

# Compact harmonic $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces are harmonic manifolds

Zhangkai Huang \*

December 31, 2024

## Abstract

This paper focus on the properties and characterizations of harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces, which are the counterparts of harmonic Riemannian manifolds in the non-smooth setting. We prove that a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space is isometric to a locally harmonic Riemannian manifold if it satisfies either of the following harmonicity conditions:

1. the heat kernel  $\rho(x, y, t)$  depends only on the variable  $t$  and the distance between points  $x$  and  $y$ .
2. the volume of the intersection of two geodesic balls depends only on their radii and the distance between their centers.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	RCD spaces . . . . .	3
1.2	Main results . . . . .	4
1.3	Outline of the proofs . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Metric space . . . . .	6
2.2	RCD space and heat kernel . . . . .	7
2.3	Convergence of RCD spaces . . . . .	10
2.4	Calculus on $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces . . . . .	12
<b>3</b>	<b>Symmetric and harmonic <math>\text{RCD}(K, N)</math> spaces</b>	<b>16</b>

---

\*Sun Yat-sen University: huangzhk27@mail.sysu.edu.cn

<b>4 Smoothness Theorem 1.11</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 Co-area formula and disintegration formula on RCD spaces . . . . .	23
4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.11 . . . . .	25

# 1 Introduction

In  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , there exist harmonic functions that depend only on the geodesic distance. For example when  $n > 2$ , the function  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2)^{1-n/2}$  is harmonic on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . Inspired by this property, Ruse sought to identify harmonic functions on Riemannian manifolds with similar characteristics in 1930. However, it turned out that such radial harmonic functions exist only in very special cases. He proposed, and indeed, the historical definition of such special classes of manifolds, which is stated as follows.

**Definition 1.1.** A Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$  is said to be *harmonic* if the volume density function  $\theta_p := \sqrt{|\det(g_{ij})|}$  in the normal coordinate at each point  $p$  is a radial function.

Today, numerous equivalent definitions about harmonic manifolds have been established (see for instance [Bes78, DR92, Wil50]). Below, we list a few of these definitions for clarity.

**Theorem 1.2.** *A complete  $n$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$  is harmonic if and only if either of the following condition holds.*

- (1) *For any point  $p \in M^n$  and the distance function  $d_p := d_g(p, \cdot)$ ,  $\Delta d_p^2$  is radial on some small ball  $B_r(p)$ .*
- (2) *For any  $p \in M^n$  there exists a nonconstant radial harmonic function in a punctured neighborhood of  $p$ .*
- (3) *Every small geodesic sphere in  $M^n$  has constant mean curvature.*
- (4) *Every harmonic function satisfies the mean value property.*

When the space is simply connected, we have other equivalent characterizations of the space's harmonicity.

**Theorem 1.3** ([CH11, Thm. 3], [CH12, Thm. 1]). *A connected, simply connected and complete Riemannian manifold is harmonic if and only if the volume of the intersection of two geodesic balls depends only on their radii and the distance between their centers.*

**Theorem 1.4** ([Sza90, Thm. 1.1]). *A connected, simply connected and complete Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$  is harmonic if and only if the heat kernel  $\rho(x, y, t)$  depends only on the variable  $t$  and the distance between points  $x$  and  $y$ , i.e., it is of the form  $\rho(x, y, t) = \rho(d_g(x, y), t)$ .*

Given a Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$ , let  $H_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) be two functions on  $M^n \times M^n$  such that for any  $x \in M^n$  the functions  $H_i^x(\cdot) := H_i(x, \cdot)$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) are  $L^2$ -integrable. Under these conditions, the convolution of  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , denoted as  $H_1 * H_2$ , is defined by

$$H_1 * H_2(x, y) = \int_{M^n} H_1(x, z) H_2(y, z) \, d\text{vol}_g(z).$$

A function  $H : M^n \times M^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called radial kernel if  $H(x, y)$  depends only on the geodesic distance between  $x$  and  $y$ , that is, if  $H = h \circ d_g$ , where  $h : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an arbitrary function.

As an application of Theorem 1.4, through the approximation with characteristic functions, we can immediately deduce the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.5** ([Sza90, Prop. 2.1]). *A connected, simply connected and complete Riemannian manifold is harmonic if and only if the convolution of the radial kernel functions  $H_1 = h_1 \circ d_g$  and  $H_2 = h_2 \circ d_g$  is a radial kernel function whenever  $h_1, h_2$  are  $L^2$ -integrable functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  with compact support.*

The primary objective of this paper, is to characterize non-smooth contexts, namely  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  metric measure spaces which are defined precisely in the following subsection and satisfy the conditions outlined in Theorem 1.3-1.5.

## 1.1 RCD spaces

In this paper, by metric measure space we mean a triple  $(X, d, \mathbf{m})$  such that  $(X, d)$  is a complete separable metric space and that  $\mathbf{m}$  is a nonnegative Borel measure with full support on  $X$  and being finite on any bounded subset of  $X$ .

The curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}(K, N)$ , which involves a lower Ricci curvature bound  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  and an upper dimension bound  $N \in [1, \infty)$  for metric measure spaces in a synthetic sense, was first introduced in [Stu06a, Stu06b] by Sturm and in [LV09] by Lott-Villani respectively. Subsequently, by adding a Riemannian structure into  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  metric measure spaces, Ambrosio-Gigli-Savaré [AGS14], Gigli [Gig13, Gig15], Erbar-Kuwada-Sturm [EKS15] and Ambrosio-Mondino-Savaré [AMS19] introduced the notion of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. To be precise, a metric measure space is classified as an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space if it satisfies the  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  condition and its  $H^{1,2}$ -Sobolev space is Hilbertian.

Although  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces are generally not smooth, they still possess some desirable analytical properties. For instance, Jiang-Li-Zhang [JLZ16] established the Gaussian estimates for the heat kernels on  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces, which implies the existence of locally Lipschitz representation of the heat kernels. Furthermore, Bruè-Semola [BS20] demonstrated that each  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  bears a unique integer  $n \in [1, N]$ , which is called its essential dimension and is denoted by  $n := \dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X)$ , such that the the tangent space of  $\mathbf{m}$ -almost every point is  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

It is worth mentioning that De Philippis-Gigli [PG18] introduced a synthetic counterpart of volume non-collapsed Gromov-Hausdorff limit spaces of Riemannian manifolds with a constant dimension and a lower Ricci curvature bound, namely non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces, meaning that the reference measure equals  $N$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure  $\mathcal{H}^N$ . In this case it can be readily checked that in this case  $N$  must be an integer and  $N := \dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^N}(X)$ .

It is natural to explore additional conditions that could improve the regularity of general  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. Recently, Brena-Gigli-Honda-Zhu [BGHZ23] demonstrated the equivalence between non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces and weakly non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. Furthermore, the author [Hua23] proved that every  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space is non-collapsed, given an isometrically heat kernel immersing condition. Additionally, in [Hua23], the author demonstrated that a compact non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space with eigenfunctions that realize an isometric immersion into Euclidean space is, in fact, smooth.

## 1.2 Main results

In this paper, we focus on the following specific subclasses of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces.

**Definition 1.6** (Strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space). An  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is said to be *strongly harmonic* if there exists a real valued function  $H : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the heat kernel  $\rho$  of  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  satisfies

$$\rho(x, y, t) = H(\mathbf{d}(x, y), t), \quad \forall x, y \in X, \quad \forall t > 0. \quad (1.1)$$

**Definition 1.7** (Radial symmetric  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space). An  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is said to be *radial symmetric* if there exists a real valued function  $F : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and non-constant eigenfunctions  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^m$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x)\phi_i(y) = F(\mathbf{d}(x, y)), \quad \forall x, y \in X. \quad (1.2)$$

We prove the following three regularity results for the above subclasses of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces.

**Theorem 1.8.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be a strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space. Then  $\mathbf{m} = c\mathcal{H}^n$  for some constant  $c > 0$ , where  $n = \dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X)$  is the essential dimension of the space. In particular,  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space.*

**Theorem 1.9.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  be a non-collapsed radial symmetric  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space. Then  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is isometric to an  $n$ -dimensional smooth closed Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, \mathbf{g})$ .*

**Corollary 1.10.** *Assume  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is a compact strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X) = n$ . Then  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is isometric to an  $n$ -dimensional smooth closed Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, \mathbf{g})$ .*

As an application of Corollary 1.10, we are positioned to establish the following theorem, which bears a direct relationship with Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 1.11.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space. If in addition the measure of the intersection of two geodesic balls depends only on their radii and the distance between their centers, then the following holds.*

- (1)  $\mathbf{m} = c\mathcal{H}^n$  for some constant  $c > 0$  and  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space;
- (2)  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is isometric to an  $n$ -dimensional smooth closed Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, \mathbf{g})$ .
- (3) Moreover, if in the addition that  $X$  is simply-connected, then it is a harmonic manifold.

### 1.3 Outline of the proofs

In section 3, we initially focus on the smoothness of compact, non-collapsed, radial symmetric  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  spaces  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$ . Our main goal is to establish that the map  $(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , constructed from eigenfunctions meeting the conditions in (1.2), is an isometric immersion. The smoothness is then inferred from [Hua23, Thm. 1.10]. Regarding the proof for the regularity of strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ , we employ a blow-up argument to demonstrate their non-collapsing nature and to enhance the upper bound  $N$  to its essential dimension  $n := \dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X)$ . Subsequently, we establish the smoothness of compact, non-collapsed, strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  spaces, leveraging the observation that they are radial symmetric.

In section 4, we explore regularities of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ , where the volume of the intersection of two geodesic balls is only determined by their radii and the distance between their centers. Utilizing a blow-up argument demonstrate

that these spaces are non-collapsed and that the upper bound  $N$  can be refined to the essential dimension  $n := \dim_{\text{d,m}}(X)$ . Furthermore, under the additional assumption of compactness for  $X$ , we examine the smoothness of the space. We observe that any geodesic can be extended to a length equal to its diameter. This observation allows us to construct bi-Lipschitz coordinate charts using distance functions, which shares some similarity of the bi-Lipschitz coordinates near regular points in Alexandrov spaces (see for instance [BGP92]). By mapping back to Euclidean space, we derive a key equation for any two distinct points  $x, \bar{x} \in X$ .

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{r} \left( \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(B_r(x) \setminus B_{\text{d}(x, \bar{x})}(\bar{x}))}{\omega_n r^n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \Delta \text{d}_{\bar{x}}(x).$$

Notably, as shown in [HT03], in a smooth setting, the second term in this equation corresponds to the mean curvature of the geodesic sphere of radius  $\text{d}(x, \bar{x})$  centered at  $\bar{x}$ . Finally, under polar coordinates, the volume density function is found to be radial, which implies that the space is strongly harmonic and, consequently, smooth.

**Acknowledgements** The author acknowledges the support of Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Sun Yat-sen University, Grant Number 24qnp105. He is thankful to Prof. Shouhei Honda and Prof. Huichun Zhang for their insightful discussions.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this paper we consistently employ  $C = C(k_1, \dots, k_m)$  to denote a positive constant that depends solely on the parameters  $k_1, \dots, k_m$ . For convenience, we may occasionally abbreviate this to  $C$ , acknowledging that it may change from one line to another if necessary.

### 2.1 Metric space

In this subsection, we will review some fundamental notation pertaining to metric spaces. Let  $(X, \text{d})$  be a metric space that is both complete and separable.

- We denote by  $C(X)$  and  $\text{Lip}(X, \text{d})$  the set of continuous function and Lipschitz functions on  $(X, \text{d})$ , respectively. The subsets  $\text{Lip}_b(X, \text{d})$  and  $\text{Lip}_c(X, \text{d})$  represent bounded Lipschitz functions and compactly supported Lipschitz functions, respectively.
- For any  $f \in \text{Lip}(X, \text{d})$ , the Lipschitz constant of  $f$  is defined by

$$\text{Lip } f := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(y) - f(x)|}{\text{d}(y, x)};$$

the pointwise Lipschitz constant of  $f$  at a point  $x \in X$  is defined by

$$\text{lip } f(x) := \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{|f(y) - f(x)|}{\mathbf{d}(y, x)}$$

if  $x$  is not isolated, and is understood to be 0 if  $x$  is isolated.

- We denote by  $B_r^X(x)$  (or briefly  $B_r(X)$ ) the open ball of radius  $r > 0$  centered at  $x$ , i.e.  $\{y \in X : \mathbf{d}(y, x) < r\}$  and by  $A_{r_1, r_2}^X(x)$  (or briefly  $A_{r_1, r_2}(x)$ ) the annulus  $\{y \in X : r_1 < \mathbf{d}(x, y) < r_2\}$ .
- For any  $n \in [1, \infty)$ , we define  $\mathcal{H}_d^n$  (or simply  $\mathcal{H}^n$  when the context is clear and there is no risk of confusion) as the  $n$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure on  $(X, \mathbf{d})$ . Specifically, we denote by  $\mathcal{L}^n$  the standard Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , which is consistent with the  $n$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. Additionally, we let  $\omega_n$  represent Lebesgue measure of the unit ball  $B_1(0_n)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .
- If  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is compact, then we define its diameter as:

$$\text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d}) := \sup_{x, y \in X} \mathbf{d}(x, y).$$

## 2.2 RCD space and heat kernel

Throughout this paper, when referring to a triple  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  as a metric measure space, we mean that  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is a complete and separable metric space and  $\mathbf{m}$  is a non-negative Borel measure which is finite on bounded sets. Now, let us consider  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  as a metric measure space.

The Cheeger energy  $\text{Ch} : L^2(\mathbf{m}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is a convex and lower semi-continuous functional defined as

$$\text{Ch}(f) := \inf_{\{f_i\}} \left\{ \int_X (\text{lip } f_i)^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken among all sequences  $\{f_i\} \subset \text{Lip}_b(X, \mathbf{d}) \cap L^2(\mathbf{m})$  such that  $\|f_i - f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{m})} \rightarrow 0$ . The Sobolev space  $H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is then defined as the set of  $L^2$ -integrable functions with finite Cheeger energy. Subsequently, unless it leads to ambiguity, we will use the simplified notations  $L^p$  for  $L^p(X, \mathbf{m})$  and  $H^{1,2}$  for  $H^{1,2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ .

For any function  $f \in H^{1,2}$ , we can employ a minimizing sequence and apply Mazur's Lemma to uniquely identify a minimal relaxed slope  $|\nabla f| \in L^2$  such that

$$\text{Ch}(f) = \int_X |\nabla f|^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m}.$$

This minimal relaxed slope possesses the locality property, meaning that  $|\nabla f| = |\nabla h|$   $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e. on  $\{f = h\}$ .

Let us further make a convention that all metric measure spaces under consideration in this paper is *infinitesimally Hilbertian*. This term signifies that the associated Sobolev spaces of these spaces are Hilbert spaces. It is noteworthy that, as demonstrated in [AGS14, Gig15], under this condition, for any two functions  $f, h \in H^{1,2}$ , the following function is well-defined:

$$\langle \nabla f, \nabla h \rangle := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{|\nabla f + \epsilon h|^2 - |\nabla h|^2}{2\epsilon} \in L^1.$$

Furthermore, the domain of the Laplacian, denoted as  $D(\Delta)$  can be defined as the set of functions  $f \in H^{1,2}$  for which the following equation

$$\int_X \langle \nabla f, \nabla \varphi \rangle \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} = - \int_X h \varphi \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m}, \quad \forall \varphi \in H^{1,2},$$

holds for some  $h \in L^2$ . This  $h$  is unique and is denoted by  $\Delta f$ . As a localized version, for any open set  $U \subset X$  we denote by  $D(\Delta, U)$  the set of all  $f \in H^{1,2}(U, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  such that the following holds for some  $h \in L^2(U)$ , which is denoted by  $\Delta_U f$ ,

$$\int_X \langle \nabla f, \nabla \varphi \rangle \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} = - \int_X h \varphi, \quad \forall \varphi \in \text{Lip}_c(U, \mathbf{d}).$$

Here by  $f \in H^{1,2}(U, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  we mean that  $\varphi f \in H^{1,2}$  for any  $\varphi \in \text{Lip}_c(U, \mathbf{d})$  and  $f, |\nabla f| \in L^2(U)$ .

We are now in a position to introduce the definition of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. See [AGS15, AMS19, EKS15, Gig15] for details.

**Definition 2.1.** For any  $K \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $N \in [1, \infty]$ , an infinitesimally Hilbertian metric measure space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is said to be an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space if it satisfies the following conditions.

1. There exists  $x \in X$  and  $C > 1$  such that for any  $r > 0$  we have  $\mathbf{m}(B_r(x)) \leq C \exp(Cr^2)$ .
2. Any  $f \in H^{1,2}$  satisfying  $|\nabla f| \leq 1$   $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e. has a 1-Lipschitz representative.
3. For any  $f \in D(\Delta)$  with  $\Delta f \in H^{1,2}$  and any  $\varphi \in \text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  with  $\varphi \geq 0$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X |\nabla f|^2 \Delta \varphi \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \geq \int_X \varphi \left( \frac{(\Delta f)^2}{N} + \langle \nabla f, \nabla \Delta f \rangle + K |\nabla f|^2 \right) \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m},$$

where  $\text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is the class of test functions defined by

$$\text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}) := \{ \varphi \in \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}) \cap D(\Delta) \cap L^\infty : \Delta f \in H^{1,2} \cap L^\infty \}.$$



If in addition  $\mathbf{m} = \mathcal{H}^N$ , then  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is said to be a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space.

Throughout this paper, when referring to an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space, we always mean that  $N \in (1, \infty)$ . For the remainder of this subsection, let us consider  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  as a representative example of an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space.

It should be emphasized that  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces satisfy the following Bishop-Gromov volume growth inequality (see [LV09, Thm. 5.31], [Stu06b, Thm. 2.3]).

**Theorem 2.2.** *For any  $R > r > 0$  ( $R \leq \pi\sqrt{(N-1)/K}$  if  $K > 0$ ) it holds that*

$$\frac{\mathbf{m}(B_R(x))}{\mathbf{m}(B_r(x))} \leq \frac{V_{K,N}(R)}{V_{K,N}(r)},$$

where  $V_{K,N}(r)$  denotes the volume of a ball of radius  $r$  in the  $N$ -dimensional model space with Ricci curvature  $K$ .

Building on the contributions by Sturm (see [Stu95, Prop. 2.3], [Stu96, Cor. 3.3]) and Jiang-Li-Zhang (as detailed in Theorem 2.3 below), it is established that  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces possess locally Lipschitz continuous heat kernels. More precisely, there exists a non-negative function  $\rho$  on  $X \times X \times (0, \infty)$  such that the unique solution to the heat equation can be expressed as follows.

$$\mathbf{h}_t f = \int_X \rho(\cdot, y, t) f(y) \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m}(y), \quad \forall f \in L^2, \quad \forall t > 0,$$

where by heat equation we mean  $\mathbf{h}_t f$  satisfies that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{h}_t f = \Delta \mathbf{h}_t f, \quad \text{in } L^2; \quad \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \|\mathbf{h}_t f - f\|_{L^2} = 0.$$

**Theorem 2.3** (Gaussian estimates for the heat kernel [JLZ16, Thm. 1.1, Thm. 1.2]). *Let  $\rho$  be the heat kernel of  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ . Then given any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist  $C_i = C_i(K, N, \epsilon)$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) such that*

$$C_1^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbf{d}^2(x, y)}{(4 - \epsilon)t} - C_2 t\right) \leq \mathbf{m}(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x)) \rho(x, y, t) \leq C_1 \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbf{d}^2(x, y)}{(4 + \epsilon)t} + C_2 t\right) \quad (2.1)$$

holds for any  $x, y \in X$  and

$$|\nabla_x \rho(x, y, t)| \leq \frac{C_3}{\sqrt{t} \mathbf{m}(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))} \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbf{d}(x, y)}{(4 + \epsilon)t} + C_4 t\right)$$

holds for  $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e.  $x, y \in X$ .

In particular, if  $K = 0$ , then there exists  $C_5 = C_5(N, \epsilon)$  such that (2.1) can be improved to

$$C_5^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \epsilon)t}\right) \leq \mathbf{m}(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))\rho(x, y, t) \leq C_5 \exp\left(-\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 - \epsilon)t}\right),$$

for any  $x, y \in X$ .

*Remark 2.4* (Rescaled RCD spaces). For any  $a, b \in (0, \infty)$ , the rescaled metric measure space  $(X, ad, b\mathbf{m})$  is an  $\text{RCD}(a^{-2}K, N)$  space, and its heat kernel  $\tilde{\rho}$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho} : X \times X \times (0, \infty) &\longrightarrow (0, \infty) \\ (x, y, t) &\longmapsto b^{-1}\rho(x, y, a^{-2}t). \end{aligned}$$

### 2.3 Convergence of RCD spaces

We omit the precise definition of pointed measure Gromov-Hausdorff (pmGH) convergence. The details about this definition and the following theorem can be found for instance in [GMS15, Sec. 3].

**Theorem 2.5.** *Assume that  $\{(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}_i, x_i)\}$  is a sequence of pointed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces such that*

$$0 < \liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}_i(B_1^{X_i}(x_i)) \leq \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}_i(B_1^{X_i}(x_i)) < \infty.$$

*Then this sequence has a subsequence  $\{(X_{i(j)}, \mathbf{d}_{i(j)}, \mathbf{m}_{i(j)}, x_{i(j)})\}$  which pmGH converges to a pointed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, x)$ .*

Consequently, we can define the concept of *regular sets* as follows.

**Definition 2.6** (Regular set). Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space. The tangent space at  $x \in X$ , denoted by  $\text{Tan}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, x)$ , is defined as

$$\left\{ (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y, y) : \exists r_i \downarrow 0, \text{ s.t. } \left( X, \frac{1}{r_i}\mathbf{d}, \frac{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x))}, x \right) \xrightarrow{\text{pmGH}} (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y, y) \right\}.$$

The  $k$ -dimensional regular set is then defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_k := \left\{ x \in X : \text{Tan}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, x) = \left\{ \left( \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^k}, \frac{1}{\omega_k} \mathcal{L}^k, 0_k \right) \right\} \right\}.$$

For the subsequent result concerning the existence of the *essential dimension* in RCD spaces, we refer to [BS20, Thm. 0.1].

**Theorem 2.7.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space. There exists a unique integer  $n \in [1, N]$  such that  $\mathbf{m}(X \setminus \mathcal{R}_n) = 0$ . This integer  $n$  is referred to as the essential dimension of  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  and is denoted by  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X)$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{m}$  can be represented as  $\theta \mathcal{H}^n \llcorner \mathcal{R}_n$  for some Borel function  $\theta$  defined on  $X$ .*

*Remark 2.8.* Under the assumption of Theorem 2.7, we define the set

$$\mathcal{R}_n^* := \left\{ x \in \mathcal{R}_n : \exists \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{m}(B_r(x))}{r^n} \in (0, \infty) \right\},$$

and assert that  $\mathbf{m}(\mathcal{R}_n \setminus \mathcal{R}_n^*) = 0$ . Furthermore, for  $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{R}_n^*$ , the density function  $\theta$  is given by

$$\theta(x) = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{m}(B_r(x))}{\omega_n r^n}, \quad \mathbf{m}\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{R}_n^*.$$

For further details, refer to [AHT18, Thm. 4.1].

Specifically, in the case of non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  spaces, the following assertion regarding the density function and the essential dimension is valid.

**Theorem 2.9** ([PG18, Cor. 1.7]). *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  be a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space. Then its essential dimension  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n}(X)$  equals  $n$  (notably  $n$  is an integer), and it holds that  $\theta(x) \leq 1$  for any  $x \in X$ . Moreover, equality  $\theta(x) = 1$  occurs if and only if  $x \in \mathcal{R}_n$ .*

In the subsequent part of this subsection, we consider a sequence of pointed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces, denoted by  $\{(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}_i, x_i)\}$ , which converges in the pointed measured Gromov-Hausdorff (pmGH) sense to another pointed  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space, namely  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, x)$ .

We assume that readers are familiar with the definitions of  $L^2$ -weak and  $L^2$ -strong convergence and  $L^2_{\text{loc}}$  (and their counterparts for Sobolev functions, namely  $H^{1,2}$ -weak and  $H^{1,2}$ -strong convergence, and  $H^1_{\text{loc}}$ -weak and  $H^1_{\text{loc}}$ -strong convergence) on various spaces. For reference, see [AST17, LH17, GMS15] and [Hon15, Def. 1.1]. We conclude this subsection by presenting some useful results related to this topic.

**Theorem 2.10** (Pointwise convergence of heat kernels [AHT18, Thm. 3.3]). *The heat kernels  $\rho_i$  of  $(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}_i)$  satisfy*

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho_i(x_i, y_i, t_i) = \rho(x, y, t)$$

*whenever  $X_i \times X_i \times (0, \infty) \ni (x_i, y_i, t_i) \rightarrow (x, y, t) \in X \times X \times (0, \infty)$ .*

**Theorem 2.11** (Arzelà-Ascoli theorem). *Assume  $f_i \in C(X_i)$  ( $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ) such that the sequence  $\{f_i\}$  meets the following two conditions.*

1. *(Locally uniformly bounded) For any  $R > 0$  it holds that*

$$\sup_i \sup_{y_i \in B_R(x_i)} |f_i(y_i)| < \infty.$$

2. *(Locally equicontinuous) For any  $\epsilon, R \in (0, \infty)$ , there exists  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  such that for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  it holds that*

$$|f_i(y_i) - f_i(z_i)| < \epsilon, \quad \forall y_i, z_i \in B_R(x_i) \text{ such that } \mathbf{d}_i(y_i, z_i) < \delta.$$

*Then after passing to a subsequence, there exists  $f \in C(X)$  such that  $\{f_i\}$  pointwisely converges to  $f$  in the following sense:*

$$f_i(y_i) \rightarrow f(y) \text{ whenever } X_i \ni y_i \rightarrow y \in X.$$

Utilizing the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem discussed above, we can demonstrate the subsequent theorem concerning precompactness in the context of  $L^2$ -weak convergence.

**Theorem 2.12.** *Assume  $f_i \in L^2(\mathbf{m}_i)$  ( $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ) such that  $\sup_i \|f_i\|_{L^2(\mathbf{m}_i)} < \infty$ , then after passing to a subsequence  $f_i$   $L^2$ -weakly converges to some  $f \in L^2(\mathbf{m})$ .*

The forthcoming theorem is instrumental in our subsequent arguments and is derived from [AH18].

**Theorem 2.13** (Stability of Laplacian on balls). *Let  $f_i \in D(\Delta, B_R(x_i))$  ( $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ) such that  $\sup_i \|\Delta f_i\|_{L^2(B_R(x_i))} < \infty$  and  $\{f_i\}$   $L^2$ -strongly converges to some  $f \in L^2(B_R(x), \mathbf{m})$  on  $B_R(x)$ . Then for any  $r \in (0, R)$  the following holds.*

1.  $f|_{B_r(x)} \in D(\Delta, B_r(x))$ .
2.  $\{\Delta_i f_i\}$   $L^2$ -weakly converges to  $\Delta f$  on  $B_r(x)$ .
3.  $\{f_i\}$   $H^{1,2}$ -strongly converges to  $f$  on  $B_r(x)$ .

## 2.4 Calculus on $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces

Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be an  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space.

For the sake of brevity, we forgo detailing the definitions of the spaces of  $L^p$ -one forms,  $L^p$ -tensor fields of type (0,2) over a Borel set  $A \subset X$ , denoted by  $L^p(T^*(A, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}))$ ,  $L^p((T^*)^{\otimes 2}(A, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}))$ , respectively. We also omit the definition of the pointwise Hilbert-Schmidt norm, denoted by  $|\cdot|_{\text{HS}}$ , for  $L^p$ -tensor fields. Instead, we only report some crucial results on the calculus within  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. Details can be found in for instance [Gig18a, Gig18b].

**Theorem 2.14** (Exterior derivative). *The linear operator  $d$ , called the exterior derivative, defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} d : H^{1,2} &\longrightarrow L^2(T^*(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})) \\ f &\longmapsto df \end{aligned}$$

*satisfies that  $|df| = |\nabla f|$   $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e. for any  $f \in H^{1,2}$ . Moreover, the set  $\{df : f \in H^{1,2}\}$  is dense in  $L^2(T^*(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}))$ .*

**Theorem 2.15** (The Hessian). *For any  $f \in \text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ , there exists a unique  $T \in L^2((T^*)^{\otimes 2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}))$ , called the Hessian of  $f$ , denoted by  $\text{Hess } f$ , such that for any  $f_i \in \text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),*

$$2T(\nabla f_1, \nabla f_2) = \langle \nabla f_1, \nabla \langle \nabla f_2, \nabla f \rangle \rangle + \langle \nabla f_2, \nabla \langle \nabla f_1, \nabla f \rangle \rangle - \langle \nabla f, \nabla \langle \nabla f_1, \nabla f_2 \rangle \rangle \quad (2.2)$$

*holds for  $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ . Moreover, the following holds for any  $f \in \text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ ,  $\varphi \in \text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  with  $\varphi \geq 0$ .*

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_X \Delta \varphi \cdot |\nabla f|^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \geq \int_X \varphi (|\text{Hess } f|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \langle \nabla \Delta f, \nabla f \rangle + K|\nabla f|^2) \, d\mathbf{m}. \quad (2.3)$$

*Remark 2.16.* Since  $\text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is dense in  $D(\Delta)$ , for any  $f \in D(\Delta)$ , the Hessian  $\text{Hess } f$  is well-defined and belongs to  $L^2((T^*)^{\otimes 2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}))$ . Furthermore, if  $f_i \in D(\Delta) \cap \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d})$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), then we have  $\langle \nabla f_1, \nabla f_2 \rangle \in H^{1,2}$  and  $\text{Hess } f_1 = \text{Hess } f_2$   $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e. on  $\{f_1 = f_2\}$ . Additionally, the following holds for any  $\varphi \in H^{1,2}$ .

$$\langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla \langle \nabla f_1, \nabla f_2 \rangle \rangle = \text{Hess } f_1(\nabla f_2, \nabla \varphi) + \text{Hess } f_2(\nabla f_1, \nabla \varphi) \quad \mathbf{m}\text{-a.e.} \quad (2.4)$$

We note that when  $\text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d}) > 2$ , for any  $f \in D(\Delta)$ , the local  $L^2$ -norm of the Hessian of  $f$  can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_1(x)} |\text{Hess } f|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, d\mathbf{m} &\leq C(K, N) \left( \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, d\mathbf{m} + \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_2(x)} ||\nabla f|^2 - m| \, d\mathbf{m} \right) \\ &\quad - 2(K \wedge 0) \int_{B_2(x)} |\nabla f|^2 \, d\mathbf{m}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

It is important to highlight that, due to the locality of the Hessian, even if a function  $f$  belongs to  $D(\Delta, B_2(x))$ , its Hessian on  $B_1(x)$ , which is still denoted by  $\text{Hess } f$ , can be interpreted as  $\text{Hess}(\varphi f)$ , where  $\varphi$  is a non-negative cut-off function in  $\text{Test}F(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  such that  $\varphi = 1$  on  $B_1(x)$ , that the support of  $\varphi$  is contained within  $B_2(x)$ , and that  $|\Delta \varphi| + |\nabla \varphi| \leq C(K, N)$   $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e. on  $B_2(x)$ . See [AMS14, Thm. 6.7], [Gig18b] and [MN14, Lem. 3.1] for details.

Let us consider a function  $f \in D(\Delta, B_{2r}(x))$  for some  $0 < r < \text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d})/2$ , and examine  $f/r$  on the rescaled  $\text{RCD}(r^2K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}/r, \mathbf{m}/\mathbf{m}(B_r(x)))$ . Then it immediately follows from (2.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 \int_{B_r(x)} |\text{Hess } f|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} &\leq C(K, N) \left( r^2 \int_{B_{2r}(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} + \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_{2r}(x)} \left| |\nabla f|^2 - m \right| \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \right) \\ &\quad - 2r^2(K \wedge 0) \int_{B_{2r}(x)} |\nabla f|^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Equation (2.5) was first introduced in [BPS23b, Sec. 1.3]. We express our gratitude to Elia Brué for providing a comprehensive proof of this equation, which is reproduced below for the reader's convenience.

*Proof of (2.5).* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $K$  is non-positive. Consider the auxiliary problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \tilde{f} = 0 & \text{on } B_2(x), \\ \tilde{f} - f \in H_0^{1,2}(B_2(x)). \end{cases}$$

The existence of such a solution is guaranteed by [BM95, Cor. 1.2] and [BB11, Thm 10.12]. Since  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces satisfy (2,2)-Poincaré inequality, they consequently fulfill the Sobolev inequality (see [Raj12, Thm. 1] and [HK00, Thm. 5.1]) and [BB11, Thm. 5.51]). This allows us to directly estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_2(x)} |\nabla(f - \tilde{f})|^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} &= \int_{B_2(x)} (f - \tilde{f}) \Delta f \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \\ &\leq \left( \int_{B_2(x)} (f - \tilde{f})^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C(K, N) \left( \int_{B_2(x)} |\nabla(f - \tilde{f})|^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\int_{B_2(x)} |\nabla(f - \tilde{f})|^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \leq C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m}. \tag{2.7}$$

Using (2.3) (2.7), taking the cut-off function  $\varphi$ , and applying integral by parts we

see

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_1(x)} \left| \text{Hess}(f - \tilde{f}) \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \leq \int_{B_2(x)} \varphi \left| \text{Hess}(f - \tilde{f}) \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& \leq C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \nabla(f - \tilde{f}) \right|^2 \, d\mathbf{m} - \int_{B_2(x)} \varphi \langle \nabla \Delta(f - \tilde{f}), \nabla(f - \tilde{f}) \rangle \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& = C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \nabla(f - \tilde{f}) \right|^2 \, d\mathbf{m} + \int_{B_2(x)} \left( \varphi (\Delta f)^2 + \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla(f - \tilde{f}) \rangle \Delta f \right) \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& \leq C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, d\mathbf{m}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Similarly, given that  $\Delta \tilde{f} = 0$  and applying (2.7), we deduce that for any  $m \in \mathbb{R}$  the following equation holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_1(x)} \left| \text{Hess} \tilde{f} \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_2(x)} \Delta \varphi \left( \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 - m \right) \, d\mathbf{m} - K \int_{B_2(x)} \varphi \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& \leq C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 - m \right| \, d\mathbf{m} - K \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& = C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 - m \right| \, d\mathbf{m} - K \int_{B_2(x)} \left( \left| \nabla f \right|^2 - \left| \nabla(f - \tilde{f}) \right|^2 \right) \, d\mathbf{m} \\
& \leq C(K, N) \left( \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 - m \right| \, d\mathbf{m} + \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \right) - K \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \nabla f \right|^2 \, d\mathbf{m}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Since

$$\int_{B_1(x)} \left| \text{Hess} f \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, d\mathbf{m} \leq 2 \int_{B_1(x)} \left( \left| \text{Hess}(f - \tilde{f}) \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 + \left| \text{Hess} \tilde{f} \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \right) \, d\mathbf{m}, \tag{2.10}$$

to conclude it suffices to show that

$$\inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla \tilde{f} \right|^2 - m \right| \, d\mathbf{m} \leq \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla f \right|^2 - m \right| \, d\mathbf{m} + C(K, N) \int_{B_2(x)} (\Delta f)^2 \, d\mathbf{m}. \tag{2.11}$$

Let  $\hat{m}$  be the real number such that

$$\int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla f \right|^2 - \hat{m} \right| \, d\mathbf{m} = \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \left| \nabla f \right|^2 - m \right| \, d\mathbf{m}.$$

Then the harmonicity of  $\tilde{f}$  gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{m \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{B_2(x)} \left| |\nabla \tilde{f}|^2 - m \right| \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \leq \int_{B_2(x)} \left| |\nabla \tilde{f}|^2 - \hat{m} \right| \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \\ & \leq \int_{B_2(x)} \left| |\nabla f|^2 - \hat{m} \right| \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} + \int_{B_2(x)} \left| |\nabla f|^2 - |\nabla \tilde{f}|^2 \right| \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \\ & = \int_{B_2(x)} \left| |\nabla f|^2 - \hat{m} \right| \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} + \int_{B_2(x)} \left| \nabla(f - \tilde{f}) \right|^2 \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.7) yields (2.11).

Finally, the conclusion is derived from (2.9)-(2.11).  $\square$

**Theorem 2.17** (Canonical Riemannian metric [AHPT21, GP22]). *There exists a unique Riemannian metric  $g \in L^\infty((T^*)^{\otimes 2}(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}))$  such that  $|g|_{\text{HS}} = \sqrt{n}$   $\mathbf{m}$ -a.e. and that for any  $f_1, f_2 \in H^{1,2}$  it holds that*

$$g(\nabla f_1, \nabla f_2) = \langle \nabla f_1, \nabla f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathbf{m}\text{-a.e.}$$

We are now prepared to present a recent result in [Hua23, Thm. 1.10], which concludes this subsection. The theorem establishes that compact non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  spaces equipped with isometrically immersing eigenmaps are, in fact, smooth.

**Theorem 2.18.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  be a compact non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space and  $g$  be the canonical Riemannian metric on it. If there exist a finite number of non-constant eigenfunctions  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^m$  such that*

$$g = \sum_{i=1}^m d\phi_i \otimes d\phi_i,$$

*then  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is isometric to an  $n$ -dimensional smooth closed Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$ .*

This theorem played an important role in proving the smoothness of compact isometrically heat kernel immersing  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces as demonstrated in [Hua23]. By ‘‘isometrically heat kernel immersing’’ we mean that there exists a function  $t \mapsto c(t)$  on  $(0, \infty)$  such that for each  $t > 0$ , the function  $x \mapsto (y \mapsto \sqrt{c(t)} \rho(x, y, t))$  provides an isometric immersion into  $L^2$ .

### 3 Symmetric and harmonic $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces

The first part of this section is aimed at proving Theorem 1.9. To achieve this, we require several key estimates concerning eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. For further details and background, refer to [AHPT21, Appendix] and [ZZ19].



**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $\mathbf{m}(X) = 1$ . Let  $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$  be all its eigenvalues counted with multiplicities and let  $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  be the corresponding eigenfunctions, which form an  $L^2$ -orthonormal basis. Then, there exists a constant  $C = C(K, N, \text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d}))$ , such that for all  $i \geq 1$  we have*

$$\|\varphi_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \lambda_i^{\frac{N}{4}}, \quad \|\nabla \varphi_i\|_{L^\infty} \leq C \lambda_i^{\frac{N+2}{4}}, \quad C^{-1} i^{\frac{2}{N}} \leq \lambda_i \leq C i^2.$$

In the rest of this section we use the notation of (1.2). We let  $\mu_i$  be the corresponding eigenvalue of  $\phi_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, m$ ) and use  $C$  to denote the constant

$$C = C(K, m, n, \text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d}), \mathcal{H}^n(X), \mu_1, \dots, \mu_m, \|\phi_1\|_{L^2}, \dots, \|\phi_m\|_{L^2}).$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.9.* Let us first show that

$$\left| \frac{F(0) - F(\mathbf{d}(x, y))}{\mathbf{d}^2(x, y)} \right| \leq C, \quad \forall x, y \in X. \quad (3.1)$$

Letting  $x = y$  in (1.2) we know

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i^2(x) = F(0), \quad \forall x \in X. \quad (3.2)$$

Therefore, it clearly follows from (1.2) and (3.2) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(y))^2 = 2(F(0) - F(\mathbf{d}(x, y))), \quad \forall x, y \in X. \quad (3.3)$$

As a result, we have

$$\frac{F(0) - F(\mathbf{d}(x, y))}{\mathbf{d}^2(x, y)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{\phi_i(x) - \phi_i(y)}{\mathbf{d}(x, y)} \right)^2, \quad \forall x, y \in X,$$

which together with the Proposition 3.1 yields (3.1).

From now on let us take an arbitrary but fixed

$$x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_n(X) \cap \bigcap_{i,j=1}^m \text{Leb}(\langle \nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j \rangle),$$

where  $\text{Leb}(\langle \nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j \rangle)$  is the Lebesgue point of the function  $\langle \nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j \rangle$ .

We first claim that

$$\frac{1}{2} \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(0) - F(r)}{r^2} > 0. \quad (3.4)$$

We prove by contradiction. Assume there exists a sequence  $\{r_l\} \subset (0, \infty)$  such that  $r_l \rightarrow 0$ , and that  $r_l^{-2}(F(0) - F(r_l)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ . After passing to a subsequence, we have

$$(X_l, \mathbf{d}_l, \mathcal{H}^n, x_0) := \left( X, \frac{1}{r_l} \mathbf{d}, \frac{1}{r_l^n} \mathcal{H}_d^n, x_0 \right) \xrightarrow{\text{pmGH}} (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \mathcal{L}^n, 0_n).$$

For convenience, we denote the gradient and the Laplacian on  $(X_l, \mathbf{d}_l, \mathcal{H}^n)$  by  $\Delta_l, \nabla_l$  respectively. Additionally, we use  $B_r^l(x_0)$  to represent the ball  $B_r^{X_l}(x_0)$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , let us set  $\varphi_{i,l} := (\phi_i - \phi_i(x_0))/r_l$ . Then we have

$$|\nabla_l \varphi_{i,l}| = |\nabla \phi_i|, \quad \Delta_l \varphi_{i,l} = r_l \Delta \phi_i = -r_l \mu_i \phi_i.$$

Particularly, the forthcoming estimates are straightforwardly extracted from Proposition 3.1:

$$\|\nabla_l \varphi_{i,l}\|_{L^\infty(X_l)} \leq C; \quad \|\Delta_l \varphi_{i,l}\|_{L^\infty(X_l)} \leq C r_l \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

According to the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem (Theorem 2.11), for any  $R > 0$ , and for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , the sequence  $\{\varphi_{i,l}\}_l$  uniformly converges to a Lipschitz continuous function  $\varphi_i$  on  $B_R(0_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Furthermore, (3.5) and Theorem 2.13 indicate that each  $\varphi_i$  is a harmonic function satisfying  $|\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_i| \leq C$ , and thus is a linear function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore, for each  $i, j$ , since  $x_0 \in \text{Leb}(\langle \nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j \rangle)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j \rangle(x_0) &= \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \langle \nabla \phi_i, \nabla \phi_j \rangle \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega_n} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_1^l(x_0)} \langle \nabla_l \varphi_{i,l}, \nabla_l \varphi_{j,l} \rangle \, d\mathcal{H}^n = \langle \nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_i, \nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any  $y \in \partial B_1(0_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , by taking  $y_l \in \partial B_1^l(x_0) = \partial B_{r_l}(x_0)$  such that  $y_l \rightarrow y$ , we observe from (3.3) and the fact  $\mathbf{d}_l(y_l, x_0) \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(y, 0_n)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(0) - F(\mathbf{d}(x_0, y_l))}{\mathbf{d}^2(x_0, y_l)} &= 2 \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{r_l}{\mathbf{d}(x_0, y_l)} \right)^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{\phi_i(x_0) - \phi_i(y_l)}{r_l} \right)^2 \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \varphi_i^2(y) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

As a result,  $|\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_1| \equiv |\nabla \phi_1|(x_0) = 0$ . This is impossible since one can choose  $x_0$  as the Lebesgue point of the set  $\{y \in X : |\nabla \phi_1|(y) \neq 0\}$ . Therefore we complete the proof of (3.4). Additionally, from the above discussion we know  $\sum_i |\nabla \phi_i|^2 > 0$  for  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in X$ .

Next let us consider an arbitrary sequence  $\{r_l\}$  with  $r_l \rightarrow 0$  such that the following limit exists.

$$\frac{1}{2} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(0) - F(r_l)}{r_l^2} = c > 0.$$

Then according to the linearity of  $\varphi_i$  and (3.6), on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  it holds that  $\sum_i \varphi_i^2(y) = c|y|^2$ . It is easy to see that  $\sum_i |\nabla \phi_i|^2(x_0) = \sum_i |\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_i|^2 \equiv nc$ . Hence we deduce that

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{F(0) - F(r)}{r^2} = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m |\nabla \phi_i|^2(x_0) := 2nc > 0, \quad (3.7)$$

because the sequence  $\{r_l\}$  is taken to be arbitrary.

Finally, we assert that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^m d\phi_i \otimes d\phi_i - cg \right|_{\text{HS}} = 0, \quad \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e.}, \quad (3.8)$$

where  $c$  is the constant obtained in (3.7), and  $g$  is the canonical Riemannian metric on  $(X, d, \mathcal{H}^n)$ .

Now let  $x_0$  be an arbitrary but fixed point in  $\text{Leb} \left( \left| cg - \sum_{i=1}^m d\phi_i \otimes d\phi_i \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \right) \cap \mathcal{R}_n$  and use the notations as above. Then since on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  it holds that  $\sum_i \varphi_i^2(y) = c|y|^2$ , by applying the linearity of each  $\varphi_i$  and taking partial derivatives we know

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial y^\alpha} \frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial y^\beta} = c \delta_{\alpha\beta},$$

which implies that  $cg_{\mathbb{R}^n} = \sum_i d\varphi_i \otimes d\varphi_i$ .

For each  $i$ , the  $H^{1,2}$ -strong convergence of the sequence  $\{\varphi_{i,l}\}_l$  on any  $B_R(0_n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  (Theorem 2.13) as well as (3.5) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| cg - \sum_{i=1}^m d\phi_i \otimes d\phi_i \right|_{\text{HS}}^2(x_0) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_r(x_0)} \left| cg - \sum_{i=1}^m d\phi_i \otimes d\phi_i \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega_n} \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_1^l(x_0)} \left| cg_{X_l} - \sum_{i=1}^m d\varphi_{i,l} \otimes d\varphi_{i,l} \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \int_{B_1(0_n)} \left| cg_{\mathbb{R}^n} - \sum_{i=1}^m d\varphi_i \otimes d\varphi_i \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{L}^n = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $x_0 \in \text{Leb} \left( \left| cg - \sum_{i=1}^m d\phi_i \otimes d\phi_i \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 \right) \cap \mathcal{R}_n$  is arbitrary, we have completed the proof of (3.8). It now remains to apply Theorems 2.7 and 2.18 to reach our conclusion.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* In fact, the condition of radial symmetry in Theorem 1.9 can be reduced to the existence of a real valued function  $F : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and non-constant eigenfunctions  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^m$  such that for any  $x \in X$  there exists  $\epsilon_x > 0$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x)\phi_i(y) = F(\mathbf{d}(x, y)), \forall y \in B_{\epsilon_x}(x).$$

Next, we focus on strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. Specifically, we consider the  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  with  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X) = n$  for the remainder of this section. Let us recall the definition of a strongly harmonic  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space: there exists a real valued function  $H : [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the heat kernel  $\rho$  of  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  satisfies

$$\rho(x, y, t) = H(\mathbf{d}(x, y), t), \forall x, y \in X, \forall t > 0. \quad (3.9)$$

We begin with the proof of Theorem 1.8, which parallels the proof of [Hua23, Thm. 1.7].

*Proof of Theorem 1.8.* We state that there exists a constant  $\tilde{c} > 0$  such that

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^n H(rt, t^2) = \tilde{c} (4\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{4}\right), \forall r > 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Take an arbitrary but fixed  $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_n^*(X)$ . For any  $\{r_i\} \subset \mathbb{R}$  with  $r_i \rightarrow 0$ , after passing to a subsequence, consider the following pmGH convergence.

$$(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}, x_0) := \left(X, \frac{1}{r_i} \mathbf{d}_i, \frac{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0))}, x_0\right) \xrightarrow{\text{pmGH}} \left(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \frac{1}{\omega_n} \mathcal{L}^n, 0_n\right).$$

On each  $(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}_i)$ , the heat kernel  $\rho_i$  satisfies that

$$\rho_i(x_i, y_i, 1) = \mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0)) \rho(x_i, y_i, r_i^2), \forall x_i, y_i \in X_i. \quad (3.11)$$

For each  $i$ , we can take  $x_i, y_i \in B_{2r_i}(x_0)$  such that  $\mathbf{d}_i(x_i, y_i) = r_i$ . Then after passing to a subsequence, we may assume that  $X_i \ni x_i \rightarrow x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $X_i \ni y_i \rightarrow y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Due to Theorem 2.10, we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho_i(x_i, y_i, 1) = (4\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4}\right). \quad (3.12)$$

Combining (3.9), (3.11) and (3.12) then gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \vartheta_n(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})(x_0) \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} r_i^n H(r_i|x-y|, r_i^2) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0)) H(r_i|x-y|, r_i^2) = (4\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Since the aforementioned equality does not depend on the choice of the sequence  $r_i \downarrow 0$ , and the limit  $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^n H(rt, t^2)$  does not depend on the choice of  $x_0 \in \mathcal{R}_n^*(X)$ , we thereby complete the proof of (3.10). Indeed, we have also proved that

$$\vartheta_n(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})(x) = \tilde{c}^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{m}\text{-a.e. } x \in \mathcal{R}_n^*(X).$$

Moreover, if we initially take  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and then choose sequences  $\{x_i\}, \{y_i\}$  such that  $X_i \ni x_i \rightarrow x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $X_i \ni y_i \rightarrow y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  in the above argument, we can find that

$$\frac{\mathbf{d}(x_i, y_i)}{r_i} = \mathbf{d}_i(x_i, y_i) \rightarrow |x - y|, \quad \text{as } i \rightarrow \infty.$$

As a result, by following the calculations in (3.13), (3.10) can be refined to

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} t^n H(rt + o(t), t^2) = \tilde{c} (4\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{4}\right), \quad \forall r > 0. \quad (3.14)$$

Assume there exists a point  $x_0$  such that  $\vartheta_n(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})(x_0) \neq \tilde{c}$ . For any  $r_i \downarrow 0$ , after passing to a subsequence, there exists a pointed RCD(0,  $n$ ) space  $(X_\infty, \mathbf{d}_\infty, \mathbf{m}_\infty, x_\infty)$  such that

$$(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathbf{m}, x_0) := \left(X, \frac{1}{r_i} \mathbf{d}_i, \frac{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0))}, x_0\right) \xrightarrow{\text{pmGH}} (X_\infty, \mathbf{d}_\infty, \mathbf{m}_\infty, x_\infty).$$

Let  $\rho_\infty$  be the heat kernel on  $(X_\infty, \mathbf{d}_\infty, \mathbf{m}_\infty)$ . For any  $z_\infty, w_\infty \in X_\infty$ , we can select two sequences  $\{z_i\}$  and  $\{w_i\}$  such that  $X_i \ni z_i \rightarrow z_\infty$ ,  $X_i \ni w_i \rightarrow w_\infty$ . Similarly, we can show that the heat kernel on the limit space satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\infty(z_\infty, w_\infty, 1) &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho_i(z_i, w_i, 1) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0)) \rho(z_i, w_i, r_i^2) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0)) H(r_i \mathbf{d}_i(z_i, w_i), r_i^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Owing to Theorem 2.3 and (3.14), by letting  $z_\infty = x_\infty$  and selecting  $w_\infty \in \partial B_1(x_\infty)$ , we observe from (3.15) that

$$(\tilde{c} C)^{-1} \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbf{m}(B_{r_i}(x_0))}{r_i^n} \leq \tilde{c}^{-1} C,$$

where  $C = C(K, N)$  is a positive constant. Specifically, we know

$$(\tilde{c} C)^{-1} \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{m}(B_r(x_0))}{r^n} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{m}(B_r(x_0))}{r^n} \leq \tilde{c}^{-1} C.$$

Therefore, applying [AT04, Thm. 2.4.3] implies that  $\mathcal{H}^n \ll \mathbf{m}$ . This result, combined with Remark 2.8 then shows that  $\mathbf{m} = \tilde{c}^{-1} \mathcal{H}^n$ . Ultimately, it follows from [BGHZ23, Thm. 1.5 and 2.22] that  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a non-collapsed RCD( $K, n$ ) space.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.10.* According to Theorem 1.8,  $\mathbf{m} = c\mathcal{H}^n$  for some  $c > 0$ , and  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is an RCD( $K, n$ ) space. Since the space can be rescaled, without loss of generality we may assume that  $\mathcal{H}^n(X) = 1$ . To conclude, it suffices to verify that  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a radial symmetric RCD( $K, n$ ) space.

Recall that for any  $x, y \in X$  any  $t > 0$ , our assumption implies that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} e^{-\mu_i t} \phi_i(x) \phi_i(y) = \rho(x, y, t) = H(\mathbf{d}(x, y), t).$$

Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_m$  be the  $L^2$ -orthonormal basis of eigenspace with corresponding eigenvalue  $\mu_1$ . Given any two points  $x, y \in X$ , for any  $t > 0$  we calculate that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x) \phi_i(y) = e^{\mu_1 t} (H(\mathbf{d}(x, y), t) - 1) - \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} e^{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)t} \phi_i(x) \phi_i(y). \quad (3.16)$$

Let  $N_0$  be the integer such that

$$\mu_i \geq 2C_1(K, n) i^{\frac{2}{n}} \geq 2\mu_1, \quad \forall i \geq N_0.$$

Then the second term of the right hand side of (3.16) satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} e^{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)t} \phi_i(x) \phi_i(y) \right| &\leq C_2(K, N) \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} e^{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)t} i^{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &= \sum_{i=m+1}^{N_0} e^{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)t} i^{\frac{n}{2}} + \sum_{i=N_0+1}^{\infty} e^{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)t} i^{\frac{n}{2}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=m+1}^{N_0} e^{(\mu_1 - \mu_i)t} i^{\frac{n}{2}} + \sum_{i=N_0+1}^{\infty} e^{C_1(K, N) i^{-\frac{2}{n}}} i^{\frac{n}{2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Finally it follows from (3.16) and (3.17) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \phi_i(x) \phi_i(y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\mu_1 t} (H(\mathbf{d}(x, y), t) - 1) := F(\mathbf{d}(x, y)),$$

which shows that  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a radial symmetric RCD( $K, n$ ) space. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Smoothness Theorem 1.11

The core of our analysis in this section is the proof of Theorem 1.11. We first present several useful results.

### 4.1 Co-area formula and disintegration formula on RCD spaces

In this section, we will frequently utilize the coarea formula. Let's review the version of the statement that we will require. For a more detailed discussion, refer to [Jr.03, Proposition 4.2], and for the representation of the perimeter measure using Hausdorff measures, see [ABS19, BPS23b]. Furthermore, we refer to for instance [GH16, Rmk. 3.5] for an explanation of how the total variation measure of a Lipschitz function coincides with the product of its weak upper gradient and the reference measure.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  be a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space. Let  $v$  be a Lipschitz function on  $X$ . Then  $\{v > t\}$  has finite perimeter for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $t > 0$ , and for every Borel function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  it holds:*

$$\int_X f |\nabla v| \, d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \int_{\{v=t\}} f \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right) dt.$$

We may also need some knowledge concerning the disintegration formula of the distance function  $\mathbf{d}_x := \mathbf{d}(x, \cdot)$  on a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$ , where  $x \in X$  is a fixed point. We refer to for instance [CM20b, Sec. 3].

It is worth pointing out the following geodesically non-branching property in the RCD setting.

**Theorem 4.2** ([Den20, Thm. 1.3]).  *$\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces are non-branching. That is, there do not exist two unit speed geodesics  $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$  such that they are parameterized on the unit interval and that there exist  $t \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$\gamma_1(s) = \gamma_2(s), \quad \forall s \in [0, t].$$

For the remainder of this subsection, we assume that  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X) \geq 2$ . Let us fix a point  $x \in X$  and define the set  $\Gamma$  as follows:

$$\Gamma := \{(y, z) \in X \times X : \mathbf{d}_x(y) - \mathbf{d}_x(z) = \mathbf{d}(y, z)\}.$$

The transpose of  $\Gamma$  is given by  $\Gamma^{-1}$ , defined as  $\Gamma^{-1} := \{(y, z) \in X \times X : (z, y) \in \Gamma\}$ . We then define the transport relation  $R$  as  $R := \Gamma \cup \Gamma^{-1}$ . Furthermore, we denote

by  $\Gamma(y) = \{z \in X : (y, z) \in \Gamma\}$  the section of  $\Gamma$  through  $y$  in the first coordinate, and similarly for  $R(y)$  (through either coordinate by symmetry). Subsequently, we introduce the forward branching point set, following the approach outlined in [Cav14]:

$$\mathcal{E} = \{w \in X : \exists (y, z) \in \Gamma(w) \times \Gamma(w) \setminus R\}.$$

We note here that by combining Theorem 4.2 with our assumption that  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X) \geq 2$ , the backward branching point set in our context is precisely  $\{x\}$ .

Let us consider the non-branched transport set  $\mathcal{T} := X \setminus (\mathcal{E} \cup \{x\})$ , which is a  $\sigma$ -compact set with  $\mathbf{m}$ -measure zero by [Cav14, Lem. 4.3, Prop. 4.5]. We also define the non-branched transport relation  $\mathcal{R} := R \cap (\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T})$ . According to [Cav14, Thm. 4.6] (see also [BC13]),  $\mathcal{R}$  is an equivalence relation over  $\mathcal{T}$  and that for any  $y \in \mathcal{T}$ ,  $R(y) \subset (X, \mathbf{d})$  is a unit speed geodesic defined on a closed interval, starting from  $x$ .

As a result, the non-branched transport set  $\mathcal{T}$  is partitioned into a disjoint family of equivalence classes, denoted by  $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Q}$ , where  $Q$  is an index set. It follows naturally to introduce the quotient map  $\mathfrak{Q} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow Q$ , which is induced by this partition:

$$\alpha = \mathfrak{Q}(y) \iff y \in X_\alpha.$$

Furthermore, we can equip  $Q$  with the quotient  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{Q}$ , which is derived from the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{X}$  over  $X$  consisting of  $\mathbf{m}$ -measurable sets. This quotient  $\sigma$ -algebra is defined by

$$A \in \mathcal{Q} \iff \mathfrak{Q}^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{X},$$

and it represents the finest  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $Q$  for which  $\mathfrak{Q}$  is measurable. It is straightforward to verify that  $\mathfrak{Q}_\# \mathbf{m} \ll \mathfrak{q}$ . Owing to [Cav14, Thm. 5.5], for  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces we have  $\mathbf{m}(X \setminus \mathcal{T}) = 0$ . After normalization, we can introduce the quotient measure  $\mathfrak{q}$  as  $\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{Q}_\#(\mathbf{m})$ , meaning that  $\mathfrak{q}$  is obtained by pushing forward  $\mathbf{m}(X)^{-1} \mathbf{m}$  via the quotient map  $\mathfrak{Q}$ .

Indeed, there is a rather explicit construction of the quotient map  $\mathfrak{Q}$  which embeds  $Q$  a subset of  $X$  and ensures that the map itself is  $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable, where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the analytic sets of  $X$ , as detailed in [CM17b] and [CM20a, Lem. 3.8].

Thus, by combining the classical disintegration theorem [Fre03, Prop. 452F] with recent localization results ([BC13, Thm. 9.5] and [CM17a, Thm. 5.1]), we can summarize the above findings in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  be a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}}(X) \geq 2$  and let  $x \in X$  be a fixed point. Then the measure  $\mathbf{m}$  restricted to the non-branched transport set  $\mathcal{T}$  admits the following disintegration formula:*

$$\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{T}} := \int_Q \mathbf{m}_\alpha \, \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{q}(\alpha), \tag{4.1}$$



where  $\mathfrak{q}$  is a Borel probability measure over  $Q \subset X$  such that  $\mathfrak{Q}_\# \mathfrak{m} \ll \mathfrak{q}$ . Moreover,  $\{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Q}$  satisfies the following properties.

1. For  $\mathfrak{q}$ -a.e.  $\alpha \in Q$ , there exists a non-negative Borel function  $h_\alpha$  on  $X_\alpha$  such that  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha = h_\alpha \mathcal{H}^1 \llcorner_{X_\alpha}$  and that  $h_\alpha$  is a  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  density on  $X_\alpha$  (or equivalently by writing  $\overline{X}_\alpha$  as the closure of  $X_\alpha$ ,  $(\overline{X}_\alpha, \mathbf{d}, h_\alpha \mathcal{H}^1)$  verifies the  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  condition).
2. For any  $\mathfrak{m}$ -measurable set  $B$ , the map  $\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_\alpha(B)$  is  $\mathfrak{q}$ -measurable.
3. For any  $\mathfrak{m}$ -measurable set  $B$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$ -measurable set  $A$ , the following disintegration formula holds:

$$\mathfrak{m}(B \cap \mathfrak{Q}^{-1}(A)) = \int_A \int_{X_\alpha} \chi_B \, d\mathcal{H}^1 \, d\mathfrak{q}(\alpha).$$

*Remark 4.4.* In the second property of the family  $\{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in Q}$ , we omit the precise definition of the  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  metric measure spaces, referring instead to [LV09, Stu06a, Stu06b] for details. We note that for all  $\alpha$  such that  $h_\alpha$  is a  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  density on  $X_\alpha$ ,  $h_\alpha$  is locally semi-concave in the interior of  $X_\alpha$ . That is, for every  $z_0$  in the interior of  $X_\alpha$ , there exists a constant  $C(z_0, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}$  such that the function  $z \mapsto (h_\alpha - C(z_0, \alpha)z^2)$  is concave in a neighborhood (in  $X_\alpha$ ) of  $z_0$ .

Finally, we recall that if  $([a, b], \mathbf{d}_\mathbb{R}, h \mathcal{H}^1)$  is a  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  metric measure space, then the derivative of  $\log h$  is bounded as follows:

$$-(N-1) \frac{V'_{K,N}(b-t)}{V_{K,N}(b-t)} \leq (\log h)'(t) \leq (N-1) \frac{V'_{K,N}(t-a)}{V_{K,N}(t-a)}, \quad (4.2)$$

for  $t \in (a, b)$  being a point of differentiability of  $h$ . See, for instance [CM21, Lem. A.9].

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.11

For reader's convenience, we recall Theorem 1.11 as follows.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$  be a compact  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space with  $\dim_{\mathbf{d}, \mathfrak{m}}(X) = n$ . If in addition the measure of the intersection of two geodesic balls depends only on their radii and the distance between their centers, then*

- (1)  $\mathfrak{m} = c \mathcal{H}^n$  for some constant  $c > 0$  and  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(K, n)$  space;
- (2)  $(X, \mathbf{d})$  is isometric to an  $n$ -dimensional smooth closed Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, \mathbf{g})$ .

*Remark 4.6.* By approximating with characteristic functions, one can demonstrate that the assumption of Theorem 4.5 is equivalent to the following condition: the convolution of two radial kernel functions  $H_1 = h_1 \circ \mathbf{d}$  and  $H_2 = h_2 \circ \mathbf{d}$  results in a radial kernel function, provided that  $h_1, h_2$  are  $L^2$ -integrable functions on  $\mathbb{R}$  with compact support. This finding offers a generalization of Theorem 1.5 within the RCD framework.

*Proof of Theorem 4.5(1).* From our assumption we deduce the existence of a function  $\theta : [0, \text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d})] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that

$$\mathbf{m}(B_r(x)) = \theta(r), \forall x \in X, \forall r \in [0, \text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d})].$$

Then Theorem 2.7, in conjunction with Remark 2.8 indicates the existence of a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{m}(B_r(x))}{\omega_n r^n} = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\theta(r)}{\omega_n r^n} = c. \quad (4.3)$$

Finally, following the argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.8, we complete the proof of statement (1).  $\square$

*Remark 4.7.* A metric measure space  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is said to be ball-homogeneous if

$$\mathbf{m}(B_r(x)) = \theta(r), \forall x \in X, \forall r \in [0, \infty).$$

To the best of the author's knowledge, the following proposition represents the state-of-the-art in the regularity of ball-homogeneous  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. Nevertheless, it remains an open question whether a compact ball-homogeneous  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space is isometric to a smooth closed Riemannian manifold, or even a Lipschitz manifold.

**Proposition 4.8.** *Assume  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  is a ball-homogeneous  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  space. Then statement (1) of Theorem 4.5 also holds and  $(X, \mathbf{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a  $C^\alpha$ -manifold, where  $\alpha$  is a constant depending only on  $n$ .*

*Proof.* The first part can be derived using the same proof as that of statement (1) in Theorem 4.5.

As for the second part, let us denote by  $(X_r, \mathbf{d}_r, \mathcal{H}^n, x) = (X, \mathbf{d}/r, \mathcal{H}_\mathbf{d}^n/r^n, x)$  for convenience and claim that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{x \in X} \mathbf{d}_{\text{pmGH}}((X_r, \mathbf{d}_r, \mathcal{H}^n, x), (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \mathcal{L}^n, 0_n)) = 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Assume the contrary, i.e. there exists  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $r_i \rightarrow 0$  and  $\{x_i\} \subset X$  such that

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{pmGH}}((X_{r_i}, \mathbf{d}_{r_i}, \mathcal{H}^n, x_i), (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \mathcal{L}^n, 0_n)) > \epsilon. \quad (4.5)$$

After passing to a subsequence, there exists an  $\text{RCD}(0, n)$  space  $(Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y, y)$  such that

$$(X_{r_i}, \mathbf{d}_{r_i}, \mathcal{H}^n, x_i) \xrightarrow{\text{pmGH}} (Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y, y).$$

From (4.3) we know that for any  $X_{r_i} \ni z_i \rightarrow z \in Y$ , it holds

$$\mathbf{m}_Y(B_r^Y(z)) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{H}_d^n(B_{r_i r}^X(z_i))}{r_i^n} = c \omega_n r^n, \quad \forall r > 0.$$

As a consequence, following the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.5 (1), we deduce that  $\mathbf{m}_Y = c \mathcal{H}^n$  and that  $(Y, \mathbf{d}_Y, \mathcal{H}^n)$  is a non-collapsed  $\text{RCD}(0, n)$  space. Consequently, by [PG18, Thm. 1.6], it follows that  $(Y, \mathbf{d}_Y)$  is isometric to  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n})$ . However, this leads to a contradiction with (4.5).

By Theorem 2.9 we know  $X = \mathcal{R}_n$ . Finally, applying [CC97, Thm. A.1.2] completes the proof.  $\square$

In the remainder of this section, we focus on the second statement of Theorem 4.5.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5, any geodesic with length less than the diameter of  $X$  is locally extendible.*

*Proof.* Let  $D = \text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d})$  and choose  $x_0, y_0 \in X$  such that  $\mathbf{d}(x_0, y_0) = D$ . Consider the unit speed geodesic  $\gamma_0 : [0, D] \rightarrow X$  from  $x_0$  to  $y_0$ . Note that for any  $r, s, t > 0$  satisfying  $r + s + t < D$ , since  $\gamma_0(r + s + \frac{t}{2}) \in B_{r+t}(\gamma_0(s)) \setminus B_{r+s}(x_0)$ , which is an open set, we have  $\mathcal{H}^n(B_{r+t}(\gamma_0(s)) \setminus B_{r+s}(x_0)) > 0$ .

Given any arbitrary but fixed two points  $x, y \in X$  such that  $e := \mathbf{d}(x, y) < D$ , let  $\gamma : [0, e] \rightarrow X$  be the unit speed geodesic from  $x$  to  $y$ . For any  $\epsilon, e' \in (0, \min\{e, D - e\}/4)$ , it follows the fact  $\mathcal{H}^n(B_{e+\epsilon}(\gamma(e')) \setminus B_{e+e'}(x)) > 0$  that  $B_{e+\epsilon}(\gamma(e')) \setminus B_{e+e'}(x) \neq \emptyset$ . Consequently, for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can select a point  $z_i \in B_{e+\frac{1}{i}}(\gamma(e')) \setminus B_{e+e'}(x)$ . By taking a subsequence, we may assume that  $\{z_i\}$  converges to a point  $z \in X$ . Thus we have

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left( e + \frac{1}{i} + e' \right) \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(z_i, \gamma(e')) + e' \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}(z_i, x) = \mathbf{d}(z, x) \geq e + e'.$$

If we let  $\gamma' : [0, e'] \rightarrow X$  be the unit speed geodesic from  $y$  to  $z$ , then for any  $s \in [0, e]$ ,  $s' \in [0, e']$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} e + e' = \mathbf{d}(x, z) &\leq \mathbf{d}(x, \gamma(s)) + \mathbf{d}(\gamma(s), \gamma'(s)) + \mathbf{d}(\gamma'(s), z) \\ &= \mathbf{d}(\gamma(s), \gamma'(s)) + s + e' - s'. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathbf{d}(\gamma(s), \gamma'(s)) \leq \mathbf{d}(\gamma(s), y) + \mathbf{d}(y, \gamma'(s)) = e - s + s'.$$

Therefore,  $\mathbf{d}(\gamma(s), \gamma'(s)) = e - s + s'$ . Finally, owing to Theorem 4.2, the curve  $\tilde{\gamma} : [0, e + e'] \rightarrow X$  defined by

$$\tilde{\gamma}(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma(s) & \text{if } s \in [0, e], \\ \gamma'(s - e') & \text{if } s > e. \end{cases}$$

is a minimal geodesic from  $x$  to  $z$ . □

**Lemma 4.10.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5, the injectivity radius of  $X$  equals its diameter.*

*Proof.* First, we demonstrate that for any  $x, y \in X$  with  $0 < \mathbf{d}(x, y) = l < D$ , there exists a unique unit speed geodesic from  $x$  to  $y$ , denoted by  $\gamma_{x,y}$  for the remainder of this section.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that there are two geodesics  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  from  $x$  to  $y$ . By Lemma 4.9 we can assume that the domain of  $\gamma_1$  can be extended to  $[0, D]$  such that  $\gamma_1(0) = x$  and  $\gamma_1(l) = y$ . For convenience, the extended curve is still denoted by  $\gamma_1$ , and it remains a unit speed geodesic.

Given any  $\delta \in (0, D - l)$ , we calculate that

$$l + \delta = \mathbf{d}(\gamma_1(l + \delta), \gamma_2(0)) \leq \mathbf{d}(\gamma_1(l + \delta), \gamma_2(l)) + \mathbf{d}(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(l)) = l + \delta.$$

Let

$$\eta(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma_2(s) & \text{if } s \in [0, l], \\ \gamma_1(s - l) & \text{if } l < s < D. \end{cases}$$

Therefore  $\eta$  is also a minimal geodesic from  $x$  to  $\gamma_1(D)$  which agrees with  $\gamma_2$  on  $[0, l]$ . However, this leads to a contradiction with the non-branching property of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces (Theorem 4.2). □

**Lemma 4.11.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5, given any fixed point  $x_0 \in X$ , we have the disintegration formula (4.1) on  $X \setminus \mathcal{T}_{x_0}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{d}_{x_0}$ , where  $\mathcal{T}_{x_0} = \{x_0\} \cup \partial B_D(x_0)$  and  $Q = \partial B_{D/2}(x_0)$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $0 < r_1 < r_2 < D$ , let us set

$$\begin{aligned} F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1} : \partial B_{r_2}(x_0) &\longrightarrow \partial B_{r_1}(x_0) \\ y &\longmapsto \gamma_{x_0, y}(r_1), \end{aligned}$$

which is well defined and is a bijection due to Lemmas 4.9 and 4.10. Moreover, if  $\partial B_{r_2}(x_0) \ni y_i \rightarrow y \in \partial B_{r_2}(x_0)$ , by Lemma 4.10 we know  $\gamma_{x_0, y_i}$  must converge

to  $\gamma_{x_0, y}$ , which means that  $F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1}(y_i) \rightarrow F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1}(y)$ . Hence  $F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1}$  is continuous. Similarly  $(F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1})^{-1}$  (which is denoted by  $F_{r_1 \rightarrow r_2}$  later on for convenience) is also continuous. Therefore  $F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1}$  is a homomorphism. Indeed, arguing by contradiction, we can show that  $F_{r_2 \rightarrow r_1}$  and  $F_{r_1 \rightarrow r_2}$  are uniform continuous.

As a result, the following map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{Q} : \mathcal{T}_{x_0} &\longrightarrow Q := \partial B_{D/2}(x_0) \\ y &\longmapsto F_{\mathbf{d}(y, x_0) \rightarrow D/2}(y), \end{aligned}$$

is continuous and thus Borel. We also observe that in our context, each  $\alpha \in \partial B_{D/2}(x_0)$  uniquely determines a geodesic starting from  $x_0$ , which gives a partition

$$X \setminus \mathcal{T}_{x_0} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \partial B_{D/2}(x_0)} X_\alpha,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X_\alpha : (0, D) &\longrightarrow X \\ t &\longmapsto F_{D/2 \rightarrow t}(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, Theorem 2.2 ensures that  $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial B_D(x_0)) = 0$ , which permits the application of Theorem 4.3 to  $X \setminus (\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \cup \partial B_D(x_0))$ . Consequently, using the identification

$$X \setminus (\mathcal{T}_{x_0} \cup \partial B_D(x_0)) \ni y \mapsto (F_{\mathbf{d}(x_0, y) \rightarrow D/2}(y), \mathbf{d}(x_0, y)) \in \partial B_{D/2}(x_0) \times (0, D),$$

we can reformulate the disintegration formula as

$$\int_X f \, d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_{\partial B_{D/2}(x_0)} \int_{(0, D)} f(\alpha, t) \sigma_{x_0}(\alpha, t) \, dt \, d\mathbf{q}_{x_0}(\alpha), \quad \forall f \in L^1. \quad (4.6)$$

□

*Remark 4.12.* As a direct consequence of (4.6) and Theorem 4.1, we see that  $\partial B_R(x_0)$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ -measurable for any  $R \in (0, D)$ . Moreover, for any continuous function  $f$  on  $X$  it holds that

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_0)} f \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \int_{\partial B_{D/2}(x_0)} f(\alpha, R) \sigma_{x_0}(\alpha, R) \, d\mathbf{q}_{x_0}(\alpha), \quad \forall R \in (0, D).$$

We also observe that, according to Theorem 2.2, for any fixed point  $y_0 \in X$ , the function  $r \mapsto \mathcal{H}^n(B_r(y_0))/V_{K,n}(r)$  is monotone decreasing. Therefore its derivative is non-positive, yielding that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_r(y_0)) \leq \frac{V'_{K,n}(r) \mathcal{H}^n(B_r(y_0))}{V_{K,n}(r)} \leq C(K, n, D) r^{n-1}. \quad (4.7)$$

*Remark 4.13.* According to Remark 4.4 and [CM20b, Prop. 4.7], it is known that for any  $x \in X$  and any  $\delta \in (0, \mathbf{d}(x_0, x))$ , the following inequality holds:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{d}_{x_0}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\delta/2}(x))} \leq C(\mathbf{d}(x_0, x), \delta, K, N).$$

Furthermore, applying Theorem 2.2 and (2.6) implies that

$$\int_{B_r(y)} |\text{Hess } \mathbf{d}_{x_0}|_{\text{HS}}^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^n \leq C(\mathbf{d}(x_0, x), \delta, K, N), \quad \forall y \in B_{\delta/4}(x), \quad \forall r \in (0, \delta/4).$$

As a result, by letting  $r \rightarrow 0$  we deduce that

$$\|\text{Hess } \mathbf{d}_{x_0}|_{\text{HS}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{\delta/4}(x))} \leq C(\mathbf{d}(x_0, x), \delta, K, n).$$

**Lemma 4.14.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5, there exists a positive real number  $\epsilon_0$  depending on  $K, n, D$  satisfying the following property: given any fixed point  $x_0 \in X$ , and any  $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ , one can find  $\delta > 0$  and  $n$  points  $\{p_i\} \subset \partial B_{D/3}(x_0)$  such that by letting  $u_i := \mathbf{d}_{p_i} - D/3$ , the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U} : B_\delta(x_0) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \\ y &\longmapsto (u_1(y), \dots, u_n(y)), \end{aligned}$$

*is bijective. Moreover,  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^{-1}|_{\mathbf{U}(B_\delta(x_0))}$  are both  $(1 + C(K, n, D)\epsilon)$ -Lipschitz continuous.*

*Proof.* For any  $p \in \partial B_{D/3}(x_0)$ ,  $\gamma_{p, x_0}$  can be extended to length  $2D/3$ . Moreover, Remarks 4.12 and 4.13 guarantees the existence of a constant  $C = C(K, n, D) > 1$  such that

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{d}_p\|_{L^\infty(B_{D/6}(x_0))} + \|\text{Hess } \mathbf{d}_p|_{\text{HS}}\|_{L^\infty(B_{D/6}(x_0))} \leq C. \quad (4.8)$$

Let us first fix a point  $p_1 \in \partial B_{D/3}(x_0)$ . Then with the aid of Theorems 2.11 and 2.13,  $(\mathbf{d}_{p_1} - D/3)/r$  uniformly converges to a linear function whose norm is 1 under the convergence (4.4) as  $r \rightarrow 0$ . In addition, by Gromov-Hausdorff approximation, there exists  $r_1 < \epsilon$  and a point  $p'_2 \in \partial B_{r_1}(x_0)$  such that

$$\left| \mathbf{d}_{p_1}(p'_2) - \frac{D}{3} \right| \leq \epsilon r_1.$$

Set  $p_2 = F_{r_1 \rightarrow D/3}(p'_2)$ . Then the  $C$ -Lipschitz continuity of  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle$  on  $B_{r_1}(x_0)$  follows from the combination of (2.4) and (4.8). Furthermore, the following

calculation implies that  $|\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle|(x_0) \leq C\epsilon$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbf{d}_{p_1}(p'_2) - \frac{D}{3} \right| \\
&= \left| \int_0^{r_1} \langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle(\gamma_{x,p_2}(t)) dt \right| \\
&\geq r_1 |\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle(x_0)| - \left| \int_0^{r_1} (\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle(\gamma_{x,p_2}(t)) - \langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle(x_0)) dt \right| \\
&\geq r_1 |\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle(x_0)| - \frac{C}{2}(r_1)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Let  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  be limits of  $\gamma_{x,p_1}, \gamma_{x,p_2}$  under the convergence (4.4). Then thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle$  and [HM17], the angle  $\angle \gamma_1 0_n \gamma_2$  is uniquely determined by  $\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_1}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_2} \rangle(x_0)$  and satisfies that  $|\angle \gamma_1 0_n \gamma_2 - \pi/2| \leq C\epsilon$ . Similarly, one can identify points  $p_3, \dots, p_n \in \partial B_{D/3}(x_0)$  such that

$$|\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_i}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_j} \rangle|(x_0) \leq C\epsilon, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

Therefore, combining (4.8) we have

$$\max_{y \in B_{4\epsilon}(x_0)} |\langle \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_i}, \nabla \mathbf{d}_{p_j} \rangle|(y) \leq 5C\epsilon, \quad \forall i \neq j,$$

which yields

$$\max_{y \in B_{4\epsilon}(x_0)} \left| g - \sum_{i=1}^m d \mathbf{d}_{p_i} \otimes d \mathbf{d}_{p_i} \right|(y) \leq 5nC\epsilon.$$

We now let  $u_i := \mathbf{d}_{p_i} - D/3$  and  $\mathbf{U} := (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  and claim that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{y \in B_{2\epsilon}(x_0)} \max_{w \in \partial B_r(y)} \frac{|\mathbf{U}(w) - \mathbf{U}(y)|}{r} \geq 1 - C\epsilon. \tag{4.10}$$

We argue by contradiction. Assume there exists two sequences of points  $\{w_i\}$  and  $\{y_i\}$  such that  $r_i = \mathbf{d}(w_i, y_i) \rightarrow 0$  and that  $|\mathbf{U}(w_i) - \mathbf{U}(y_i)| < (1 - C\epsilon)r_i$ . Then using (4.4) and passing to a subsequence, we deduce that

$$(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i, \mathcal{H}^n, y_i) := \left( X, \frac{1}{r_i} \mathbf{d}, \frac{1}{r_i^n} \mathcal{H}^n, y_i \right) \xrightarrow{\text{pmGH}} (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{d}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, \mathcal{L}^n, 0_n).$$

Owing to (4.8) and Theorem 2.13, for each  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\{u_j^i := u_j/r_i\}$  uniformly converges to a linear function  $f_j : x \mapsto \alpha_j \cdot x$  with  $|\alpha_j| = 1$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore, we

can estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_n \sum_{j \neq l} (\alpha_j \cdot \alpha_l)^2 &= \int_{B_1(0_n)} \left| g_{\mathbb{R}^n} - \sum_{j=1}^n d f_j \otimes d f_j \right|^2 d\mathcal{L}^n \\
&= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_1^{X_i}(y_i)} \left| g_i^{X_i} - \sum_{j=1}^n d u_j^i \otimes d u_j^i \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \\
&= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r_i^n} \int_{B_{r_i}(y_i)} \left| g - \sum_{j=1}^n d u_j \otimes d u_j \right|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq 25 \omega_n C^2 \epsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote  $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \partial B_1(0_n)$  as the limit point of  $w_i$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - C\epsilon)^2 &\geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{|\mathbf{U}(w_i) - \mathbf{U}(y_i)|}{r_i} \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_j \cdot b_k \right)^2 = 1 + \sum_{k \neq l} b_k b_l (\alpha_k \cdot \alpha_l)^2 \\
&\geq 1 - 4C^2 \epsilon^2 \sum_{k \neq l} \frac{b_k^2 + b_l^2}{2} \geq 1 - 25n C^2 \epsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore to deduce the contradiction it suffices to set  $\epsilon_0 = 1/(25nC + C)$ . Similarly, one can show that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \sup_{y \in B_{2\epsilon}(x_0)} \max_{w \in \partial B_r(y)} \frac{|\mathbf{U}(w) - \mathbf{U}(y)|}{r} \leq 1 + C\epsilon. \quad (4.11)$$

Finally by (4.10) and (4.11) it suffices to choose  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$1 - 2C\epsilon \leq \sup_{y \in B_{2\epsilon}(x_0)} \max_{w \in \partial B_r(y)} \frac{|\mathbf{U}(w) - \mathbf{U}(y)|}{r} \leq 1 + 2C\epsilon, \quad \forall r < \delta.$$

□

*Remark 4.15.* Indeed, by employing a blow up argument, one can show that the choice of  $\delta$  is independent of  $x_0$ .

We are now in a position to prove the following key proposition.

**Proposition 4.16.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5, given any fixed point  $\bar{x} \in X$ , it holds that*

$$\Delta \mathbf{d}_{\bar{x}}(y) = \Delta \mathbf{d}_{\bar{x}}(z), \quad \forall y, z \in \partial B_R(\bar{x}), \quad \forall R \in (0, D). \quad (4.12)$$

*In other words, the value of  $\Delta \mathbf{d}_{\bar{x}}$  only depends on the value of  $\mathbf{d}_{\bar{x}}$ .*



*Proof.* Since we have the freedom to rescale the space, it suffices to consider equation (4.12) near a point  $x_0 \in X$  with  $d(\bar{x}, x_0) = D/3$ . Let us define  $u_n = d_{\bar{x}} - D/3$ . Subsequently, we can choose a small  $\delta > 0$  and construct a bi-Lipschitz map  $\mathbf{U} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) : B_\delta(x_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  as described in Lemma 4.14. We claim that for  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in B_\delta(x_0)$  the following holds.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \left( \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(B_t(x) \setminus B_{d(\bar{x}, x)}(x))}{\omega_n t^n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) = \Delta d_{\bar{x}}(x). \quad (4.13)$$

Let us take

$$x \in \bigcap_{j,k=1}^n \text{Leb}(\langle \text{Hess } u_j, \text{Hess } u_k \rangle) \cap \bigcap_{j,k,l=1}^n \text{Leb}(\text{Hess } u_j(\nabla u_k, \nabla u_l)) \cap B_\delta(x_0),$$

and constants  $a_{ij}$  ( $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ ) and  $b_{jk}^i$  ( $i, j, k = 1, \dots, n$ ) such that the functions  $v_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(u_j - u_j(x)) + \sum_{j,k=1}^n b_{jk}^i(u_j - u_j(x))(u_k - u_k(x))$  satisfy  $v_i(x) = 0$ ,  $\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle(x) = \delta_{ij}$  and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_t(x)} |\text{Hess } v_i|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{H}^n = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (4.14)$$

To determine these constants, it is sufficient to solve the following system of equations, the solution of which can be approached in a manner analogous to that described in [BMS23, Sec. 4].

$$\sum_{k,l=1}^n a_{ik} a_{jl} \langle \nabla u_k, \nabla u_l \rangle(x) = \delta_{ij}, \quad (4.15)$$

and for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_t(x)} \left( \sum_{j,k,l=1}^n a_{ij} b_{kl}^i \text{Hess } u_j(\nabla u_k, \nabla u_l) + \sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{ij} a_{ik} \langle \text{Hess } u_j, \text{Hess } u_k \rangle \right) d\mathcal{H}^n = 0. \quad (4.16)$$

By (4.8), we may assume that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \|\text{Hess } v_i\|_{\text{HS}} + \|\nabla v_i\| + \|\Delta v_i\| \right) \leq \tilde{C} \quad (4.17)$$

for some constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$  (which may vary from line to line) and some sufficiently small  $t_0 > 0$ . The subsequent discussion is predicated on the assumption that  $t \ll t_0$ .

For convenience, let  $\mathbf{V} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$  and  $r := |\mathbf{V}|$ . We recall that, from (4.14) (4.15) and [BMS23, Prop. 4.8], it follows that

$$\int_{B_t(x)} \left( \sum_{i,j} |\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle - \delta_{ij}| + \left| |\nabla r| - 1 \right| + \left| \Delta r^2 - 2n \right| \right) d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \tilde{C}t \xi(t), \quad (4.18)$$

where  $\xi$  is a positive function that satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \xi(t) = 0$ , and is given by the following expression:

$$\xi : t \mapsto \max_i \sup_{s < t} \int_{B_s(x)} |\text{Hess } v_i|_{\text{HS}}^2 d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

To conclude, we may need the following three lemmas.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.17.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5 and the setting in the proof of Proposition 4.16 we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\omega_n t^{n+1}} \int_{B_{2t}(x)} \left| (\det(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle))^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\omega_n t^{n+1}} \int_{\mathbf{V}(B_t(x)) \cap \{u_n \geq u_n(x)\}} \left| (\det(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle))^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right| d\mathcal{L}^n = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(B_t(x) \setminus B_{d(x,\bar{x})}(x)) = \mathcal{L}^n(\mathbf{V}(B_t(x)) \cap \{u_n \geq u_n(x)\}) + o(t^{n+1}). \quad (4.20)$$

*Proof.* For the first limit in (4.19), since  $\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle(x) = \delta_{ij}$ , it follows from (4.17) that the matrix  $(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle)(x)$  is of positive definite whenever  $x$  is sufficiently close to  $x_0$ . Then the limit can be deduced directly from (4.18).

As for the second limit in (4.19), first following the argument used in the proof of Lemma 4.14, we can assume that the restrictions  $\mathbf{V}|_{B_t(x)}$  and  $\mathbf{V}^{-1}|_{\mathbf{V}(B_t(x))}$  are both  $(1 + \tilde{C}t)$ -Lipschitz maps. Then it suffices to apply a similar proof as in [Hua23, Lem. 4.7] to verify that

$$\mathbf{V}_\#(\mathcal{H}^n) = (\det(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}^n.$$

This together with (4.19) then implies (4.20).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.18.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5 and the setting in the proof of Proposition 4.16 we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_t(0_n) \cap \{u_n \geq u_n(x)\}} (\det(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle))^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\mathcal{L}^n \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{V}(B_t(x)) \cap \{u_n \geq u_n(z)\}} (\det(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle))^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\mathcal{L}^n + o(t^{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof closely follows the approach outlined in [BMS23, Lem. 3.5]. Let  $\tilde{r} = \max\{r, d_x\}$  and  $\Omega_t := B_t(x) \cup \mathbf{V}^{-1}(B_t(0_n))$ . Clearly we have  $\Omega_t = \{\tilde{r} \leq t\}$  and  $B_{t-\tilde{C}t^2}(x) \subset \Omega_t \subset B_{t+\tilde{C}t^2}(x)$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{H}^n(\Omega_t) - \omega_n t^n \geq -t^{n+1}\xi(2t)$ .

Using Theorem 4.1 we see

$$\int_{\Omega_t} \frac{r|\nabla\tilde{r}|}{\tilde{r}^{n+1}} |\nabla(\tilde{r} - r)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} |\nabla(\tilde{r} - r)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds = I_1 + I_2,$$

where

$$I_1 = \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} (|\nabla\tilde{r}|^2 + |\nabla r|^2) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds, \quad I_2 = -2 \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} \langle \nabla r, \nabla\tilde{r} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds.$$

Due to the locality of minimal relax slopes, we know  $|\nabla\tilde{r}| = \xi_{\{r \leq d_x\}} + \xi_{\{r \geq d_x\}} |\nabla r|$ . Therefore applying (4.18) we have

$$I_1 = 2 \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds + \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} (|\nabla\tilde{r}|^2 + |\nabla r|^2 - 2) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds = I_3 + I_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |I_4| &= \left| \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} (|\nabla\tilde{r}|^2 + |\nabla r|^2 - 2) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds \right| \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s \cap \{\tilde{r} \geq d_x\}} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \int_{\partial\Omega_s} \frac{r}{s^{n+1}} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds = \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{r|\nabla\tilde{r}|}{\tilde{r}^{n+1}} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^n} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \tilde{C} \int_{B_{2t}(x)} \frac{1}{d_x^n} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{t^n} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{in} \int_{A_{2^{-i}t, 2^{-(i-1)}t}(x)} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}}{t^n} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{in} \int_{B_{2^{-(i-1)}t}(x)} \left| |\nabla r|^2 - 1 \right| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \tilde{C}t \xi(2t). \end{aligned}$$

Regrading for  $I_3$ , we begin by substituting  $r$  with  $\tilde{r}$  in the proof of [BMS23, Prop. 4.8 i)] to observe that

$$\int_{\partial B_s(x)} \tilde{r} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \leq s + s^2 \xi(s) \quad (4.21)$$

Therefore according to (4.7) and (4.21) we know

$$I_3 = 2 \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\partial\Omega_s} (r - s) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} ds + 2 \int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_s)}{s^n} ds,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\partial\Omega_s} (r-s) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, ds \right| \\
&= \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\partial\Omega_s} (s-r) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, ds = \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{|\nabla\tilde{r}|}{\tilde{r}^{n+1}} (\tilde{r}-r) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \int_{B_{2t}(x)} \frac{\tilde{C}}{\mathbf{d}_x^{n+1}} (\tilde{r}-r) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\
&= \tilde{C} \int_0^{2t} \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\partial B_s(x)} (\tilde{r}-r) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds \leq \tilde{C} \int_0^{2t} \frac{1}{s^{n-1}} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_s(x)) \xi(s) \, ds \leq \tilde{C}t \xi(2t).
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -a.e.  $s \in (0, t)$ , the exterior unit normal of  $\partial\Omega_s$  coincides  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ -a.e. with  $\nabla\tilde{r}$  (as shown in [BPS23a, Prop. 6.1]), and applying the Gauss-Green formula from [BPS23b] along with (4.18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= - \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\Omega_s} \Delta r^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds \\
&= -2n \int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(\Omega_s)}{s^{n+1}} \, ds - \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\Omega_s} (\Delta r^2 - 2n) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds,
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\left| \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\Omega_s} (\Delta r^2 - 2n) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds \right| \leq \tilde{C}t \xi(2t).$$

Now by recalling the conclusion of [BMS23, Lem. 3.5] we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Omega_t} \frac{r|\nabla\tilde{r}|}{\tilde{r}^{n+1}} |\nabla(\tilde{r}-r)|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \tilde{C} \int_{B_{2t}(x)} \frac{r}{\tilde{r}^{n+1}} |\nabla(\tilde{r}-r)|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\
&\leq \tilde{C} \int_0^{2t} \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\partial B_s(x)} r |\nabla(\tilde{r}-r)|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, ds \\
&\leq \tilde{C} \int_0^{2t} \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\partial B_s(x)} r |\nabla(\mathbf{d}_x - r)|^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, ds \leq \tilde{C}t \xi(2t).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally from the Newton-Leibniz rule for  $\mathcal{L}^1$ -integrable functions we know

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{t^n} \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla\tilde{r}| \, d\mathcal{H}^n - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s^n} \int_{\Omega_s} |\nabla\tilde{r}| \, d\mathcal{H}^n \\
&= -n \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\Omega_s} |\nabla\tilde{r}| \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds + \int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_s)}{s^n} \, ds \\
&= -n \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{\Omega_s} (|\nabla\tilde{r}| - 1) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds - \int_0^t \frac{n \mathcal{H}^n(\Omega_s)}{s^{n+1}} \, ds + \int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_s)}{s^n} \, ds \\
&= -n \int_0^t \frac{1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{B_{2s}(x)} (|\nabla\tilde{r}| - 1) \, d\mathcal{H}^n \, ds - \int_0^t \frac{n \mathcal{H}^n(\Omega_s)}{s^{n+1}} \, ds + \int_0^t \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_s)}{s^n} \, ds \\
&\leq \tilde{C}t \xi(2t).
\end{aligned}$$

Since a combination of (4.17) and the  $(1 + \tilde{C}t)$ -bi-Lipschitz property of  $\mathbf{V}$  implies that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-n} \int_{\Omega_t} |\nabla \tilde{r}| d\mathcal{H}^n = \omega_n$ , and  $t^{-n} \int_{\Omega_t} ||\nabla \tilde{r}| - 1| d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \tilde{C}t\xi(2t)$ , we obtain  $\mathcal{H}^n(\Omega_t) - \omega_n t^n \leq \tilde{C}t^{n+1}\xi(2t)$ . Following the argument presented in the proof of Lemma 4.17, we deduce that  $|\mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{V}^{-1}B_t(0_n)) - \omega_n t^n| \leq t^{n+1}\xi(t)$ . Additionally, since it is established in [BMS23, Prop. 4.1] that  $|\mathcal{H}^n(B_t(x)) - \omega_n t^n| \leq t^{n+1}\xi(t)$ , we conclude the proof by observing that

$$\int_{B_t(0_n) \Delta \mathbf{V}(B_t(x))} (\det(\langle \nabla v_i, \nabla v_j \rangle))^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\mathcal{L}^n = \mathcal{H}^n(\mathbf{V}^{-1}(B_t(0_n)) \Delta B_t(x)) = o(t^{n+1}).$$

□

**Lemma 4.19.** *Under the assumption of Theorem 4.5 and the setting in the proof of Proposition 4.16 we have for  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -a.e.  $x \in B_\delta(x_0)$  it holds that*

$$2\mathcal{L}^n(B_t(0_n) \cap \{u_n \geq u_n(x)\}) - \omega_n t^n = 2\omega_n \Delta \mathbf{d}_{\bar{x}}(x)(t^{n+1} + o(t^{n+1})). \quad (4.22)$$

*Proof.* To facilitate the subsequent discussion, let us first establish the notation. We denote by  $c = u_n(x)$ ,  $f = u_n = \mathbf{d}_{\bar{x}} - D/3$ ,  $\{u_n \geq c\} = \{f \geq c\}$  for simplicity, and by  $A = (a_{ij})$ ,  $A^{-1} = (\tilde{a}_{ij})$ ,  $g^{ij} = \langle \nabla u_i, \nabla u_j \rangle(x)$ ,  $(g_{ij}) = (g^{ij})_{ij}^{-1}$ . □

Due to [HT03], the left-hand side of (4.22) corresponds precisely to the mean curvature of the level set  $\{f = c\}$  at the origin in Euclidean space. This mean curvature can be expressed as follows (with all partial derivatives evaluated at the origin).

$$\begin{aligned} & (|\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} f|)^{-1} \Delta^{\mathbb{R}^n} f - (|\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} f|)^{-3} \text{Hess}^{\mathbb{R}^n} f (\nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} f, \nabla^{\mathbb{R}^n} f) \\ &= \left( \sum_i f_i^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_i f_{ii} - \left( \sum_i f_i^2 \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{ij} f_{ij} f_i f_j. \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

According to (4.15) and (4.16), we see

$$f_i = \tilde{a}_{ni}, \quad f_{ij} = -2\tilde{a}_{nk} \tilde{a}_{\alpha j} b_{\alpha\beta}^k \tilde{a}_{\beta i}. \quad (4.24)$$

Moreover, since  $a_{ij} g^{jk} a_{kl} = \delta_{il}$ , we know that  $\sum_i f_i^2 = g^{nn} = 1$ . Let us recall that in [Han18], Han proved that

$$\Delta v_i = \text{Tr}(\text{Hess } v_i) = \langle \text{Hess } v_i, \mathbf{g} \rangle, \quad \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e.},$$

which yields that for each  $i$

$$0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_t(x)} \Delta v_i d\mathcal{H}^n = \sum_j a_{ij} \Delta u_j(x) + 2 \sum_{j,k} b_{jk}^i g^{jk}.$$

As a result, one may check that

$$\sum_i f_{ii} = \Delta u_n(x).$$

For the second term in (4.23), for each  $i, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}$ , notice that

$$\text{Hess } v_i(\nabla u_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \nabla u_{\tilde{\beta}}) = \sum_j a_{ij} \text{Hess } u_j(\nabla u_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \nabla u_{\tilde{\beta}}) + 2 \sum_{k,l} b_{kl}^i g^{\tilde{\alpha}k} g^{\tilde{\beta}l}.$$

Since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_t(x)} \text{Hess } v_i(\nabla u_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \nabla u_{\tilde{\beta}}) d\mathcal{H}^n = 0,$$

combining (4.15), (4.16) and (4.24) we calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} f_{ij} f_i f_j &= -2 \sum_{i,j,k,\alpha,\beta} \tilde{a}_{ni} \tilde{a}_{nj} \tilde{a}_{nk} \tilde{a}_{\alpha j} b_{\alpha\beta}^k \tilde{a}_{\beta i} \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k,l,\alpha,\beta,\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta}} \tilde{a}_{ni} \tilde{a}_{nj} \tilde{a}_{nk} \tilde{a}_{\alpha j} \tilde{a}_{\beta i} g_{\tilde{\alpha}\alpha} g_{\tilde{\beta}\beta} a_{kl} \text{Hess } u_l(\nabla u_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \nabla u_{\tilde{\beta}})(x) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k,l,\alpha,\beta,\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta}} \tilde{a}_{ni} \tilde{a}_{nj} \tilde{a}_{\alpha j} \tilde{a}_{\beta i} g_{\tilde{\alpha}\alpha} g_{\tilde{\beta}\beta} \text{Hess } u_n(\nabla u_{\tilde{\alpha}}, \nabla u_{\tilde{\beta}})(x) \\ &= \text{Hess } u_n(\nabla u_n, \nabla u_n)(x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we conclude.

*Proof of Theorem 4.5(2).* According to Lemmas 4.11 and 4.14, Remark 4.12, Proposition 4.16 and [CM20b, Prop. 4.7], there exists a positive Lipschitz function  $\omega$ , which is independent of the choice of the base point  $x \in X$ , defined on  $(0, D)$  such that for any  $r \in (0, D)$  it holds that

$$d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \llcorner_{\partial B_r(x)} = \omega(r) d\mathbf{q}_x.$$

Let us set

$$\begin{aligned} R_x : \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}) &\longrightarrow C([0, D]) \\ f &\longmapsto \left( r \mapsto \int_{\partial B_r(x)} f d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_x : C([0, D]) &\longrightarrow \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d}) \\ f &\longmapsto (y \mapsto f(\mathbf{d}(x, y))). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that  $\tilde{\rho} : (x, y, t) \mapsto R_x A_x \rho(x, \cdot, t)(y)$  is also a heat kernel.

First we observe that for any test function  $f$ , since  $\int_{\partial B_{D/2}(x)} d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) = 1$ , we have

$$R_x A_x f(y) = \int_{B_{d(x,y)}(x)} f d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} = \int_{\partial B_{D/2}(x)} f(\alpha, \mathbf{d}(x, y)) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha),$$

which implies that  $R_x A_x f \in \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d})$ . Moreover, for any test function  $\varphi$ , applying the co-area formula with base point  $x$  and the Gauss-Green formula in [BPS23b] shows

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_X \Delta \varphi R_x A_x f d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_X \langle \nabla \varphi, \nabla \mathbf{d}_x \rangle (A_x f)'(\mathbf{d}_x) d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \int_0^D \omega(r) \left[ \int_{B_{D/2}(x)} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} f(\alpha, r) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) \int_{B_{D/2}(x)} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \varphi(\alpha, r) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) \right] dr \\ &= \int_0^D \left[ \int_{\partial B_r(x)} \langle \nabla f, \nabla \mathbf{d}_x \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \int_{B_{D/2}(x)} \varphi(\alpha, r) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) \right) \right] dr \\ &= \int_0^D \left[ \int_{B_r(x)} \Delta f d\mathcal{H}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \int_{B_{D/2}(x)} \varphi(\alpha, r) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) \right) \right] dr \\ &= - \int_0^D \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( \int_{B_r(x)} \Delta f d\mathcal{H}^n \right) \int_{B_{D/2}(x)} \varphi(\alpha, r) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) \right] dr \\ &= - \int_0^D \left[ \int_{\partial B_r(x)} \Delta f d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \int_{B_{D/2}(x)} \varphi(\alpha, r) d\mathbf{q}_x(\alpha) \right] dr = \int_X \varphi R_x A_x \Delta f d\mathcal{H}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the set of test functions is dense in  $H^{1,2}$ . Therefore, we deduce that  $R_x A_x f \in D(\Delta)$  and  $\Delta R_x A_x f = R_x A_x \Delta f$ . This finding verifies that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{\rho}(x, \cdot, t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} R_x A_x \rho(x, \cdot, t) = R_x A_x \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(x, \cdot, t) = R_x A_x \Delta \rho(x, \cdot, t) = \Delta \tilde{\rho}(x, \cdot, t). \quad (4.25)$$

Especially for any  $f \in \text{Lip}(X, \mathbf{d})$ , let

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f : x \mapsto \int_X \tilde{\rho}(y, x, t) f(y) d\mathcal{H}^n(y),$$

we will show that

$$\left\| \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f - f \right\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.26)$$

The first step is to show that

$$\left\| \int_X \varphi \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f d\mathcal{H}^n - \int_X \varphi f d\mathcal{H}^n \right\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall \varphi \in L^2. \quad (4.27)$$

For any  $y \in X$ , it is clear that  $\text{Lip}(R_y A_y f) \leq \text{Lip} f$ . Then the Bakry-Émery estimate (see for instance [Gig18a, Thm. 6.1.4]) implies  $\|\nabla \mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \exp(-Kt) \|\mathfrak{h}_t(|\nabla R_y A_y f|^2)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \exp(-Kt) \text{Lip} f$ . As a result, the  $L^2$ -convergence  $\mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f) \rightarrow R_y A_y f$  can be improved to uniform convergence. In particular, we have  $(\mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f))(y) \rightarrow (R_y A_y f)(y) = \lim_{z \rightarrow y} (R_y A_y f)(z) = f(y)$ .

According to Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \varphi \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f \, d\mathcal{H}^n &= \int_X \int_X \varphi(y) R_y A_y \rho(y, \cdot, t)(x) f(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) \\ &= \int_X \varphi(y) \int_0^D \int_{\partial B_r(y)} \rho(y, z, t) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z) \int_{\partial B_r(y)} f(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) \\ &= \int_X \varphi(y) \int_0^D \int_{\partial B_r(y)} \rho(y, z, t) (R_y A_y f)(z) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) \\ &= \int_X \varphi(y) (\mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f))(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4.27) is derived from the observation that  $\int_X (\mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f))^2(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(X) (\sup_X f)^2 < \infty$ , combined with the application of dominated convergence theorem. In particular, one can prove (4.26) through the following calculation.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X (\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f)^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^n &= \int_X \tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f(y) (\mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f))(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) \\ &= \int_X (\mathfrak{h}_t(R_y A_y f))^2(y) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) \rightarrow \int_X f^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^n, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (4.25), (4.26) and the uniqueness of the solution to the heat equation, for any  $s, t > 0$ , since  $\mathfrak{h}_s f$  is a test function, it follows that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t \mathfrak{h}_s f = \mathfrak{h}_{t+s} f$ . Moreover, by letting  $s \rightarrow 0$  and using dominated convergence theorem again, we see  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}}_t f = \mathfrak{h}_t f$ . Ultimately, considering the density of the set of test functions in  $H^{1,2}$  (and hence in  $L^2$ ) we can conclude

$$\rho(x, y, t) = \tilde{\rho}(y, x, t), \quad \forall x, y \in X, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

This verifies the strong harmonicity of  $(X, \mathfrak{d}, \mathcal{H}^n)$ , which in fact, implies the smoothness due to Corollary 1.10. □

## References

- [ABS19] L. Ambrosio, E. Brué, and D. Semola. Rigidity of the 1-bakry-Émery in equality and sets of finite perimeter in rcd spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(4):949–1001, 2019.



- [AGS14] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014.
- [AGS15] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Bakry–Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(1):339–404, 2015.
- [AH18] L. Ambrosio and S. Honda. Local spectral convergence in  $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$  spaces. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 177(Part A):1–23, 2018.
- [AHPT21] L. Ambrosio, S. Honda, J. Portegies, and D. Tewodrose. Embedding of  $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$  spaces in  $L^2$  via eigenfunctions. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 280(10):108968, 2021.
- [AHT18] L. Ambrosio, S. Honda, and D. Tewodrose. Short-time behavior of the heat kernel and Weyl’s law on  $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$  spaces. *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.*, 53:97–119, 2018.
- [AMS14] L. Ambrosio, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. On the Bakry–Émery condition, the gradient estimates and the Local-to-Global property of  $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$  metric measure spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 26(1):24–56, 2014.
- [AMS19] L. Ambrosio, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. Nonlinear diffusion equations and curvature conditions in metric measure spaces. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 262(1270):v+121, 2019.
- [AST17] L. Ambrosio, F. Stra, and D. Trevisan. Weak and strong convergence of derivations and stability of flows with respect to MGH convergence. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 272(3):1182–1229, 2017.
- [AT04] L. Ambrosio and P. Tilli. *Topics on analysis in metric spaces*, volume 25. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2004.
- [BB11] A. Björn and J. Björn. *Nonlinear Potential Theory on Metric Spaces*. European Mathematical Society, 2011.
- [BC13] S. Bianchini and F. Cavalletti. The Monge problem for distance cost in geodesic spaces. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 318(3):615–673, 2013.
- [Bes78] A. Besse. *Manifolds all of whose geodesics are closed*, volume 93. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1978.

- [BGHZ23] C. Brena, N. Gigli, S. Honda, and X. Zhu. Weakly non-collapsed RCD spaces are strongly non-collapsed. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 2023(794):215–252, 2023.
- [BGP92] Y. Burago, M. Gromov, and G. Perelman. Ad alexandrov spaces with curvature bounded below. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 47(2):1, 1992.
- [BM95] M. Biroli and U. Mosco. A saint-venant type principle for dirichlet forms on discontinuous media. *Ann. Matem. Pura e Applicata*, 169:125–181, 1995.
- [BMS23] E. Brué, A. Mondino, and D. Semola. The metric measure boundary of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 33:593–636, 2023.
- [BPS23a] E. Brué, E. Pasqualetto, and D. Semola. Constancy of the dimension in codimension one and locality of the unit normal on  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 24(3):1765–1816, 2023.
- [BPS23b] E. Brué, E. Pasqualetto, and D. Semola. Rectifiability of the reduced boundary for sets of finite perimeter over  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 25(2):413–465, 2023.
- [BS20] E. Bruè and D. Semola. Constancy of the dimension for  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces via regularity of Lagrangian flows. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 73(6):1141–1204, 2020.
- [Cav14] F. Cavalletti. Monge problem in metric measure spaces with Riemannian curvature-dimension condition. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 99:136–151, 2014.
- [CC97] J. Cheeger and T. Colding. On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. I. *J. Differential Geom.*, 46(3):406–480, 1997.
- [CH11] B. Csikós and M. Horváth. On the volume of the intersection of two geodesic balls. *Differential Geom. Appl.*, 29(4):567–576, 2011.
- [CH12] B. Csikós and M. Horváth. A characterization of harmonic spaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 90(3):383–389, 2012.
- [CM17a] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. Optimal maps in essentially non-branching spaces. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 19(6):1750007, 27, 2017.

- [CM17b] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. Sharp and rigid isoperimetric inequalities in metric-measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds. *Invent. Math.*, 208(3):803–849, 2017.
- [CM20a] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. Almost Euclidean isoperimetric inequalities in spaces satisfying local Ricci curvature lower bounds. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2020(5):1481–1510, 2020.
- [CM20b] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. New formulas for the Laplacian of distance functions and applications. *Anal. PDE*, 13:2091 – 2147, 2020.
- [CM21] F. Cavalletti and E. Milman. The globalization theorem for the curvature-dimension condition. *Invent. Math.*, 226(1):1–137, 2021.
- [Den20] Q. Deng. Hölder continuity of tangent cones in  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces and applications to non-branching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07956*, 2020.
- [DR92] E. Damek and F. Ricci. A class of nonsymmetric harmonic riemannian spaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 27(1):139–142, 1992.
- [EKS15] M. Erbar, K. Kuwada, and K. Sturm. On the equivalence of the entropic curvature-dimension condition and Bochner’s inequality on metric measure spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 201(3):993–1071, 2015.
- [Fre03] D. H. Fremlin. *Measure theory. Vol. 4.* Torres Fremlin, 2003. Topological measure spaces. Part I.
- [GH16] N. Gigli and B. Han. Independence on  $p$  of weak upper gradients on  $\text{rd}$  spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 271:1–11, 2016.
- [Gig13] N. Gigli. The splitting theorem in non-smooth context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.5555*, 2013.
- [Gig15] N. Gigli. *On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications*, volume 236. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 2015.
- [Gig18a] N. Gigli. Lecture notes on Differential Calculus on  $\text{RCD}$  spaces. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 54(4):855–918, 2018.
- [Gig18b] N. Gigli. Nonsmooth differential geometry—an approach tailored for spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 251(1196):v+161, 2018.

- [GMS15] N. Gigli, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. Convergence of pointed non-compact metric measure spaces and stability of ricci curvature bounds and heat flows. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 111(5):1071–1129, 2015.
- [GP22] N. Gigli and E. Pasqualetto. Equivalence of two different notions of tangent bundle on rectifiable metric measure spaces. *Comm. Anal. and Geom.*, 30(1):1–51, 2022.
- [Han18] B. Han. Ricci tensor on  $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$  spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 28(2):1295–1314, 2018.
- [HK00] P. Hajlasz and P. Koskela. Sobolev met Poincaré. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 145:1–101, 2000.
- [HM17] B. Han and A. Mondino. Angles between curves in metric measure spaces. *Anal. Geom. Metr. Space*, 5(1):47–68, 2017.
- [Hon15] S. Honda. Ricci curvature and  $L^p$ -convergence. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 2015(705):85–154, 2015.
- [HT03] D. Hulin and M. Troyanov. Mean curvature and asymptotic volume of small balls. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 110(10):947–950, 2003.
- [Hua23] Z. Huang. Isometric immersions of  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces via heat kernels. *Calc. Var.*, 62:paper no.121, 2023.
- [JLZ16] R. Jiang, H. Li, and H. Zhang. Heat kernel bounds on metric measure spaces and some applications. *Potential Anal.*, 44:601–627, 2016.
- [Jr.03] M. Miranda Jr. Functions of bounded variation on “good” metric spaces. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 82(8):975–1004, 2003.
- [LH17] Ambrosio L and S. Honda. New stability results for sequences of metric measure spaces with uniform Ricci bounds from below. In *Measure theory in non-smooth spaces*, Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory, pages 1–51. De Gruyter Open, Warsaw, 2017.
- [LV09] J. Lott and C. Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Ann. Math.*, 169(3):903–991, 2009.
- [MN14] A. Mondino and A. Naber. Structure theory of metric-measure spaces with lower ricci curvature bounds. *Accepted at Journ. European Math Soc.*, pages arXiv:1405.2222, 2014., 2014.

- [PG18] G. De Philippis and N. Gigli. Non-collapsed spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. *J. Éc. Polytech. Math.*, 5:613–650, 2018.
- [Raj12] T. Rajala. Local Poincaré inequalities from stable curvature conditions on metric spaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 44(3):477–494, 2012.
- [Stu95] K. Sturm. Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. II. Upper Gaussian estimates for the fundamental solutions of parabolic equations. *Osaka J. Math.*, 32(2):275–312, 1995.
- [Stu96] K. Sturm. Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. III. The parabolic Harnack inequality. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 75(9):273–297, 1996.
- [Stu06a] K. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I. *Acta Math.*, 196:65–131, 2006.
- [Stu06b] K. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):133–177, 2006.
- [Sza90] Z. Szabó. The lichnerowicz conjecture on harmonic manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 31(1):1–28, 1990.
- [Wil50] T. Willmore. Mean value theorems in harmonic Riemannian spaces. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, s1-25(1):54–57, 1950.
- [ZZ19] H. Zhang and X. Zhu. Weyl’s law on  $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$  metric measure spaces. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 27(8):1869–1914, 2019.