

The embedding dimension of Laplacian eigenfunction maps

Jonathan Bates¹

Department of Mathematics, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA

Abstract

Any closed, connected Riemannian manifold M can be smoothly embedded by its Laplacian eigenfunction maps into \mathbb{R}^m for some m . We call the smallest such m the maximal embedding dimension of M . We show that the maximal embedding dimension of M is bounded from above by a constant depending only on the dimension of M , a lower bound for injectivity radius, a lower bound for Ricci curvature, and a volume bound. We interpret this result for the case of surfaces isometrically immersed in \mathbb{R}^3 , showing that the maximal embedding dimension only depends on bounds for the Gaussian curvature, mean curvature, and surface area. Furthermore, we consider the relevance of these results for shape registration.

Keywords: spectral embedding, eigenfunction embedding, eigenmap, diffusion map, global point signature, heat kernel embedding, shape registration, nonlinear dimensionality reduction, manifold learning

1. Introduction

Let $M = (M, g)$ be a closed (compact, without boundary), connected Riemannian manifold; we assume both M and g are smooth. The Laplacian of M is a differential operator given by $\Delta := -\text{div} \circ \text{grad}$, where div and grad are the Riemannian divergence and gradient, respectively. Since M is compact and connected, Δ has a discrete spectrum $\{\lambda_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, $0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \uparrow \infty$. We may choose an orthonormal basis for $L^2(M)$ of eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of Δ , where $\Delta \varphi_j = \lambda_j \varphi_j$, $\varphi_j \in C^\infty(M)$, $\varphi_0 \equiv V(M)^{-1/2}$. Here, $V(M)$ denotes the volume of M with respect to the canonical Riemannian measure $V = V_{(M,g)}$.

We consider maps of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^m : M &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \\ x &\longmapsto \{\varphi_j(x)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

If $\Phi^m : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ happens to be a smooth embedding, then we call it an *m-dimensional eigenfunction embedding* of M . The smallest number m for which Φ^m is an embedding for *some* choice of basis $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ will herein be called the *embedding dimension* of M , and the smallest number m for

Email address: jonrbates@gmail.com (Jonathan Bates)

¹Now a Postdoctoral Fellow in Medical Informatics at VA Connecticut, West Haven, CT 06516, USA

which Φ^m is an embedding for *every* choice of basis $\{\varphi_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ will be called the *maximal embedding dimension* of M . Our aim is to establish a (qualitative) bound for the maximal embedding dimension of a given Riemannian manifold in terms of basic geometric data.

That finite eigenfunction maps of the form (1) yield smooth embeddings for large enough m appears in a few papers in the spectral geometry literature. Abdallah [1] traces this fact back to Bérard [2]. To our knowledge, the latest embedding result is given in Theorem 1.3 in Abdallah [1], who shows that when $(M, g(t))$ is a family of Riemannian manifolds with $g(t)$ analytic in a neighborhood of $t = 0$, then there are $\epsilon > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and eigenfunctions $\{\varphi_j(t)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ of $\Delta_{g(t)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (M, g(t)) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \\ x &\longmapsto \{\varphi_j(x; t)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

is an embedding for all $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. The proof does not suggest how topology and geometry determine the embedding dimension, however.

Jones, Maggioni, and Schul [3, 4] have studied local properties of eigenfunction maps, and their results are essential to the proof of our main result. In particular, they show that at $z \in M$, for an appropriate choice of weights $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and eigenfunctions $\varphi_{j_1}, \dots, \varphi_{j_n}$, one has a coordinate chart (U, Φ_a) around $z \in M$, where $\Phi_a(x) := (a_1 \varphi_{j_1}(x), \dots, a_n \varphi_{j_n}(x))$, satisfying $\|\Phi_a(x) - \Phi_a(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \sim d_M(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in U$. A more explicit statement of this result is given below.

Minor variants of such eigenfunction maps have been used in a variety of contexts. For example, spectral embeddings

$$\begin{aligned} M &\longrightarrow \ell^2 \\ x &\longmapsto \{e^{-\lambda_j t/2} \varphi_j(x)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \quad (t > 0) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

have been used to embed closed Riemannian manifolds into the Hilbert space ℓ^2 (i.e. square summable sequences with the usual inner product) in Bérard, Besson, and Gallot [5, 6]; Fukaya [7]; Kasue and Kumura, e.g. [8, 9]; Kasue, Kumura, and Ogura [10]; Kasue, e.g. [11, 12]; and Abdallah [1].

Relatives of the eigenfunction maps, or a discrete counterpart, have been studied for data parametrization and dimensionality reduction, e.g. [13–18]; for shape distances, e.g. [19–22]; and for shape registration, e.g. [23–29]. In particular, in the data analysis community, (1) is known as the *eigenmap* [13], (3) is known as the *diffusion map* [15, 16], and $x \mapsto \{\lambda_j^{-1/2} \varphi_j(x)\}$ is known as the *global point signature* [18]. These maps are all equivalent up to an invertible linear transformation. Hence, any embedding result applies to all of them. For an overview of spectral geometry in shape and data analysis, we refer the reader to Mémoli [22].

There seem to be no rules for choosing the number of eigenfunctions to use for a given application. While not all applications require an (injective) embedding of data, many eigenfunction-based shape registration methods do, e.g. [24–29], as we explain in Section 1.1 below. In the discrete setting one can write an algorithm to determine the smallest m for which $\Phi^m : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is an embedding, although such an approach may become computationally intensive. For example, if M is represented as a polyhedral surface, one may write an algorithm to check for self-intersections of polygon faces in the image $\Phi^m : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. The fail-proof approach is to use all eigenfunctions, in which case one is assured an embedding. This approach is mentioned for point cloud data in Coifman and Lafon [16]. Specifically, they bound the maximal embedding dimension from above by the size of the full point sample. This becomes computationally

demanding, however, especially in applications where one must solve an optimization problem over all eigenspaces, e.g. [21, 24, 25, 28], as we discuss in Section 1.1. Under the assumption that the shape or data is a sample drawn from some Riemannian manifold, we expect the embedding dimension of the sample to depend only on the topology and geometry of the manifold and the quality of the sample (e.g. covering radius). In this note we consider what topological and geometric data influence the embedding dimension of the underlying manifold.

The 3D image $\Phi^3 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ of a hippocampus is plotted in Figure 1. It is not clear from inspection whether the 3D image has self-intersections. To use the N -D image for registration as in [23–29], it would help to have an *a priori* estimate for the number of eigenfunctions necessary to embed the hippocampus by its eigenfunctions into Euclidean space. As the hippocampus is initially embedded in Euclidean space, the reason for re-embedding it by its eigenfunctions is geometric, as explained in Section 1.1 below. The 3D images $\Phi^3 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ of a few human model surfaces are plotted in Figure 2. From this figure, one may get a sense of why eigenfunction embeddings have been used to find point correspondences between shapes, as the arms and legs are better aligned in the image. The eigenfunctions in these examples are computed using the normalized graph Laplacian with Gaussian weights (cf. [30–32] and references therein).




Figure 1: A hippocampus from two angles (left) and its 3D eigenfunction map (right). Surface color is given by distance in spectral space from the point indicated by the ball.




Figure 2: A few human model surfaces (left) and their 3D eigenfunction maps (right). Two angles of the image are shown. Note that axes are also plotted.

We now recall some relevant notions from differential geometry. Let M, M' be smooth manifolds. A smooth map $F : M \rightarrow M'$ is called an *immersion* if $\text{rank } dF_x = \dim M$ for every $x \in M$. A smooth map $F : M \rightarrow M'$ is called a (*smooth*) *embedding* if F is an immersion and a homeomorphism onto its image $F(M)$. Recall that for a compact manifold M , if $F : M \rightarrow M'$ is

an injective immersion, then it is a smooth embedding.

Suppose now that $M = (M, g)$ and $M' = (M', g')$ are Riemannian manifolds. We write the corresponding geodesic distance metrics as d_M and $d_{M'}$. For M and M' to be *isometric* means that there is a diffeomorphism $F : M \rightarrow M'$ such that $F^*g' = g$. Such a map $F : M \rightarrow M'$ is called an *isometry*. In particular, if $F : M \rightarrow M'$ is an isometry, then $d_M(x, y) = d_{M'}(F(x), F(y))$ for all $x, y \in M$.

Let $M = (M, g)$ be a complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Herein, $B(x, r)$ will denote the geodesic ball of radius r centered at $x \in M$, and $B(r)$ will denote the Euclidean ball of radius r centered at the origin of \mathbb{R}^n . As M is complete, the domain of the exponential map is $T_x M \cong \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e. $\exp_x : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M$. The *injectivity radius* of M , denoted $\text{inj}(M)$, is the largest real number for which the restriction $\exp_x : B(r) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow B(x, r)$ is a diffeomorphism for all $x \in M$, $r \leq \text{inj}(M)$.

Let $x \in M$, and let P be a 2-plane in $T_x M$. The circle of radius $r < \text{inj}(M)$ centered at 0 in P is mapped by $\exp_x : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow M$ to the geodesic circle $C_P(r)$, whose length we denote $l_P(r)$. Then

$$l_P(r) = 2\pi r \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{6}K(P) + O(r^3)\right) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (4)$$

The number $K(P)$ is called the *sectional curvature* of P . If $\dim M = 2$, then $K(x) = K(T_x M)$ is equivalent to the Gaussian curvature at x .

Next, we use V to denote the canonical Riemannian measure associated with (M, g) . Let $x \in M$. The pulled-back measure $\exp_x^*(V)$ has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure in $T_x M \cong \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $(r, u) \in [0, \infty) \times S^{n-1}$ be polar coordinates in $T_x M$. For $r < \text{inj}(M)$, we may write $\exp_x^*(V) = \theta_x(r, u) dr du$. Then

$$\theta_x(r, u) = r^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{r^2}{6}\text{Ric}_x(u, u) + O(r^3)\right) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (5)$$

The term $\text{Ric}_x(u, u)$ is a quadratic form in u , whose associated symmetric bilinear form is called the *Ricci curvature* at x . If $\dim M = 2$, then $\text{Ric}_x(u, u) = K(x)g(u, u)$, where $K(x)$ is the Gaussian curvature at x .

Heat flow on a closed Riemannian manifold (M, g) is modeled by the heat equation

$$(\partial_t + \Delta)u(t, x) = 0, \quad (6)$$

where Δ is the Laplacian of M applied to $x \in M$. Any initial distribution $f \in L^2(M)$ determines a unique smooth solution $u(t, x)$, $t > 0$, to (6) such that $u_t \rightarrow_{L^2} f$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. This solution is given by

$$u(t, x) = \int_M p(t, x, y) f(y) dV(y), \quad (7)$$

where $p \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+ \times M \times M)$ is called the *heat kernel* of M . For example, the heat kernel of \mathbb{R}^n (with Euclidean metric) is the familiar Gaussian kernel. Lastly, the heat kernel may be expressed in the eigenvalues-functions as

$$p(t, x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_j t} \varphi_j(x) \varphi_j(y). \quad (8)$$

For more on the Laplacian, heat kernel, and Riemannian geometry, we refer the reader to, e.g., [33–36].

We are now ready to state the results of this note. Let $\kappa_0 \geq 0, i_0 > 0$ be fixed constants, $n \geq 2$, and consider the class of closed, connected n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds

$$\mathcal{M} := \{ (M, g) \mid \dim M = n, \text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)\kappa_0 g, \text{inj}(M) \geq i_0, V(M) = 1 \}. \quad (9)$$

Note that $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)\kappa_0 g$ means

$$\text{Ric}(\xi, \xi) \geq -(n-1)\kappa_0 g(\xi, \xi) \quad (\forall \xi \in TM). \quad (10)$$

If M is a surface and K denotes its Gaussian curvature, then $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)\kappa_0 g$ is equivalent to $K \geq -\kappa_0$.

Note that the following Theorems 1, 2, and 3 are independent of the choice of eigenfunction basis. We first show that the eigenfunction maps Φ^m are well-controlled immersions in the sense that the neighborhoods on which they are embeddings cannot be too small.

Theorem 1. *There is a positive integer m and constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, for all $z \in M$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_z^m : B(z, \epsilon) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \\ x &\longmapsto (\varphi_1(x), \dots, \varphi_m(x)) \end{aligned}$$

is a smooth embedding.

The proofs are deferred to the sections following. Our main goal is to prove the following result.

Theorem 2 (Uniform maximal embedding dimension). *There is a positive integer d such that, for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^d : M &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \\ x &\longmapsto (\varphi_1(x), \dots, \varphi_d(x)) \end{aligned}$$

is a smooth embedding.

We lastly consider closed, connected surfaces isometrically immersed in \mathbb{R}^3 . We denote mean curvature by H , Gaussian curvature by K , and surface area by V . Let H_0, κ_0, A be fixed positive constants and consider the class of surfaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} := \{ (M, g) \mid \dim M = 2, |K| \leq \kappa_0, \\ |H| \leq H_0, V(M) \leq A, \\ \iota : M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ is an isometric immersion} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Theorem 3 (Uniform maximal embedding dimension for surfaces). *There is a positive integer d such that, for all $M \in \mathcal{S}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^d : M &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \\ x &\longmapsto (\varphi_1(x), \dots, \varphi_d(x)) \end{aligned}$$

is a smooth embedding.

Before continuing, we consider the natural question of whether the eigenfunction maps are stable under perturbations of the metric. This has been answered in [6].

Theorem 4 (Bérard-Besson-Gallot [6]). *Let (M, g) be a closed n -dimensional Riemannian manifold, $\epsilon_0 > 0$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let g' be any metric on M such that $(1 - \epsilon)g \leq g' \leq (1 + \epsilon)g$, $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0)$. We assume that all metrics under consideration satisfy $\text{Ric}_{(M, g')} \geq -(n - 1)\kappa_0 g'$ for some constant $\kappa_0 \geq 0$. There exist constants $\eta_{g, j, \kappa_0}(\epsilon)$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, which go to 0 with ϵ , such that to any orthonormal basis $\{\varphi'_j\}$ of eigenfunctions of $\Delta_{g'}$ one can associate an orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_j\}$ of eigenfunctions of Δ_g satisfying $\|\varphi'_j - \varphi_j\|_{L^\infty} \leq \eta_{g, j, \kappa_0}(\epsilon)$ for $j \leq m$.*

1.1. Motivations from eigenfunction-based shape registration methods

Here we consider the significance of a uniform maximal embedding dimension from the perspective of the shape registration methods in [24–29]. In shape registration, we begin with two closed, connected Riemannian manifolds $M = (M, g)$ and $M' = (M', g')$, and our goal is to find a correspondence between them given by $\alpha : M \rightarrow M'$. (Note some use a looser notion of correspondence, e.g. [22], allowing for many-many matches between points of the “shapes”.) Moreover, if M and M' are isometric, we require the correspondence $\alpha : M \rightarrow M'$ to be an isometry. This correspondence may be established using eigenfunction maps, followed by closest point matching as follows. Here we must be precise regarding the choice of eigenfunction basis, and we let $\mathcal{B}(M)$ denote the set of orthonormal bases of real eigenfunctions of the Laplacian of M . For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(M)$, $b = \{\varphi_j^b\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, let Φ_b^m denote the corresponding eigenfunction map, i.e. $x \mapsto \{\varphi_j^b(x)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$. Given $b \in \mathcal{B}(M)$, $b' \in \mathcal{B}(M')$, and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider as a potential correspondence the map $\alpha(b, b', m) : M \rightarrow M'$ given by

$$\alpha(x; b, b', m) := \arg \inf_{x' \in M'} \|\Phi_{b'}^m(x') - \Phi_b^m(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}, \quad (12)$$

ties being broken arbitrarily. We first consider the sense in which α yields the desired correspondence for isometric shapes, and then the sense in which α is stable.

Proposition 1. *If M and M' are isometric and $m \geq$ the maximal embedding dimensions of M and M' , then $\alpha(b, b', m) : M \rightarrow M'$ is an isometry for some choice of $b \in \mathcal{B}(M)$, $b' \in \mathcal{B}(M')$.*

Proof. Let $F : M \rightarrow M'$ be an isometry, and let $m \geq$ the maximal embedding dimensions of M and M' . Note that there are $b \in \mathcal{B}(M)$, $b' \in \mathcal{B}(M')$ such that $\varphi_j^b = \varphi_j^{b'} \circ F$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. [34]). In particular, $\Phi_b^m(x) = \Phi_{b'}^m(F(x))$ for all $x \in M$. Since $\Phi_{b'}^m$ is injective (as it is an embedding), the infimum in (12) is uniquely realized for each $x \in M$. Hence $\alpha(b, b', m) \equiv F$. \square

Now let $M = (M, g)$ be any closed, connected Riemannian manifold, $\epsilon_0 > 0$ fixed, and g_ϵ , $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0)$, a family of Riemannian metrics on M such that $(1 - \epsilon)g \leq g_\epsilon \leq (1 + \epsilon)g$ for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0)$. We assume that there exist $\kappa_0 \geq 0$, $i_0 > 0$ for which, with \mathcal{M} as defined in (9), $M_\epsilon := (M, g_\epsilon) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0)$. For each $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0)$, let $b'_\epsilon \in \mathcal{B}(M_\epsilon)$ be arbitrary. The following proposition is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4, the triangle inequality, and the definition of α .

Proposition 2. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. There is a constant $\eta_m(\epsilon)$, which goes to 0 with ϵ , and $b : \epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0) \mapsto b_\epsilon \in \mathcal{B}(M)$ such that, for all $\epsilon \in [0, \epsilon_0)$,*

$$\sup_{x \in M} \|\Phi_{b'_\epsilon}^m(\alpha(x; b_\epsilon, b'_\epsilon, m)) - \Phi_{b'_\epsilon}^m(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \leq \eta_m(\epsilon), \quad (13)$$

where $\alpha(b_\epsilon, b'_\epsilon, m)$ is defined as in (12).

The size of the search space of potential correspondences $\{\alpha(b, b', m) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(M), b' \in \mathcal{B}(M')\}$ grows at least exponentially in m . To see this, note that we may arbitrarily flip the sign of any eigenfunction, and so $|\{\Phi_b^m \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(M)\}| \geq 2^m$. Consequently, to find the isometry asserted by Proposition 1 with minimal computational demands, it would be useful to know the maximal embedding dimensions of M and M' .

1.2. Examples: the embedding dimensions of the sphere and stretched torus

We now compute the embedding dimensions of the standard sphere and a “stretched torus” using formulas for their eigenfunctions. One usually cannot derive the embedding dimension in this way, however, as, to paraphrase from [37], there are only a few Riemannian manifolds for which we have explicit formulas for the eigenfunctions.

Identifying the standard sphere $S^n = (S^n, \text{can})$ with the Riemannian submanifold

$$\{(x^1, \dots, x^{n+1}) \mid \|x\|_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} = 1\} \quad (14)$$

of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , the eigenfunctions of Δ_{S^n} are restrictions of harmonic homogeneous polynomials on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} [34, 37]. A polynomial $P(x^1, \dots, x^{n+1})$ on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} is called (1) *homogeneous (of degree k)* if $P(rx) = r^k P(x)$ and (2) *harmonic* if $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} P(x) = 0$. Moreover, if $P(x)$ is a harmonic homogeneous polynomial of degree k , then its corresponding eigenvalue is $\lambda = k(n+k-1)$, whose multiplicity is

$$\binom{n+k}{k} - \binom{n+k-2}{k-2}. \quad (15)$$

One may show that an $L^2(S^n)$ -orthogonal basis of the eigenspace corresponding to $\lambda(S^n) = n$ is given by the restriction of the coordinate functions x^1, \dots, x^{n+1} on \mathbb{R}^{n+1} to S^n (cf. Proposition 1, p. 35, [34]). We immediately have

Proposition 3. *The embedding dimension of S^n is $d = n + 1$.*

Although we get an explicit answer for the sphere, it does not reveal how geometry influences the embedding dimension. Let us look at another space.

Explicit formulas are also available for the eigenfunctions of products of spheres, e.g. tori, by virtue of the decomposition $\Delta_{M \times N} = \Delta_M + \Delta_N$. We consider stretching a flat torus to have a given injectivity radius and volume, and then explicitly compute the embedding dimension. We see that the embedding dimension depends on both injectivity radius and volume, and thus cannot be bounded using only curvature and volume bounds, or curvature and injectivity radius bounds. In particular, let $0 < a < b$, $n \geq 2$, and consider the flat n -torus T constructed by gluing the rectangle

$$\{(x^1, \dots, x^n) \mid 0 \leq x^j \leq a \ (j \neq n), \ 0 \leq x^n \leq b\} \quad (16)$$

as usual. Note $\text{Ric}_T = 0$, $\text{inj}(T) = a/2$, and $V(T) = a^{n-1}b$.

Proposition 4. *The embedding dimension of T is*

$$\begin{aligned} d &= 2(\lceil a^{-1}b \rceil + n - 2) \\ &\geq 2^{1-n}V(T)/\text{inj}(T)^n, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\lceil x \rceil =$ the smallest integer greater than or equal to x .

Proof. Put $f_1(x) := \cos(2\pi x)$, $f_2(x) := \sin(2\pi x)$. The unnormalized real eigenfunctions of T are

$$f_{k_1}(a^{-1}m_1x^1) \cdots f_{k_{n-1}}(a^{-1}m_{n-1}x^{n-1})f_{k_n}(b^{-1}m_nx^n) \quad (m_i \in \mathbb{N}, k_i \in \{1, 2\}), \quad (18)$$

with corresponding eigenvalues

$$\lambda(m_1, \dots, m_n) = (2\pi)^2(a^{-2}m_1^2 + \cdots + a^{-2}m_{n-1}^2 + b^{-2}m_n^2). \quad (19)$$

We denote $\lambda(m_j, j) = \lambda(0, \dots, m_j, \dots, 0)$.

First, suppose $a^{-1}b$ is not an integer, and put $p := \lfloor a^{-1}b \rfloor$. One may check that the initial sequence of eigenvalues corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \lambda(1, n) < \lambda(2, n) < \cdots < \lambda(p, n) \\ &< \lambda(1, 1) = \lambda(1, 2) = \cdots = \lambda(1, n-1) \\ &< \cdots \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The eigenvalues $\lambda(k, n)$, $k \leq p$, each have multiplicity 2; for example, the eigenspace corresponding to $\lambda(k, n)$ has as a basis $\{f_1(b^{-1}kx^n), f_2(b^{-1}kx^n)\}$. It follows that $\Phi^{2p} : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2p}$ depends only on x^n . It is readily verified that $x^n \mapsto \Phi^{2p}(x)$ is injective since, up to phase, $\Phi^{2p}(x) = (f_1(b^{-1}x^n), f_2(b^{-1}x^n))$. Thus $x^n \mapsto \Phi^{2p}(x)$ is injective. Put $F(x^j) = (f_1(a^{-1}x^j), f_2(a^{-1}x^j))$. Then, up to phase and up to a permutation of the last $2(n-1)$ coordinates,

$$\Phi^{2p+2(n-1)}(x) = (\Phi^{2p}(x), F(x^1), F(x^2), \dots, F(x^{n-1})). \quad (21)$$

Noting $x^j \mapsto F(x^j)$ is an embedding of $[0, a]/(0 \sim a)$ into \mathbb{R}^2 , we deduce that $\Phi^{2p+2(n-1)} : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2p+2(n-1)}$ is an embedding and, furthermore, that if any one of the last $2(n-1)$ coordinates are removed, then the map is no longer injective. It follows that $d = 2p + 2(n-1) = 2(\lfloor a^{-1}b \rfloor + n - 2)$ is the embedding dimension of T when $a^{-1}b$ is not an integer.

Now suppose that $a^{-1}b$ is an integer; put $p := a^{-1}b$. One may check that the initial sequence of eigenvalues is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \lambda(1, n) < \cdots < \lambda(p-1, n) \\ &< (2\pi)^2 a^{-2} = \lambda(1, 1) = \cdots = \lambda(1, n-1) = \lambda(p, n) \\ &< \cdots \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Following the preceding arguments, we see that $\Phi^{2(p-1)+2(n-1)} : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2(p-1)+2(n-1)}$ is an embedding when the eigenfunctions are ordered according to the sequence suggested by (22), where the two eigenfunctions corresponding to $\lambda(p, n)$ are not included as coordinates. \square

Remark 1. Note the stretched torus example shows that the embedding dimension of $\mathcal{M}(n, \kappa_0, i_0)$ is bounded below by $2^{1-n}i_0^{-n}$.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

We first show that the manifolds of \mathcal{M} have uniformly bounded diameter. That is, there is a $D > 0$ such that diameter $d(M) \leq D$ for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$. Recall $d(M) := \sup_{x, y \in M} d_M(x, y)$. To see this, let $M \in \mathcal{M}$. By the Theorem of Hopf-Rinow, we may take a unit speed geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ that realizes the diameter, say, $d(\gamma(0), \gamma(d(M))) = d(M)$. Stack geodesic balls of

radius $i_0/2$ end-to-end along γ . It is a simple exercise in proof by contradiction to show these balls are disjoint. The volumes of these balls are uniformly bounded below by Croke's estimate (see below). Finally, the volume requirement $V(M) = 1$ limits the number of such balls, hence the diameter of M .

We now recall a few function norms (cf., e.g., [38]). Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, k a nonnegative integer, $1 \leq p < \infty$. In this note, the following norms and seminorms will be used with a smooth function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We write

$$\|f\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} := \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} |f(x)| \quad (23)$$

$$[f]_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} := \sup_{x, y \in \bar{\Omega}, x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^\alpha} \quad (24)$$

$$\|f\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} := \|f\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})} + [f]_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} \quad (25)$$

$$\|f\|_{W^{k,p}(\Omega)} := \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \int_{\Omega} |D^\alpha f|^p dx \right)^{1/p}. \quad (26)$$

Theorem 1 is an adaptation of the following local embedding result.

Theorem 5 (Jones-Maggioni-Schul [3]; see also [4]). *Assume $V(M) = 1$. Let $z \in M$ and suppose $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a chart satisfying the following properties.*

There exist positive constants r, C_1, C_2 such that

- (1) $u(z) = 0$;
- (2) $u(U) = B$, where $B := B(r)$ is the ball of radius r in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin;
- (3) for some $\alpha > 0$, the coefficients $g^{ij}(u) = g(du^i, du^j)$ of the metric inverse satisfy $g^{ij}(0) = \delta^{ij}$ and are controlled in the C^α topology on B :

$$C_1^{-1} \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \sum_{ij} \xi_i \xi_j g^{ij}(u) \leq C_1 \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \quad (\forall u \in B, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n); \quad (27)$$

$$[g^{ij}]_{C^\alpha} \leq C_2 \quad (\forall i, j). \quad (28)$$

Then there are constants $\nu = \nu(n, C_1, C_2) > 1$, $a_j > 0$, $j = 1, \dots, n$, and integers j_1, \dots, j_n such that the following hold.

(a) *The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_a : B(z, \nu^{-1}r) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \\ x &\longmapsto (a_1 \varphi_{j_1}(x), \dots, a_n \varphi_{j_n}(x)) \end{aligned}$$

satisfies, for all $x, y \in B(z, \nu^{-1}r)$,

$$\frac{\nu^{-1}}{r} d_M(x, y) \leq \|\Phi_a(x) - \Phi_a(y)\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{\nu}{r} d_M(x, y); \quad (29)$$

(b) *the associated eigenvalues satisfy $\nu^{-1}r^{-2} \leq \lambda_{j_1}, \dots, \lambda_{j_n} \leq \nu r^{-2}$.*

We point out that this result (Theorem 2.2.1 in [4]) is stated for $g \in C^\alpha$, $\alpha > 0$, and M possibly having a boundary. We now invoke an eigenvalue bound to use with (b) in Theorem 5.

Theorem 6 (Bérard-Besson-Gallot [6]). *Let M be a closed, connected Riemannian manifold such that $\dim M = n$, $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)\kappa_0 g$, and $d(M) \leq D$. There is a constant $C_\lambda = C_\lambda(n, \kappa_0, D)$ such that*

$$C_\lambda j^{2/n} \leq \lambda_j(M) \quad (\forall j \geq 0).$$

Finally, we must choose a coordinate system satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5. We use harmonic coordinates. By definition, a coordinate chart (U, x^i) of $M = (M^n, g)$ is *harmonic* if $\Delta_M x^i = 0$ on U for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (cf., e.g., [39, 40]). All necessary properties of harmonic coordinates for this note are contained in the following result, which follows from the proof of Theorem 0.3 in Anderson-Cheeger [41].

Lemma 1. *Let $\kappa_0 \geq 0$ and $i_0 > 0$, let (M, g) be a closed n -dimensional Riemannian manifold satisfying*

$$\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)\kappa_0 g, \quad \text{inj}(M) \geq i_0, \quad (30)$$

and let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $Q > 1$ be fixed. Then there exist constants r_h, C_h , both depending only on $n, \kappa_0, i_0, \alpha, Q$, such that for all $z \in M$ there is a harmonic coordinate chart $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

(1) $u(z) = 0$;

(2) $u(U) = B$, where $B := B(r_h)$ is the ball of radius r_h in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin;

(3) the coefficients $g^{ij}(u) = g(du^i, du^j)$ of the metric inverse satisfy $g^{ij}(0) = \delta^{ij}$ and are controlled in the C^α topology on B :

$$Q^{-1} \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \sum_{ij} \xi_i \xi_j g^{ij}(u) \leq Q \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \quad (\forall u \in B, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n); \quad (31)$$

$$[g^{ij}]_{C^\alpha} \leq C_h \quad (\forall i, j). \quad (32)$$

In deriving Lemma 1, we will use the following Sobolev-type estimate (cf. Theorem 5.6.5 in Evans [38]).

Proposition 5 (Morrey's inequality). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, bounded, and with C^1 boundary. Assume $p > n$ and $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ is continuous. Then $u \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})$, for $\alpha = 1 - n/p$, with*

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega})} \leq C \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)}, \quad (33)$$

where C is a constant depending only on n, α, Ω .

Proof of Lemma 1. Theorem 0.3 in Anderson and Cheeger [41] asserts that under the given hypotheses there is a harmonic coordinate chart $u : B(z, r_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $E := u(B(z, r_0))$, such that

(1') $u(z) = 0$;

(2') $r_0 = r_0(n, \kappa_0, i_0, \alpha, Q)$;

(3') the coefficients $g_{ij}(u) = g(\frac{\partial}{\partial u^i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u^j})$ of the Riemannian metric satisfy $g_{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij}$ and, with p defined by $\alpha = 1 - n/p$,

$$Q^{-1} \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \leq \sum_{ij} \xi^i \xi^j g_{ij}(u) \leq Q \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^2 \quad (\forall u \in E, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n); \quad (34)$$

$$r_0^\alpha \|\nabla g_{ij}\|_{L^p(E)} \leq Q - 1 \quad (\forall i, j). \quad (35)$$

First, we put $r_h := r_0 / \sqrt{Q}$ and show that $B = B(r_h) \subseteq E$. Fix a unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and put $\gamma(t) = tv$. Note $\|\gamma'(t)\|_g^2 \leq Q$ by (34). Let $L(\cdot)$ denote the length function on curves in M . Then $t < r_0 / \sqrt{Q}$ implies $d_M(\gamma(0), \gamma(t)) \leq L(\gamma|_{[0,t]}) \leq t \sqrt{Q} < r_0$.

Second, by Morrey's inequality, there is a constant $C = C(n, \alpha, r_0)$ for which $\|g_{ij}\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{B})} \leq C \|g_{ij}\|_{W^{1,p}(B)}$. Then, by (34) and (35), there is a constant $C = C(n, \alpha, r_0, Q)$ such that $[g_{ij}]_{C^\alpha(\bar{B})} \leq \|g_{ij}\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{B})} \leq C$ for all i, j .

Third, note that bounds (34) and (31) on the metric and its inverse are equivalent.

Fourth, we show that $[g^{ij}]_{C^\alpha} = [g^{ij}]_{C^\alpha(\bar{B})}$ is bounded. For $x, y \in B$, put $A := (g_{ij}(x))$ and $B := (g_{ij}(y))$. We use $\|\cdot\|_2$ to denote the induced 2-norm on matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ to denote the largest magnitude over entries of a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Note $\|\cdot\|_{\max} \leq \|\cdot\|_2 \leq n\|\cdot\|_{\max}$, $\|A^{-1}\|_2 \leq Q$, $\|B^{-1}\|_2 \leq Q$, and $A^{-1} - B^{-1} = -A^{-1}(A - B)B^{-1}$. Hence

$$|g^{ij}(x) - g^{ij}(y)| \leq \|A^{-1} - B^{-1}\|_{\max} \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \|A^{-1} - B^{-1}\|_2 \quad (37)$$

$$= \|A^{-1}(A - B)B^{-1}\|_2 \quad (38)$$

$$\leq \|A^{-1}\|_2 \|A - B\|_2 \|B^{-1}\|_2 \quad (39)$$

$$\leq nQ^2 \cdot \max_{kl} |g_{kl}(x) - g_{kl}(y)| \quad (40)$$

It follows that $[g^{ij}]_{C^\alpha} \leq nQ^2C$ for all i, j . \square

Using harmonic coordinates and the eigenvalue bound with Theorem 5, we finish the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1. Fix $Q > 1$ and $\alpha < 1$. Our choice of n, κ_0, i_0 then fixes the constants r_h, C_h for harmonic coordinates. Use harmonic coordinates in Theorem 5 with $C_1 = Q, C_2 = C_h$, and $r = r_h$. These determine the constants $\nu = \nu(n, C_1, C_2)$ and $C_\lambda = C_\lambda(n, \kappa_0, D)$ in Theorems 5 and 6, respectively. Let $m + 1$ be the smallest integer such that $C_\lambda(m + 1)^{2/n} > \nu r_h^{-2}$. Now, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, $\lambda_{m+1}(M) \geq C_\lambda(m + 1)^{2/n} > \nu r_h^{-2}$. It follows from Theorem 5 that $\Phi_z^m(M) : B(z, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is an embedding with $\epsilon = \nu^{-1} r_h$. \square

3. Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of Theorem 2 builds on Theorem 1, extending injectivity to the whole manifold via heat kernel estimates. In particular, a Gaussian bound for the heat kernel will be extended to the partial sum

$$p^k(t, x, y) := \sum_{j=0}^k e^{-\lambda_j t} \varphi_j(x) \varphi_j(y) \quad (41)$$

through a universal bound for the remainder term.

3.1. Off-diagonal Gaussian upper bound for the heat kernel

Theorem 7 (Li-Yau [42]). *Let M be a complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifold without boundary and with $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n - 1)\kappa_0 g$ ($\kappa_0 \geq 0$). Put $V_x(r) = V(B(x, r))$. Then, for $0 < \delta < 1$, the heat kernel satisfies*

$$p(t, x, y) \leq \frac{C(n, \delta)}{V_x^{1/2}(\sqrt{t}) V_y^{1/2}(\sqrt{t})} \exp \left\{ -\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \delta)t} + C(n)\kappa_0 t \right\}.$$

for all $t > 0$ and $x, y \in M$. Moreover, $C(n, \delta) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 8 (Croke [43]). *Let M be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Then there is a constant C_n depending only on n such that, for all $x \in M$, for all $r \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{inj}(M)$,*

$$V(B(x, r)) \geq C_n r^n.$$

Corollary 1. *There is a constant $C_U > 0$ such that, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}$, for any $x, y \in M$, for any $t \in (0, i_0/2]$,*

$$p(t, x, y; M) \leq \frac{C_U}{t^{n/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \delta)t} \right\},$$

where $0 < \delta < 1$.

Proof. Put $\delta = 1/2$. Applying Croke's estimate to the Li-Yau heat kernel bound,

$$p(t, x, y; M) \leq \frac{C(n, \delta)}{C_n t^{n/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{d^2(x, y)}{(4 + \delta)t} + C(n)\kappa_0 i_0/2 \right\}.$$

□

3.2. Truncating the heat kernel sum

We consider control over $M \in \mathcal{M}$ of the remainder term

$$R_k(t; M) := \sup_{x \in M} \sum_{j \geq k} e^{-\lambda_j t} \varphi_j^2(x). \quad (42)$$

Lemma 2. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there is $E_k : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that, for all $M \in \mathcal{M}$,*

$$R_k(t; M) \leq E_k(t) t^{-n/2}, \quad (43)$$

and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k(t) = 0$ for fixed $t > 0$.

Proof. From the proof of Theorem 17 in [6] (p. 393), there exists $E_0 = E_0(n, \kappa_0, D)$ such that

$$R_k(t; M) \leq E_0 t^{-n/2} \int_{t\lambda_k}^{\infty} s^{n/2} e^{-s} ds. \quad (44)$$

Now recall from Theorem 6 above that $C_\lambda k^{2/n} \leq \lambda_k$, where $C_\lambda = C_\lambda(n, \kappa_0, D)$. Put

$$E_k(t) := E_0 \int_{C_\lambda k^{2/n} t}^{\infty} s^{n/2} e^{-s} ds. \quad (45)$$

Hence $R_k(t; M) \leq E_k(t) t^{-n/2}$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k(t) = 0$ for fixed $t > 0$. □

3.3. Final steps

Now take $\epsilon > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ from Theorem 1. Put

$$g(t) := 1 - \frac{C_U}{t^{n/2}} \exp \left\{ \frac{-\epsilon^2}{(4 + \delta)t} \right\}. \quad (46)$$

Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$, and let p be its heat kernel. Note the bound $p(t, x, x) \geq \varphi_0^2(x) = V(M)^{-1} = 1$, which follows from the series expansion (8) of the heat kernel. Then, combined with Corollary 1, for $t \in (0, i_0/2]$,

$$g(t) \leq \inf_{d_M(x, y) \geq \epsilon} p(t, x, x) - p(t, x, y), \quad (47)$$

and $g(t) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. Choose $T \in (0, i_0/2]$ to satisfy $g(T) \geq 4/5$; then choose $d \geq m$ satisfying $E_{d+1}(T) T^{-n/2} \leq 1/5$. We now complete the proof.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Theorem 1, since $d \geq m$, we already know that Φ^d is an immersion and that it distinguishes points within distance ϵ of one another. Suppose $d_M(x, y) \geq \epsilon$. Then, noting

$$\sup_{x', y' \in M} |p(T, x', y') - p^d(T, x', y')| \leq R_{d+1}(T; M) \leq 1/5, \quad (48)$$

we have

$$4/5 \leq g(t) \quad (49)$$

$$\leq p(T, x, x) - p(T, x, y) \quad (50)$$

$$\leq p^d(T, x, x) - p^d(T, x, y) + 2/5, \quad (51)$$

hence $p^d(T, x, x) > p^d(T, x, y)$. Finally, observe that $p^d(T, x, x) \neq p^d(T, x, y)$ implies $\Phi^d(x) \neq \Phi^d(y)$. \square

Remark 2. Note that were we able to explicitly compute ϵ and m in Theorem 1, we could also write an explicit bound for the maximal embedding dimension d as follows. The foregoing proof reduces to finding the smallest $d \geq m$ for which $g(t) > 2E_{d+1}(t)t^{-n/2}$ is satisfied for some $t \in (0, i_0/2]$. Moreover, to achieve a tighter bound, we could improve the lower bound $g(t)$ from (46) above to

$$\frac{C_L}{t^{n/2}} - \frac{C_U}{t^{n/2}} \exp\left\{\frac{-\epsilon^2}{(4 + \delta)t}\right\}, \quad (52)$$

where $p(t, x, x) \geq C_L/t^{n/2}$ for all $t \in (0, i_0/2]$, $C_L = C_L(n, \kappa_0)$, follows from the on-diagonal Gaussian lower bound for the heat kernel (cf. [44, 45]). Explicit computation of the maximal embedding dimension would then reduce to writing out the constants C_L , C_U , E_0 , and C_λ . One can use the formulas in [46] to compute C_L , the formulas in [33, 36] to compute C_U , and the formulas in [6, 33], along with Croke's estimate to establish the uniform diameter bound D , to compute E_0 and C_λ .

However, in this note, both ϵ and m depend on the scaled ‘‘harmonic radius’’ r_h of Lemma 1, whose dependency on injectivity radius and Ricci curvature is established by indirect means (proof by contradiction) in Anderson and Cheeger [41], and the author of this note has not pursued deriving a formula for r_h in terms of injectivity radius and Ricci curvature.

4. Proof of Theorem 3

The last theorem derives from the following two results.

Theorem 9 (Cheeger [47]). *Let K denote the sectional curvature of a complete Riemannian manifold M . If $|K| \leq \kappa_0$, $V(M) \geq V_0$, $d(M) \leq D$, then $\text{inj}(M) \geq i_0$ for some $i_0 = i_0(n, \kappa_0, V_0, D)$.*

Theorem 10 (Topping [48]). *Let M be a closed n -dimensional Riemannian manifold isometrically immersed in \mathbb{R}^k with mean curvature vector H . There is a constant $C = C(n)$ such that*

$$d(M) \leq C \int_M |H|^{n-1} dV. \quad (53)$$

Recall

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} := \{ (M, g) \mid \dim M = 2, |K| \leq \kappa_0, \\ |H| \leq H_0, V(M) \leq A, \\ \iota : M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ is an isometric immersion} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $(M, g) \in \mathcal{S}$ and we scale g by $a > 0$ so that $V(M, a^2g) = 1$, then $1 = V(M, a^2g) = a^2V(M, g) \leq a^2A$, or, $a^{-1} \leq A^{1/2}$. Noting $K(M, a^2g) = a^{-2}K(M, g)$ and $H(M, a^2g) = a^{-1}H(M, g)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (M, a^2g) \in \{ (M, g) \mid \dim M = 2, |K| \leq A\kappa_0, \\ |H| \leq A^{1/2}H_0, V(M) = 1, \\ \iota : M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ is an isometric immersion} \}. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

For surfaces, note that Gaussian curvature K and sectional curvature coincide, and K is related to Ricci curvature by $\text{Ric}_M = Kg$. Applying Theorem 10, then Theorem 9, reduces the present case to that of Theorem 2. It follows that \mathcal{S} has a uniform embedding dimension.

Acknowledgements

The human model surfaces (triangle meshes) were provided by the McGill 3D Shape Benchmark (<http://www.cim.mcgill.ca/%7eshape/benchMark/>).

The hippocampus surface was segmented from a baseline MR scan from the Alzheimers Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) database (adni.loni.ucla.edu). For up-to-date information, see www.adni-info.org. Segmentation was done by the Florida State University Imaging Lab using the software *FreeSurfer* [49, 50]. We thank Xiuwen Liu, Dominic Pafundi, and Prabesh Kanel for their help with this data.

References

- [1] H. Abdallah, Embedding Riemannian manifolds via their eigenfunctions and their heat kernel, *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.* 49 (5) (2012) 939–947.
- [2] P. Bérard, Volume des ensembles nodaux des fonctions propres du laplacien, *Séminaire Bony-Sjöstrand-Meyer, École Polytechnique*, 1984–1985, exposé no. 14.
- [3] P. Jones, M. Maggioni, R. Schul, Manifold parametrizations by eigenfunctions of the Laplacian and heat kernels, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 105 (6) (2008) 1803–1808.
- [4] P. W. Jones, M. Maggioni, R. Schul, Universal local parametrizations via heat kernels and eigenfunctions of the Laplacian, *Ann. Acad. Scient. Fen.* 35 (2010) 1–44.
- [5] P. Bérard, G. Besson, S. Gallot, On embedding Riemannian manifolds in a Hilbert space using their heat kernels, *Prépublication de l’Institut Fourier*, no. 109 (1988).
- [6] P. Bérard, G. Besson, S. Gallot, Embedding Riemannian manifolds by their heat kernel, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 4 (4) (1994) 373–398.
- [7] K. Fukaya, Collapsing of Riemannian manifolds and eigenvalues of Laplace operator, *Invent. Math.* 87 (3) (1987) 517–547.
- [8] A. Kasue, H. Kumura, Spectral convergence of Riemannian manifolds, *Tohoku Math. J.* (2) 46 (2) (1994) 147–179.
- [9] A. Kasue, H. Kumura, Spectral convergence of Riemannian manifolds II, *Tohoku Math. J.* 48 (1) (1996) 71–120.
- [10] A. Kasue, H. Kumura, Y. Ogura, Convergence of heat kernels on a compact manifold, *Kyushu J. Math.* 51 (2) (1997) 453–524.
- [11] A. Kasue, Convergence of Riemannian manifolds and Laplace operators I, in: *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, Vol. 52, Chartres: l’Institut, 2002, pp. 1219–1258.

- [12] A. Kasue, Convergence of Riemannian manifolds and Laplace operators II, *Potent. Anal.* 24 (2) (2006) 137–194.
- [13] M. Belkin, P. Niyogi, Laplacian eigenmaps and spectral techniques for embedding and clustering, in: *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NIPS)*, Vol. 14, MIT Press, 2001, pp. 585–591.
- [14] X. Bai, E. R. Hancock, Heat kernels, manifolds and graph embedding, in: A. L. N. Fred, T. Caelli, R. P. W. Duin, A. C. Campilho, D. de Ridder (Eds.), *SSPR/SPR*, Vol. 3138 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2004, pp. 198–206.
- [15] S. Lafon, *Diffusion maps and geometric harmonics*, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University (2004).
- [16] R. R. Coifman, S. Lafon, Diffusion maps, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 21 (1) (2006) 5–30.
- [17] B. Lévy, Laplace-Beltrami eigenfunctions: Towards an algorithm that understands geometry, in: *Int. Conf. Shape Model. Appl. (SMI)*, 2006.
- [18] R. M. Rustamov, Laplace-Beltrami eigenfunctions for deformation invariant shape representation, in: *Symp. Geom. Process. (SGP)*, 2007, pp. 225–233.
- [19] V. Jain, H. Zhang, A spectral approach to shape-based retrieval of articulated 3D models, *Comput. Aided Des.* 39 (5) (2007) 398–407.
- [20] H. ElGhawalby, E. Hancock, Measuring graph similarity using spectral geometry, in: A. Campilho, M. Kamel (Eds.), *Image Analysis and Recognition*, Vol. 5112 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 517–526. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-69812-8_51.
- [21] J. Bates, X. Liu, W. Mio, Scale-space spectral representation of shape, in: *Proc. Int. Conf. Pattern Recognit. (ICPR)*, 2010, pp. 2648–2651.
- [22] F. Mémoi, A spectral notion of Gromov-Wasserstein distance and related methods, *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* 30 (3) (2011) 363–401.
- [23] M. Carcassoni, E. R. Hancock, Spectral correspondence for deformed point-set matching, in: H.-H. Nagel, F. J. P. López (Eds.), *AMDO*, Vol. 1899 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2000, pp. 120–132.
- [24] V. Jain, H. Zhang, O. van Kaick, Non-rigid spectral correspondence of triangle meshes, *Int. J. Shape Model.* 13 (1) (2007) 101–124.
- [25] D. Mateus, R. Horaud, D. Knossow, F. Cuzzolin, E. Boyer, Articulated shape matching using Laplacian eigenfunctions and unsupervised point registration, in: *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. (CVPR)*, 2008, pp. 1–8.
- [26] X. Liu, A. Donate, M. Jemison, W. Mio, Kernel functions for robust 3D surface registration with spectral embeddings, in: *Proc. Int. Conf. Pattern Recognit. (ICPR)*, 2008, pp. 1–4.
- [27] J. Bates, Y. Wang, X. Liu, W. Mio, Registration of contours of brain structures through a heat-kernel representation of shape, in: *Int. Symp. Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, 2009, pp. 943–946.
- [28] M. Reuter, Hierarchical shape segmentation and registration via topological features of Laplace-Beltrami eigenfunctions, *Int. J. Comput. Vis.* 89 (2) (2010) 287–308.
- [29] A. Sharma, R. Horaud, Shape matching based on diffusion embedding and on mutual isometric consistency, in: *Conf. Comput. Vis. Pattern Recognit. Workshops (CVPRW)*, 2010, pp. 29–36.
- [30] U. von Luxburg, M. Belkin, O. Bousquet, Consistency of spectral clustering, *Ann. Statistics* (2008) 555–586.
- [31] M. Belkin, P. Niyogi, Convergence of Laplacian eigenmaps, *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst. (NIPS)* 19.
- [32] D. Ting, L. Huang, M. Jordan, An analysis of the convergence of graph Laplacians, preprint arXiv:1101.5435.
- [33] P. Bérard, *Spectral geometry: direct and inverse problems*, *Lecture notes in math.*, Springer-Verlag, 1986.
- [34] I. Chavel, *Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry*, *Pure and applied math.*, Academic Press, 1984.
- [35] S. Rosenberg, *The Laplacian on a Riemannian Manifold*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [36] A. Grigor’yan, *Heat kernel and analysis on manifolds*, *Studies in advanced mathematics*, AMS/IP, 2009.
- [37] S. Zelditch, Local and global analysis of eigenfunctions on Riemannian manifolds, in: L. Ji, P. Li, R. Schoen, L. Simon (Eds.), *Handbook of Geometric Analysis*, Vol. 7 of *Adv. Lect. Math.*, 2008, pp. 545–658.
- [38] L. C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, AMS, 1998.
- [39] I. K. Sabitov, S. Z. Shefel’, The connections between the order of smoothness of a surface and its metric, *Siberian Math. J.* 17 (4) (1976) 687–694. doi:10.1007/BF00971679
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00971679>
- [40] D. M. DeTurck, J. L. Kazdan, Some regularity theorems in Riemannian geometry, *Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.* 14 (3) (1981) 249–260.
- [41] M. Anderson, J. Cheeger, C^α -compactness for manifolds with Ricci curvature and injectivity radius bounded below, *J. Differential Geom.* 35 (1992) 265–281.
- [42] P. Li, S.-T. Yau, On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator, *Acta Math.* 156 (1) (1986) 153–201.
- [43] C. Croke, Some isoperimetric inequalities and eigenvalue estimates, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* 13 (4) (1980) 419–435.
- [44] J. Cheeger, S.-T. Yau, A lower bound for the heat kernel, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 34 (4) (1981) 465–480.
- [45] E. Davies, N. Mandouvalos, Heat kernel bounds on hyperbolic space and Kleinian groups, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 3 (1) (1988) 182–208.
- [46] A. Grigor’yan, M. Noguchi, The heat kernel on hyperbolic space, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 30 (6) (1998) 643–650.

doi:10.1112/S0024609398004780.

- [47] J. Cheeger, Finiteness theorems for Riemannian manifolds, *Amer. J. Math.* 92 (1) (1970) 61–74.
- [48] P. Topping, Relating diameter and mean curvature for submanifolds of Euclidean space, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 83 (3) (2008) 539–546.
- [49] B. Fischl, D. Salat, A. van der Kouwe, N. Makris, F. Sgonne, A. Dale, Sequence-independent segmentation of magnetic resonance images, *NeuroImage* 23 (2004) S69–S84.
- [50] B. Fischl, D. Salat, E. Busa, M. Albert, M. Dieterich, C. Haselgrove, A. van der Kouwe, R. Killiany, D. Kennedy, S. Klaveness, A. Montillo, N. Makris, B. Rosen, A. Dale, Whole brain segmentation. Automated labeling of neuroanatomical structures in the human brain, *Neuron* 33 (3) (2002) 341–355.