

$$\lim_n \left| \frac{1}{r_n^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \operatorname{sinc}(\pi p_i^{(n)} r_n) \right) \right| \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

in contradiction with (19). This concludes the proof. \square

4.2. Torus. Consider the torus

$$\mathbb{T}^m := \mathbb{R}^m / (-1 + 2\mathbb{Z})^m$$

with its natural quotient map $\pi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m$. Let π^{-1} be the inverse of the bijective map

$$\pi : [-1, 1)^m \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^m.$$

Let d_∞ be the distance in \mathbb{R}^m associated with the infinity norm, given by

$$d_\infty(x, y) := \max\{|x_i - y_i| : i \in \{1, \dots, m\}\}$$

for any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ in \mathbb{R}^m . With respect to this distance, the open ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is

$$Q_r(x) := \prod_{i=1}^m (-r + x_i, x_i + r). \quad (20)$$

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^m$, set

$$\tilde{d}_\infty(x, y) = \inf_{z \in \pi^{-1}(x), w \in \pi^{-1}(y)} d_\infty(z, w).$$

Then \tilde{d}_∞ defines a distance on \mathbb{T}^m , and we denote by $\tilde{Q}_r(x)$ the open ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at $x \in \mathbb{T}^m$ with respect to this distance. We also introduce the probability measure

$$\mathbb{L}^m := \pi_\# \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}^m}{2^m} \right)$$

on \mathbb{T}^m . Note that this is also the normalized Haar measure of \mathbb{T}^m seen as a Lie group.

It is obvious that the metric measure space $\mathfrak{X}^m := (\mathbb{T}^m, \tilde{d}_\infty, \mathbb{L}^m)$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1, hence we know that for any small enough r ,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{1,r} = \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) > 0.$$

Then the following holds.

Proposition 4.2.

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) > 0.$$

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{T}^m$ and $r > 0$ small enough, the ball $\tilde{Q}_r(x) \subset \mathbb{T}^m$ is given by

$$\tilde{Q}_r(x) = \pi(Q_r(\tilde{x}))$$

where \tilde{x} is any element in $\pi^{-1}(x)$, and $Q_r(\tilde{x})$ is as in (20). Then

$$\mathbb{L}^m(\tilde{Q}_r(x)) = \frac{\mathcal{L}^m(Q_r(\tilde{x}))}{2^m} = r^m \quad (21)$$

so that the r -energy functional of \mathfrak{T}^m writes as

$$\tilde{E}_{r, \mathfrak{T}^m}(f) = \frac{1}{r^m} \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} \int_{\tilde{Q}_r(x)} \left(\frac{f(x) - f(y)}{r} \right)^2 d\mathbb{L}^m(y) d\mathbb{L}^m(x) \quad (22)$$

for any $f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)$.

We act by contradiction. Assume that there exist $r_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\{f_n\} \subset L^2(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{T}^m} f_n d\mathbb{L}^m = 0$ and $\|f_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^m)} = 1$, such that

$$-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_n = \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n}) f_n, \quad \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (23)$$

With no loss of generality, we assume that each r_n is small enough to ensure that $\tilde{E}_{r_n, \mathfrak{T}^m}$ writes as in (22).

From (21) we can write, for any n and \mathbb{L}^m -a.e. $x \in \mathbb{T}^m$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_n(x) &= \frac{1}{r_n^2} \left(f_n(x) - \frac{1}{r_n^m} \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} 1_{\tilde{Q}_{r_n}(x)}(y) f_n(y) d\mathbb{L}^m(y) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_n^2} \left(f_n(x) - \frac{1}{r_n^m} \left(1_{\tilde{Q}_{r_n}(0)} * f_n \right)(x) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

We consider the Fourier decomposition of f_n , $1_{\tilde{Q}_{r_n}(0)}$, and $-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_n$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &= \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^m} a_{p,n} e_p \\ 1_{\tilde{Q}_{r_n}(0)} &= \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^m} b_{p,n} e_p \\ -\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_n &= \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^m} c_{p,n} e_p \end{aligned}$$

where $\{e_p\}_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^m}$ is the orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)$ given by

$$e_p : \mathbb{T}^m \ni x \mapsto e^{i\pi p \cdot \pi^{-1}(x)} \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{Z}^m.$$

Since the Fourier coefficients of a convolution are the product of the coefficients, we obtain from (24) that

$$c_{p,n} = \frac{1}{r_n^2} \left(a_{p,n} - \frac{b_{p,n}}{r_n^m} a_{p,n} \right) = \frac{a_{p,n}}{r_n^2} \left(1 - \frac{b_{p,n}}{r_n^m} \right).$$

We can compute each coefficient $b_{p,n}$ by means of Fubini's Theorem; we obtain

$$b_{p,n} = \int_{Q_{r_n}(0)} e^{i\pi p \cdot x} \frac{d\mathcal{L}^m(x)}{2^m} = r_n^m \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r_n).$$

Thus

$$c_{p,n} = \frac{a_{p,n}}{r_n^2} \left(1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r_n) \right).$$

Using Lemma 4.1, for $p \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ we conclude that there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{r_n^2} \left| 1 - \prod_{i \in J(p)} \text{sinc}(p_i r_n) \right| \geq \alpha.$$

This implies that

$$|c_{p,n}|^2 \geq |a_{p,n}|^2 \alpha^2.$$

By Parseval's identity, and since $f_n \in \Pi(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)$ we have $a_{0,n} = 0$,

$$\| -\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_n \|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^m)} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^m} |c_{p,n}|^2 \geq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^m \setminus \{0\}} |a_{p,n}|^2 \alpha^2 = \alpha^2 \|f_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^m)}^2,$$

in contradiction with $\| -\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_n \|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^m)} \rightarrow 0$ provided by (23). \square

4.3. Growing hypercubes. For any $b > 0$, consider the metric measure space $\Omega^m(b) := ([0, b]^m, d_\infty, \mathcal{L}^m)$. It trivially satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1, so that for any small enough r ,

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{1,r} = \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r,\Omega^m(b)}) > 0. \quad (25)$$

Then the following holds.

Lemma 4.3.

$$\liminf_{b \rightarrow 0} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r,\Omega^m(b)}) = +\infty. \quad (26)$$

Proof. We suppose by contradiction that (26) fails. Then there exist $b_n \rightarrow 0$ and $r_n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\lim_n \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n,\Omega^m(b_n)}) < +\infty.$$

Since we are first taking the limit in r and then in b , we can assume that $\bar{r}_n := \frac{r_n}{b_n} \rightarrow 0$. For any n , by a simple scaling argument we have

$$\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n,\Omega^m(b_n)}) = \frac{1}{\bar{r}_n^2} \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\bar{r}_n,\Omega^m(1)})$$

thus

$$\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\bar{r}_n,\Omega^m(1)}) \rightarrow 0.$$

From (25), assuming that each r_n is small enough, we know that there exists $f_n \in \Pi([0, 1]^m, \mathcal{L}^m)$ such that $\|f_n\|_{L^2([0,1]^m, \mathcal{L}^m)} = 1$ and

$$\tilde{E}_{\bar{r}_n,\Omega^m(1)}(f_n) = \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\bar{r}_n,\Omega^m(1)}).$$

Consider the continuous function

$$\begin{aligned} T &: \mathbb{T}^m &\rightarrow & [0, 1]^m \\ &x &\mapsto & (|\bar{x}_1|, \dots, |\bar{x}_m|) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{x} = \pi^{-1}(x) \in [-1, 1]^m$. For any n , set

$$\tilde{f}_n = f_n \circ T \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m).$$

From this we have that $f_n \in \Pi(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)$. Let us prove that

$$\|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)} = 1.$$

Let C_1, \dots, C_{2^m} denote the 2^m sets of the form $I_1 \times \dots \times I_m$ where each I_i is either $[-1, 0]$ or $[0, 1]$. For any $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^m\}$, set

$$\begin{aligned} N_j &: [0, 1]^m &\rightarrow & C_j \\ &(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) &\mapsto & (\varepsilon_i \xi_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m \xi_m) \end{aligned}$$

where ε_i is 1 if $I_i = [0, 1]$ and -1 otherwise. Note that N_j is an isometry which preserves the Lebesgue measure, and that $T \circ \pi \circ N_j$ is equal to the identity. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} (f_n \circ T)^2 d\mathbb{L}^m = \frac{1}{2^m} \int_{[-1, 1]^m} (f_n \circ T \circ \pi)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{C_j} (f_n \circ T \circ \pi)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{[0, 1]^m} (f_n \circ T \circ \pi \circ N_j)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m \\ &= \|f_n\|_{L^2([0, 1]^m, \mathcal{L}^m)}^2 = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$4\tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \tilde{\mathfrak{x}}^m}(\tilde{f}_n) \leq 2^m \tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1)}(f_n). \quad (27)$$

Since $\tilde{f}_n \in \Pi(\mathbb{T}^m, \mathbb{L}^m)$, the latter provides a contradiction with Proposition 4.2, namely

$$0 < \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \tilde{\mathfrak{x}}^m}) \leq 2^m \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1)}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Given $x \in \mathbb{T}^m$, define

$$\tilde{G}_n(x) := \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_n^m} \int_{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{r}_n}(x)} \left(\frac{\tilde{f}_n(x) - \tilde{f}_n(y)}{\tilde{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathbb{L}^m(y).$$

For any $x \in [0, 1]^m$, set

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(x) &:= \int_{\tilde{Q}_{\tilde{r}_n}(x)} \left(\frac{1}{V(x, \tilde{r}_n)} + \frac{1}{V(y, \tilde{r}_n)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(x) - f_n(y)}{\tilde{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$V(z, r) := \mathcal{L}^m(Q_r(z) \cap [0, 1]^m)$$

for any $z \in [0, 1]^m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 4\tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \tilde{\mathfrak{x}}^m}(\tilde{f}_n) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} \tilde{G}_n(x) d\mathbb{L}^m(x) \\ 4\tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1)}(f_n) &= \int_{[0, 1]^m} G_n(x) d\mathcal{L}^m(x). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for all $x \in \mathbb{T}^m$,

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{r}_n^m} \leq \frac{2^m}{\mathcal{L}^m(Q_{\tilde{r}_n}(T(x)) \cap [0, 1]^m)} = \frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \tilde{r}_n)}. \quad (28)$$

For any $x \in \mathbb{T}^m$, there exists some $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^m\}$ and $\bar{x} \in C_k$ such that $\pi(\bar{x}) = x$. We will now consider for each $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^m\}$ the rectangle given by

$$R_{n,j}(x) := T(\pi(C_j) \cap \tilde{Q}_{\tilde{r}_n}(x)) \subset [0, 1]^m.$$

and we point out that

$$R_{n,j}(x) \subset R_{n,k}(x) = [0, 1]^m \cap Q_{\tilde{r}_n}(T(x)) \quad (29)$$

for any $j \in \{1, \dots, 2^m\}$. This follows since for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ we have 4 possibilities

- (1) $|\bar{x}_i| < \tilde{r}_n$
- (2) $|1 - \bar{x}_i| < \tilde{r}_n$
- (3) $|-1 - \bar{x}_i| < \tilde{r}_n$
- (4) $\neg((1) \vee (2) \vee (3))$.

If $\pi_i : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the projection in the i -th coordinate, we conclude

$$\pi_i(R_{n,k}(x)) = \begin{cases} [0, \bar{r}_n + |\bar{x}_i|] & \text{if (1)} \\ [-\bar{r}_n + |\bar{x}_i|, 1] & \text{if (2)} \\ [-\bar{r}_n + |\bar{x}_i|, 1] & \text{if (3)} \\ [-\bar{r}_n, \bar{r}_n] & \text{if (4)} \end{cases}$$

$$\pi_l(R_{n,k}(x)) = \begin{cases} \pi_i(R_{n,l}(x)) = \pi_i(R_{n,k}(x)) & \text{if } \pi_i(C_j) = \pi_i(C_k) \\ [0, \bar{r}_n - |\bar{x}_i|] & \text{if (1) and } \neg(\pi_i(C_j) = \pi_i(C_k)) \\ [2 - \bar{r}_n - |\bar{x}_i|, 1] & \text{if (2) and } \neg(\pi_i(C_j) = \pi_i(C_k)) \\ [2 - \bar{r}_n - |\bar{x}_i|, 1] & \text{if (3) and } \neg(\pi_i(C_j) = \pi_i(C_k)) \\ \emptyset & \text{if (4) and } \neg(\pi_i(C_j) = \pi_i(C_k)). \end{cases}$$

Thus we conclude that for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $l \in \{1, \dots, 2^m\}$ we have $\pi_i(R_{n,l}(x)) \subset \pi_i(R_{n,k}(x))$, and since these sets are rectangles, we conclude equation (29).

From (28) we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_n(x) &= \frac{1}{\bar{r}_n^m} \int_{\tilde{Q}_{\bar{r}_n}(x)} \left(\frac{\tilde{f}_n(x) - \tilde{f}_n(y)}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathbb{L}^m(y) \\ &\leq \int_{\tilde{Q}_{\bar{r}_n}(x)} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(T(y), \bar{r}_n)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(T(y))}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathbb{L}^m(y) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{\tilde{Q}_{\bar{r}_n}(x) \cap \pi(C_j)} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(T(y), \bar{r}_n)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(T(y))}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathbb{L}^m(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{\pi^{-1}(\tilde{Q}_{\bar{r}_n}(x)) \cap C_j} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(T(\pi(y)), \bar{r}_n)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(T(\pi(y)))}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \end{aligned}$$

For each integral, change coordinates by N_j to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_n(x) &\leq \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{N_j^{-1}(\pi^{-1}(\tilde{Q}_{\bar{r}_n}(x)) \cap C_j)} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(T(\pi(N_j(y))), \bar{r}_n)} \right) \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(T(\pi(N_j(y))))}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(y). \end{aligned}$$

We have that

$$N_j^{-1}(\pi^{-1}(\tilde{Q}_{\bar{r}_n}(x)) \cap C_j) = R_{n,j}(x),$$

so by equation (29) and the fact that $T \circ \pi \circ N_j = id$, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{G}_n(x) &\leq \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{R_{n,j}(x)} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(T(y), \bar{r}_n)} \right) \times \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(y)}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{R_{n,k}(x)} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(y, \bar{r}_n)} \right) \times \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(y)}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \\
&= \int_{[0,1]^m \cap Q_{\bar{r}_n}(T(x))} \left(\frac{2^m}{V(T(x), \bar{r}_n)} + \frac{2^m}{V(y, \bar{r}_n)} \right) \times \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{f_n(T(x)) - f_n(y)}{\bar{r}_n} \right)^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \\
&= 2^m G_n(T(x)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we integrate both sides in \mathbb{T}^m and change variables by π and N_j to conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
4\tilde{E}_{\bar{r}_n, \bar{\alpha}^m}(\tilde{f}_n) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} \tilde{G}_n(x) d\mathbb{L}^m(x) \leq 2^m \int_{\mathbb{T}^m} G_n(T(x)) d\mathbb{L}^m(x) \\
&= \int_{[-1,1]^m} G_n(T(\pi(x))) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{C_j} G_n(T(\pi(x))) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{[0,1]^m} G_n(T(\pi(N_j(x)))) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{2^m} \int_{[0,1]^m} G_n(x) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\
&= 2^m 4\tilde{E}_{\bar{r}_n, [0,1]^m}(f_n) = 2^m 4\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\bar{r}_n, \Omega^m(1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

With this we obtain (27). \square

5. L^2 CONVERGENCE

In this section, we prove Theorem 2. Let M be a smooth, compact, connected manifold of dimension $m \geq 2$. Assume that M is endowed with a smooth Riemannian metric g and let d_g and vol_g be the associated Riemannian distance and volume measure on M .

In this smooth context, the function $V(\cdot, r)$ is obviously continuous for any $r > 0$. Since M is compact, this implies that the metric measure space (M, d_g, vol_g) satisfies (A_r) and (A_r^*) . Then Lemma 3.2 applies and ensures that $\tilde{\Delta}_r$ is a bounded self-adjoint operator acting on $L^2(M, \text{vol}_g)$. The compactness of M also ensures that (M, d_g, vol_g) is locally Ahlfors regular: there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that for any $x \in M$ and $r \in (0, \text{diam}(M)]$,

$$C^{-1}r^m \leq V(x, r) \leq Cr^m. \quad (30)$$

5.1. Convergence in the sense of distributions. Recall that C_m is defined in (2). For any $x \in M \setminus \partial M$, we let \exp_x be the exponential map centered at x . We identify $T_x M$ with \mathbb{R}^m and write $\mathbb{B}_r^m(v)$ for the Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^m centered at v with radius $r > 0$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the restriction of \exp_x to $\mathbb{B}_\delta^m(0)$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image; recall that the injectivity radius $i_M(x)$ of M at x is the supremum of the set of such numbers δ . We let J_x be the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the measure $(\exp_x^{-1})_\# \text{vol}_g$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure \mathcal{L}^m . It is well-known that for any $\xi \in \mathbb{B}_{i_M}^m(0)$,

$$J_x(\xi) = 1 + \underline{Q}_K(|\xi|^2)$$

where for any $h > 0$, the notation $\underline{Q}_K(h)$ stands for a quantity independent on $x \in K$ whose absolute value divided by h is bounded. Here K is a compact subset of M . We write \underline{Q} instead of \underline{Q}_M . Then the following holds.

Proposition 5.1. Consider $f, \psi \in C^2(M)$. Then

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r f, \psi \rangle_2 = C_m \int_M \langle df, d\psi \rangle_g \, \text{dvol}_g. \quad (31)$$

Proof. For any $x \in M$ and $r > 0$, set

$$\tilde{e}_r(f, \psi; x) := \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_r(x)} \left(1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)} \right) \frac{(f(x) - f(y))(\psi(x) - \psi(y))}{r^2} \, \text{dvol}_g(y)$$

so that

$$\langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r f, \psi \rangle_2 = \int_M \tilde{e}_r(f, \psi; y) \, \text{dvol}_g(y).$$

On one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{e}_r(f, \psi; x)| &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_r(x)} \left(1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)} \right) \frac{|f(x) - f(y)| |\psi(x) - \psi(y)|}{r^2} \, \text{dvol}_g(y) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \int_{B_r(x)} \left(1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)} \right) \frac{\text{Lip}(f) \text{Lip}(\psi) d_g^2(x, y)}{r^2} \, \text{dvol}_g(y) \\ &\leq \frac{\text{Lip}(f) \text{Lip}(\psi)}{4} \int_{B_r(x)} \left(1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)} \right) \, \text{dvol}_g(y). \end{aligned}$$

By (30), we obtain

$$|\tilde{e}_r(f, \psi; x)| \leq \frac{\text{Lip}(f) \text{Lip}(\psi)(1 + C^2)}{4}. \quad (32)$$

On the other hand, assume that r is smaller than $i_M(x)$, and consider $\tilde{f} := f \circ \exp_x$ and $\tilde{\psi} := \psi \circ \exp_x$ on $\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)$. The first-order Taylor expansion of \tilde{f} and $\tilde{\psi}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(\xi) &= \tilde{f}(0) + (d\tilde{f})_0(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(|\xi|^2) \\ \tilde{\psi}(\xi) &= \tilde{\psi}(0) + (d\tilde{\psi})_0(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(|\xi|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_r(x)} (f(x) - f(y))(\psi(x) - \psi(y)) \, d\text{vol}_g(y) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} (\tilde{f}(0) - \tilde{f}(\xi))(\tilde{\psi}(0) - \tilde{\psi}(\xi))J(\xi) \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} ((d\tilde{f})_0(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(r^2))((d\tilde{\psi})_0(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(r^2))(1 + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}) \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^m [(d\tilde{f})_0]_i [(d\tilde{\psi})_0]_j \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} \xi_j \xi_i \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(r^{m+3}) \\
&= (d\tilde{f})_0 \cdot (d\tilde{\psi})_0 \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} \xi_1^2 \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(r^{m+3}).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it is known that (see e.g. [MT23, Remark 2.11])

$$1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)} = 2 + \underline{Q}_{\{x\}}(r^2)$$

and since $V(x, r)/\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)) \rightarrow 1$ as $r \downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_r(x)} \left(1 + \frac{V(x, r)}{V(y, r)}\right) (f(x) - f(y))(\psi(x) - \psi(y)) \, d\text{vol}_g(y) \\
&= \frac{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0))(2 + \underline{Q}_{\{x\}}(r^2))}{V(x, r)} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} (\tilde{f}(0) - \tilde{f}(\xi))(\tilde{\psi}(0) - \tilde{\psi}(\xi))J(\xi) \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) \\
&= (2 + \underline{Q}_{\{x\}}(r^2)) \left((d\tilde{f})_0 \cdot (d\tilde{\psi})_0 \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} \xi_1^2 \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) + \underline{Q}_{\{0\}}(r^3) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(d\tilde{f})_0 \cdot (d\tilde{\psi})_0 = \langle df, d\psi \rangle_g(x)$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} \xi_1^2 \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) = 2r^2 C_m$$

by change of variable $\xi \leftrightarrow \eta/r^2$, we eventually obtain that

$$\tilde{e}_r(f, \psi; x) = C_m \langle df, d\psi \rangle_g(x) + \underline{Q}_{\{x\}}(r) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

By (32) and the compactness of M , we can apply the dominated convergence theorem to the functions $\tilde{e}_r(f, \psi; \cdot)$. Then we get (31). \square

Using integration by parts in (31), we immediately obtain the following.

Corollary 5.2. Let ∂g be the Riemannian metric induced by g on ∂M . For any $f \in C^\infty(M)$, the following convergence holds in the sense of distributions as $r \downarrow 0$:

$$(\tilde{\Delta}_r f) \, \text{vol}_g \rightarrow C_m \left((\Delta_g f) \, \text{vol}_g + (\partial_\nu^g f) \, \text{vol}_{\partial g} \right).$$

5.2. Pointwise convergence. We aim to prove Theorem 2 in a similar way as Proposition 5.1, that is to say, by means of the dominated convergence theorem. To this aim, we first establish that pointwise convergence holds vol_g -a.e. on M . We recall that ∂M is a vol_g -negligible subset of M .

Proposition 5.3. Let $f \in C^\infty(M)$. Then for any $x \in M - \partial M$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\Delta}_r f(x) = C_m \Delta_g f(x).$$

Moreover, the convergence is uniform on any compact subset of $M - \partial M$.

Proof. Let K be a compact subset of $M - \partial M$. Consider $x \in K$ and $r \in (0, i_M(x))$. Set $\tilde{f}_x := f \circ \exp_x$. Acting like in the proof of Proposition 5.1, we get

$$\tilde{\Delta}_r f(x) = \frac{(2 + \underline{Q}_K(r^2))}{2r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} (\tilde{f}_x(\xi) - \tilde{f}_x(0)) d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi).$$

The second-order Taylor expansion of \tilde{f}_x yields

$$\tilde{f}_x(\xi) = \tilde{f}_x(0) + (d\tilde{f}_x)_0(\xi) + \frac{1}{2}(d^{(2)}\tilde{f}_x)_0(\xi, \xi) + \underline{Q}_K(|\xi|^3)$$

hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} \tilde{f}_x(\xi) - \tilde{f}_x(0) d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} (d\tilde{f}_x)_0(\xi) d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} (d^{(2)}\tilde{f}_x)_0(\xi, \xi) d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) + \underline{Q}_K(r^3). \end{aligned}$$

The first term vanishes by symmetry. The second term is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2} \Delta \tilde{f}_x(0) \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0)} \xi_1^2 d\mathcal{L}^m(\xi) = \Delta_g f(x) r^2 C_m.$$

In the end we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta}_r f(x) &= \frac{2 + \underline{Q}_K(r^2)}{2r^2} (\Delta_g f(x) r^2 C_m + \underline{Q}_K(r^3)) \\ &= (1 + \underline{Q}_K(r^2)) (C_m \Delta_g f(x) + \underline{Q}_K(r)) \end{aligned}$$

from which follows the desired result, by letting $r \downarrow 0$. \square

5.3. Uniform bound. We wish now to provide a uniform L^∞ bound for the functions $-\tilde{\Delta}_r \psi$ where r is in a neighborhood of zero. This is easy to do when $\partial M = 0$, but much more difficult when $\partial M \neq 0$.

Proposition 5.4. Assume that $\partial M \neq 0$. Consider $f \in C_v^\infty(M)$. Then there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{0 < r < r_0} \|\tilde{\Delta}_r f\|_{L^\infty(M)} < +\infty.$$

Proof. Since ∂M is compact, we can find a finite collection of smooth parameterizations $\psi_i : (-4, 4)^{m-1} \rightarrow \partial M$ such that

$$\partial M = \bigcup_i \psi_i \left([-1, 1]^{m-1} \right). \quad (33)$$

Step 1. We work with any of the previous ψ_i which we denote by ψ . For any $x \in \partial M$, let $\nu_x \in T_x M$ be the unit inner normal vector of ∂M at x . Since ∂M is smooth, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that the map $E : \partial M \times [0, \epsilon] \rightarrow M$ given by

$$E(x, t) = \exp_x^M(t\nu_x)$$

is an embedding, and there exists a smooth family of metrics $\{g_t\}_{t \in [0, \epsilon]}$ on ∂M such that for any $(x, t) \in \partial M \times [0, \epsilon]$,

$$(E^*g)_{(x,t)} = (g_t \oplus d\tau^2)_{(x,t)}. \quad (34)$$

Pulling back each metric g_t by ψ we have, for any $\xi \in (-4, 4)^{m-1}$ and $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$,

$$(\psi^*g_t)_\xi(v, w) = v^T \cdot A_{(\xi,t)} \cdot w, \quad (35)$$

for some positive definite, symmetric $(m-1)$ -square matrix $A_{(\xi,t)}$. From the non-degeneracy of the metric and a Lipschitz bound, we have that there exist $C, \tilde{c} > 0$ such that for all $t, s \in [0, \epsilon]$, $\xi \in [-3, 3]^{m-1}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we have

$$[(\psi^*g_t) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi,t)}(v, v) \geq \tilde{c}|v|^2, \quad (36)$$

$$\left| [(\psi^* g_t) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}(v, v) - [(\psi^* g_s) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}(v, v) \right| \leq C|v|^2|t - s|. \quad (37)$$

Claim 1. There exists $K > 0$ such that for any $t, s \in [0, \epsilon]$, $\xi \in [-3, 3]^{m-1}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$|O(\xi, t, s, v)| \leq K|v| \cdot |t - s|, \quad (38)$$

where

$$O(\xi, t, s, v) = [(\psi^* g_t) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v, v) - [(\psi^* g_s) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v, v). \quad (39)$$

Proof. Consider $\tilde{c} > 0$ given by (36). We know that there exists $M > 0$ such that the map $\sqrt{\cdot} : [\tilde{c}, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is M -Lipschitz. By homogeneity in $|v|$ of (38), we can assume that $|v| = 1$. Then the Lipschitz condition and (37) yield

$$\begin{aligned} |O(\xi, t, s, v)| &= \left| [(\psi^* g_t) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v, v) - [(\psi^* g_s) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(v, v) \right| \\ &\leq M \left| [(\psi^* g_t) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}(v, v) - [(\psi^* g_s) \oplus d\tau^2]_{(\xi, t)}(v, v) \right| \\ &\leq MC|v|^2|t - s| = MC|t - s|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Step 2. Let $T(\epsilon) := E(\partial M \times [0, \epsilon])$ be the ϵ tubular neighborhood of the boundary. Then E is a diffeomorphism between $\partial M \times [0, \epsilon]$ and $T(\epsilon)$. For fixed $s \in [0, \epsilon]$, consider the product metric $g_s \oplus d\tau^2$ in $\partial M \times [0, \epsilon]$ and define the metric in $T(\epsilon)$

$$\eta_s := (E^{-1})^*(g_s \oplus d\tau^2).$$

Let d_s be the distance induced from this metric. Consider the map $\Phi : (-4, 4)^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon] \rightarrow M$ given by

$$\Phi(\xi, t) = E(\psi(\xi), t) \quad (40)$$

and note that (34) implies that for any $(\xi, t) \in (-4, 4)^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$,

$$(\Phi^* g)_{(\xi, t)} = (\psi^* g_t \oplus d\tau^2)_{(\xi, t)}. \quad (41)$$

Set $\mathbb{H}^m := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m : v_m \geq 0\}$. Let $L(\tilde{\gamma})$ be the Euclidean length of a curve $\tilde{\gamma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$.

Claim 2. Let $\tilde{c} > 0$ be given by (36). For any $r > 0$ and $s \in [0, \epsilon]$, if a couple $(\xi, t) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$ is such that $\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m \subset [-3, 3]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$, then the following holds for any $y \in M$.

- (1) If $d(\Phi(\xi, t), y) < r$, then the image of any d -minimizing geodesic $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is contained in $\Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$ and $\tilde{\gamma} = \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma$ satisfies $L(\tilde{\gamma}) < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$.
- (2) If $d_s(\Phi(\xi, t), y) < r$, then the image of any d_s -minimizing geodesic $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is contained in $\Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$ and $\tilde{\gamma} = \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma$ satisfies $L(\tilde{\gamma}) < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$.

Proof. We prove the first result only since the proof of the second one follows from similar lines. Consider a d -minimizing geodesic $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ from $\Phi(\xi, t)$ to y . Set

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &:= \sup \left\{ t \in [0, 1] : \gamma(s) \in \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m) \text{ for any } s \in [0, t] \right\}, \\ \tilde{\gamma} &:= \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma|_{[0, \delta]}, \end{aligned}$$

and observe that $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$ if and only if $\delta = 1$. We claim that

$$L(\tilde{\gamma}) \leq \frac{d_g(\Phi(\xi, t), y)}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}. \quad (42)$$

Indeed, setting $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}_m) := \tilde{\gamma}$ where $\tilde{\alpha} : [0, \delta] \rightarrow [-3, 3]^{m-1}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_m : [0, \delta] \rightarrow [0, \epsilon]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\Phi(\xi, t), y) &= \int_0^1 g_{\tilde{\gamma}(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) dw \\
&\geq \int_0^\delta g_{\tilde{\gamma}(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) dw \\
&= \int_0^\delta (\Phi^* g)_{\tilde{\gamma}(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)) dw \\
&= \int_0^\delta (\psi^* g_{\tilde{\gamma}_m(w)} \oplus d\tau^2)_{\tilde{\gamma}(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)) dw && \text{by (41)} \\
&\geq \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\tilde{c}} |\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)| dw && \text{by (36)} \\
&= \sqrt{\tilde{c}} L(\tilde{\gamma}).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we claim that:

$$\delta < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_g(\Phi(\xi, t), y) \geq r. \quad (43)$$

Indeed, if $\delta < 1$, since $\tilde{\gamma}(0) = (\xi, t)$ and $\tilde{\gamma}(\delta) \in \partial \mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m$, then

$$L(\tilde{\gamma}) \geq \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$$

and we get $d_g(\Phi(\xi, t), y) \geq r$ from (42). Therefore, if $d_g(\Phi(\xi, t), y) < r$, then (43) implies that $\delta = 1$ which means $\gamma([0, 1])$ is included in $\Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$, and (42) yields $L(\tilde{\gamma}) < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$ as desired. \square

Claim 3. There exists $K > 0$ such that for all $(\xi, t), (\eta, s) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$ and $r > 0$ such that $\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m \subset [-3, 3]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$:

$$d(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) < r \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_t(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) < r + Kr^2, \quad (44)$$

$$d(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) \geq r \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_t(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) \geq r - Kr^2. \quad (45)$$

Proof. Suppose that $d(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) < r$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a \mathbf{d} -minimizing geodesic between $\Phi(\xi, t)$ and $\Phi(\eta, s)$. Then by Claim 2, we have that $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$, and by defining $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}_m) = \tilde{\gamma} := \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma$, we have that $L(\tilde{\gamma}) < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$.

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) &= \int_0^1 g_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&= \int_0^1 g_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw - \int_0^1 (\eta_t)_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 (\eta_t)_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&= \int_0^1 (\psi^* g_{\tilde{\gamma}_m(w)} \oplus d\tau^2)_{(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w))}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)) \, dw \\
&\quad - \int_0^1 (\psi^* g_t \oplus d\tau^2)_{(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w))}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)) \, dw \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 (\eta_t)_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&= \int_0^1 O(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w), t, \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&\quad + \int_0^1 (\eta_t)_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw, \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use (39) to get the last equality. By Claim 1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_0^1 O(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w), t, \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \right| &\leq \int_0^1 |O(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w), t, \dot{\gamma}(w))| \, dw \\
&\leq \int_0^1 K |\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)| |t - \tilde{\gamma}_m(w)| \, dw.
\end{aligned}$$

By Claim 2, we have that $|t - \tilde{\gamma}_m(s)| < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$ and $L(\tilde{\gamma}) < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$, hence we get

$$\left| \int_0^1 O(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w), t, \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \right| \leq K \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}} \int_0^1 |\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)| \, dw < K \frac{r^2}{\tilde{c}}. \tag{47}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}_t(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) &\leq \int_0^1 (\eta_t)_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&\leq \mathbf{d}(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) + \left| \int_0^1 O(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w), t, \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \right| \\
&\leq \mathbf{d}(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) + K \frac{r^2}{\tilde{c}} \\
&< r + K \frac{r^2}{\tilde{c}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where we use (46) to get the second inequality and (47) to get the third one. This proves (44).

To prove (45), we may assume $\mathbf{d}(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) \geq r$ and $\mathbf{d}_t(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) < r$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a geodesic in the metric $g_t \oplus d\tau^2$. By Claim 2, we have $\gamma([0, 1]) \subset \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{\frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}^m}(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$ with $(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}_m) = \tilde{\gamma} = \Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma$ satisfying $L(\tilde{\gamma}) < \frac{r}{\sqrt{\tilde{c}}}$.

The same estimates as before are satisfied, hence we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
r &< \mathbf{d}(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) \leq \int_0^1 g_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \\
&\leq \int_0^1 (\eta_t)_{\gamma(w)}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\dot{\gamma}(w), \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw + \left| \int_0^1 O(\tilde{\alpha}(w), \tilde{\gamma}_m(w), t, \dot{\gamma}(w)) \, dw \right| \\
&\leq d_t(\Phi(\xi, t), \Phi(\eta, s)) + \frac{K}{\tilde{c}} r^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We omit the proof of the next elementary claim.

Claim 4. Let $(x, t), (y, \tau) \in \partial M \times [0, \epsilon]$ and $s \in [0, \epsilon]$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \partial M$ be the geodesic between x and y in the metric g_s . Then the curve

$$w \in [0, 1] \mapsto (\gamma(w), (1-w)t + w\tau)$$

is a geodesic in the metric $g_s \oplus d\tau^2$.

Step 3. For every $t \in [0, \epsilon]$, consider the exponential map \exp^{g_t} given by the metric g_t . Since g_t varies smoothly with respect to t , and $\partial M \times [0, \epsilon]$ is compact, we know that there exists $\delta > 0$ lower than the injectivity radius of each \exp^{g_t} . For any (ξ, t, ζ, s) in

$$D_\delta := [-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon] \times \mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \times [0, \epsilon]$$

define

$$\Psi(\xi, t, \zeta, s) := E(\exp_{\psi(\xi)}^{g_t}((d\psi)_\xi A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta), s).$$

We may write

$$\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s) = \Psi(\xi, t, \zeta, s)$$

to see Ψ as a function of the two last variables only, the two first being frozen. Observe that for any (ξ, t, ζ) in $[-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon] \times \mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(gt)_{\psi(\xi)}^{\frac{1}{2}}((d\psi)_\xi A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta, (d\psi)_\xi A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta) &= (\psi^* g_t)_\xi^{\frac{1}{2}}(A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta, A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta) \\
&= \left| \zeta^T A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} A_{(\xi, t)} A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{by (35)} \\
&= |\zeta| < \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Since δ is lower than the injectivity radius of the exponentials, the map

$$\zeta \in \mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \mapsto \exp_{\psi(\xi)}^{g_t}((d\psi)_\xi A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \zeta)$$

is injective. Thus for every $(\xi, t) \in [-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$ the map $\Psi_{(\xi, t)}$ defined on $\mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \times [0, \epsilon]$ is a local parametrization of M . Moreover,

$$\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t) = E(\psi(\xi), t) = \Phi(\xi, t), \quad (48)$$

and

$$\det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi, t)}^* g \right]_{(0, t)} \right) = 1.$$

Claim 5. Consider $(\xi, t) \in [-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$, and $(\zeta, s) \in \mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \times [0, \epsilon]$. Then

$$d_t(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s), \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t)) = \sqrt{|\zeta|^2 + (t-s)^2}.$$

Proof. By Claim 4, we know that the geodesic between $E^{-1}(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t))$ and $E^{-1}(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s))$ in the metric $g_s \oplus d\tau^2$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma : w \in [0, 1] &\mapsto (\exp_{\psi(\xi)}^{g_t}((d\psi)_\xi A_{(\xi, t)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} w\zeta), (1-w)t + ws) \\
&=: (\tilde{\gamma}(w), \gamma_m(w)).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we also know that, for any $w \in [0, 1]$,

$$(g_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\tilde{\gamma}(w)}(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)) = |\zeta|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} d_t(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\zeta, s), \Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t)) &= \int_0^1 \sqrt{(g_t)^2_{\tilde{\gamma}(w)}(\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w), \dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(w)) + (s-t)^2} dw \\ &= \sqrt{|\zeta|^2 + (s-t)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 6. There exist $r_0, \kappa > 0$ such that for all $(\xi, t) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$ and $r \in (0, r_0)$ such that $\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t) \subset [-3, 3]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon]$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^m \left(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, t) \triangle \left(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}^{-1} (B_r(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t))) \right) \right) \leq \kappa r^{m+1}.$$

Proof. For any $(\xi, t) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$, there exists $r_0(\xi, t) > 0$ small enough such that

$$B_{r_0}(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t)) = B_{r_0}(\Phi(\xi, t)) \subset \Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \times [0, \epsilon]). \quad (49)$$

By compactness of $[-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$ and continuity of the maps $\Psi_{(\xi,t)}^{-1}$, we get that there exists a common $r_0 > 0$ such that the previous holds for any $(\xi, t) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$. Consider $r < r_0$ and $(\xi, t) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$, then

$$B_r(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t)) \subset \text{Im}(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}).$$

Set $A_1 := \Psi_{(\xi,t)}^{-1}(B_r(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t)))$ and $A_2 := \mathbb{B}_r^m(0, t)$. We will show that there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$A_1 \setminus A_2 \subset \mathbb{B}_{r+Kr^2}^m(0, t) \setminus \mathbb{B}_r^m(0, t). \quad (50)$$

For $(\zeta, s) \in A_1 \setminus A_2$, we know that

$$d(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\zeta, s), \Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t)) < r.$$

Therefore, from (48) and Claim 3, we conclude that there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$d_t(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\zeta, s), \Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0, t)) < r + Kr^2.$$

Then we get from Claim 5 that

$$\sqrt{|\zeta|^2 + (t-s)^2} < r + Kr^2$$

hence (50) is proved. A similar proof shows that

$$A_2 \setminus A_1 \subset \mathbb{B}_r^m(0, t) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{r-Kr^2}^m(0, t).$$

From the latter and (50) we conclude that

$$A_1 \triangle A_2 \subset \mathbb{B}_{r+Kr^2}^m(0, t) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{r-Kr^2}^m(0, t).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^m(A_1 \triangle A_2) &\leq \mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_{r+Kr^2}^m(0, t) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{r-Kr^2}^m(0, t)) \\ &\leq r^m \mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_{1+Kr}^m(0) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{1-Kr}^m(0)) \\ &= r^m \omega_m((1+Kr)^m - (1-Kr)^m) \\ &\leq r^m C(Kr) && \text{for some } C > 0 \\ &\leq (CK)r^{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 7. There exist $C, r_0 > 0$ such that for all $r \in (0, r_0)$ and

$$(\xi, t, \zeta, s) \in [-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/4] \times \mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \times [0, \epsilon]$$

such that $\mathbb{B}_{2r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m \subset [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$ and $d(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s), \Phi(\xi, t)) < r$, then

$$\left| \frac{1}{V(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s), r)} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{r^{m-1}}.$$

Proof. Let us first consider the map $G : D_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$G(\xi, t, \zeta, s) := \det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi, t)}^* g \right]_{(\zeta, s)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This map is C^∞ , and its value at any $(\xi, t) \times (0, t)$ is 1, thus by a Taylor expansion in the variable (ζ, s) centered at $(0, t)$, and compactness of D_δ , we obtain that there exists $k > 0$ such that for all $(\xi, t, \zeta, s) \in D_\delta$ we have

$$\left| \det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi, t)}^* g \right]_{(\zeta, s)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right| \leq k |(\zeta, s) - (0, t)|. \quad (51)$$

In particular there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $(\xi, t, \zeta, s) \in D_\delta$,

$$\left| \det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi, t)}^* g \right]_{(\zeta, s)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right| \leq C.$$

Let us now consider r, ξ, t, ζ, s as in the statement of the claim. Set $y := \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s)$. Since $d(y, \Phi(\xi, t)) < r$, and $\mathbb{B}_{2r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t) \subset [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$, we know by Claim 2 that $y \in \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)$. Thus if we set

$$(\eta, \tau) := \Phi^{-1}(y) \in [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2], \quad (52)$$

we obtain that

$$\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\eta, \tau) \cap \mathbb{H}^m \subset \mathbb{B}_{2r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m \subset [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2].$$

Thus by Claim 2, we conclude that $B_r(y) = B_r(\Phi(\eta, \tau)) \subset \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\eta, \tau))$.

By (48) and (40), we easily see that

$$s = \tau. \quad (53)$$

Moreover, by (52) and (53), we also have that

$$\Psi_{(\eta, s)}(0, s) = E(\psi(\eta), s) = \Phi(\eta, s) = y.$$

Choose r_0 such that $\frac{r_0}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$. Since $t \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ and $(\eta, s) \in \mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t)$, this implies that $s \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Thus we can use Claim 6 to ensure that

$$\mathcal{L}^m \left(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, s) \Delta (\Psi_{(\eta, s)})^{-1} (B_r(\Psi_{(\eta, s)}(0, s))) \right) \leq \kappa r^{m+1}. \quad (54)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} V(y, r) &= \int_{\Psi_{(\eta, s)}^{-1}(B_r(y))} \left| \det \left[\Psi_{(\eta, s)}^* g \right]_w \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} d\mathcal{L}^m(w) \\ &= \int_{\Psi_{(\eta, s)}^{-1}(B_r(y))} 1 \cdot d\mathcal{L}^m(w) + O(r^{m+1}) && \text{by (51)} \\ &= \mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m) + O(r^{m+1}) && \text{by (54)} \end{aligned}$$

that is, there exists $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that

$$|\text{vol}_g(B_r(y)) - \mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, z) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)| \leq \tilde{C} r^{m+1}$$

Thus using the local Ahlfors regularity of (M, g) and Claim 6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\text{vol}_g(B_r(\bar{y}))} - \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, z) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \right| &= \left| \frac{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, z) \cap \mathbb{H}^m) - \text{vol}_g(B_r(\bar{y}))}{\text{vol}_g(B_r(\bar{y}))\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, z) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C\tilde{C}r^{m+1}}{r^m\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0, z) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \\ &\leq \frac{C\tilde{C}}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_1^m(0) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)r^{m-1}} \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. \square

Step 4.

Claim 8. For all $f \in C^\infty(M)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $(\xi, t, \zeta, s) \in D_\delta$ we have

$$|f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s) - f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t)| \leq C\|(\zeta, s) - (0, t)\|_2,$$

$$|f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s) - f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t) - \nabla(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)})(0, t) \cdot ((\zeta, s) - (0, t))| \leq C\|(\zeta, s) - (0, t)\|_2^2$$

Also if $\partial_\nu f|_{\partial M} = 0$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_m f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t)| \leq Ct \tag{55}$$

Proof. The map $\tilde{f}((\xi, t), (\zeta, s)) = f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s)$ is C^∞ , thus by a Taylor expansion of order 1 and 2 respectively, and compactness of D_δ , we conclude the first two inequalities. For the last, we notice that

$$\partial_m f \circ \Psi_{(\xi, 0)}(0, 0) = (\partial_\nu f)(\psi(\xi, 0)) = 0.$$

Thus by a Taylor expansion and compactness of D_δ we conclude (55). \square

Now we will fix a function $f \in C^\infty(M)$ such that $\partial_\nu f|_{\partial M} = 0$, and show that for $x \in M$ such that $d(x, \partial M) < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ then $\Delta_r f(x)$ is uniformly bounded. The proof for points x with $d(x, \partial M) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$, follows from the uniform convergence obtained in Proposition 5.3. We will study the following term of the AMV:

$$G_r(x) := \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{B_r(x)} \frac{1}{\text{vol}_g(B_r(y))} (f(y) - f(x)) \, d\text{vol}_g(y)$$

since the bound for the remainder follows similarly.

We notice that by equation (33) we have that there exists some $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ and $(\xi, t) \in [-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \frac{\epsilon}{4}]$ such that $x = \Phi_i(\xi, t)$. We let $\Phi = \Phi_i$. Also by (49), for $0 < r < r_0$ in the conditions of the Claim, we have that $B_r(x) = B_r(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t)) \subset \Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\mathbb{B}_\delta^{m-1}(0) \times [0, \epsilon])$. Also we can choose r_0 small enough so that for all $(\xi, t) \in [-1, 1]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/4]$ we have $\mathbb{B}_{2r_0/\sqrt{\epsilon}}(x, t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m \subset [-2, 2]^{m-1} \times [0, \epsilon/2]$. With this we can apply Claim 2 to conclude that $B_r(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t)) \subset \Phi(\mathbb{B}_{r/\sqrt{\epsilon}}^m(\xi, t))$ and we can also apply Claim 7 for points $\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s) \in B_r(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t))$.

Thus we can change variables of the integral to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} G_r(x) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\Psi_{(\xi, t)}^{-1}(B_r(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t)))} \frac{1}{\text{vol}_g(B_r(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s)))} \\ &\quad \times (f(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(\zeta, s)) - f(\Psi_{(\xi, t)}(0, t))) \det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi, t)}^* g \right]_{\zeta, s} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, d\mathcal{L}^m(\zeta, s) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
G_r(x) &= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\Psi_{(\xi,t)}^{-1}(B_r(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0,t)))} \frac{f(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\zeta,s)) - f(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0,t))}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \times \\
&\quad \times \det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi,t)}^* g \right]_{\zeta,s} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\mathcal{L}^m(\zeta,s) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{f(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\zeta,s)) - f(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0,t))}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \times \\
&\quad \times \det \left(\left[\Psi_{(\xi,t)}^* g \right]_{\zeta,s} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\mathcal{L}^m(\zeta,s) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{f(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(\zeta,s)) - f(\Psi_{(\xi,t)}(0,t))}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \times \\
&\quad \times d\mathcal{L}^m(\zeta,s) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \partial_j(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t) \zeta_i + \partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t)(s-t)}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \times \\
&\quad \times d\mathcal{L}^m(\zeta,s) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \partial_j(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t) \zeta_i + \partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t)(s-t)}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \times \\
&\quad \times d\mathcal{L}^{m-1}(\zeta) d\mathcal{L}(s) + O(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{\partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t)(s-t)}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} \times \\
&\quad \times d\mathcal{L}^{m-1}(\zeta) d\mathcal{L}(s) + O(1)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we separate further in two cases. First if $d(x, \partial M) > 2r$ then $t > 2r$ and so for all $(\zeta, s) \in \mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m$ we have $\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m) = \mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0))$, and so we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{\partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t)(s-t)}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} d\mathcal{L}^{m-1}(\zeta) d\mathcal{L}(s) \\
&= \frac{1}{r^2 \mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0))} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(\xi,t)})(0,t)(s-t) d\mathcal{L}^{m-1}(\zeta) d\mathcal{L}(s) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $G_r(x) = O(1)$ for x such that $2r < d(x, \partial M) < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ since there are only a finite number of parametrizations. On the other hand if $d(x, \partial M) \leq 2r$, then we have by Lemma 8 that for $t \leq 2r$ then $|\partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(x,t)})(0,t)| \leq 2Cr$, and so

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,t) \cap \mathbb{H}^m} \frac{\partial_m(f \circ \Psi_{(x,t)})(0,t)(s-t)}{\mathcal{L}^m(\mathbb{B}_r^m(0,s) \cap \mathbb{H}^m)} d\mathcal{L}^{m-1}(y) d\mathcal{L}(s) = O(1),$$

which shows that $G_r(x) = O(1)$ for x such that $d(x, \partial M) < 2r$. \square

6. SPECTRAL CONVERGENCE

In this section, we prove Theorem 3. We consider a smooth, compact, connected manifold M^m endowed with a smooth Riemannian metric g . We let d_g and vol_g be the associated Riemannian distance and volume measure on M , respectively. If

$\partial M = \emptyset$ (resp. $\partial M \neq \emptyset$), we let $\{\mu_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of Laplace (resp. Neumann) eigenvalues of (M, g) .

6.1. Existence of limit eigenfunctions. Recalling that $C_\nu^\infty(M)$ is defined in (3), we define the Hilbert space

$$H := \overline{C_\nu^\infty(M)}^{\|\cdot\|_{W^{2,2}}}.$$

We let $\Pi(M, \text{vol}_g)$ be defined as in (13) and we consider the operator $T : \Pi(M, \text{vol}_g) \rightarrow H^*$ which maps any $f \in \Pi(M, \text{vol}_g)$ to

$$T(f) := \left(v \in H \mapsto - \int_M f \Delta_g v \, d\text{vol}_g \right).$$

Lemma 6.1. The operator T is injective.

Proof. For $f \in \Pi(M, \text{vol}_g)$ such that $f \neq 0$, let $v \in H$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_g v = f & \text{in } M, \\ \partial_\nu v = 0 & \text{in } \partial M. \end{cases}$$

The solution to this problem exists since $\int_M f = 0 = \int_{\partial M} \partial_\nu v$. In fact by regularity theory we can conclude that $v \in H$, and so we conclude that

$$T(f)(v) = - \int_M f \Delta_g v \, d\text{vol}_g = \int_M f^2 \, d\text{vol}_g \neq 0.$$

Thus $T(f) \neq 0$, concluding that T is injective. \square

Let us now prove the existence of L^2 -weak limit eigenfunctions.

Proposition 6.2. Let k be a positive integer and (r_n) a sequence of positive numbers such that $r_n \rightarrow 0$. Then there exists a Laplace (resp. Neumann) eigenfunction f of (M, g) with associated eigenvalue μ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k,r_n} &\xrightarrow{L^2} f, \\ \lambda_{k,r_n} &\rightarrow C_m \mu, \\ \sup_n E_{r_n}(f_{k,r_n} - f) &< +\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Proof. By the proof of Theorem 1, in particular (17), there exists $\lambda \geq 0$ and a subsequence such that $\lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n}) \rightarrow \lambda$ up to subsequence. Since $\|f_{k,r_n}\|_{L^2(M)} = 1$ for any n , there exists $f \in L^2(M, \text{vol}_g)$ such that the weak convergence (67) holds up to subsequence. Therefore, by Theorem 2, we get that for any $\psi \in C^\infty(M)$ (resp. $C_{\partial_\nu}^\infty(M)$),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M f \Delta_g \psi \, d\text{vol}_g &= \lim_n \frac{1}{C_m} \int_M f_{k,r_n} \tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} \psi \, d\text{vol}_g = \frac{1}{C_m} \lim_n \int_M (\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_{k,r_n}) \psi \, d\text{vol}_g \\ &= -\frac{1}{C_m} \lim_n \lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n}) \int_M f_{k,r_n} \psi \, d\text{vol}_g = -\frac{1}{C_m} \lambda \int_M f \psi \, d\text{vol}_g. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since for any n it holds that $\lambda_{k,r_n} > 0$ and

$$0 = \int_M -\tilde{\Delta}_{r_n} f_{k,r_n} \, d\text{vol}_g = \int_M \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r_n} f_{k,r_n} \, d\text{vol}_g$$

we get that $\int_M f_{k,r_n} = 0$. Thus $\int_M f \, d\text{vol}_g = 0$ by weak convergence.

Now let $v \in W^{2,2}(M)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_g v = \frac{\lambda}{C_m} f & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu v = 0 & \text{in } \partial M \end{cases}$$

satisfying $\int_M v = 0$. Then we have that for $\psi \in H \cap C^\infty(M)$ then

$$\int_M v \Delta_g \psi \, d\text{vol}_g = -\frac{1}{C_m} \lambda \int_M f \psi \, d\text{vol}_g = \int_M f \Delta_g \psi \, d\text{vol}_g.$$

Since this is a dense subspace of H and the functionals are continuous with respect to $W^{2,2}(M)$ in ψ , the equality holds for all H . Thus by Lemma 6.1 we conclude that $v = f$, and so f satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_g f = \frac{\lambda}{C_m} f & \text{in } M \\ \partial_\nu f = 0 & \text{in } \partial M \end{cases}$$

thus f is a Neumann eigenfunction, and so it must be $C^\infty(M)$. Also since both $f_{k,r_n}, f \in \Pi(M, \text{vol}_g)$, we know by Proposition 3.9 using triangle inequality of the inner product,

$$E_{r_n}(f_{k,r_n} - f)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq E_{r_n}(f_{k,r_n})^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_{r_n}(f)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We know that $E_{r_n}(f_{k,r_n}) = \lambda_{k,r_n} \|f_{k,r_n}\|_{L^2(M)} = \lambda_{k,r_n}$ which is uniformly bounded. Also since $f \in C^\infty(M)$, by Lemma 5.1, we know that $E_{r_n}(f)$ is also uniformly bounded, concluding the proof. \square

6.2. Energy comparison. Let us now compare the energy of a map defined on M with the energy of the image of the map through a local chart parametrizing a neighborhood of an open subset of ∂M . To this aim, up to scaling, we consider a map $\Phi : (-1, 1)^{m-1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ which is a bi-Lipschitz homeomorphism onto its image. We set

$$\mathcal{Q} := (-1/2, 1/2)^{m-1} \times [0, 1/2]. \quad (68)$$

Lemma 6.3. There exist constants $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\Phi) > 0$ and $\tilde{c} = \tilde{c}(\Phi) > 0$ such that for any $f \in L^2(M)$, for any $r \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\tilde{E}_{\tilde{c}r, \mathcal{Q}}(f \circ \Phi) \leq \tilde{C} E_{r, \mathfrak{M}}(f).$$

where $\mathcal{Q} := (\mathcal{Q}, d_\infty, \mathcal{L}^m)$ and $\mathfrak{M} := (M, d, \mu)$.

Proof. We start by pointing out that there exist constants $c = c(\Phi) > 0$ and $C = C(\Phi) > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $r \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\Phi(Q_{cr}(x)) \subset B_r(\Phi(x)) \subset \Phi(Q_{Cr}(x)),$$

$$V(\Phi(x), r) \leq C \mathcal{L}^m(Q_{cr}(x) \cap \mathcal{Q}),$$

$$\det(g_x) \geq 0,$$

where g_x is the metric in the coordinates given by Φ . Then for any $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{a}_{r, \mathfrak{M}}(\Phi(x), \Phi(y)) &= 1_{B_r(\Phi(x))}(\Phi(y)) \left(\frac{1}{V(\Phi(x), r)} + \frac{1}{V(\Phi(y), r)} \right) \\ &\geq 1_{Q_{cr}(x)}(y) \left(\frac{1}{C \mathcal{L}^m(Q_{cr}(x) \cap \mathcal{Q})} + \frac{1}{C \mathcal{L}^m(Q_{cr}(y) \cap \mathcal{Q})} \right) \\ &= \frac{\tilde{a}_{cr, \mathcal{Q}}(x, y)}{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{E}_{r,\mathfrak{M}}(f) &\geq \iint_{\Phi(\mathcal{Q})^2} \tilde{a}_{r,\mathfrak{M}}(p,q) \left(\frac{f(p) - f(q)}{r} \right)^2 \mathrm{dvol}_g(q) \mathrm{dvol}_g(p) \\
&= \iint_{\mathcal{Q}^2} \tilde{a}_{r,\mathfrak{M}}(\Phi(x), \Phi(y)) \left(\frac{f(\Phi(x)) - f(\Phi(y))}{r} \right)^2 \\
&\quad \times \sqrt{\det(g_x) \det(g_y)} \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^m(y) \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\
&\geq \iint_{\mathcal{Q}^2} \frac{c}{C} \tilde{a}_{cr,\Omega}(x,y) \left(\frac{f(\Phi(x)) - f(\Phi(y))}{r} \right)^2 \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^m(y) \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\
&= \frac{c}{C} E_{cr,\Omega}(f \circ \Phi).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\tilde{c} = c$ and $\tilde{C} = \frac{C}{c}$, we obtain the result. \square

6.3. Proof of Theorem 3. We are now in a position to prove Theorem 3.

Proof. Step 1. First we show strong $L^2(M, \mu)$ of the sequence. We proceed by contradiction. By Proposition 6.2, we can assume that there exist $\alpha > 0$, $f \in L^2(M, \mu)$ which is a Neumann eigenfunction, and $(r_n) \subset (0, +\infty)$ such that $r_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$f_{k,r_n} \xrightarrow{L^2} f, \quad \|f_{k,r_n} - f\|_{L^2(M)}^2 \geq \alpha.$$

Since M is a compact manifold with boundary, up to scaling there exist finitely many bi-Lipschitz homeomorphisms $\{\Phi_j : (-1, 1)^{m-1} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M\}_{j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}}$ such that

$$\bigcup_j \Phi_j(\mathcal{Q}) = M,$$

where \mathcal{Q} is as in (68), and

$$\bigcup_j \Phi_j\left((-1/2, 1/2)^{m-1} \times \{0\}\right) = \partial M.$$

Then there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that, up to a subsequence,

$$\inf_n \int_{\Phi_j(\mathcal{Q})} |f_{k,r_n} - f|^2 \mathrm{dvol}_g \geq \frac{\alpha}{\ell} > 0.$$

From this we conclude that there exists $\tilde{\alpha} > 0$ such that

$$\inf_n \int_{\mathcal{Q}} |f_{k,r_n} - f|^2 \circ \Phi_j \mathrm{d}\mathcal{L}^m \geq \tilde{\alpha} > 0.$$

Let us set $\Phi := \Phi_j$. Then there exist $C, \tilde{C}, \tilde{c} > 0$ such that for any n ,

$$\begin{aligned}
C &\geq \tilde{E}_{r_n}(f_{k,r_n} - f) && \text{by Proposition 6.2} \\
&\geq \tilde{C}^{-1} \tilde{E}_{\tilde{c}r_n, \Omega}((f_{k,r_n} - f) \circ \Phi) && \text{by Lemma 6.3.}
\end{aligned}$$

By the weak convergence we also have

$$h_n := (f_{k,r_n} - f) \circ \Phi \xrightarrow{L^2} 0. \quad (69)$$

Let us set $\bar{r}_n = \tilde{c}r_n$. We consider a decomposition of \mathcal{Q} into L disjoint subcubes $\{\tilde{Q}_i\}$ of size $1/N$ to be chosen later. For any $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}
a_r(x, y) &:= \chi_{Q_r(x) \cap \mathcal{Q}}(y) \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^m(Q_r(x) \cap \mathcal{Q})} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^m(Q_r(y) \cap \mathcal{Q})} \right), \\
a_{r,i}(x, y) &:= \chi_{Q_r(x) \cap \mathcal{Q}_i}(y) \left(\frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^m(Q_r(x) \cap \mathcal{Q}_i)} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^m(Q_r(y) \cap \mathcal{Q}_i)} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and we point out that for $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}_i$

$$a_r(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{2^m} a_{r,i}(x, y).$$

We also set for any n ,

$$\epsilon_{i,n} := \int_{\mathcal{Q}_i} h_n \, d\mathcal{L}^m, \quad \delta_n := \max_i |\epsilon_{i,n}|.$$

We obtain that for any n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega}(h_n) &= \int_{\mathcal{Q}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{Q}} a_{\tilde{r}_n}(x, y) \frac{(h_n(x) - h_n(y))^2}{\tilde{r}_n^2} \, d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \right) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\ &= \sum_i \int_{\mathcal{Q}_i} \left(\int_{\mathcal{Q}} a_{\tilde{r}_n}(x, y) \frac{(h_n(x) - h_n(y))^2}{\tilde{r}_n^2} \, d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \right) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_i \int_{\mathcal{Q}_i} \left(\int_{\mathcal{Q}_i} a_{\tilde{r}_n,i}(x, y) \frac{(h_n(x) - h_n(y))^2}{\tilde{r}_n^2} \, d\mathcal{L}^m(y) \right) d\mathcal{L}^m(x) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_i \tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \mathcal{Q}_i}(h_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_i \tilde{E}_{\tilde{r}_n, \mathcal{Q}_i}(h_n - \epsilon_{i,n}) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_i \|h_n - \epsilon_{i,n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Q}_i)}^2 \lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \mathcal{Q}_i}) \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1/N)})}{2^m} \sum_i \|h_n - \epsilon_{i,n}\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Q}_i)}^2 \\ &= \frac{\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1/N)})}{2^m} \sum_i \left(\|h_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Q}_i)}^2 - 2\epsilon_{n,i} \int_{\mathcal{Q}_i} h_n \, d\mathcal{L}^m + \mathcal{L}^m(\mathcal{Q}_i) \epsilon_{n,i}^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1/N)})}{2^m} \left(\|h_n\|_{L^2(\mathcal{Q})}^2 - 3L\delta_n \right) \\ &\geq \frac{\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega^m(1/N)})}{2^m} (\tilde{\alpha} - 3L\delta_n). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.3, we choose N big enough to ensure that for any n ,

$$\lambda_1(-\tilde{\Delta}_{\tilde{r}_n, \Omega(1/N)}) > C\tilde{C} \frac{2^{m+2}}{\tilde{\alpha}}.$$

By the weak convergence (69) we know that $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, and so we can choose n big enough to guarantee

$$\delta_n < \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{6L}.$$

With these choices we eventually get

$$\tilde{E}_{r_n}(f_{k,r_n} - f) > C,$$

which is a contradiction.

Step 2. Now we show that $\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r_n} \rightarrow \mu_k$, where μ_k is the k -th Neumann eigenvalue. Let $r_n \rightarrow 0$. We know by the previous result that there exist eigenfunctions f_0, \dots, f_k with Neumann eigenvalue $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i,r_n} &\xrightarrow{L^2} f_i, \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k\}, \\ \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r_n} &\rightarrow C_m \lambda_k, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lambda_i \leq \lambda_k \quad \forall i \in \{0, \dots, k\}. \quad (70)$$

Since $\langle f_{i,r_n}, f_{j,r_n} \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$, we also have by strong convergence that $\langle f_i, f_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$. Thus we have that

$$V_{k+1} := \text{Span}(f_0, \dots, f_k) \in \mathcal{G}_{k+1}(L^2(M, \text{vol}_g)),$$

and so by equation (70), we conclude

$$C_m \mu_k \leq \max_{f \in V_{k+1}} \frac{\langle \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle}{\|f\|_{L^2}^2} = C_m \lambda_k = \lim_n \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r_n}.$$

This shows that $\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} \geq C_m \mu_k$

To prove $\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} \leq C_m \mu_k$, let $\{f_0, \dots, f_k\}$ be an $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_2$ -orthonormal family of Laplace (resp. Neumann) eigenfunctions associated with the eigenvalues $\{\mu_0, \dots, \mu_k\}$ respectively satisfying $\mu_0 \leq \dots \leq \mu_k$. By elliptic regularity, we know that these functions belong to $C^\infty(M)$. Then Proposition 5.1 implies that given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $r_\epsilon > 0$ such that for $r \in (0, r_\epsilon)$,

$$|\langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r f_i, f_j \rangle_2 - \delta_{i,j} C_m \mu_j| < \epsilon$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the usual Kronecker delta. Set $U := \text{Span}(f_0, \dots, f_k)$ and

$$v := \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \psi_i$$

for some $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{S}^{k-1}$. Then

$$\left| \langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r v, v \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 C_m \mu_i \right| = \left| \sum_{i,j=1}^k a_i a_j \langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r f_i, f_j \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 C_m \mu_i \right| \leq k^2 \epsilon.$$

Since U is a $k+1$ -dimensional subspace, we conclude that

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} \leq \max_{v \in U} \frac{\langle -\tilde{\Delta}_r v, v \rangle}{\|v\|_2^2} \leq \max_{a \in \mathbb{S}^k} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i^2 \mu_i + k^2 \epsilon \leq \mu_k + k^2 \epsilon.$$

Take the limit superior as $r \rightarrow 0$ and then let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ to obtain $\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r} \leq C_m \mu_k$. Combined with Corollary 3.8, the latter implies the existence of $r_k > 0$ such that $\min \sigma_{\text{ess}}(-\tilde{\Delta}_r) \geq \mu_k + 1 \geq \tilde{\lambda}_{k,r}$ for any $r \in (0, r_k)$, so that $\tilde{\lambda}_{k,r}$ indeed coincides with $\lambda_k(-\tilde{\Delta}_r)$. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB18] Luigi Ambrosio and Jérôme Bertrand. DC calculus. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 288:1037–1080, 2018.
- [AGG19] T. Adamowicz, M. Gaczkowski, and P. Górk. Harmonic functions on metric measure spaces. *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 32(1):141–186, 2019.
- [AKS22] T. Adamowicz, A. Kijowski, and E. Soultanis. Asymptotically mean value harmonic functions in doubling metric measure spaces. *Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces*, 10(1):344–372, 2022.
- [AKS23] T. Adamowicz, A. Kijowski, and E. Soultanis. Asymptotically mean value harmonic functions in subriemannian and RCD settings. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 33(3):80, 2023.
- [Ald18] JM Aldaz. Local comparability of measures, averaging and maximal averaging operators. *Potential Analysis*, 49(2):309–330, 2018.
- [BQWZ12] Mikhail Belkin, Qichao Que, Yusu Wang, and Xueyuan Zhou. Toward understanding complex spaces: Graph laplacians on manifolds with singularities and boundaries. In *Conference on learning theory*, pages 36–1. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2012.
- [CC00] Jeff Cheeger and Tobias H. Colding. On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. III. *J. Differential Geom.*, 54(1):37–74, 2000.

- [GG09] Michał Gaczkowski and Przemysław Górk. Harmonic functions on metric measure spaces: convergence and compactness. *Potential Anal.*, 31(3):203–214, 2009.
- [Gig15] Nicola Gigli. On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 236(1113):vi+91, 2015.
- [Gór09] Przemysław Górk. Campanato theorem on metric measure spaces. *Annales Fennici Mathematici*, 34(2):523–528, 2009.
- [KMS01] Kazuhiro Kuwae, Yoshiroh Machigashira, and Takashi Shioya. Sobolev spaces, Laplacian, and heat kernel on Alexandrov spaces. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 238(2):269–316, 2001.
- [Kok06] Simon L. Kokkendorff. A Laplacian on metric measure spaces. Unpublished note, 2006.
- [MT20] A. Minne and D. Tewodrose. Asymptotic mean value Laplacian in metric measure spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 491(2):124330, 2020.
- [MT23] Andreas Minne and David Tewodrose. Symmetrized and non-symmetrized Asymptotic Mean Value Laplacian in metric measure spaces. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, pages 1–38, 2023.

M. DIAS: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND DATA SCIENCE, VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL, PLEINLAAN 2, B-1050 ELSENE, BELGIUM.

Email address: `manuel.dias@vub.be`

D. TEWODROSE: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND DATA SCIENCE, VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL, PLEINLAAN 2, B-1050 ELSENE, BELGIUM.

Email address: `david.tewodrose@vub.be`