

Geometric singularities and a flow tangent to the Ricci flow

LASHI BANDARA, SAJJAD LAKZIAN AND MICHAEL MUNN

Abstract. We consider a geometric flow introduced by Gigli and Mantegazza which, in the case of a smooth compact manifold with a smooth metric, is tangential to the Ricci flow almost-everywhere along geodesics. To study spaces with geometric singularities, we consider this flow in the context of a smooth manifold with a rough metric possessing a sufficiently regular heat kernel. On an appropriate non-singular open region, we provide a family of metric tensors evolving in time and provide a regularity theory for this flow in terms of the regularity of the heat kernel.

When the rough metric induces a metric measure space satisfying a Riemannian curvature dimension condition, we demonstrate that the distance induced by the flow is identical to the evolving distance metric defined by Gigli and Mantegazza on appropriate admissible points. Consequently, we demonstrate that a smooth compact manifold with a finite number of geometric conical singularities remains a smooth manifold with a smooth metric away from the cone points for all future times. Moreover, we show that the distance induced by the evolving metric tensor agrees with the flow of $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces defined by Gigli and Mantegazza.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 53C44 (primary); 58J05, 35J15, 58J60 (secondary).

1. Introduction

Nearly ten years ago, using the tools of optimal transportation, Lott-Villani [21] and Sturm [28, 29] extended the notion of lower Ricci curvature bounds to the setting of general metric measure spaces. Among other things, they showed that this so-called curvature-dimension condition, denoted $\text{CD}(K, N)$ for $K \in \mathbb{R}$, $N \in [1, \infty]$, is stable under measured Gromov-Hausdorff limits and consistent with the notion of Ricci curvature lower bounds for Riemannian manifolds. That is to say, for smooth Riemannian manifolds, the $\text{CD}(K, N)$ condition is equivalent to having the Ricci curvature tensor bounded below by K and dimension of the manifold at most N . In a similar way, for a metric measure space (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) , the $\text{CD}(K, N)$ condition is understood to say that \mathcal{X} has N -dimensional Ricci curvature bounded below by K .

Received June 23, 2015; accepted in revised form February 11, 2016.

Published online June 2017.

Although $CD(K, N)$ spaces enjoy many favourable properties, Villani shows in [30] that such spaces also allow for Finsler structures. This is a somewhat unsettling fact as it is known that Finsler manifolds cannot arise as the Gromov-Hausdorff limit of Riemannian manifolds with lower Ricci curvature bounds. Even more so, classical results such as the Cheeger-Gromoll splitting theorem were known to fail for general metric measure spaces which are merely $CD(K, N)$. In order to retain these nice properties while also ruling out Finsler geometries, Ambrosio-Gigli-Savaré introduced a further refined version of the curvature-dimension bound requiring that in addition, the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{X})$ is a Hilbert space. Combining this condition of *infinitesimally Hilbertian* structure with the classical curvature dimension condition, they define the *Riemannian Curvature Dimension* condition, denoted $RCD(K, N)$.

In recent years there has been an increased interest in better understanding the fine geometric and analytic consequences of this Riemannian curvature dimension condition. There has been a great deal of progress in this direction and a number of very deep results describing the structure of these spaces. See, for example, recent work of Ambrosio, Cavalletti, Gigli, Mondino, Naber, Rajala, Savaré, Sturm in [2,3,9,13,15,16,23]. We emphasise that this list is by no means exhaustive, and encourage the reader to consult the references within.

The starting point of our considerations is the paper [15] by Gigli and Mantegazza, where they define a geometric flow for spaces that are possibly singular. There, the authors consider a compact $RCD(K, N)$ space (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) and define a family of evolving distance metrics d_t for positive time. They build this via the heat flow of d and μ in *Wasserstein space*, the space of probability measures on \mathcal{X} with the so-called Wasserstein metric. The essential feature of this flow is when the triple (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) arises from a smooth compact manifold (\mathcal{M}, g) . In this setting, the evolution d_t is given by an evolving smooth metric tensor which satisfies

$$\partial_t g_t(\dot{\gamma}(s), \dot{\gamma}(s))|_{t=0} = -2\text{Ric}_g(\dot{\gamma}(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)),$$

for almost-every $s \in [0, 1]$ along g -geodesics γ . That is, g_t is *tangential* to the Ricci flow in this weak sense. This work of Gigli-Mantegazza gives one direction in which one could possibly define a Ricci flow for general metric measure spaces for all $t > 0$.

The latter correspondence is obtained by writing an evolving metric tensor via a partial differential equation. First, at each $t > 0, x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, they consider the *continuity equation*

$$\begin{aligned} -\text{div}_g(\rho_t^g(x, y)\nabla\varphi_{t,x,v}(y)) &= (d_x\rho_t^g(x, y))(v) \\ \int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi_{t,x,v}(y) d\mu_g(y) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{CE}$$

For smooth metrics, the existence and regularity of solutions to this flow are immediate and they define a smooth family of metrics evolving in time by

$$g_t(u, v)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} g(\nabla\varphi_{t,x,u}(y), \nabla\varphi_{t,x,v}(y)) \rho_t^g(x, y) d\mu_g(y). \tag{GM}$$

While the formulation of this flow for $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces gives the existence of a time evolving distance metric for a possible singular space, it reveals little regularity information in positive time. On the other hand, the evolving metric tensor is only specified when both the initial metric and underlying manifold are smooth.

One of the motivating questions of the current paper is to better understand the behaviour of this flow on manifolds with geometric singularities and hence, the question of regularity will be a primary focus. Since there are few tools in the setting of $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces that are sufficiently mature to extract regularity information, we restrict ourselves exclusively to compact manifolds that are *smooth*, by which we assume only that they admit a smooth differential structure. While this may seem a potentially severe restriction, we vindicate ourselves by allowing for the metric tensor to be *rough*, *i.e.*, a symmetric, positive-definite, $(2, 0)$ -tensor field with measurable coefficients. Rough metrics and their salient features are discussed in Subsection 2.1.

Such metrics allow a wide class of phenomena, so large that such a metric may not even induce a length structure, only an n -dimensional measure. Moreover, they may induce spaces that are not RCD. However, this potentially outrageous behaviour is redeemed by the fact that they are able to capture a wide class of *geometric singularities*, including Lipschitz transformations of C^1 geometries, conical singularities, and Euclidean boxes. These objects are considered in Subsection 3.2.

Our primary concern is when a metric exhibits singular behaviour on some closed subset $S \neq M$, but has good regularity properties on the open set $M \setminus S$. This is indeed the case for a Euclidean box, or a smooth compact manifold with finite number of geometric conical singularities. In this situation, away from the singular part, we are able to construct a metric tensor g_t evolving according to (GM). We say that two points $x, y \in M \setminus S$ are g_t -admissible if for any absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$ connecting these points, there is another absolutely continuous curve $\gamma' : I \rightarrow M$ between x and y with length (measured via d_t) less than γ and for which $\gamma'(s) \in M \setminus S$ for almost-every s . For such a pair of points, we assert that the distance $d_t(x, y)$, given by the $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ -flow of Gigli and Mantegazza, is induced by the metric tensor g_t . The following is a more precise showcasing of our main theorem. It is proved in Section 7.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a smooth, compact manifold with rough metric g that induces a distance metric d_g . Moreover, suppose there exists $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $N > 0$ such that $(M, d_g, \mu_g) \in \text{RCD}(K, N)$. If $S \neq M$ is a closed set and $g \in C^k(M \setminus S)$, there exists a family of metrics $g_t \in C^{k-1,1}$ on $M \setminus S$ evolving according to (GM) on $M \setminus S$. For two points $x, y \in M$ that are g_t -admissible, the distance $d_t(x, y)$ given by the $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ Gigli-Mantegazza flow is induced by g_t .*

The *divergence form* structure is an essential feature that allows for the analysis of the defining continuity equation (CE). In the compact case, it turns out that near every rough metric g , there is a smooth metric \tilde{g} in a suitable L^∞ -sense. Coupling this with the divergence structure, we are able to *perturb* this problem to the study of a divergence form operator with bounded, measurable coefficients on \tilde{g} of the

form

$$-\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}} \rho_t^{\tilde{g}}(x, \cdot) B \theta \nabla \varphi_{t,x,v} = \theta d_x(\rho_t^{\tilde{g}}(x, \cdot))(v),$$

where B is a bounded, measurable $(1, 1)$ -tensor transforming \tilde{g} to g and θ the Raydon-Nikodym derivative of the two induced measures $\mu_{\tilde{g}}$ and μ_g .

This trick of “hiding” singularities in an operator has its origins to the investigations of boundary value problems with low regularity boundary. For us, this philosophy has a geometric reincarnation arising from investigations of the Kato square root problem on manifolds, with its origins in a seminal paper [4] by Axelsson, Keith and McIntosh and more recently by Morris in [24], and Bandara and McIntosh in [7].

In Section 4, we study the existence and regularity of solutions to such continuity equations by using spectral methods and PDE tools. We further emphasise that such equations allow for a certain *disintegration* - that is, at each point x , we solve a differential equation in the y variable. Eventually, we are concerned with objects involving an integration in y , and hence, we are able to allow weak solutions in y while being able to prove stronger regularity results in x .

While the reduction of a nonlinear problem to a pointwise linear one is a tremendous boon to the analysis that we conduct in this paper, there is a price to pay. The equation (CE) is nonlinear in x , and this nonlinear behaviour requires the analysis in x of the family of operators

$$x \mapsto \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}} \rho_t^{\tilde{g}}(x, \cdot) B \theta \nabla.$$

This is not as significant a disadvantage as one initially anticipates as this opens up the possibility to attacking regularity questions by the means of operator theory.

One of the main points of this paper is to illustrate how the regularity properties of the flow (GM) relate to the regularity properties of the heat kernel. Theorem 1.1 allows for the possibility of the evolving metric to become *less* regular than the original metric on the non-singular subset. An inspection of the continuity equation (CE) shows that the solution at a point x depends on sets of full measure potentially far away from this point. Thus, it is possible that singularities may resolve from smoothing properties emerging from the heat kernel. However, it is also possible that potentially unruly behaviour somewhere in heat kernel forces the flow to introduce additional singularities. That being said, we show that for $k \geq 1$, C^k metrics will continue to be C^k under the flow. We discuss these results and surrounding issues in greater depth in Section 3.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. This research was conducted during the “Junior Trimester Program on Optimal Transport” at the Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics in Bonn, Germany. The authors acknowledge the gracious support of this institution as well as the program. The authors would like to thank Nicola Gigli for encouraging conversations as well as Christian Ketterer, Martin Kell and Alex Amenta for helpful conversations and suggestions.

2. Geometric singularities

Throughout this paper, by the term *geometric singularity*, we shall mean singularities that arise in the metric g of a *smooth manifold* \mathcal{M} . We allow such singularities to be a lack of differentiability or even the lack of continuity. To emphasise this point, we contrast this to pure topological singularities, which are singularities that live in the topology and cannot be smoothed and transferred into the metric.

Let \mathcal{M} to be a smooth manifold (possibly non-compact) of dimension $\dim \mathcal{M} = n$. By this, we mean a second countable, Hausdorff space that is locally Euclidean, with the transition maps being smooth.

On an open subset $\Omega \subset \mathcal{M}$, we write $C^{k,\alpha}(\Omega)$ ($k \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$) to mean k -times continuously differentiable functions bounded *locally* in coordinate patches inside Ω , and where the k -th partial derivatives are α -Hölder continuous *locally*. We write $C^k(\Omega)$ instead of $C^{k,0}(\Omega)$.

Let $\mathcal{T}^{(p,q)}\mathcal{M}$ denote the tensors of covariant rank p and contravariant rank q . We write $T^*\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{T}^{(1,0)}\mathcal{M}$ and $T\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{T}^{(0,1)}\mathcal{M}$, the *cotangent* and *tangent* bundles respectively. The bundle of differentiable k -forms are given by $\Omega^k\mathcal{M}$ and the exterior algebra is given by $\Omega\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n \Omega^k\mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{M} \times \mathbb{R} = \Omega^0\mathcal{M}$ (the bundle of functions), and $T^*\mathcal{M} = \Omega^1\mathcal{M}$.

The differentiable structure of the smooth manifold affords us with a differential operator $d : C^\infty(\Omega^k\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\Omega^{k+1}\mathcal{M})$. Indeed, this differential operator is dependent on the differentiable structure we associate to the manifold. We remark on this fact since, in dimensions higher than 4, there are homeomorphic differentiable structures that are not diffeomorphic (*cf.* [22] by Milnor and [12] by Freedman). From this point onward, we fix a differentiable structure on \mathcal{M} . We shall only exercise interest in the case of $k = 0$ where $d : C^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow C^\infty(T^*\mathcal{M})$ and sometimes use the notation ∇ to denote d .

We emphasise that a smooth manifold also affords us with a measure structure. We say that a set $A \subset \mathcal{M}$ is measurable if for any chart (ψ, U) with $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$, we obtain that $\psi(U \cap A) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is Lebesgue measurable. By second countability, this quantification can be made countable. By writing $\Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(p,q)}\mathcal{M})$ we denote the sections of the vector bundle $\mathcal{T}^{(p,q)}\mathcal{M}$ with *measurable* coefficients.

2.1. Rough metrics

In connection with investigating the geometric invariances of the Kato square root problem, Bandara introduced a notion of a *rough metric* in [5]. This notion is of fundamental importance to the rest of this paper and therefore, in this sub-section, we will describe some of the important features of such metrics. We do not assume that \mathcal{M} is compact until later in this section. Let us first recall the definition of a rough metric.

Definition 2.1. We say that a real-symmetric $g \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(2,0)}\mathcal{M})$ is a *rough metric* if for each $x \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists some chart (ψ, U) containing x and a constant $C \geq 1$

(dependent on U), such that, for y -a.e. in U ,

$$C^{-1} |u|_{\psi^*\delta(y)} \leq |u|_{g(y)} \leq C |u|_{\psi^*\delta(y)},$$

where $u \in T_y\mathcal{M}$, $|u|_{g(y)}^2 = g(u, u)$ and $\psi^*\delta$ is the pullback of the Euclidean metric inside $\psi(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Such a chart is said to satisfy the *local comparability condition*.

It is easy to see that by taking U to be the pullback of a Euclidean ball contained in a chart near x , every $C^{k,\alpha}$ metric (for $k \geq 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$) is a rough metric.

Two rough metrics g and \tilde{g} are said to be C -close (for $C \geq 1$) if

$$C^{-1} |u|_{g(x)} \leq |u|_{\tilde{g}(x)} \leq C |u|_{g(x)}$$

for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$. If we assume that \mathcal{M} is compact, then it is easy to see that for any rough metric g , there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ and a smooth metric \tilde{g} such that g and \tilde{g} are C -close. Two continuous metrics are C -close if the C -close condition above holds everywhere. Moreover, we note the following. Its proof is given in [5, Proposition 10].

Proposition 2.2. *Let g and \tilde{g} be two rough metrics that are C -close. Then, there exists $B \in \Gamma(T^*\mathcal{M} \otimes T\mathcal{M})$ such that it is real, symmetric, almost-everywhere positive, invertible, and*

$$\tilde{g}_x(B(x)u, v) = g_x(u, v)$$

for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Furthermore, for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$C^{-2} |u|_{\tilde{g}(x)} \leq |B(x)u|_{\tilde{g}(x)} \leq C^2 |u|_{\tilde{g}(x)},$$

and the same inequality holds with \tilde{g} and g interchanged. If $\tilde{g} \in C^k$ and $g \in C^l$ (with $k, l \geq 0$), then the properties of B are valid for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $B \in C^{\min\{k,l\}}(T^*\mathcal{M} \otimes T\mathcal{M})$.

A rough metric always induces a measure described by the expression

$$d\mu_g(x) = \sqrt{\det(g_{ij}(x))} d\mathcal{L}(x)$$

inside a locally comparable chart. The well-definedness of this expression is verified just as in the case of a $C^{k,\alpha}$ metric. This measure can easily be proven to be Borel and finite on compact sets. The notion of measurable which we have defined agrees with the notion of μ_g -measurable obtained via a rough metric. Moreover, the following holds for two C -close metrics.

Proposition 2.3. *Let g and \tilde{g} be C -close for some $C \geq 1$. Then, the measure $d\mu_g(x) = \sqrt{\det B(x)} d\mu_{\tilde{g}}(x)$ for x -a.e., and $C^{-\frac{n}{2}}\mu_g \leq \mu_{\tilde{g}} \leq C^{\frac{n}{2}}\mu_g$. Moreover, if \tilde{g} is continuous, then the measure μ_g is Radon.*

Proof. The first part of the statement is proved as [5, Proposition 11]. We prove that μ_g is Radon by using the fact that $\mu_{\tilde{g}}$ is inner regular. That is, for a Borel $B \subset \mathcal{M}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $K_\varepsilon \subset B$ such that $\mu_{\tilde{g}}(B) - \mu_{\tilde{g}}(K_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_g(B) - \mu_g(K_\varepsilon) &= \int (\chi_B - \chi_{K_\varepsilon}) d\mu_g \leq C^{n/2} \int (\chi_B - \chi_{K_\varepsilon}) d\mu_{\tilde{g}} \\ &\leq C^{n/2} (\mu_{\tilde{g}}(B) - \mu_{\tilde{g}}(K_\varepsilon)) \leq C^{n/2} \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the fact that $\chi_B - \chi_{K_\varepsilon} \geq 0$. Thus, $\mu_g(B) = \sup_{K \in B} \mu_g(K)$. □

We remark that throughout the paper, when we say that (\mathcal{M}, g) induces a length structure, we mean that between any two points $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ there exists an absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with $\gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = y$ such that

$$0 < \int_I |\dot{\gamma}(t)|_{g(\gamma(t))}^2 < \infty.$$

Then, the induced distance $d_g(x, y)$ is simply given as in the smooth case by taking an infimum over all curves between such points of the square root of this quantity.

2.2. L^∞ -metrics and metrics of divergence form operators

The goal of this subsection is to illustrate the connections of rough metrics to other low-regularity metrics that are often mentioned in folklore. In fact, we shall see that as a virtue of compactness, these notions are indeed equivalent. This section is intended as motivation for us considering rough metrics and can be safely omitted.

First, we highlight the following simple lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $g \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(2,0)}\mathcal{M})$ is symmetric and that there exists a smooth metric h and $C \geq 1$ such that*

$$C^{-1} |u|_{h(x)} \leq |u|_{g(x)} \leq C |u|_{h(x)}$$

for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Then g is a rough metric.

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and let (ψ, U) be a chart near $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $V = \psi^{-1}(B_r(\psi(x)))$, where $B_r(\psi(x)) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Euclidean ball with $r > 0$ chosen such that $\overline{B_r(\psi(x))} \subset \psi(U)$. Then, by virtue of the smoothness of h and since \overline{V} is compact, we obtain some $C_V \geq 1$ such that

$$C_V^{-1} |u|_{\psi^*\delta(y)} \leq |u|_{h(y)} \leq C_V |u|_{\psi^*\delta(y)},$$

for all $y \in V$. On combining this with our hypothesis, we find that for almost-every $y \in V$,

$$(C_V C)^{-1} |u|_{h(y)} \leq |u|_{g(y)} \leq C_V C |u|_{h(y)}.$$

That is, g is a rough metric. □

Next, we define the following notion of an L^∞ -metric.

Definition 2.5. We say that a real-symmetric $g \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(2,0)}\mathcal{M})$ is an L^∞ -metric on \mathcal{M} if:

- (i) There exists a $g^{-1} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(0,2)}\mathcal{M})$ inverse to g , by which we mean that writing $G = (g^{ij}(x))$ and $G' = (g_{ij}^{-1}(x))$, $GG' = G'G = I$ for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$, and
- (ii) There exists a smooth metric h and constants $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 > 0$ such that $|g|_h \leq \Lambda_1$ and $|g^{-1}|_h \leq \Lambda_2$.

We prove that an L^∞ -metric is indeed a rough metric.

Proposition 2.6. An L^∞ -metric g is a rough metric. It is $(\max\{\Lambda_1 n, \Lambda_2 n\})$ -close to a smooth metric h .

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathcal{M}$ in which the inequalities in the definition of an L^∞ -metric is valid. Let $\{e^i\}$ be a frame for $T_x\mathcal{M}$ so that $h_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij}$. Let $G = (g^{ij}(x))$. Then, note that

$$\Lambda_1 \geq |g(x)|_{h(x)}^2 = g^{ij}(x)g^{mn}(x)h_{im}(x)h_{jn} = \sum_{ij} |g^{ij}|^2.$$

Now, let $u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} |u|_{g(x)}^2 &= g(x)(u, u) = g^{ij}u_i u_j \leq \sum_j \left| \sum_i g^{ij}u_i u_j \right| \\ &\leq \sum_j \left(\sum_i |g^{ij}u_j|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_i |u_i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the Cauchy Schwarz inequality. Now, by our previous calculation, we have that $|g^{ij}|^2 \leq \Lambda_1$, and hence,

$$\sum_j \sum_i |g^{ij}u_j|^2 \leq \Lambda_1 n \sum_j |u_j|^2 = \Lambda_1 n |u|_{h(x)}^2.$$

That is, $|u|_{g(x)} \leq \sqrt{\Lambda_1 n} |u|_{h(x)}$. Applying this with g^{-1} in place of g and h^{-1} in place of h , we further obtain that $|u|_{g^{-1}(x)} \leq \sqrt{\Lambda_1 n} |u|_{h^{-1}(x)}$.

Now, we note that $\tilde{G} = (g_{ij}^{-1}(x)) = G^{-1}$. Since G is symmetric, let $G = PDP^{\text{tr}}$, its eigenvalue decomposition. Indeed, $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_i)$ and $\lambda_i > 0$ since G is invertible. On letting $D^{-1} = \text{diag}(\sigma_i)$, note that $\sigma_n = \lambda_1$ and we have that $\sigma_n \leq \Lambda_2 n$, which means that $\lambda_1 \leq \frac{1}{\Lambda_2 n}$. So, now

$$\begin{aligned} |u|_{g(x)}^2 &= u^{\text{tr}}Gu = u^{\text{tr}}PDP^{\text{tr}}u = (P^{\text{tr}}u)^{\text{tr}}D(P^{\text{tr}}u) = \tilde{u}^{\text{tr}}D\tilde{u} \\ &= \sum_i \lambda_i |\tilde{u}_i| \geq \min\{\lambda_i\} \sum_i |\tilde{u}_i| \geq \frac{1}{\Lambda_2 n} |P^{\text{tr}}u| = \frac{1}{\Lambda_2 n} |u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

since P is an orthonormal matrix. That is, we have shown that for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$, and every $u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$,

$$(\Lambda_2 n)^{-1} |u|_{g(x)} \leq |u|_{h(x)} \leq (\Lambda_1 n)^{-1} |u|_{h(x)}.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.4, g is a rough metric. □

Another class of metrics we consider are metrics arising from coefficients of elliptic operators in divergence form. In particular, see the paper [27] by Saloff-Coste, where the author explicitly considers this class of metrics, although he makes a qualitative assumption that the coefficients are smooth.

Fix some smooth metric h and let $A \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(1,1)}\mathcal{M}, h)$ be real-symmetric. Consider the real-symmetric form $J_A[u, v] = \langle A\nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_h$. In order for this to define an elliptic operator, the natural assumption is to ask that there exist $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$ such that

$$h(Au, u)(x) \geq \kappa_1 |u|_{h(x)}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |A|_{h(x)} \leq \kappa_2,$$

for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$. For the sake of nomenclature, let us say that the coefficients A are *elliptic* if this condition is met. Under these conditions, the self-adjoint operator associated to J_A is $L_A u = \operatorname{div}_h A\nabla u$. Such operators have been amply studied in the literature.

Let us now define a metric associated to elliptic coefficients A by writing $g(u, v) = h(Au, v)$. Then, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.7. *A metric g induced from elliptic coefficients A via a smooth metric h is a rough metric. The metric g is $(\max\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2\})$ -close to h .*

Proof. By virtue of the fact that A are elliptic coefficients, we immediately obtain that for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $|u|_{g(x)}^2 = h(Au, u) \geq \kappa_1^2 |u|_{h(x)}^2$ for every $u \in T_x\mathcal{M}$.

For the upper bound, fix an x where the ellipticity inequality is valid, and choose a frame so that let $h_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij}$. Then, we have that $|A|_{h(x)}^2 = \sum_{ij} |A_j^i|^2$. Then,

$$|u|_{g(x)}^2 = h_x(Au, u) |Au|_{h(x)} |u|_{h(x)}.$$

Now,

$$|Au|_{h(x)}^2 = \sum_j \left| \sum_i A_j^i u_i \right|^2 \leq \sum_j \left(\sum_i |A_j^i|^2 \right) \left(\sum_i |u_i|^2 \right) \leq \kappa_2^4 |u|_{h(x)}^2.$$

Thus, $|u|_{g(x)}^2 \leq \kappa_2^2 |u|_{h(x)}^2$. By invoking Lemma 2.4, we obtain that g is a rough metric. □

As a finale, on collating our results here, we present the following proposition.

Proposition 2.8. *We have the following:*

- (i) *Every rough metric that is close to a smooth one is an L^∞ -metric;*
- (ii) *Every L^∞ -metric is a metric induced via elliptic coefficients;*
- (iii) *Every metric induced via elliptic coefficients is an L^∞ -metric.*

If \mathcal{M} is compact, then all these notions are equivalent.

Proof. For (i), suppose that g is a rough metric and that it is C -close to a smooth metric h . Then, by Proposition 2.2, we obtain a $B \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(1,1)}\mathcal{M})$ so that $g(u, v) = h(Bu, v)$ and

$$C^{-2} |u|_{h(x)} \leq |B(x)u|_{h(x)} \leq C^2 |u|_{h(x)},$$

for almost-every x . Fix an x where this inequality is valid and choose a h orthonormal frame $\{e_i\}$ at x . Then,

$$|g(x)|_{h(x)}^2 = \sum_{ij} |g^{ij}(x)|^2 = \sum_{ij} |h(Be_i, e_j)| \leq \sum_{ij} |Be_i|_{h(x)} |e_j|_{h(x)} \leq n^2 C^2.$$

So, $|g|_h \leq n^2 C^2$ almost-everywhere. Since $g^{-1}(u, v) = h^{-1}(B^{-1}u, v)$, a similar calculation shows that $|g^{-1}|_{h^{-1}} \leq n^2 C^2$.

To prove (ii), suppose that g is an L^∞ -metric. Then, we have shown in Proposition 2.6 that it is a rough metric that is close to a smooth metric h . Hence, by Proposition 2.2, we have $B \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{(1,1)}\mathcal{M})$ which can easily be checked to satisfy ellipticity. Hence, $g(u, v) = h(Bu, v)$, *i.e.*, it is a metric induced by elliptic coefficients. Then, it is a rough metric that is C -close to a smooth one and by (i), we obtain that it is an L^∞ -metric.

If further we assume that \mathcal{M} is a compact manifold, then near every rough metric g , there is a smooth metric h , and hence, by (i), we obtain that every rough metric is L^∞ or equivalently, defined via elliptic coefficients. □

In particular, this proposition gives credence to the notion of a rough metric since it is a sufficiently general notion that is able to capture the behaviour of these other aforementioned low regularity metrics.

2.3. Lebesgue and Sobolev space theory

A more pertinent feature of rough metrics is that they admit a Sobolev space theory. In order to make our exposition shorter and more accessible, from here on, we assume that \mathcal{M} is compact. First, we note that since (\mathcal{M}, μ_g) is a measure space, we obtain a Lebesgue theory. Let $L^p(\mathcal{T}^{(p,q)}\mathcal{M}, g)$ denote the p -integrable Lebesgue spaces over the bundle of (p, q) tensors. We write $L^p(\mathcal{M}, g)$ for the case that $p = q = 0$. We quote the following result which is listed as in [5, Proposition 8].

Proposition 2.9. *For a rough metric g , $\nabla_p : C^\infty \cap L^p(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow C^\infty \cap L^p(T^*\mathcal{M})$ and $\nabla_c : C_c^\infty(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow C_c^\infty(T^*\mathcal{M})$ given by $\nabla_p = d$ and $\nabla_c = d$ on the respective domains are closable, densely-defined operators.*

As a consequence, we define the Sobolev spaces as function spaces by writing $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{\nabla_p})$ and $W_0^{1,p} = \mathcal{D}(\overline{\nabla_c})$.

Proposition 2.10. *Let g and \tilde{g} be two C -close rough metrics on a compact manifold \mathcal{M} . Then:*

(i) *Whenever $p \in [1, \infty)$, $L^p(\mathcal{T}^{(r,s)}\mathcal{M}, g) = L^p(\mathcal{T}^{(r,s)}\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ with*

$$C^{-(r+s+\frac{n}{2p})} \|u\|_{p,\tilde{g}} \leq \|u\|_{p,g} \leq C^{r+s+\frac{n}{2p}} \|u\|_{p,\tilde{g}};$$

(ii) *For $p = \infty$, $L^\infty(\mathcal{T}^{(r,s)}\mathcal{M}, g) = L^\infty(\mathcal{T}^{(r,s)}\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ with*

$$C^{-(r+s)} \|u\|_{\infty,\tilde{g}} \leq \|u\|_{\infty,g} \leq C^{r+s} \|u\|_{\infty,\tilde{g}};$$

(iii) *The Sobolev spaces $W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, g) = W^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) = W_0^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, g) = W_0^{1,p}(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ with*

$$C^{-(1+\frac{n}{2p})} \|u\|_{W^{1,p},\tilde{g}} \leq \|u\|_{W^{1,p},g} \leq C^{1+\frac{n}{2p}} \|u\|_{W^{1,p},\tilde{g}};$$

(iv) *The Sobolev spaces $W^{d,p}(\mathcal{M}, g) = W^{d,p}(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ with*

$$C^{-(n+\frac{n}{2p})} \|u\|_{W^{d,p},\tilde{g}} \leq \|u\|_{W^{d,p},g} \leq C^{n+\frac{n}{2p}} \|u\|_{W^{d,p},\tilde{g}};$$

(v) *The divergence operators satisfy $\operatorname{div}_g = \theta^{-1} \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}} \theta B$;*

(vi) *The Laplacians satisfy $\Delta_g = -\theta^{-1} \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}} \theta B \nabla$.*

We emphasise (iii), which demonstrates that $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}, g) = W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ for any rough metric g , since, as we have aforementioned, compactness guarantees the existence of a smooth metric \tilde{g} that is C -close to g .

3. Main results and applications

3.1. Existence and regularity of the flow

The broader perspective underpinning our analysis in this paper is to relate the regularity of the heat kernel to the regularity of the Gigli-Mantegazza flow. Indeed, this is to be expected simply from inspection of the main governing equation (CE) for this flow.

In Section 4, we consider L^∞ -coefficient differential operators on smooth manifolds, and we obtain solutions to more general equations similar to (CE). Furthermore, we conduct operator theory on operators of the type $x \mapsto \operatorname{div}_g \omega_x \nabla$ in order

to define a notion of derivative that is weak enough to account for the lack of regularity of the coefficients ω_x but sufficiently strong enough to be useful to demonstrate the regularity of the the flow (GM). In Section 5, we prove some auxiliary facts needed to ensure that (GM) indeed does define a Riemannian metric, and on coupling our main results from Section 4, we obtain the following theorem. It is the most general geometric result that we showcase in this paper. Its proof can be found in Subsection 5.2.

Theorem 3.1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a smooth, compact manifold and g a rough metric. Suppose that the heat kernel $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and that on an open set $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{N}$, $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in C^k(\mathcal{N}^2)$ where $k \geq 2$. Then, for $t > 0$, g_t is a Riemannian metric on \mathcal{N} of regularity $C^{k-2,1}$.*

We remark that allowing for a Lipschitz heat kernel is neither a restriction nor is it too general. We will see in the following section that the most important class of objects we consider, namely when (\mathcal{M}, g) is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space, will admit such a heat kernel.

The reader may find it curious that, even though we assume that the heat kernel is C^k away from the singular region, and only a single derivative of the heat kernel appears in the source term of (CE), we are only able to assert that the resulting flow is $C^{k-2,1}$. In a sense, it is because the global regularity of the heat kernel, which is only Lipschitz, becomes significant in proving the continuity of the $(k-1)$ -th partial derivatives. We remark that it may be possible to assert this continuity performing the operator theory of $x \mapsto \text{div}_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot) \nabla$ with greater care than we have done.

For a C^1 global heat kernel, we are able to assert that the $(k-1)$ -th partial derivatives are indeed continuous. This is the content of the following theorem. Note that, unlike Theorem 3.1 where we assumed that the heat kernel was at least twice continuously differentiable on the non-singular part, we allow for heat kernels with only a single derivative on the non-singular region. This theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.3 in Subsection 6.1.

Theorem 3.2. *Let \mathcal{M} be a smooth, compact manifold and g a rough metric. Suppose that the heat kernel $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in C^1(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and that on an open set $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{N}$, $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in C^k(\mathcal{N}^2)$ where $k \geq 1$. Then, for $t > 0$, g_t is a Riemannian metric on \mathcal{N} of regularity C^{k-1} .*

We remark that for the case $k = 1$, Bandara in [6] asserts the continuity of $x \rightarrow g_t(x)$ on \mathcal{N} without imposing any global regularity assumptions on $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y)$. This is accomplished by reducing this assertion to a *homogeneous* Kato square root problem that he proves in this context.

Typically, in an open region where the metric is C^k for $k \geq 1$, we expect the heat kernel to improve to C^{k+1} . This is an immediate consequence of the fact that the region is open, and because we can write the Laplacian via a change of coordinates as a non-divergence form equation with C^{k-1} coefficients. We then obtain regularity via Schauder theory. This analysis is conducted in Subsection 6.2. By

considering the situation where a rough metric improves to a C^k metric away from a closed singular set, Theorem 3.1 yields a metric tensor away from the singular set that is of regularity $C^{k-1,1}$. That is, the resulting flow may be *more* singular than the initial metric inside such a region. However, by coupling the results of Subsection 6.2 with Theorem 3.2, we are able to assert that the flow remains at least as regular as the initial metric.

Theorem 3.3. *Let \mathcal{M} be a smooth, compact manifold and $g \in C^k$ for $k \geq 1$. Then, the flow $g_t \in C^k$ for each $t > 0$.*

We emphasise that we are not providing sharp regularity information via these theorems. That is, we are unable to assert that if the initial metric is $C^k \setminus C^{k-1}$, then the resulting flow is also $C^k \setminus C^{k-1}$. In fact, this may not be the case, it may be possible that in some instances, the flow g_t improves in regularity. These are interesting open questions beyond the scope of this paper.

3.2. Applications to geometrically singular spaces

In this subsection we consider geometric applications of Theorem 3.1, particular to spaces with geometric singularities.

As a start, we describe our notion of a *geometric conical singularity*. For that, let us first describe the n -cone of radius r and height h by

$$\mathcal{C}(r, h) = \left\{ (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : |x| = \frac{r}{h}(h - t) : t \in [0, h] \right\}.$$

With this notation in hand, we define the following.

Definition 3.4 (Geometric conical singularities). Let \mathcal{M} be a smooth manifold and g a rough metric. Let $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and suppose there exists a charts (ψ_i, U_i) mutually disjoint such that $g \in C^k(\mathcal{M} \setminus \cup_i \overline{U}_i)$. Moreover, suppose for each i , there is a Lipeomorphism $F_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(r_i, h_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ which improves to a C^{k+1} diffeomorphism (for $k \geq 1$) on $U_i \setminus \{p_i\}$ and that $g = F_i^*(\cdot, \cdot)_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}$ inside U_i . Then, we say that (\mathcal{M}, g) is C^k -geometry with *geometric conical singularities* at points $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$.

A direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 is then the following:

Corollary 3.5. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be a C^k -geometry for $k \geq 1$ with geometric conical singularities at $\{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$. Then, the flow $g_t \in C^{k-1,1}(\mathcal{M} \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_k\})$ and the induced metric coincides everywhere with the flow of the metrics d_t for $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces defined by Gigli-Mantegazza.*

Moreover, we are able to flow the sphere with a conical pole. See Subsection 7.2 for the construction and proof.

Corollary 3.6 (Witch’s hat sphere). *Let (S^n, g_{witch}) be the sphere with a cone attached at the north pole. Then, the flow $g_t \in C^\infty$ at least on the region away from the north pole and the induced metric agrees with the flow of the metrics d_t for $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces defined by Gigli-Mantegazza.*

Also, as a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we are able to consider the n -dimensional box in Euclidean space. Again, its proof is contained in Subsection 7.2.

Corollary 3.7. *Let (B, g) be an n -box. Then, the flow $g_t \in C^\infty(\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{S})$, where \mathcal{S} is the set of edges and corners, induces the same distance as d_t , the $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ Gigli-Mantegazza flow, for g_t -admissible points.*

We remark that a shortcoming of our analysis of the flow for the box is that we have not classified the g_t -admissible points. We do not expect this analysis to be straightforward since it involves understanding whether the flat pieces are preserved in some way under d_t . However, since we have supplied a metric g_t away from a set of measure zero, we expect it to be possible to induce d_t via this metric on a very large part of the box.

4. Elliptic problems and regularity

Throughout this section, let us fix $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ to be an open subset of \mathcal{M} . To study the flow of Gigli-Mantegazza, we study a slightly more general elliptic problem than (CE). Let $\omega \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$ be a function satisfying $\omega(x, y) > 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, let $x \mapsto \omega(x, \cdot) \in C^k(\mathcal{N})$ where $k \geq 1$. For convenience, we write $\omega(x, \cdot) = \omega_x$. Then, for $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ we want to solve for $\varphi \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying the equation

$$-\text{div}_g \omega_x \nabla \varphi = \eta. \tag{F}$$

In this section we establish existence, uniqueness and regularity (in x) for this equation.

4.1. L^∞ -coefficient divergence form operators on smooth metrics

Due to the lack of regularity of an arbitrary rough metric, we are forced to solve the the problem (F) via perturbation to a smooth metric. Indeed, this is not a small perturbation result as we are not guaranteed the existence of arbitrarily close smooth metrics to a rough metric. Instead, we will have to contend ourselves to studying elliptic PDE of the form $-\text{div} A \nabla$, where A are only bounded measurable coefficients defining an elliptic problem.

More precisely, throughout this subsection, we fix \mathcal{M} to be a smooth compact manifold and \tilde{g} to be a smooth metric. Let $A \in L^\infty(\mathcal{T}^{(1,1)}\mathcal{M}) = L^\infty(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}^{(1,0)}\mathcal{M}))$ be real-symmetric. That is, for almost-every x , in coordinates, $A(x)$ can be written as a symmetric matrix with real coefficients. Further, we assume that there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that $\langle Au, u \rangle \geq \kappa \|u\|^2$. That is, A is bounded below. Moreover, we

quantify the L^∞ bound for A via assuming there exists $\Lambda > 0$ satisfying $\langle Au, u \rangle = \|\sqrt{A}\|^2 \leq \Lambda$

Let $J_A : W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \times W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be given by

$$J_A[u, v] = \langle A\nabla u, \nabla v \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{g}_x(A(x)\nabla u(x), \nabla v(x)) \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}}(x).$$

Then, by the lower bound on A , we obtain that $J_A[u, u] \geq \kappa \|\nabla u\|^2$. The Lax-Milgram theorem then yields a unique, closed, densely-defined self-adjoint operator L_A with domain $\mathcal{D}(L_A) \subset W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $J_A[u, v] = \langle L_A u, v \rangle$ for $u \in \mathcal{D}(L_A)$ and $v \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$. Moreover, since the form J_A is real-symmetric due to the fact that A are real-symmetric coefficients, this theorem further yields that $\mathcal{D}(\sqrt{L_A}) = W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and $J_A[u, v] = \langle \sqrt{L_A}u, \sqrt{L_A}v \rangle$. The uniqueness then allows us to assert that $L_A = -\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}} A \nabla$.

For the remainder of this section, we rely on some facts from the spectral theory of sectorial and, more particularly, self-adjoint operators. We refer the reader to [18] by Kato, [1] by Albrecht, Duong and McIntosh, [17] by Gilbarg and Trudinger and [10] by Cowling, Doust, McIntosh and Yagi for a more detailed exposition on the connection between PDE and spectral theory.

As a first, we establish a spectral splitting for L_A . We recall that for $u \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathcal{M})$, $u_B = \int_B u \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}}$ for $B \subset \mathcal{M}$ a Borel set.

Proposition 4.1. *The space $L^2(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{N}(L_A) \oplus^\perp \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$ and the operator L_A restricted to either $\mathcal{N}(L_A)$ or $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$ preserves each space respectively. Moreover, $\mathcal{N}(L_A) = \mathcal{N}(\nabla)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} = \{u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) : \int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0\}$.*

Proof. The fact that the operator splits the space orthogonally to $\mathcal{N}(L_A)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$, and that its restriction to each of these spaces preserves the respective space is a direct consequence of the fact that L_A is self-adjoint. See [10, Theorem 3.8].

First, let us apply this same argument to the operator $\sqrt{L_A}$, so that we obtain the splitting $L^2(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A}) \oplus^\perp \overline{\mathcal{R}(\sqrt{L_A})}$. Now, fix $u \in \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A})$. Then, $\sqrt{L_A}u = 0$ which implies that $u \in \mathcal{D}(L_A)$ and $L_A u = \sqrt{L_A}(\sqrt{L_A}u) = 0$. Hence, $u \in \mathcal{N}(L_A)$. For the reverse inclusion, suppose that $0 \neq u \in \mathcal{N}(L_A)$. Then, $\sqrt{L_A}\sqrt{L_A}u = 0$. That is, $\sqrt{L_A}u \in \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A})$. But since $\sqrt{L_A}$ preserves $\mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A})$, $u \in \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A})$. Thus, $\mathcal{N}(L_A) = \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A})$. Now, since we have that for all $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$, $\kappa \|\nabla u\|^2 \leq \|\sqrt{L_A}u\|^2 \leq \Lambda \|\nabla u\|^2$, we obtain that $\mathcal{N}(\nabla) = \mathcal{N}(\sqrt{L_A})$ and hence, $\mathcal{N}(\nabla) = \mathcal{N}(L_A)$.

Now, recall that (\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) admits a Poincaré inequality: there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u - u_{\mathcal{M}}\| \leq C \|\nabla u\|,$$

for every $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$. Note then that, if $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$, then $\|u\| \leq C \|\nabla u\|$. Thus, if we further assume that $u \in \mathcal{N}(\nabla)$ then we obtain that $u = 0$. On letting $Z = \{u \in L^2(\mathcal{M}) : \int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0\}$, that is precisely

$$\{0\} = \mathcal{N}(L_A) \cap W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \cap Z = \mathcal{N}(L_A) \cap Z,$$

since $\mathcal{N}(L_A) \subset W^{1,2}(\mathcal{V})$. Therefore, $Z \subset \mathcal{N}(L_A)^\perp = \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$. For the reverse inclusion, let $u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$. Then, there exists a sequence $v_n \in \mathcal{D}(L_A)$ such that $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_A v_n$ in $L^2(\mathcal{M})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} &= \langle u, 1 \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle L_A v_n, 1 \rangle \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle -\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}} A \nabla v_n, 1 \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle A \nabla v_n, \nabla(1) \rangle = 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that since L_A preserves the spaces $\mathcal{N}(L_A)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$, we obtain that the restricted operator

$$L_A^R = L_A|_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}} : \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)},$$

and

$$J_A^R = J_A|_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \cap W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})},$$

with $\mathcal{D}(J_A^R) = W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$.

Proposition 4.2. *The operator L_A^R is a closed, densely-defined operator with associated form J_A^R .*

Proof. By definition, we obtain that $\mathcal{D}(L_A^R) = \mathcal{D}(L_A) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$. Now, let D_A^R be the operator given via the form J_A^R . We note that J_A^R is both densely-defined and closed. Now, note that

$$\mathcal{D}(D_A^R) = \left\{ u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} : W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{R}(L_A) \ni v \mapsto J_A^R[u, v] \text{ is continuous} \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{D}(L_A) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \subset \mathcal{D}(D_A^R)$.

For the reverse inclusion, assume that $u \in \mathcal{D}(D_A^R)$, and $v \in \mathcal{R}(L_A) \cap W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ so that $v \mapsto \langle A \nabla v, \nabla v \rangle$ is continuous. Now, we have that $\mathcal{R}(L_A)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{M})$ as well as in $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{L_A})$ (by a functional calculus argument). Thus, this continuity is valid for every $v \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and hence, $u \in \mathcal{D}(L_A)$. Since we have by assumption that $u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$, we have that $\mathcal{D}(D_A^R) \subset \mathcal{D}(L_A) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$.

It is easy to see that $L_A^R = D_A^R$ which is a closed, densely-defined operator by the Lax-Milgram theorem. □

We compute the spectrum of L_A via the spectrum for L_A^R .

Proposition 4.3. *The spectra of the operators L_A and L_A^R relate by:*

$$\sigma(L_A) = \{0\} \cup \sigma(L_A^R) \subset \{0\} \cup [\kappa \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}), \infty).$$

Proof. Fix $\zeta \neq 0$ and $\zeta \in \rho(L_A^R)$, That is, $\zeta - L_A^R : \mathcal{D}(L_A^R) = \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \cap \mathcal{D}(L_A) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A^R)}$ is invertible. Thus, for any $u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \cap \mathcal{D}(L_A)$, there exists a $v \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$ such that $u = (\zeta - L_A^R)^{-1}v$ or equivalently, $v = (\zeta - L_A^R)u$. But we have that $L_A^R = L_A|_{\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \cap \mathcal{D}(L_A)}$ and therefore, we obtain that $v = (\zeta - L_A)u$. That is, $u = (\zeta - L_A^R)^{-1}(\zeta - L_A)u$. From this, we also obtain that $v = (\zeta - L_A)u = (\zeta - L_A)(\zeta - L_A^R)^{-1}v$. That is, on $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$, $(\zeta - L_A)^{-1} = (\zeta - L_A^R)^{-1}$.

Now, fix $u \in \mathcal{N}(L_A)$. Then, we have that $(\zeta - L_A)u = \zeta u$. Since we assume $\zeta \neq 0$, we obtain that $(\zeta - L_A^{-1})u = \zeta^{-1}u$. This proves that $\rho(L_A^R) \setminus \{0\} \subset \rho(L_A)$ or $\sigma(L_A) \subset \sigma(L_A^R) \cup \{0\}$

Now, suppose that $\zeta \in \rho(L_A)$. Then, for $u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$ there exists a $v \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \cap \mathcal{D}(L_A)$ such that $u = (\zeta - L_A)v$. But $(\zeta - L_A)v = (\zeta - L_A^R)v$. By the invertibility of $(\zeta - L_A)$ we obtain the invertibility of $(\zeta - L_A^R)$. Thus, $\rho(L_A) \subset \rho(L_A^R)$ and $\sigma(L_A^R) \subset \sigma(L_A)$. Since we already know that $0 \in \sigma(L_A)$, we obtain that $\sigma(L_A^R) \cup \{0\} \subset \sigma(L_A)$.

Next, note that since L_A^R is self-adjoint, $\sigma(L_A^R) \subset \overline{\text{nr}(L_A^R)}$ where

$$\text{nr}(L_A^R) = \left\{ \langle L_A u, u \rangle : u \in \mathcal{D}(L_A^R), \|u\| = 1 \right\},$$

is the numerical-range of L_A^R . Moreover, via the Poincaré inequality, we obtain that

$$J_A^R[u, u] \geq \kappa \|\nabla u\|^2 \geq \kappa \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) \|u\|^2$$

for $u \in \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \cap W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$, and where $\lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$ is the first nonzero eigenvalue for the smooth Laplacian $\Delta_{\tilde{g}}$. This shows that $\rho(L_A^R) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus [\kappa \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}), \infty)$. \square

Moreover, we obtain that the operator L_A has discrete spectrum.

Proposition 4.4. *The spectrum $\sigma(L_A) = \{0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 < \dots\}$ is discrete and $\lambda_1 \geq \kappa \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})$.*

Proof. Fix $\delta > 0$ and write $L_{A,\delta} u = L_A u + \delta u$. It is easy to see that $\sigma(L_{A,\delta}) = \{\delta\} \cup [\kappa \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) + \delta, \infty)$. Moreover, the operator $L_{A,\delta}$ is invertible, in fact, $L_{A,\delta}^{-1}$ is a resolvent of L_A and thus $L_{A,\delta}^{-1} : L^2(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$ boundedly.

Furthermore, note that

$$\|\nabla L_{A,\delta}^{-1} u\| \lesssim \|\sqrt{L_{A,\delta}} L_{A,\delta}^{-1} u\| = \|L_{A,\delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}} u\| \lesssim \|u\|.$$

Thus, we can obtain that $L_{A,\delta}^{-1} : L^2(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ boundedly. Let us call this operator $L_{A,\delta,W^{1,2}}^{-1}$.

Now, on a compact manifold, the inclusion map $E : W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$ is compact. Thus, we can write $L_{A,\delta}^{-1} = E L_{A,\delta,W^{1,2}}^{-1}$. This shows that $L_{A,\delta}^{-1}$ is compact. That is, $\sigma(L_{A,\delta}^{-1})$ is discrete with 0 as the only accumulation point. Hence,

by combining with our previous bound for the spectrum of $\sigma(L_A)$, we obtain the claim. \square

By the invertibility of L_A^R on $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$, and by our previous characterisation of $\overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$, we obtain the following first existence result.

Proposition 4.5. *For every $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{M}} f \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$, we obtain a unique solution $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$ to the equation $L_A u = f$. This solution is given by $u = (L_A^R)^{-1} f$.*

Proof. The operator L_A^R is invertible by the fact that the associated form is bounded and coercive. Moreover, it is easy to see that $L_A^R : \mathcal{D}(L_A) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$ and hence, $(L_A^R)^{-1} : \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(L_A) \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}(L_A)}$. The uniqueness is by virtue of the fact that $\mathcal{N}(L_A^R) = \{0\}$. The fact that the solution $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ easily follows since $(\mathcal{D}(L_A), \|\cdot\|_{L_A}) \subset W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ is a continuous embedding. \square

4.2. Existence and uniqueness for a similar problem

Let us return to the situation where g is a rough metric on \mathcal{M} . Recall that in this situation, there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ and a smooth metric \tilde{g} that is C -close to g . Let $B \in L^\infty(\mathcal{T}^{(1,1)}\mathcal{M})$ be real-symmetric such that

$$g_x(u, v) = \tilde{g}_x(B(x)u, v)$$

for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $\theta(x) = \sqrt{\det B(x)}$ for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$ so that $g(x) = \theta(x)d\mu_{\tilde{g}}(x)$.

For the sake of convenience, we write $D_x = -\operatorname{div}_g \omega_x \nabla$. It is easy to see that $J_x[u, v] = \langle \omega_x \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_g$ is the real-symmetric form associated to D_x .

First, we note the following:

Proposition 4.6. *There exist $\kappa > 0$ such that $J_x[u, u] \geq \kappa \|\nabla u\|_g^2$ uniformly for $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Moreover, $J_x[u, v] = \langle \omega_x B \theta \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_{\tilde{g}}$ and $J_x[u, u] \geq \kappa C^{1+\frac{n}{4}} \|\nabla u\|_{\tilde{g}}$. A function $\varphi \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ solves (F) if and only if*

$$-\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}}(\theta B \omega_x \nabla \varphi) = \theta \eta.$$

Proof. First, we note that $\omega(x, y) > 0$ for all x, y . Secondly, since we assume that $\omega \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$, for $k \geq 1$, by the virtue of compactness of \mathcal{M} , we obtain that $\inf_{x,y} \omega(x, y) = \min_{x,y} \omega(x, y) > 0$. That is, set $\kappa = \min_{x,y} \omega(x, y)$ and we're done.

The description of J_x in \tilde{g} and its ellipticity estimate in \tilde{g} follow from Proposition 2.10 (i) with $p = 2$, and $r = 1, s = 0$.

The equivalence of solutions for the (F) simply follows from Proposition 2.10(vi). \square

This is the crucial observation which allows us to reduce the (CE) to solving a divergence form equation with bounded, measurable coefficients on the nearby smooth metric \tilde{g} .

With the aid of this, we demonstrate existence and uniqueness of solutions to (CE).

Proposition 4.7. *Let $\eta \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ satisfy $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta \, d\mu_g = 0$. Then, there exists a unique solution $\varphi \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying (F) such that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi \, d\mu_g = 0$.*

Proof. Let $f = \theta\eta$. Then, note that

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} f \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta\theta \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta \, d\mu_g = 0.$$

Set $A = \theta B\omega_x$ and by what we have proved about f , we are able to apply Proposition (4.5) to the operator L_A in $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\tilde{g}}$ to obtain a unique solution $\tilde{\varphi}$ satisfying $L_A \tilde{\varphi} = f = \theta\eta$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{\varphi} \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$.

Define $\varphi(y) = \tilde{\varphi}(y) - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{\varphi}(y) \, d\mu_g$ which satisfies $J[\varphi, f] = \langle \eta, f \rangle_{\tilde{g}}$ and we also find that

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi(y) \, d\mu_g(y) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{\varphi}(y) \, d\mu(y) - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{\varphi}(y) \, d\mu_g(y) \right) \, d\mu_g(y) = 0.$$

Thus, φ solves (F).

To prove uniqueness, let us fix two solutions φ^1 and φ^2 solving (F) with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi^i \, d\mu_g = 0$. Then, on writing $\psi = \varphi^1 - \varphi^2$, we obtain that ψ satisfies

$$-\operatorname{div}_g \omega_x \nabla \psi = 0$$

with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \psi \, d\mu = 0$. Now, define $\tilde{\psi}(y) = \psi(y) - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \psi \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}}$. It is easy to see that $\tilde{\psi}$ satisfies

$$-L_A \tilde{\psi} = 0.$$

with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{\psi} \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$. Thus, by the uniqueness guaranteed by Proposition 4.5, we obtain that $\tilde{\psi} = 0$. That is, $\psi(y) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \psi(y) \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}}(y)$, and on integrating this with respect to g , we obtain that

$$0 = \mu_g(\mathcal{M}) \int_{\mathcal{M}} \psi(y) \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}}(y).$$

That is, $\psi = \tilde{\psi} = 0$.

□

4.3. Operator theory of $x \mapsto D_x$

Let us return to the PDE (F), and recall the operator $D_x = -\operatorname{div}_g \omega_x \nabla$ where $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$, and $x \mapsto \omega_x \in C^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{N})$. Let $J_x[u, v]$ be its associated real-symmetric form, $J_x[u, v] = \langle \omega_x \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle$.

In order to understand the regularity $x \mapsto \varphi_{t,x,v}$ of solutions to (CE), we need to prove some preliminary regularity results about the operator family D_x . First, we obtain the constancy of domain as well as the following formula.

Proposition 4.8. *The family of operators $\mathcal{M} \ni x \mapsto D_x$ satisfies $\mathcal{D}(D_x) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and $D_x u = \omega_x \Delta_g u - g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x)$.*

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $u, v \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$. Then, note that $\omega_x v \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and that,

$$\langle \nabla u, \nabla(\omega_x v) \rangle_g = \langle \nabla u, \omega_x \nabla v + v \nabla \omega_x \rangle_g = \langle \omega_x \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_g + \langle g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x), v \rangle_g.$$

That is, $\langle \omega_x \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_g = \langle \nabla u, \nabla(\omega_x v) \rangle_g - \langle g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x), v \rangle_g$.

First we show that for any $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$, $v \mapsto \langle g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x), v \rangle_g$ is continuous. Observe that $|\langle g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x), v \rangle_g| \leq \|g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x)\|_g \|v\|_g$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Moreover,

$$\|g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x)\|_g^2 = \int_{\mathcal{M}} |g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x)|^2 d\mu_g \leq \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\nabla u|^2 |\nabla \omega_x|^2 d\mu_g.$$

However, since $y \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M})$ and \mathcal{M} is compact, we have that $\operatorname{esssup}_y |\nabla \omega_x(y)| \leq C$, and hence, $\|g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x)\|_g \leq C \|\nabla u\|_g$. This proves that $v \mapsto \langle g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x), v \rangle_g$ is continuous.

Now, suppose that $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$, then $\langle \nabla u, \nabla(\omega_x v) \rangle_g = \langle \Delta_g u, \omega_x v \rangle$ and hence, $v \mapsto \langle \nabla u, \nabla(\omega_x v) \rangle_g$ is continuous. Since we have already shown that $v \mapsto \langle g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x), v \rangle_g$ is continuous, we obtain that $v \mapsto \langle \omega_x \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle$ is continuous. Hence, $u \in \mathcal{D}(D_x)$ which proves that $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) \subset \mathcal{D}(D_x)$.

Similarly, for $u \in \mathcal{D}(D_x)$, we find that $v \mapsto \langle \nabla u, \nabla(\omega_x v) \rangle_g$ is continuous. Hence, $u \in \mathcal{D}(\omega_x \Delta_g) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$. This shows that $\mathcal{D}(D_x) \subset \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$. \square

Remark 4.9. We note that an immediate consequence of this is that the unique solution φ to (F) satisfies $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ as $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) = \mathcal{D}(D_x) = \mathcal{D}(L_x)$. This observation is essential in our approach to regularity.

We also obtain the following uniform boundedness for the operator family parametrised in $x \in \mathcal{N}$.

Proposition 4.10. *The family of operators $\mathcal{M} \ni x \mapsto D_x : (\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g), \|\cdot\|_{\Delta_g}) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$ is a uniformly bounded family of operators. Moreover, $\|u\|_{D_x} \simeq \|u\|_{\Delta_g}$ holds with the implicit constant independent of $x \in \mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. We show that $\|D_x u\| \lesssim \|u\|_{\Delta_g} = \|\Delta_g u\| + \|u\|$, where the implicit constant is independent of $x \in \mathcal{M}$. Fix $x \in \mathcal{M}$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_x u\| &\leq \|\omega_x \Delta_g u\| + \|g(\nabla u, \nabla \omega_x)\| \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{y \in \mathcal{M}} |\omega_x(y)| \right) \|\Delta_g u\| + \left(\text{esssup}_{y \in \mathcal{M}} |\nabla \omega_x(y)| \right) \|\nabla u\|. \end{aligned}$$

But since $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$, the Lipschitz constant is in both variables, and hence, there is a $C > 0$ such that $\text{esssup}_{y \in \mathcal{M}} |\nabla \omega_x(y)| \leq C$. The quantity $\sup_{y \in \mathcal{M}} |\omega_x(y)|$ is also independent of C simply by coupling the continuity of $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y)$ with the compactness of \mathcal{M} .

Now, note that by ellipticity,

$$\|\nabla u\|^2 \leq |\langle \Delta_g u, u \rangle| \leq \|\Delta_g u\| \|u\| \leq \|\Delta_g u\|^2 + \|u\|^2.$$

This complete the proof. The reverse inequality is argued similarly on noting that $\omega_x(y) > 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$. □

Remark 4.11. Note that the two previous propositions are valid on all of \mathcal{M} , not just on $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ where $x \mapsto \omega_x$ enjoys higher regularity.

Let $v \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ and $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$. Let $f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, where \mathcal{V} where \mathcal{V} is some normed vector space. Then, we write the difference quotient as

$$Q_s^v f(x) = \frac{f(x) - f(\gamma(s))}{s}.$$

We define the *directional derivative* of f (when it exists and it is independent of the generating curve γ) to be

$$(d_x f(x))(v) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} Q_s^v f(x).$$

In our particular setting, we consider $\mathcal{V} = L^2(\mathcal{M})$ with the weak topology for the choice $f(x) = D_x$. More precisely, if there exists $\tilde{D}_x : \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$ satisfying

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle Q_s^v D_x u, w \rangle = \langle \tilde{D}_x u, w \rangle,$$

for every $w \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$, we say that D_x has a (weak) derivative at x and write $(d_x D_x) = \tilde{D}_x$. In what is to follow, we will see that this is a sufficiently strong enough notion of derivative to obtain regularity properties for the flow defined by (GM).

With this notation at hand, we prove the following important proposition.

Proposition 4.12. *The operator valued function $\mathcal{N} \ni x \mapsto D_x : \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$ is weakly differentiable k times. At each $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and for every $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$,*

$$(d_x D_x)(v) = -\operatorname{div}_g((d_x \omega_x)(v))\nabla : \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$$

is densely-defined and symmetric. Moreover, inside a chart $\Omega \Subset \mathcal{N}$ containing x for which the vector v is constant, there is a constant C_Ω such that

$$\|(d_x D_x)(v)u\| \leq C_\Omega \|u\|_{\Delta_g}.$$

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and a chart $\Omega \Subset \mathcal{N}$ with a constant vector $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, and note that because of the higher regularity of ω_x at x , we have $(x, y) \mapsto (d_x \omega_x(y))(v) \in C^0(\Omega \times \mathcal{M})$ and $x \mapsto (d_x \omega_x(y))(v) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M})$. Coupling this with the compactness of \mathcal{M} and $\bar{\Omega}$, there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that $-\Lambda < (d_x \omega_x(y))(v) < \Lambda$, for all $x \in \Omega$ and $y \in \mathcal{M}$. Thus, let $f_{x,\varepsilon} = (d_x \omega_x)(v) + \Lambda + \varepsilon$ and define $K_\varepsilon[u, w] = \langle f_{x,\varepsilon} \nabla u, \nabla w \rangle$. By the Lax-Milgram theorem, the operator associated to the form K_ε is exactly

$$\tilde{D}_{x,\varepsilon} = -\operatorname{div}_g[(d_x \omega_x)(v) + (\Lambda + \varepsilon)]\nabla,$$

and is guaranteed to be non-negative self-adjoint. Since we have that ω_x is k times differentiable at our chosen x , the map $y \mapsto f_{x,\varepsilon}(y)$ is still Lipschitz and hence, we are able to apply Proposition 4.8 with $f_{x,\varepsilon}$ in place of ω_x to obtain that $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{D}_{x,\varepsilon}) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$. Consequently, we obtain that $\tilde{D}_{x,\varepsilon} - (\Lambda + \varepsilon)\Delta_g$ has domain $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and so, an easy calculation via the defining form, demonstrates that

$$D'_x u = -\operatorname{div}_g(d_x \omega_x)(v)\nabla u = \tilde{D}_{x,\varepsilon} u - (\Lambda + \varepsilon)\Delta_g u,$$

from which its clear that the operator is densely-defined.

A repetition of the argument in Proposition 4.10, utilising the higher regularity of $x \mapsto \omega_x$ on \mathcal{N} , there exists a constant $C_\Omega > 0$ such that $|(d_x \omega_x(y))(v)| \leq C_\Omega$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and almost-every $y \in \mathcal{M}$. Thus, $\|D_{x,\varepsilon} u\| \leq C_\Omega \|u\|_{\Delta_g}$ and the estimate in the conclusion follows.

Now we show that the formula in the conclusion is valid. Fix $w \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$, $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and compute

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle Q_s^v D_x u, w \rangle &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle -\operatorname{div} Q_s^v \omega_x \nabla u, w \rangle = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle Q_s^v \omega_x \nabla u, \nabla w \rangle \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} Q_s^v \omega_x(y) g_y(\nabla u(y), \nabla w(y)) \, d\mu_g(y). \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that

$$|Q_s^v \omega_x(y)| \leq \left| \frac{\omega_x(y) - \omega_{\gamma(s)}(y)}{s} \right| \leq C$$

since $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and $x \mapsto \omega_x \in C^1(\mathcal{M})$. So, we are able to apply the dominated convergence theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle Q_s^v D_x u, w \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} Q_s^v \omega_x(y) g_y(\nabla u(y), \nabla w(y)) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \langle (d_x D_x)(v) \nabla u, \nabla w \rangle = \langle -\operatorname{div}_g(d_x D_x)(v) \nabla u, w \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that we assume that $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and we have already shown that $\mathcal{D}(-\operatorname{div}_g((d_x \omega_x)(v)) \nabla) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$.

The equality of operators in the conclusion follows from the fact that $w \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{M})$. □

Remark 4.13. Let $v_1, \dots, v_l \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, with $k \leq l$, and note that the map $(x, y) \mapsto (d_x^l \omega_x)(v_1, \dots, v_l) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$, where $(d_x^2 \omega_x)(v_1, v_2) = (d_x(d_x \omega_x)(v_1))(v_2)$. Thus, on applying this proposition repeatedly, we can assert that

$$(d_x^l D_x)(v_1, \dots, v_l) = -\operatorname{div}_g((d_x^l \omega_x)(v_1, \dots, v_l)) \nabla : \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) \rightarrow L^2(\mathcal{M})$$

is a densely-defined operator.

Now, we are able to prove the following product rule for the operator D_x . This product rule is the essential tool for obtaining the existence of weak derivatives $\partial_x \varphi_x$ of solutions for (CE).

Proposition 4.14. Let $x \mapsto u_x : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$, $v \in T_x \mathcal{M}$ and suppose that $(d_x u_x)(v)$ exists weakly. Then $(d_x D_x u_x)(v)$ exists weakly if and only if $D_x((d_x u_x)(v))$ exists weakly and

$$(d_x D_x u_x)(v) = (d_x D_x)(v) u_x + D_x((d_x u_x)(v)).$$

Proof. Fix $w \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and define $f(x, y) = \langle D_x u_y, w \rangle$. Let $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a curve in \mathcal{M} satisfying $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$. Now, note that for $s > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s} [f(\gamma(s), \gamma(s)) - f(x, x)] &= \frac{1}{s} [f(\gamma(s), \gamma(s)) - f(x, \gamma(s))] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{s} [f(x, \gamma(s)) - f(x, x)]. \end{aligned} \tag{†}$$

By Proposition 4.12, $(d_x f(x, y))(v)|_{y=x}$ exists and

$$\begin{aligned} (d_x f(x, y))(v)|_{y=x} &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} [f(\gamma(s), y) - f(x, y)]|_{y=x} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} [f(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) - f(x, \gamma(t))] \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s} [f(\gamma(s), \gamma(s)) - f(x, \gamma(s))]. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $(d_x D_x u_x)(v)$ exists weakly. Then, by (\dagger) , $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s^{-1}[f(x, \gamma(s)) - f(x, x)]$ exists and so, by further choosing $w \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{s}[f(x, \gamma(s)) - f(x, x)] &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \left\langle \frac{1}{s} D_x(u_x - u_{\gamma(s)}), w \right\rangle \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle Q_s^v u_x, D_x w \rangle = \langle (d_x u_x)(v), D_x w \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (\dagger) ,

$$\langle (d_x u_x)(v), D_x w \rangle = \langle \partial_x(D_x u_x)(v) - (\partial_x D_x)(v)u_x, w \rangle,$$

and since the right-hand side is continuous in w , we obtain that $(d_x u_x)(v) \in \mathcal{D}(D_x) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$.

Now, if $D_x(d_x u_x)(v)$ exists weakly, then from (\dagger) , we are able to assert that the limit $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} s^{-1}[f(\gamma(s), \gamma(s)) - f(x, x)]$ exists, which is precisely that $d_x(D_x u_x)(v)$ exists weakly. The product rule formula is obvious from these computations. \square

Remark 4.15. If the function $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^k(\mathcal{M}^2)$ for $k \geq 1$, then we are able to perform this analysis in the uniform operator topology $\mathcal{L}((\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g), v \cdot \|_{\Delta_g}), L^2(\mathcal{M}))$. This involves estimating the term $\sup_{x, y \in \mathcal{M}} |\nabla Q_s^v w_x(y)|$ and showing that this quantity tends to 0 as $s \rightarrow 0$. It is clear that such an estimate cannot be made even with the supremum replaced by an essential supremum when $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y)$ is only Lipschitz.

4.4. Regularity of solutions

We combine the results obtained in the previous subsections to prove the following regularity theorem for solutions to (F). Recalling that $L_x = -\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{g}}(\theta B \omega_x) \nabla$, we note the following:

Lemma 4.16. *Let $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_g = 0$. Then, $\|L_x^{-\frac{1}{2}} u\| \lesssim \|u\|$ and $\|L_x^{-1} u\| \lesssim \|u\|$, where the implicit constants are independent of x .*

Proof. For this, note that $D_x = \theta^{-1} L_x$ and that

$$\langle L_x v, v \rangle_{\tilde{g}} \geq \kappa \|\nabla v\|_{\tilde{g}}.$$

If we assume that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} v \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$, then we have by Proposition 4.6 that $\|\sqrt{L_x} v\| \geq \kappa \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g}) \|v\|$ uniformly in x . This shows the uniform boundedness for $L_x^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Next, set $v = \sqrt{L_x} w$ for $w \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$, we obtain that $\|L_x w\|_{\tilde{g}} \gtrsim \kappa^2 \lambda_1(\mathcal{M}, \tilde{g})^2 \|w\|_{\tilde{g}}$. That is, $\|L_x^{-1} w\|_{\tilde{g}} \lesssim \|w\|_{\tilde{g}}$. Now, for $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ satisfying $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u \, d\mu_g = 0$, we have that $w = \theta u$ satisfies $\int_{\mathcal{M}} w \, d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$ and $L_x^{-1} w = L_x^{-1} u$ and so $\|L_x^{-1} u\|_{\tilde{g}} \simeq \|L_x^{-1} w\|_{\tilde{g}} \lesssim \|w\|_{\tilde{g}} = \|\theta u\|_{\tilde{g}} = \|u\|_{\tilde{g}}$. \square

With this tool in hand, we present the following regularity result:

Theorem 4.17. *Suppose that $k \geq 1$ and $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and $x \mapsto \omega_x \in C^k(\mathcal{N})$. Moreover, suppose that $(x, y) \mapsto \eta_x(y) \in C^0(\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{M})$ and $x \mapsto \eta_x(y) \in C^l(\mathcal{N})$ where $l \geq 1$. If at $x \in \mathcal{N}$, φ_x solves (F) with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi_x d\mu_g = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta_x d\mu_g = 0$, the map $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle \in C^{\min\{k,l\}-1,1}(\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof. Fix $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ and assuming $(d_x\varphi_x)(v)$ exists in $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$, we obtain that $(d_x\eta_x)(v) = (d_xD_x)(v)\varphi_x + D_x(d_x\varphi_x)(v)$. Thus, on writing

$$\eta'_{x,v} = (d_x\eta_x)(v) - (d_xD_x)(v)\varphi_x$$

and rearranging the previous expression, we note that $(d_x\varphi_x)(v)$ exists as a solution to $D_x(d_x\varphi_x)(v) = \eta'_x$. We further note that this PDE is again of the form (F).

Fix a curve $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$. Then,

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} (d_x\eta_x)(v) d\mu_g = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} \eta_{\gamma(t)} d\mu_g = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta_{\gamma(t)} d\mu_g = 0$$

simply by virtue of the fact that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta_x d\mu_g = 0$ for each x .

Next, note that by Proposition 4.12

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} (d_xD_x)(v)\varphi_x d\mu_g = \langle (d_xD_x)(v)\varphi_x, 1 \rangle_g = \langle (d_x\omega_x)(v)\nabla\varphi_x, \nabla(1) \rangle_g = 0.$$

Thus, we have shown that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta'_x d\mu_g = 0$ and hence, by Proposition 4.7, we obtain that $(d_x\varphi_x)(v) \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) \subset W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ exists.

Next, we show that $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle$ is differentiable. For that, let us write $f(x, y) = \langle \eta_x, \varphi_y \rangle$. By (\dagger) , we have that

$$(d_x f(x, x))(v) = (d_x f(x, y))(v)|_{y=x} + d_x(f(y, x))(v)|_{y=x}$$

when the limits exist.

So, first for the first expression on the left hand side,

$$(d_x f(x, y))(v)|_{y=x} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \langle Q_s^v \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle = \langle (d_x\eta_x)(v), \varphi_x \rangle.$$

For the second expression,

$$(d_x f(y, x))|_{y=x} = \langle \eta_x, (d_x\varphi_x)(v) \rangle.$$

Now we show that the directional derivative is bounded in small neighbourhoods containing x . So, fix $\Omega \Subset \mathcal{N}$ a coordinate chart containing x in which the vector v is constant in this chart. We note that it suffices to show that

$$|(d_x \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle)(v)| \lesssim p(\|\eta_x\|, \|(d_x\eta_x)(v)\|),$$

for a polynomial p since $\|\eta_x\| \leq C$ and $\|(d_x \eta_x)(v)\| \leq C$, where the constant C and the implicit constant depend on Ω . This demonstrates that $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle$ is continuous at x with bounded derivatives, which in turn implies that this function is Lipschitz, and moreover that the differential exists almost-everywhere.

Recall that by Proposition 4.7, $\varphi_x = L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x + c_x$, where $c_x = \int_{\mathcal{M}} D_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x d\mu_g$. Similarly, $(d_x \varphi_x)(v) = L_x^{-1} \theta \eta'_{x,v} + c'_x$ where $c'_x = \int_{\mathcal{M}} L_x^{-1} \theta \eta'_{x,v} d\mu_g$. Hence,

$$\left| (d_x f(x, y))(v)|_{y=x} \right| = \left| \langle \eta_x, L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x + c_x \rangle \right| \leq \|\eta_x\| \|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| + \|c_x\| \|\theta \eta_x\|.$$

Now, note that by Lemma 4.16, $\|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| \lesssim \|\eta_x\|$, where the constant is uniform in $x \in \mathcal{M}$, and that

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x d\mu_g \lesssim \|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| \lesssim \|\eta_x\|,$$

which shows that $\|c_x\| \lesssim \|\eta_x\|$. Thus,

$$\left| (d_x f(x, y))(v)|_{y=x} \right| \lesssim \|\eta_x\|^2$$

with the constant independent of $x \in \mathcal{M}$.

We estimate the remaining term,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (d_x f(y, x))|_{y=x} \right| &= \left| \langle \eta_x, L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x \eta_x)(v) - L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x L_x)(v) \varphi_x + c'_x \rangle \right| \\ &\leq \left| \langle \eta_x, L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x \eta_x)(v) \rangle \right| + \left| \langle \eta_x, L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x L_x)(v) \varphi_x \rangle \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \langle c'_x, \eta_x \rangle \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\left| \langle \eta_x, L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x \eta_x)(v) \rangle \right| \lesssim \|\eta_x\| + \|L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x \eta_x)(v)\| \lesssim \|\eta_x\| + \|(d_x \eta_x)(v)\|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \eta_x, L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x D_x)(v) [L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x + c] \rangle \right| &\lesssim \|\eta_x\| + \|L_x^{-1} \theta (d_x D_x)(v) L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| \\ &\lesssim \|\eta_x\| + \|(d_x D_x)(v) L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\|, \end{aligned}$$

again by Lemma 4.16 where the implicit constant is independent of x since $(d_x D_x)(v) c_x = 0$ by the fact that $c_x \in \mathcal{N}(\nabla)$. For the last term, note that

$$\|c'_x\| \lesssim \|\eta'_{x,v}\| \leq \|(d_x \eta_x)(v)\| + \|(d_x D_x) L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\|.$$

By these calculations, it suffices to show that $\|(d_x D_x)(v) L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| \lesssim \|\eta_x\|$, where the implicit constant depends on Ω . In order to estimate this term, note that by Proposition 4.12 $\|(d_x D_x)(v) u\| \lesssim \|\Delta_g u\| + \|u\|$ uniformly in $x \in \Omega$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(d_x D_x)(v) L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| &\lesssim \|\Delta_g L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| + \|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| \\ &\lesssim \|\eta_x\| + \|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| + \|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x\| \lesssim \|\eta_x\|. \end{aligned}$$

To prove higher differentiability and continuity for $x \in \mathcal{N}$, it suffices to repeat the argument upon replacing $\eta'_{x,v}$ and ω_x , *mutatis mutandis*, to solve for higher weak derivatives. It is easy to see that this procedure can only be repeated as many times as the minimum of the regularity of η_x and ω_x . \square

5. The flow for rough metrics with Lipschitz kernels

In this section we return back to the study of the main flow problem (GM). For the benefit of the reader, we recall the governing equations (CE) and (GM).

Fix $t > 0$, $x \in \mathcal{N}$, and $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, and recall the following linear PDE satisfying, for $\varphi_{t,x,v} \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\operatorname{div}_g(\rho_t^g(x, y)\nabla\varphi_{t,x,v}(y)) &= (d_x\rho_t^g(x, y))(v) \\
 \int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi_{t,x,v}(y) d\mu_g(y) &= 0.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{CE}$$

The flow of Gigli-Mantegazza defined in [15] is then given by

$$g_t(u, v)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} g(\nabla\varphi_{t,x,u}(y), \nabla\varphi_{t,x,v}(y)) \rho_t^g(x, y) d\mu_g(y).
 \tag{GM}$$

We begin by establishing some a priori facts concerning the heat kernel of a rough metric.

5.1. Heat kernels for the rough metric Laplacian

The Laplacian for a rough metric is the non-negative self-adjoint operator $\Delta_g = -\operatorname{div}_g\nabla$, the operator associated with the real-symmetric form $J[u, v] = \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle_g$. To be precise about the results we establish here, we recall the defining features of heat kernels. We say that $\rho_g : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M}$ is the heat kernel of Δ_g if it is the minimal solution $\rho_t^g : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ to the heat equation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_t \rho_t^g(x, \cdot) &= \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot) \\
 \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \rho_t^g(x, \cdot) &= \delta_x,
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{HK}$$

where δ_x is the Dirac mass at $x \in \mathcal{M}$, satisfying

$$\rho_t^g(x, y) = \rho_t^g(y, x), \quad \rho_t^g(x, y) \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(x, y) d\mu_g(y) = 1.$$

Given an initial $u_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$, we are able to write

$$e^{-t\Delta_g}u_0(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(x, y)u(y) d\mu_g(y)$$

for almost-every $x \in \mathcal{M}$.

The following guarantees the regularity properties of the heat kernel when it exists.

Theorem 5.1. *If the heat kernel for Δ_g exists, then for each $t > 0$, there exists an $\alpha > 0$ such that $\rho_t^g \in C^\alpha(\mathcal{M}^2)$.*

This result is a direct consequence of [27, Theorem 5.3] by Saloff-Coste, by rewriting the Laplacian Δ_g as a divergence form operator with bounded measurable coefficients against a smooth background.

Before we present the main theorem regarding the existence of the metric g_t when the initial metric g is rough, we present the following two lemmas which allow us to assert the non-degeneracy of g_t , when it exists.

Lemma 5.2 (Backward uniqueness of the heat flow). *Let $u_t \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ be a strict solution to the heat equation $\partial_t u_t = \Delta_g u_t$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} u(t, x) = \Xi$, where $\Xi \in W^{-1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ is a distribution. If there exists some $t_0 > 0$ such that $u_{t_0} = 0$, then $u_t = 0$ for all $t > 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} u(t, \cdot) = 0$ in the sense of distributions.*

Proof. First, suppose that $\Xi = v \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$. Then, $u(t, x) = e^{-t\Delta_g} v$ and we note that

$$\langle v, e^{-t\Delta_g} v \rangle_g = \langle v, e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\Delta_g} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\Delta_g} v \rangle_g = \langle e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\Delta_g} v, e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\Delta_g} v \rangle_g = \|e^{-\frac{1}{2}t\Delta_g} v\|,$$

where the second equality follows by the self-adjointness of Δ_g . Thus, at $t = t_0$, we obtain that $\|e^{-\frac{1}{2}t_0\Delta_g} v\| = 0$ and by induction, $e^{\frac{1}{2^n}t_0\Delta_g} v = 0$. Hence,

$$v = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} e^{-t\Delta_g} v = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{\frac{1}{2^n}t_0\Delta_g} v = 0.$$

Now, for the case of an arbitrary distribution Ξ , we note that for $s > 0$, $u_{t+s} = e^{-t\Delta_g} u_s$ and therefore, applying our previous argument with $v = u_s$, we obtain that $u_s = 0$ for every $s > 0$. Now, fix $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, a test function, and since $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ extends continuously to a pairing $W^{-1,2}(\mathcal{M}) \times C_c^\infty(\mathcal{M})$, we obtain that

$$0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} u_t(x) f(x) d\mu_g(x).$$

That is, $\Xi = 0$. □

Also, we have the following:

Lemma 5.3. *The function $y \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and for all $t > 0$, $\partial_t \rho_t^g(x, \cdot) = \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot)$ for each $x \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{N}$ is an open subset on which $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g \in C^k(\mathcal{N}^2)$ (for $k \geq 1$), then for every $x \in \mathcal{N}$ and $v \in T_x \mathcal{M}$, $y \mapsto (d_x \rho_t^g(x, y))(v)$ solves*

$$\partial_t (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) = \Delta_g (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) = D_{x,v},$$

where $D_{x,v} \in W^{-1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ is given by $D_{x,v} f = (d_x f)(v)$.

Proof. The fact that $x \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and $\partial_t \rho_t^g(x, \cdot) = \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot)$ for $t > 0$ is by definition that $\rho_t^g : \mathcal{M}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the fundamental solution to the heat equation.

First, note that

$$\partial_t (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) = d_x (\partial_t \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) = d_x (\Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v).$$

Now, fix $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and, fix a curve $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$, $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (d_x \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), u \rangle_g &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} (d_x \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, y))(v) u(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \Delta_g \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) u(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \Delta_g \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) u(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) \Delta_g u(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) \Delta_g u(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \langle (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), \Delta_g u \rangle_g. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $u \mapsto \langle (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), \Delta_g u \rangle = \langle (d_x \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), u \rangle_g$ is continuous in u and hence $(d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and by a similar calculation,

$$\langle \partial_t (d_x \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), u \rangle_g = \langle \Delta_g (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v), u \rangle_g.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ is dense in $L^2(\mathcal{M})$, we obtain that $(d_x \Delta_g \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v)$ solves the heat equation.

Now, fix $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathcal{M})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} (d_x \rho_t^g(x, y))(v) f(y) d\mu_g(y) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) f(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) f(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) f(y) d\mu_g(y) \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} f(\gamma(s)) \\ &= (d_x f)(v). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

In order to apply the elliptic tools we have described in the previous sections, we need to assert that $\rho_t^g(x, y) > 0$. This is the content of the following:

Lemma 5.4. *For each $t > 0$, there exist $0 < \kappa_t, \Lambda_t < \infty$ such that $\kappa_t \leq \rho_t^g(x, y) \leq \Lambda_t$.*

Proof. Arguing as in [11, Theorem 5.2.1] by Davies, we obtain that $\rho_t^g(x, y) > 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$. By the compactness of \mathcal{M} , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 &= \inf_{x,y \in \mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(x, y) = \min_{x,y \in \mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(x, y) > 0, \text{ and} \\ \Lambda_1 &= \sup_{x,y \in \mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(x, y) = \max_{x,y \in \mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(x, y) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

5.2. The flow

We collate the results we have obtained so far and present the following existence and regularity theorem for g_t . Recall that in the hypothesis of Theorem 3.1, we assume that $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and that $(x, y) \mapsto \rho_t^g(x, y) \in C^k(\mathcal{N}^2)$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First, we show that for each $t > 0, x \in \mathcal{M}$ and $v \in T_x\mathcal{M}$, there exists a unique $\varphi_{t,x,v} \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ which solves (CE). By Lemma 5.4, we are able to apply Proposition 4.7 on setting $\omega_x(y) = \omega(x, y) = \rho_t^g(x, y)$ and $\eta(y) = d_x(\rho_t^g(x, y))(v)$.

The only thing that needs to be checked is that $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta \, d\mu_g = 0$. In order to do so, let $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a curve so that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$. Then, on noting that

$$(d_x(\rho_t^g(x, y)))(v) = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y),$$

we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) \, d\mu_g &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) \, d\mu_g \\ &= \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho_t^g(\gamma(s), y) \, d\mu_g = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} 1 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line, we have used the dominated convergence theorem to interchange the integral and the limit involved in differentiation. Thus, on invoking Proposition 4.7, we obtain a unique solution $\varphi_{t,x,v} \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi_{t,x,v} \, d\mu_g = 0$. It is easy to see then that g_t is symmetric at each x .

Next, we show that $\nabla \varphi_{t,x,v} = 0$ if and only if $v = 0$. Fix $v \neq 0$, and recall Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 to conclude that $(d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) \neq 0$ since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} (d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) = D_{x,v} \neq 0$. Since the solution provided by Proposition 4.5 is obtained by inverting the one-one operator L_A^R in Proposition 4.5, we must have that $\psi_{t,x,v} \notin \mathcal{N}(L_A^R) = \mathcal{N}(\nabla)$. It is easy to see that if $v = 0$, then $(d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(v) = 0$ and hence, $\varphi_{t,x,v} = 0$. This shows that $g_t(u, u)(x) \geq 0$ and $g_t(u, u)(x) = 0$ if and only if $u = 0$. That is, g_t is non-degenerate.

Furthermore, it is easy to see that, for $\alpha \neq 0$, $\alpha\varphi_{t,x,v}$ solves the equation (CE) with source term $(d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(\alpha v)$ and that, by linearity of the equation (CE), $\varphi_{t,x,v} + \varphi_{t,x,u}$ solves (CE) with source term $(d_x \rho_t^g(x, \cdot))(u + v)$. Hence, $\alpha\varphi_{t,x,v} = \varphi_{t,x,\alpha v}$ and $\varphi_{t,x,v} + \varphi_{t,x,u} = \varphi_{t,x,u+v}$. That is, $g_t(\alpha u, v)(x) = \alpha g_t(u, v)(x)$ and $g_t(u + v, w)(x) = g_t(u, w)(x) + g_t(v, w)(x)$. Thus, g_t is linear in the first variable.

By combining symmetry, non-degeneracy, and linearity in the first variable shows that $g_t(x) : T_x \mathcal{M} \times T_x \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ defines an inner product on $T_x \mathcal{M}$ and hence, a Riemannian metric.

Regularity is then a simple consequence of Theorem 4.17 since $|u|_{g_t(x)}^2 = \langle \eta_{x,u}, \varphi_{x,u} \rangle$, and the same regularity can be obtained for $x \mapsto g_t(u, v)(x)$ via polarisation. □

6. Regularity of the flow for sufficiently smooth metrics

In [15], the authors demonstrate that the flow g_t is smooth for all positive times when starting with a smooth initial metric. We demonstrate a similar result but when the initial metric is assumed to be $C^{k,\alpha}$, where $k \geq 1$. Our approach is to demonstrate that we are able to localise our weak solutions and then apply Schauder theory to obtain higher $(k + 1)$ regularity for the heat kernel ρ_t^g . On applying Theorem 4.17, we are able to assert that g_t remains C^k .

6.1. Higher regularity of the flow for C^1 heat kernels

First, we demonstrate that for a heat kernel that is C^1 everywhere, the regularity theorem (see Theorem 4.17) improves from $C^{k-1,1}$ to C^k .

Recall that $L_x u = -\operatorname{div}_g(B\theta\omega_x)\nabla u$. We estimate the difference between such operators. We fix $f : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ differentiable with $-\Lambda \leq f(x, y) \leq \Lambda$ where $\Lambda > 0$ and for $x \in U$, where U is an open set. Define $\Xi : U \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\Xi(x, y) = \|f_x - f_y\|_\infty + \|\nabla(f_x - f_y)\|_\infty,$$

where $f_x = f(x, \cdot)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $(x, y) \mapsto f_x(y) \in C^1(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and let $\Lambda > 0$ such that $-\Lambda \leq f_x(y) \leq \Lambda$ for $x \in U$, where U is an open set and all $y \in \mathcal{M}$. Define $T_x u = -\operatorname{div}_g f_x \nabla u$ with domain $\mathcal{D}(T_x) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$. Then, whenever $u \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$,*

$$\|T_x u - T_y u\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|u\|_{\Delta_g}.$$

whenever $x, y \in U$ and where the implicit constant depends on U .

Proof. Define $F_x = f_x + 2\Lambda$ and it follows that $\Lambda \leq F_x \leq 3\Lambda$ on $U \times \mathcal{M}$. On setting $S_x u = -\operatorname{div}_g F_x \nabla u$, by Proposition 4.8, we obtain that $\mathcal{D}(S_x) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g)$ and $S_x u = F_x \Delta_g u + g(\nabla u, \nabla F_x)$. It is easy to check that $T_x u = S_x u - 2\Lambda \Delta_g u$ and therefore, $T_x u - T_y u = S_x u - S_y u$.

We compute,

$$\|S_x u - S_y u\| \leq \|(F_x - F_y)\Delta_g u\| + \|g(\nabla u, \nabla(F_x - F_y))\|,$$

but $F_x - F_y = f_x - f_y$, and hence, it follows that

$$\|T_x u - T_y u\| \leq \|f_x - f_y\|_\infty \|\Delta_g u\| + \|\nabla(f_x - f_y)\|_\infty \|\nabla u\|.$$

The estimate $\|\nabla u\| \lesssim \|u\|_{\Delta_g}$ is trivial, so the claim is proved. □

We have a similar result for the resolvents L_x^{-1} on the range of the operator L_x .

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose that $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^1(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and let $u_1, u_2 \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ satisfy $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u_1 d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} u_2 d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$. Then,*

$$\|L_x^{-1} u_1 - L_y^{-1} u_2\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|u_1\| + \|u_1 - u_2\|.$$

The implicit constant is independent of x and this expression is valid for all $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. First note that for $v \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta_g) = \mathcal{D}(L_x)$,

$$\|L_x v - L_y v\| = \|\theta(D_x v - D_y v)\| \lesssim \|D_x v - D_y v\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|v\|_{\Delta_g}$$

by invoking Lemma 6.1 with $U = \mathcal{M}$.

Now, fix $u \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} u d\mu_{\tilde{g}} = 0$ and note that $L_x^{-1} u = L_x^{-1}(L_y L_y^{-1})u = (L_x^{-1} L_y) L_y^{-1} u$. Also, $L_y^{-1} u = L_x^{-1} L_x L_y^{-1} u$ since the resolvent and operator commute on its domain. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_x^{-1} u - L_y^{-1} u\| &= \|L_x^{-1} L_y L_y^{-1} u - L_x^{-1} L_x L_y^{-1} u\| = \|L_x^{-1} (L_y - L_x) L_y^{-1} u\| \\ &\lesssim \|(L_y - L_x) L_y^{-1} u\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|L_y^{-1} u\|_{\Delta_g}, \end{aligned}$$

since by Lemma 4.16, we have that $\|L_x^{-1} u\| \lesssim \|u\|$ independent of x . By Proposition 4.10, we obtain that $\|v\|_{\Delta_g} \simeq \|v\|_{D_y}$, independent of y and that $\|v\|_{D_y} \simeq \|v\|_{L_y}$. Hence, on setting $v = L_y^{-1} u$, we obtain that $\|L_y^{-1} u\|_{\Delta_g} \lesssim \|u\|$.

Now, for u_1 and u_2 as in the hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_x^{-1} u_1 - L_y^{-1} u_2\| &\leq \|L_x^{-1} u_1 - L_y^{-1} u_1\| + \|L_y^{-1} (u_1 - u_2)\| \\ &\lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|u_1\| + \|u_1 - u_2\|. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

With the aid of these two lemmas, we improve the regularity from Theorem 4.17 as follows.

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that $(x, y) \mapsto \omega_x(y) \in C^1(\mathcal{M}^2)$ and that $x \mapsto \omega_x \in C^k(\mathcal{N})$ for $k \geq 1$. Moreover, suppose that $(x, y) \mapsto \eta_x(y) \in C^0(\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{M})$ and that $x \mapsto \eta_x \in C^l(\mathcal{N})$ for $l \geq 0$. If at $x \in \mathcal{N}$, φ_x solves (F) with $\int_{\mathcal{M}} \varphi_x d\mu_g = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \eta d\mu_g = 0$. Then, $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle \in C^{\min\{k, l\}}(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. First, suppose that $l = 0$. Then, we show that $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle \in C^0(\mathcal{N})$. For that, note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle - \langle \eta_y, \varphi_y \rangle| &\leq |\langle \eta_x - \eta_y, \varphi_x \rangle| + |\langle \eta_y, \varphi_x - \varphi_y \rangle| \\ &\leq \|\eta_x - \eta_y\| \|\varphi_x\| + \|\eta_y\| \|\varphi_x - \varphi_y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since we assume that $(x, z) \mapsto \eta_x(z) \in C^0(\mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{M})$, the same is true for $(x, z) \in \bar{U} \times \mathcal{M}$, where $\bar{U} \subset \mathcal{N}$ is a compact set with nonempty interior containing x and hence, $\langle \eta_x - \eta_y \rangle$ can be made small. Now, the term $\varphi_x = L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x - \int_{\mathcal{M}} L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x d\mu_g$ and hence, it suffices to show that $\|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x - L_y^{-1} \theta \eta_y\|$ can be made small. For this, note that

$$\|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_x - L_y^{-1} \theta \eta_y\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|\eta_x\| + \|\eta_x - \eta_y\|$$

by Lemma 6.2, and hence, this term can also be made small when y is sufficiently close to x .

Next, we note that by bootstrapping, it suffices to consider the situation where $k, l = 1$ and we note that Theorem 4.17 gives us that $x \mapsto \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle$ has a bounded derivative. All we need to prove is that this derivative is continuous.

We recall that, via the product rule for the weak derivative, we write inside a chart,

$$(\partial_i \langle \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle)(v) = \langle \partial_i \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle + \langle \eta_x, \partial_i \varphi_x \rangle,$$

and hence, we show that each term of the right-hand side is continuous.

Fix $x, y \in U \subset \mathcal{M}$ open, where (ψ, \tilde{U}) is a chart with $\bar{U} \subset \tilde{U}$ compact. Then, we have

$$\langle \partial_i \eta_x, \varphi_x \rangle - \langle \partial_i \eta_y, \varphi_y \rangle \leq \langle \partial_i \eta_x - \partial_i \eta_y, \varphi_x \rangle + \langle \partial_i \eta_y, \varphi_x - \varphi_y \rangle.$$

Now, since $x \mapsto \eta_x$ is C^1 by assumption, $\|\partial_i \eta_x - \partial_i \eta_y\|$ can be made small.

In the continuity case, we have already shown that $\|\varphi_x - \varphi_y\|$ can be made small, so we consider the next term

$$\langle \eta_x, \partial_i \varphi_x \rangle - \langle \eta_y, \partial_i \varphi_y \rangle = \langle \eta_x - \eta_y, \partial_i \varphi_x \rangle + \langle \eta_y, \partial_i \varphi_x - \partial_i \varphi_y \rangle.$$

Now, it is easy to see that the first term on the right-hand side is trivially continuous because $\|\eta_x - \eta_y\|$ can be made small. The continuity for the second term follows by showing that $\|\partial_i \varphi_x - \partial_i \varphi_y\|$ can be made small. Recall that $\partial_i \varphi_x = L_x^{-1} \theta \eta'_{x,i} - \int_{\mathcal{M}} L_x^{-1} \theta \eta'_{x,i}$, where $\eta'_{x,i} = \partial_i \eta_x - (\partial_i D_x) \varphi_x$. Thus, it suffices to prove that $\|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta'_{x,i} - L_y^{-1} \theta \eta'_{y,i}\|$ can be made small. By Lemma 6.2, we have that

$$\|L_x^{-1} \theta \eta_{x,i} - L_y^{-1} \theta \eta_{y,i}\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y) \|\eta_{x,i}\| + \|L_y^{-1} \theta (\eta_{x,i} - \eta_{y,i})\|.$$

Hence, we are reduced to proving that $\|\eta'_{x,i} - \eta'_{y,i}\|$ can be made small.

Now, note that $(\partial_i D_x)\varphi_x = (\partial_i D_x)L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x$ since $(\partial_i D_x)(f_{\mathcal{M}}L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x d\mu_g) = 0$ and thus,

$$\|\eta'_{x,i} - \eta'_{y,i}\| \leq \|\partial_i\eta_x - \partial_i\eta_y\| + \|(\partial_i D_x)L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x + (\partial_i D_y)L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_y\|.$$

It is easy to see that the first term can be made small, so we only need to show that the second term can be made small. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\partial_i D_x)L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x - (\partial_i D_y)L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_y\| \\ &\leq \|[(\partial_i D_x) - (\partial_i D_y)]L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x\| + \|(\partial_i D_y)(L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x - L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_y)\|, \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 6.1, we have that

$$\|[(\partial_i D_x) - (\partial_i D_y)]L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x\| \lesssim \Xi(x, y)\|L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x\|_{\Delta_g} \lesssim \Xi(x, y)\|\eta_x\|.$$

For the remaining term, as in the proof of Lemma 6.2, we write,

$$L_x^{-1}\theta\eta_x - L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_y = L_x^{-1}(L_x - L_y)L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_x + L_y^{-1}\theta(\eta_x - \eta_y),$$

and since $\|(\partial_i D_y)L_x^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$ uniformly in x and y inside U and since \bar{U} is compact, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\partial_i D_y)(L_x^{-1}\eta_x - L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_y)\| &\lesssim \|(L_x - L_y)L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_x\| + \|L_y^{-1}\theta(\eta_x - \eta_y)\| \\ &\lesssim \Xi(x, y)\|L_y^{-1}\theta\eta_x\|_{\Delta_g} + \|\eta_x - \eta_y\| \\ &\lesssim \Xi(x, y)\|\eta_x\| + \|\eta_x - \eta_y\|. \end{aligned}$$

This is again a quantity that can be made small. This shows that $x \mapsto \eta_{x,i}$ is continuous and to show that the $(\min\{k, l\})$ -th derivative can be made continuous for $k, l \geq 1$ is obtained via a bootstrapping of this procedure. \square

Remark 6.4. Showing higher derivatives are continuous is a rather tedious task. One considers the expression solving for a second derivative (when there is sufficient regularity in $x \mapsto \omega_x$ and $x \mapsto \eta_x$) given by

$$D_x \partial_j \partial_i \varphi_x = \partial_j \partial_i \eta_x - (\partial_j \partial_i D_x)\varphi_x - (\partial_i D_x)\partial_j \varphi_x - (\partial_j D_x)\partial_i \varphi_x.$$

The first term on the right-hand side can be handled easily. The second term follows from a similar estimate as in Theorem 6.3, because $(\partial_j \partial_i D_x)$ is a divergence form operator $-\operatorname{div}_g(\partial_j \partial_i \omega_x)\nabla u$, whose coefficients satisfy $-\Lambda_U \leq \omega_x(y) \leq \Lambda_U$ for $x, y \in U$, an open neighbourhood of x for which $\bar{U} \subset \mathcal{N}$. The remaining two terms can also be handled similarly on writing $\partial_j \varphi_x$ and $\partial_i \varphi_x$ as a solution via the resolvent terms L_x^{-1} to relate back to $\eta'_{x,i}$ and to η_x .

As a corollary, we obtain an improvement of the regularity of the flow for C^1 heat kernels. This is the statement of Theorem 3.2, which is readily checked to be a direct consequence of Theorem 6.3.

6.2. Heat kernel regularity in terms of the regularity of the metric

In this subsection we relate the regularity of the heat kernel to the regularity of the metric. We first prove the following important localisation lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose that $\operatorname{div}_{\mathfrak{g}} A \nabla u = f$, for $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$. Then, for each $x \in \mathcal{M}$, there is an $r > 0$ and a chart $\psi : U \rightarrow B_r(x')$ where $x' = \psi(x)$ and such that on $\Omega = \psi^{-1}(B_{1/2r}(x'))$,*

$$\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \Omega} AB\theta \nabla u = \theta f$$

in $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$, where $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \psi^ \delta$, the pullback of the Euclidean metric in $B_r(x')$, $d\mu_{\mathfrak{g}} = \theta d\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(Bu, v) = \mathfrak{g}(u, v)$. Moreover, this equation holds if and only if*

$$\operatorname{div}_{\mathbb{R}^n, B_{1/2r}(x')} \tilde{A} \tilde{B} \tilde{\theta} \nabla \tilde{u} = \tilde{\theta} \tilde{f},$$

where $\tilde{\xi} = \eta(\xi \circ \psi^{-1})$, where η is a smooth cutoff which is 1 on $B_{1/2r}(x)$, and 0 outside $B_{3/4r}(x)$.

Proof. Fix $v \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, for $u \in \mathcal{D}(\operatorname{div}_{\mathfrak{g}})$, we have that

$$\langle \operatorname{div}_{\mathfrak{g}} u, v \rangle = \langle u, \nabla v \rangle = \langle u, \nabla v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{g})} = \langle B\theta u, \nabla v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})}.$$

Since this holds for any such $v \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, it follows that $B\theta u \in \mathcal{D}(\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \Omega})$ and hence

$$\langle B\theta u, \nabla v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})} = \langle \theta^{-1} \operatorname{div}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \Omega} B\theta u, v \rangle_{L^2(\Omega, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})}.$$

Thus, $\operatorname{div}_{\mathfrak{g}} A \nabla u = f$ implies that $\langle \operatorname{div}_{\mathfrak{g}} A \nabla u, v \rangle = \langle f, v \rangle$ for all $v \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and hence, $\operatorname{div}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \Omega} AB\theta \nabla u = \theta f$ in $L^2(\Omega, \tilde{\mathfrak{g}})$. Since η and φ induces a bijection between $C_c^\infty(B_{1/2r})$ and $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, it follows that $\operatorname{div}_{\mathbb{R}^n, B_{1/2r}(x')} \tilde{A} \tilde{B} \tilde{\theta} \nabla \tilde{u} = \tilde{\theta} \tilde{f}$. \square

When the metric is sufficiently regular (*i.e.* at least Lipschitz), we are able to write solutions to the Laplace equation in non-divergence form.

Lemma 6.6. *Let (ψ, U) be a chart near x with $\psi(U) = B_{1/2r}(x')$, and suppose that $\mathfrak{g} \in C^{k, \alpha}(U)$, where $\alpha = 1$ if $k = 0$ and otherwise, for $k \geq 1, \alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then, inside $\psi(U)$,*

$$\widetilde{\Delta_{\mathfrak{g}}} u(y) = \tilde{A}^{ij}(y) \partial_i \partial_j \tilde{u}(y) + \partial_j (\tilde{A}^{ij} \tilde{\theta}) \partial_i \tilde{u},$$

for almost-every $y \in B_{1/2r}(x')$, where $\tilde{\xi}$ is the notation from Lemma 6.5. The coefficients $\tilde{A}^{ij}, \tilde{\theta}, \partial_j(\tilde{A}^{ij}) \in C^{k-1, \alpha}$ for $k \geq 1$. Otherwise, $\tilde{A}^{ij}, \tilde{\theta}, \partial_j(\tilde{A}^{ij}) \in L^\infty(B_{1/2r}(x'))$.

Proof. This is simply a direct consequence of [17, Theorem 8.8]. This formula is precisely the one written in (8.18) in their theorem. \square

Next, we obtain the first increase in regularity which allows us to initiate a bootstrapping procedure.

Lemma 6.7. *Let (ψ, U) be a chart near x and $\psi(U) = B_r$. Suppose that $g \in C^{k,\alpha}(U)$ for $k \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and suppose that $u \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ and $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ satisfy $\Delta_g u = f$. If $\tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(B_r(x'))$, then $\tilde{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/4r}(x'))$. Moreover, $u|_\Omega \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$ where $\Omega = \psi^{-1}(B_{1/4r}(x'))$.*

Proof. First, set $r' = 1/2r$, and invoke the localisation from Lemma 6.5. Note that this equation $\operatorname{div}_{\mathbb{R}^n, B_{3/4r'}(x')} A\tilde{B}\theta\nabla\tilde{u} = \tilde{\theta}f$ is in divergence form, and since $\tilde{\theta}f \in C^\alpha(\overline{B_{3/4r'}(x')})$, we have that $\tilde{\theta}f \in L^q(B_{3/4r'}(x'))$ for any $q > n$. Hence, we can invoke the elliptic Harnack estimate from [17, Theorem 8.22] to obtain that $\tilde{u} \in C^\beta(B_{1/2r'}(x'))$ for some $\beta > 0$.

Next, we invoke Lemma 6.6, to write

$$\tilde{A}^{ij}(y)\partial_i\partial_j\tilde{u}(y) + \partial_j(\tilde{A}^{ij}\tilde{\theta})\partial_i\tilde{u} = \tilde{\theta}\tilde{f},$$

inside $B_{1/2r'}(x')$. Then, note that \tilde{u} solves

$$L\tilde{u} = \tilde{\theta}\tilde{f}, \quad \text{with } \tilde{u} = \varphi \in C^0(\partial B_{3/8r'}(x')),$$

where L has $C^{k-1,\alpha}$ coefficients and $\tilde{\theta}\tilde{f} \in C^\alpha(B_{3/8r'}(x'))$ simply on setting $\varphi = \tilde{u}$ on $\partial B_{3/8r'}(x') \subset B_{1/2r'}(x')$ on which we have already proved that \tilde{u} is C^β and hence, continuous.

Thus, we can invoke [17, Theorem 6.13] to obtain that $\tilde{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{1/2r'}(x'))$. By the definition of \tilde{u} , and on noting that $r' = 1/2r$, the conclusions for $u|_\Omega$ follow. □

With these tools in hand, we prove the following main theorem of this section. By β' we denote the a priori regularity of the heat kernel obtained from Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 6.8. *Let $g \in C^{k,\alpha}(\mathcal{N})$, where $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{N}$ is an open set and where $k \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then, $\rho_t^g \in C^{k+1,\beta}(\mathcal{N}^2)$, where $\beta = \min\{\alpha, \beta'\}$.*

Proof. By the regularity of g , we know that the heat kernel exists and that it is at least $C^{\beta'}$ for some $\beta' > 0$ by Theorem 5.1.

Fix $z \in \mathcal{M}$ and set $u(y) = \rho_t^g(y, z)$ and $f(y) = \partial_t \rho_t^g(y, z)$. Now, fix (ψ, U) , a chart near $x \in \mathcal{N}$ so that $U \subset \mathcal{N}$ and $B_r(x') = \psi(U)$

We proceed by applying [17, Theorem 6.17]. Define $\beta = \min\{\beta', \alpha\}$. First, let us apply the initial bootstrapping lemma, Lemma 6.7 to conclude that, in fact, $u|_\Omega \in C^{2,\beta}(\Omega)$, where $\Omega = \psi^{-1}(B_{1/4r}(x'))$. This shows that that $u \in C^{2,\beta}(\mathcal{N})$ and by the symmetry of the heat kernel, we obtain that $\rho_t^g \in C^{2,\beta}(\mathcal{N}^2)$. Thus, we have shown that the conclusion holds for $k = 1$.

Now, in the case that $k=2$, we have that the operator L as defined in the proof of Lemma 6.7 has $C^{1,\alpha}$ -coefficients. Therefore, since we have that $u|_\Omega, f|_\Omega \in C^{2,\beta}(\Omega)$ and, in particular, $u|_\Omega, f|_\Omega \in C^{1,\beta}(\Omega)$ by what we have just done, [17, Theorem 6.17] yields that $u|_\Omega \in C^{3,\beta}(\Omega)$.

Now, to proceed by induction, suppose we have that $u \in C^{k-1,\beta}$ and the metric $g \in C^{k,\alpha}$. Then, $f \in C^{k-1,\beta}$ and the coefficients of L are $C^{k-1,\alpha}$. Hence, [17, Theorem 6.17] gives that $u|_{\Omega} \in C^{k+1,\beta}(\Omega)$. That is, $\rho_t^g \in C^{k+1,\beta}(\mathcal{N}^2)$. \square

7. RCD(K, N) spaces and singularities

In this section we first demonstrate that the flow defined by (GM) is equal to the flow that Gigli and Mantegazza define for RCD(K, N) spaces in [15]. In fact, for a smooth initial metric, they verify this fact in their paper. We ensure that this is true in our more general setting on an admissible region.

We then consider the flow defined as (GM) on manifolds with geometric singularities away from the singular region. The correspondence we establish between this and the flow of RCD(K, N) defined by Gigli-Mantegazza then allows us to assert that this flow can be described by an evolving metric tensor away from the singular region for certain g_t -admissible points.

7.1. Correspondence to the flow for RCD(K, N) spaces

First, we recall some terminology that will be essential for the material we present here. Let (\mathcal{X}, d, μ) be a compact measure metric space, and denote set of probability measures by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. This set can be made into a metric space under

$$W_2(\nu, \sigma)^2 = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} d(x, y)^2 d\pi : \pi \text{ is a transport map from } \nu \text{ to } \sigma \right\},$$

where by transport map, we mean that $\pi(A \times \mathcal{X}) = \nu(A)$ and $\pi(\mathcal{X} \times B) = \sigma(B)$. The metric W_2 is the *Wasserstein metric* and the space $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), W_2)$ is the *Wasserstein space*. An important feature is that, when d is a length space, so is $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), W_2)$ and when d is a geodesic space, then the same property holds for $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), W_2)$.

In their paper [15], the authors demonstrate that the flow defined by (GM) for initial smooth metrics coincides with a flow which they define as a heat-flow in Wasserstein space. Namely, they demonstrate that

$$g_t(\gamma'_s, \gamma'_s) = |\dot{v}_s|^2,$$

where $v_s = \rho_t^g(\gamma_s, \cdot) d\mu$ and where $|\dot{v}_s|$ is the W_2 metric speed of the curve v_s .

In the following theorem, we verify this is indeed the case when (M, g) with g rough and inducing a distance metric satisfying an RCD(K, N) condition. The proof is essentially the same as in the proof of Theorem 3.6 in [15], which in turn relies on the uniqueness of solutions of the continuity equation stated as in [15, Theorem 2.5], when the underlying space is a Riemannian manifold with a smooth metric. The proof of their Theorem 2.5 fails to hold in our setting as they resort to

Euclidean results via the Nash embedding theorem which we are unable to do given the low regularity of our metric.

Moreover, we note that the set \mathcal{N} may not be convex with respect to g_t . Recall that two points $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ are g_t -admissible if for every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$, there is another absolutely continuous curve $\gamma' : I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with $\gamma'(s) \in \mathcal{N}$ for s -a.e. for which $\ell_{d_t}(\gamma') \leq \ell_{d_t}(\gamma)$ where

$$\ell_{d_t}(\gamma) = \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\dot{\gamma}(s)|_{d_t}^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

and where $|\dot{\gamma}(s)|_{d_t}$ is the metric speed of the curve computed with respect to d_t . With this terminology at hand, we present the following important result:

Theorem 7.1. *Let (\mathcal{M}, g) be a smooth manifold with a rough metric and suppose that g induces a length structure such that $(\mathcal{M}, d_g, d\mu_g)$ is $\text{RCD}(K, N)$. Let g_t be the flow given by Theorem 3.1 on an open subset $\mathcal{O} \neq \mathcal{N}$. Suppose $s \mapsto \gamma_s \in \mathcal{M}$ is an absolutely continuous curve between two admissible points $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ for which $\gamma(s) \in \mathcal{N}$ for s -a.e. Fix $t > 0$ and define*

$$v_s := \rho_t^g(\gamma_s, \cdot) d\mu_g = H_t(v_{0, \gamma_s}),$$

where H_t denotes the heat flow and $v_{0, \gamma_s} = \delta_{\gamma_s}$, the delta measure at γ_s . Then, $s \mapsto v_s$ is absolutely continuous with respect to W_2 and for s -a.e.,

$$g_t(\dot{\gamma}_s, \dot{\gamma}_s) = |\dot{v}_s|^2.$$

Moreover,

$$d_t(x, y)^2 = \inf_{\gamma(s) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ } s\text{-a.e.}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} |\dot{\gamma}_s|_{g_t}^2 ds.$$

Proof. The absolute continuity of v_s follows from absolute continuity of γ_s and the contraction property of the heat flow in spaces with curvature bounded below. From Theorem 3.1, we know that there exist a family $\psi_{t, \gamma_s, \dot{\gamma}_s} \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ solving the following equation (in the sense of distributions)

$$-\text{div}_g \rho_t^g(\gamma_s, \cdot) \nabla \psi_{t, \gamma_s, \dot{\gamma}_s} = d_x(\rho_t^g(\gamma_s, \cdot))(\dot{\gamma}_s).$$

Now, we note that v_s has bounded compression *i.e.* $v_s \ll d\mu_g$ and since we assume that $(\mathcal{M}, d_g, d\mu_g)$ is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space, the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(\mathcal{M})$ is Hilbert. So applying [14, Proposition 4.5], we have

$$|\dot{v}_s| = \|\nabla \psi_{t, \gamma_s, \dot{\gamma}_s}\|_{L^2(v_s)},$$

which in turn means that

$$|\dot{v}_s|^2 = \int_M |\nabla \psi_{t, \gamma_s, \dot{\gamma}_s}|^2 dv_s = g_t(\dot{\gamma}_s, \dot{\gamma}_s).$$

As a direct consequence, we get

$$d_{g_t}^2(x, y) = \inf_{\gamma} \left\{ \int_0^1 |\dot{\gamma}_s|^2 ds : \gamma(s) \in \mathcal{N} \text{ s-a.e. joining } x \text{ and } y \right\}.$$

Notice that the right-hand side the equation above is the definition of distance given by the flow (GM). So the proof is complete. \square

With this theorem at hand, and on collating results we have obtained previously, we give the following proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since we assume that $(\mathcal{M}, d_g, d\mu_g)$ is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space, we know from [2, Theorem 7.3] that $\rho_t^g \in C^{0,1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$. Moreover, we assume that $g \in C^k(\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{S})$ for $k \geq 1$, and since $\mathcal{S} \subsetneq \mathcal{M}$ is closed, $\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ is open, and so we apply Theorem 6.8 to obtain that $\rho_t^g \in C^{k+1}(\mathcal{M}^2)$. By the assumptions we have made, $k + 1 \geq 2$ and hence, we invoke Theorem 3.1 to obtain the conclusion. Moreover, by Theorem 7.1, we are able to assert that $d_t(x, y)$ is induced by g_t for g_t -admissible points $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$. \square

7.2. Witch’s hats and boxes

In this subsection we prove Corollary 3.6 and 3.7 from Subsection 3.2.

First, we note the following theorem that will make our constructions easier.

Proposition 7.2. *The gluing of two Alexandrov spaces via an isometry between their boundaries produces an Alexandrov space with the same lower curvature bound. Moreover, such a space is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space.*

Proof. The first part of the Proposition concerning the gluing of Alexandrov spaces is in [25] by Petrunin. The curvature bounds of Lott-Sturm-Villani follow from [26] by the same author. That an Alexandrov space is RCD is due to [19] by Kuwae, Machigashira, and Shioya. \square

With this tool in hand, let us first consider the case of the box. Let

$$B^n = \partial \left[-\sqrt{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}}, \sqrt{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}} \right]^{n+1}$$

and $G : B^n \rightarrow S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be the radial projection map defined by

$$G(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}.$$

We have $B^n \subset \mathbb{B}_0^n(1)$ which means that G is an expansion and hence

$$d_{B^n}(x, y) \leq d_{S^n}(G(x), G(y)) \leq \sqrt{2(n+1)} d_{B^n}(x, y).$$

The second inequality follows from the fact that $S^n \subset [-1, 1]^{n+1}$. Putting these together, we deduce that $G^{-1} : S^n \rightarrow B^n$ is Lipschitz and that the Lipschitz constant of G^{-1} satisfies $\mathbf{Lip}(G^{-1}) \leq 1$.

Immediately, by Proposition 7.2, we obtain the proof of Corollary 3.7.

Proof of Corollary 3.7. By Proposition 7.2, we obtain that B^n is an $\text{RCD}(0, n)$ space. Moreover, it is easy to see that the Riemannian metric induced via G coming from the sphere is smooth on B away from the edges and corners. Thus, we can apply Theorem 1.1 to obtain that the Gigli-Mantegazza flow for d_t is given, for g_t admissible points, by the smooth metric g_t . \square

Next, let us consider the Witch’s hat sphere. We follow the [20, Example 3.2] Let $\varphi : [0, \pi] \rightarrow [0, 2]$ be a smooth cut-off function with

$$\varphi(r) = 0, \text{ for } r \in \left[0, \frac{\pi}{4}\right] \text{ and } \varphi(r) = 1, \text{ for } r \in \left[\frac{3\pi}{4}, \pi\right]$$

and such that

$$|\varphi'(r)| \leq 1/10.$$

Let

$$f(r) := \varphi(r) \left(\frac{\pi - r}{\pi}\right) + (1 - \varphi(r)) \sin(r).$$

Now take the metric $g_{\text{witch}} = dr^2 + f(r)^2 g_{S^n}$.

The identity map $\text{Id} : (S^{n+1}, g_{S^{n+1}}) \rightarrow (S^{n+1}, g_{\text{witch}})$ is bi-Lipschitz as a map between two metric spaces and possesses a geometric conical singularity at one pole.

Proof of Corollary 3.6. The cone is obtained by gluing the following pieces via isometry between their boundaries. Let

$$A_1 = \left[0, \frac{\pi}{4}\right] \times_f S^n, \quad A_2 = \left[\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}\right] \times_f S^n \text{ and } A_3 = \left[\frac{3\pi}{4}, \pi\right] \times_f S^n.$$

Then, A_1 is a spherical cap with constant sectional curvature equal to 1. Hence, it obviously is an Alexandrov space. Furthermore, A_2 is a smooth warped product with bounded sectional curvature and therefore it is also Alexandrov. Lastly, A_3 is the standard cone with cross sectional diameter $< \pi$ which is known to be Alexandrov by [8]. So, by Proposition 7.2, we obtain that it is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space.

Moreover, since the metric g_{witch} has a geometric conical singularity at one point, and it is smooth away from that point, by Theorem 1.1, we obtain that the Gigli-Mantegazza flow d_t is induced everywhere by the metric g_t , which is smooth everywhere but at the singular point. \square

References

- [1] D. ALBRECHT, X. DUONG and A. MCINTOSH, *Operator theory and harmonic analysis*, In: “Instructional Workshop on Analysis and Geometry, Part III (Canberra, 1995)”, Proc. Centre Math. Appl. Austral. Nat. Univ., Vol. 34, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1996, 77–136.
- [2] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, A. MONDINO and T. RAJALA, *Riemannian Ricci curvature lower bounds in metric measure spaces with σ -finite measure*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), 4661–4701.
- [3] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI and G. SAVARÉ, *Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds*, Ann. Probab. **43** (2015), 339–404.
- [4] A. AXELSSON, S. KEITH and A. MCINTOSH, *Quadratic estimates and functional calculi of perturbed Dirac operators*, Invent. Math. **163** (2006), 455–497.
- [5] L. BANDARA, *Rough metrics on manifolds and quadratic estimates*, Math. Z. **283** (2016), 1245–1281.
- [6] L. BANDARA, *Continuity of solutions to space-varying pointwise linear elliptic equations*, Publ. Mat. **61** (2017), 239–258.
- [7] L. BANDARA and A. MCINTOSH, *The Kato square root problem on vector bundles with generalised bounded geometry*, J. Geom. Anal. **26** (2016), 428–462.
- [8] D. BURAGO, Y. BURAGO and S. IVANOV, “A Course in Metric Geometry”, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 33, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [9] F. CAVALLETTI, *Monge problem in metric measure spaces with Riemannian curvature-dimension condition*, Nonlinear Anal. **99** (2014), 136–151.
- [10] M. COWLING, I. DOUST, A. MCINTOSH and A. YAGI, *Banach space operators with a bounded H^∞ functional calculus*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **60** (1996), 51–89.
- [11] E. B. DAVIES, “Heat Kernels and Spectral Theory”, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Vol. 92, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [12] M. H. FREEDMAN, *The topology of four-dimensional manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **17** (1982), 357–453.
- [13] N. GIGLI, *An overview of the proof of the splitting theorem in spaces with non-negative Ricci curvature*, Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces **2** (2014), 169–213.
- [14] N. GIGLI and B. HAN, *The continuity equation on metric measure spaces*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **53** (2014), 149–177.
- [15] N. GIGLI and C. MANTEGAZZA, *A flow tangent to the Ricci flow via heat kernels and mass transport*, Adv. Math. **250** (2014), 74–104.
- [16] N. GIGLI, A. MONDINO and T. RAJALA, *Euclidean spaces as weak tangents of infinitesimally Hilbertian metric measure spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **705** (2015), 233–244.
- [17] D. GILBARG and N. TRUDINGER, “Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order”, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001, Reprint of the 1998 edition.
- [18] T. KATO, “Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators”, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, Reprint of the 1980 edition.
- [19] K. KUWAE, Y. MACHIGASHIRA and T. SHIOYA, *Sobolev spaces, Laplacian, and heat kernel on Alexandrov spaces*, Math. Z. **238** (2001), 269–316.
- [20] S. LAKZIAN and C. SORMANI, *Smooth convergence away from singular sets*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **21** (2013), 39–104.
- [21] J. LOTT and C. VILLANI, *Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport*, Ann. of Math. (2) **169** (2009), 903–991.
- [22] J. MILNOR, *On manifolds homeomorphic to the 7-sphere*, Ann. of Math. (2) **64** (1956), 399–405.
- [23] A. MONDINO and A. NABER, *Structure theory of metric-measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds I*, ArXiv e-prints (2014).

- [24] A. MORRIS, *The Kato square root problem on submanifolds*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **86** (2012), 879–910.
- [25] A. PETRUNIN, *Applications of quasigeodesics and gradient curves*, In: “Comparison Geometry (Berkeley, CA, 1993–94)”, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., Vol. 30, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997, 203–219.
- [26] A. PETRUNIN, *Alexandrov meets Lott-Villani-Sturm*, Münster J. Math. **4** (2011), 53–64.
- [27] L. SALOFF-COSTE, *Uniformly elliptic operators on Riemannian manifolds*, J. Differential Geom. **36** (1992), 417–450.
- [28] K. T. STURM, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), 65–131.
- [29] K. T. STURM, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), 133–177.
- [30] C. VILLANI, “Optimal Transport”, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Vol. 338, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009.

Mathematical Sciences
Chalmers University of Technology
and University of Gothenburg
SE-412 96, Gothenburg, Sweden
lashi.bandara@chalmers.se

Hausdorff Center for Mathematics
D-53115, Bonn, Germany
lakzians@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics
Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences
New York, NY 10012-1185, USA
munn@nyu.edu