ENTROPY IN UNIFORMLY QUASIREGULAR DYNAMICS

ILMARI KANGASNIEMI, YÛSUKE OKUYAMA, PEKKA PANKKA, AND TUOMAS SAHILSTEN

Abstract. Let $M$ be a closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian $n$-manifold, for $n \geq 2$, which is not a rational homology sphere. We show that, for a non-constant uniformly quasiregular self-map $f : M \rightarrow M$, the topological entropy $h(f)$ is $\log \deg f$. This proves Shub’s entropy conjecture in this case.

1. Introduction

A well-studied problem in topological dynamics of continuous self-maps $f : M \rightarrow M$ on an $n$-manifold $M$ is to relate the topological entropy $h(f)$ of $f$ to the spectrum of its induced linear map $f_* : H_n(M; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H_n(M; \mathbb{R})$ in homology, see for example the survey of Katok [16] for definitions and history of this problem. Shub conjectured [31, §V] that the topological entropy $h(f)$ is bounded from below by $\log s(f_*)$, where $s(f_*)$ is the spectral radius of the action of $f$ to the homology of $M$. The conjecture was proved for holomorphic maps $f : \mathbb{C}P^m \rightarrow \mathbb{C}P^m$ by Gromov in a preprint [7] from 1977 and for $C^\infty$-smooth maps by Yomdin [34] in 1987.

One direction in Gromov’s argument [7] is based on a general result of Misiurewicz and Przytycki [24] that, for a $C^1$-smooth self-map $f : M \rightarrow M$ of a closed and oriented Riemannian manifold $M$, the logarithm of the degree $\log |\deg f|$ is a lower bound for the topological entropy. The continuity of the derivative $Df$ of the map $f$ has a crucial role in the proof of Misiurewicz and Przytycki, which is based on the use of a continuous cochain $x \mapsto J_f(x)$ given by the Jacobian $J_f$ of the map $f$. The continuity of the derivative has the same crucial role in the method of Yomdin [34], which is based on real-algebraic sets.

It is known that the smoothness assumptions on the map may be relaxed by additional topological assumptions on the space $M$. For example, Misiurewicz and Przytycki proved in [24] the entropy conjecture for all continuous maps $f : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$.
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In this paper we consider the entropy conjecture in the quasiconformal category. The mappings we consider are not $C^1$-smooth but merely Sobolev regular. The distortion assumption given by quasiconformality conditions together with methods from geometric measure theory allow us to deal with the complications caused by the lack of pointwise differentiability. Before stating the main theorem, we introduce the class of uniformly quasiregular maps.

A continuous map $f: M \to N$ between oriented Riemannian $n$-manifolds $M$ and $N$ is $K$-quasiregular for $K \geq 1$ if $f$ belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,n}_{\text{loc}}(M, N)$ and satisfies the distortion inequality
\begin{equation}
\|Df(x)\|^n \leq K J_f(x) \quad \text{for Lebesgue a.e. } x \in M;
\end{equation}
here $\|Df\|$ is the operator norm of the differential $Df$ of $f$ and $J_f$ is the Jacobian determinant $J_f = \det Df$, that is, $J_f \text{vol}_M = f^* \text{vol}_M$. In this terminology, quasiconformal maps are quasiregular homeomorphisms, and 1-quasiregular maps between Riemann surfaces are holomorphic; see e.g. Rickman [28, Section I.2] and references therein. As a technical point, we mention that by a theorem of Reshetnyak, a quasiregular map is either a discrete and open map or constant. Note also that the degree of a non-constant quasiregular map between closed and oriented Riemannian manifolds is positive.

A quasiregular self-map $f: M \to M$ is uniformly $K$-quasiregular if all of its iterates $f^k = f \circ \cdots \circ f$ for $k \geq 1$ are $K$-quasiregular. Uniformly quasiregular maps admit rich dynamics akin to dynamics of holomorphic maps of one complex variable. We refer to a survey of Martin [21] for a detailed account on uniformly quasiregular maps, and merely mention here that a uniformly quasiregular map $f: M \to M$ induces a measurable conformal structure on $M$ in which the mapping $f$ could be considered as a rational map of $M$.

Our main theorem reads as follows; recall that an $n$-manifold $M$ is a rational cohomology sphere if $H^*(M; \mathbb{R})$ is isomorphic to $H^*(S^n; \mathbb{R})$.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $f: M \to M$ be a uniformly quasiregular self-map of degree at least 2 on a closed, connected, and oriented Riemannian $n$-manifold $M$ which is not a rational cohomology sphere. Then
\[ h(f) = \log \deg f. \]

It follows from [15] that $s(f^*) = \deg f$ for non-constant uniformly quasiregular self-maps $f: M \to M$. Theorem 1.1 therefore yields the equality
\[ h(f) = \log s(f^*) \]
answering to the Shub’s entropy conjecture to the positive in this case.

In the proof of Theorem 1.1 we obtain estimates $h(f) \geq \log \deg f$ and $h(f) \leq \log \deg f$ for the entropy by different methods. The lower bound employs Lyubich’s variational method [17] and the properties [14, 25] of the equilibrium measure $\mu_f$ associated $f$. The upper bound is related to [7, (5.0)] in Gromov’s article and it follows from isoperimetric arguments for Federer-Fleming currents [5]. As we will discuss shortly, the cohomological assumption on $M$ has no role in the proof of the upper bound. It remains an open question whether the lower bound $h(f) \geq \log \deg f$ holds also for uniformly quasiregular mappings on rational cohomology spheres.
In order to obtain the lower bound \( h(f) \geq \log \deg f \), the main obstacle is the lack of continuity of the derivative \( Df \). For this, we use the \( f \)-balanced measure \( \mu_f \) from [25] and the integer valued cochain \( x \mapsto i(x, f) \) given by the local index of the map \( f \) in place of cochain \( x \mapsto J_f(x) \) which is only measurable in this setting.

By [14, Theorem 1.2], the cohomological assumption on the manifold \( M \) yields that the measure \( \mu_f \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure of \( M \). This is a key element of the proof of the lower bound \( h(f) \geq \log \deg f \), since it allows us to employ Lyubich’s variational methods [17] of disintegrating topological entropy.

The upper bound \( h(f) \leq \log \deg f \) follows from the inequality

\[
(1.2) \quad h(f) \leq \log \deg f + n \log K
\]

for \( K \)-quasiregular self-maps \( f : M \to M \); see [7, (5.0)] and the ensuing isoperimetric argument on how to prove it. Since it seems to have gone unnoticed in the literature that the isoperimetric argument in [7] yields a more general result, we discuss the proof of (1.2) in detail using the language of Federer-Fleming theory of currents. In the heart of the proof of (1.2) is the following uniform Ahlfors regularity result for graphs of maps, whose components are quasiregular.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( M \) and \( N \) be closed, connected, and oriented Riemannian \( n \)-manifolds for \( n \geq 2 \), \( K \geq 1 \), and let \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : M \to N^k \) be a map from \( M \) to \( N^k \), \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), where \( f_1, \ldots, f_k \) are non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps \( M \to N \). Then the image \( \Gamma = \Gamma_g := g(M) \) is Ahlfors \( n \)-regular. More precisely, there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( n, M, N \) and \( f_1 \) with the property that, for \( y \in \Gamma \) and \( r \in (0, \text{diam } \Gamma) \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{Ck^\frac{n}{2}K^n-(\min_j \deg f_j)^n} \leq \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(B_{\Gamma}(y, r))}{r^n} \leq Ck^\frac{n}{2}K \max_j \deg f_j,
\]

where \( B_{\Gamma}(y, r) = \Gamma \cap B_{N^k}(y, r) \) with distance in \( N^k \) induced by the product Riemannian metric.

Using this theorem we prove inequality (1.2) in Section 8; see Theorem 8.1. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 consists of two parts. The upper estimate for the Hausdorff measure reduces to the area formula for Sobolev mappings. The lower estimate is more delicate. Since the mapping \( g \) is merely Sobolev regular, we consider an \( n \)-current associated to \( \Gamma_g \). The key step in the proof is to apply slicing and an isoperimetric inequality to this \( n \)-current to obtain a local lower bound for the volume of \( \Gamma_g \). It seems to us that this is also the idea in the proof of [7, (5.0)], although it does not use currents explicitly.

We finish this introduction with a discussion on the relation of our results to open questions on uniformly quasiregular dynamics. In the case of Riemann surfaces, holomorphic dynamics has a clear trichotomy into different cases: the sphere \( S^2 \) carries a rich theory with various examples, on the torus \( \mathbb{T}^2 \) the mappings are so-called Lattès maps, and on higher dimensional surfaces the theory collapses to dynamics of homeomorphisms.
On higher-dimensional Riemannian manifolds, a similar trichotomy seems to arise in uniformly quasiregular dynamics. The sphere $S^n$ and other spherical space forms admit a rich theory, see e.g. Iwaniec–Martin [11], Peltonen [20], and Martin–Peltonen [26]. The torus $T^n$ and its branched quotients admit uniformly quasiregular maps of Lattès type, see e.g. Mayer [23] and Martin–Mayer–Peltonen [19]. Finally, the existence of a uniformly quasiregular map $M \to M$ on a closed manifold yields that the manifold $M$ is so-called quasiregularly elliptic, that is, there exists a non-constant quasiregular map $\mathbb{R}^n \to M$; see Kangaslampi [13] or Iwaniec–Martin [12, Theorem 19.9.3]. Thus, hyperbolic Riemannian manifolds and manifolds with large fundamental group or cohomology do not carry uniformly quasiregular maps by results of Varopoulos [33, Theorem X.11] and Bonk–Heinonen [3]. More precisely, the dimension of the cohomology ring $H^\ast(M;\mathbb{R})$ of $M$ is at most $2^n$ by the main theorem of [14]; see also Prywes [27].

To complete this picture, it becomes a question whether a general quasiregularly elliptic manifold carries a uniformly quasiregular mapping of higher degree, and whether these mappings are actually Lattès maps if the manifold in question is not a rational cohomology sphere. Encouraged by results and conjectures of Martin and Mayer in [22] on uniformly quasiregular self-maps of spheres, we expect the second question to have a positive answer. The following conjecture is from [14]: Let $M$ be a closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian $n$-manifold for $n \geq 2$ which is not a rational cohomology sphere. Then every uniformly quasiregular self-map $f$ of $M$ comes from the Lattès construction.

We find the question interesting since, as pointed out in Martin–Mayer [22], it is similar to the invariant line field conjecture of Mané, Sad, and Sullivan [18].

Organization of the article. The article consists of two parts; Section 2 discussing the preliminaries on quasiregular maps is common to both of these. In the first part (Sections 3–4), we prove the lower bound $h(f) \geq \log \deg f$ for the topological entropy using Lyubich’s method based on measure theoretic entropy.

In the second part (Sections 5–8) we recall first some results in the Federer–Fleming theory of currents in Section 5. In Sections 6 and 7 we then discuss the proof of Theorem 1.2 based on Gromov’s original argument. Finally, in Section 8 we show how the upper bound $h(f) \leq \log \deg f$ follows from Theorem 1.2.

Acknowledgments We thank Petri Ola for suggesting us to look at the Grönwall’s inequality, which plays a key role in the upper bound for the entropy.

2. Preliminaries on quasiregular maps

2.1. Quasiregular maps. Let $n \geq 2$, and let $M$ and $N$ be oriented Riemannian $n$-manifolds. By a theorem of Reshetnyak, a non-constant quasiregular map $f : M \to N$ is open and discrete, that is, $f(W) \subset N$ is open for any open set $W \subset M$ and $f^{-1}(y) \subset M$ is discrete for every $y \in N$. Moreover, $f$ satisfies the Lusin (N)-condition, that is, $f(E) \subset N$ is Lebesgue null
In particular, we have $E \subset M$ is a null set. The branch set $B_f$ of $f$ is the set of points at which $f$ fails to be a local homeomorphism. The branch set $B_f$ has topological dimension at most $n - 2$ by the Cernavskii–Väisälä theorem (see [32]) and Lebesgue measure zero.

For $E \subset M$ and $y \in \mathbb{N}$, the multiplicity $N(f, y, E)$ of $f$ at $y$ with respect to $E$ is $\#(f^{-1}\{y\} \cap A)$. We set also $N(f, y) := N(f, y, M)$, $N(f, E) := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{N}} N(f, y, E)$, and

$$N(f) := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{N}} N(f, y) = N(f, \mathbb{N}).$$

As a preliminary step for the definition of the local index of $f$ at $x$, we denote by $B_N(y, r)$ the metric ball of radius $r > 0$ centered at $y \in \mathbb{N}$ in $N$. Since $f$ is discrete and open, there exists, for each $x \in M$, a radius $r_x > 0$ for which the $x$-component $U(x, f, r_x)$ of the preimage $f^{-1}B_N(f(x), r_x)$ is a normal neighborhood of $x$, that is, we have $fU(x, f, r_x) = B_N(f(x), r_x)$, $\partial fU(x, f, r_x) = \partial B_N(f(x), r_x)$, and $f^{-1}(f(x)) \cap U(x, f, r_x) = \{x\}$. In particular, $f$ restricts to a proper map

$$f|_{U(x, f, r_x)}: U(x, f, r_x) \to B_N(f(x), r_x)$$

and induces a homomorphism

$$(f|_{U(x, f, r_x)})^*: H_c^n(B_N(x, r); \mathbb{Z}) \to H_c^n(U(x, f, r_x); \mathbb{Z}).$$

The local index $i(x, f) \in \mathbb{Z}$ of $f$ at $x$ is the unique integer satisfying

$$(f|_{U(x, f, r_x)})^*c_{B_N(f(x), r_x)} = i(x, f)c_{U(x, f, r_x)},$$

where the cohomology classes $c_{U(x, f, r_x)}$ and $c_{B_N(f(x), r_x)}$ are generators of $H_c^n(B_N(x, r); \mathbb{Z})$ and $H_c^n(U(x, f, r_x); \mathbb{Z})$, respectively, induced by orientations of $M$ and $N$. The local index is independent on $r_x$ and hence well-defined. Note that, if $f$ is non-constant, we have $i(x, f) \geq 1$ for each $x \in M$ and we have the characterization that $x \in B_f$ if and only if $i(x, f) > 1$.

More globally, for a quasiregular map $f: M \to N$ between closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian $n$-manifolds $M$ and $N$, the degree $\deg f \in \mathbb{Z}$ of $f$ is the integer satisfying $f^*(c_N) = (\deg f)c_M$ for generators $c_M$ and $c_N$ of $H^n(M; \mathbb{Z})$ and $H^n(N; \mathbb{Z})$, respectively. Again, if $f$ is non-constant, then $\deg f \geq 1$ and

$$\sum_{x \in f^{-1}\{y\}} i(x, f) = \deg f \quad \text{for every } y \in \mathbb{N}.$$ 

In particular, we have $N(y, f) = N(f) = \deg f$ for every $y \in \mathbb{N} \setminus f(B_f)$.

We refer to the monograph of Rickman [28, Chapter I] for a more detailed discussion on these properties of quasiregular mappings.

### 2.2. Uniformly quasiregular self-maps

Let $f: M \to M$ be a uniformly quasiregular self-map of a closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian $n$-manifold $M$. The Fatou set $F(f)$ of $f$ is the region of normality of the family $\{f^k: k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, that is, the set of all points $x \in M$ for which $\{f^k|U: k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is normal on some open neighborhood $U$ of $x$. The Julia set $J(f)$ of $f$ is $M \setminus F(f)$. 

The Julia set $J(f)$ is non-empty if $\deg f > 1$. In this case, there exists by [25] an $f$-balanced probability measure $\mu_f$ on $M$, that is,

$$f^*\mu_f = (\deg f)\mu_f.$$ 

The existence of the pull-back measure follows from the push-forward of continuous functions under quasiregular maps; see Heinonen–Kilpeläinen–Martio [10, Section 14].

The measure $\mu_f$ is the weak-* limit of the measures $(\deg f_k)^{-1}(f_k)^*\text{vol}_M$, where we identify the volume form $\text{vol}_M$ with the Lebesgue measure on $M$ and tacitly assume that $\text{vol}_M(M) = 1$, and the support of $\mu_f$ is the Julia set $J(f)$ of $f$. From now on, we use the notation $\mu_f$ to denote this particular measure.

By [14, Theorem 1.2], the measure $\mu_f$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure if the manifold $M$ is not a rational cohomology sphere. Thus, similarly as in the holomorphic dynamics of one complex variable, we have that the branch set has $\mu_f$-measure zero. We record this fact as a lemma for the further use.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let $M$ be a closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian $n$-manifold for which $H^n(M; \mathbb{Q}) \not\cong H^*(S^n; \mathbb{Q})$, and let $f: M \to M$ be a uniformly quasiregular map of degree at least $2$. Then

$$\mu_f(f^{-1}(f(B_f))) = \mu_f(f(B_f)) = \mu_f(B_f) = 0.$$ 

**Proof.** By Rickman [28, Proposition I.4.14] and an application of bi Lipschitz charts, the sets $f^{-1}(f(B_f))$, $f(B_f)$, and $B_f$ are Lebesgue null. Since $\mu_f$ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure by [14, Theorem 1.2] under the assumption $H^*(M; \mathbb{Q}) \not\cong H^*(S^n; \mathbb{Q})$, the claim follows. $\square$

### 3. Preliminaries on entropy

#### 3.1. Topological entropy

Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $d_{k, \infty}$ the sup-metric, induced by $d$, on $X^{k+1}$. That is, for any $x = (x_0, \ldots, x_k)$ and $x' = (x'_0, \ldots, x'_k) \in X^{k+1}$,

$$d_{k, \infty}(x, x') := \sup_{j \in \{0, \ldots, k\}} d(x_j, x'_j).$$ 

For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $Y \subset X^{k+1}$, we also define the counting function

$$N_{\epsilon}(Y) := \max \left\{ \# E : E \subset Y, \inf_{x, x' \in E, x \neq x'} d_{k, \infty}(x, x') \geq \epsilon \right\}$$

for the discrete volume of $Y$ at scale $\epsilon$.

A graph over $X$ is by definition a subset of $X^2$. For any $\Gamma \subset X^2$, the $k$-chain of $\Gamma$ is defined by

$$\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma) := \{(x_0, \ldots, x_k) \in X^{k+1} : (x_{j-1}, x_j) \in \Gamma \text{ for any } j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}\},$$

and for each $\epsilon > 0$, we set

$$h_{\epsilon}(\Gamma) := \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(N_{\epsilon}(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))).$$

The entropy $h(\Gamma)$ of $\Gamma$ is

$$h(\Gamma) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} h_{\epsilon}(\Gamma);$$
note that the limit on the right hand side always exists.

The Bowen–Dinaburg definition of the topological entropy $h(f)$ of a continuous self-map $f$ on $X$ is

$$h(f) := h(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_X, f)})$$

where $\Gamma_{(\text{id}_X, f)} := (\text{id}_X, f)(X) \subset X^2$ is the graph $f$. The topological entropy is a topological invariant whenever $(X, d)$ is compact [4].

3.1.1. Entropy, volume, and density. Let $M$ be a closed Riemannian $n$-manifold. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\mathcal{H}^n$ to be the Hausdorff $n$-measure on the $(nk)$-dimensional product Riemannian manifold $M^k$.

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, the $\varepsilon$-density $\text{Dens}_\varepsilon(Y)$ of a $\mathcal{H}^n$-measurable set $Y \subset M^{k+1}$ is defined by

$$\text{Dens}_\varepsilon(Y) = \inf_{x \in Y} \mathcal{H}^n(Y \cap D_{k,\infty}(x, \varepsilon)),$$

where $D_{k,\infty}(x, \varepsilon) := \{ y \in M^{k+1} : d_{k,\infty}(x, y) < \varepsilon \}$.

For any $\Gamma \subset M^2$, the logarithmic volume $\text{lov}(\Gamma)$ of $\Gamma$ is defined by

$$\text{lov}(\Gamma) = \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log (\mathcal{H}^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))),$$

and the logarithmic density $\text{lodn}(\Gamma)$ of $\Gamma$ by

$$\text{lodn}(\Gamma) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \text{lodn}_\varepsilon(\Gamma),$$

where, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\text{lodn}_\varepsilon(\Gamma) := \liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log (\text{Dens}_\varepsilon(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))).$$

For completeness, we include a proof of the following key estimate.

**Theorem 3.1** ([7, (1.1)]). Let $M$ be a closed Riemannian $n$-manifold and let $\Gamma \subset M^2$ be a graph. Then

$$h(\Gamma) \leq \text{lov}(\Gamma) - \text{lodn}(\Gamma).$$

**Proof.** Let $k \geq 2$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\delta > 0$, and let $d$ be the induced Riemannian distance in $M$ and $d_{k,\infty}$ be the sup-metric on $M^{k+1}$ induced by $d$.

We show first that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)) \geq N_2\varepsilon(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)) \cdot \text{Dens}_\varepsilon(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)).$$

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose that a set $\{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_N\} \subset \text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)$ satisfies $\inf_{i \neq j} d_{k,\infty}(y_i, y_j) \geq 2\varepsilon$. Since the sets $D_{k,\infty}(y_i, \varepsilon)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, are mutually disjoint, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)) \geq \mathcal{H}^n\left(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^N D_{k,\infty}(y_i, \varepsilon)\right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma) \cap D_{k,\infty}(y_i, \varepsilon))$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Dens}_\varepsilon(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)) = N \cdot \text{Dens}_\varepsilon(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma)).$$
Thus (3.2) follows.

Having (3.2) at our disposal, we observe that, for each \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
\text{lov}(\Gamma) = \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(H^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))) \\
\geq \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \left( \log(N_{2\varepsilon}(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))) + \log(\text{Dens}_{2\varepsilon}(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))) \right) \\
\geq \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(N_{2\varepsilon}(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))) + \liminf_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(\text{Dens}_{\varepsilon}(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma))) \\
= h_{2\varepsilon}(\Gamma) + \text{lodn}_{\varepsilon}(\Gamma).
\]

Thus, (3.1) holds.

\[ \Box \]

Remark 3.2. The use of the product Riemannian distance in the definition of the Hausdorff \( n \)-measure stems from Theorem 1.2. The above considerations hold also for the Hausdorff measures based on the metrics \( d_k,\infty \).

3.2. Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy. Let \( (X, \Sigma, \mu) \) be a complete probability Lebesgue space. Note that, for a complete separable metric space \( X \) and a Borel \( \sigma \)-algebra \( B_X \) in \( X \), the completion \( (X, B_X^*, \mu^*) \) of a probability space \( (X, B_X, \mu) \) is a Lebesgue space; see [29, §2, No. 7]. As usual, we denote \( (X, \Sigma, \mu) \) by \( X \) for simplicity.

Let \( P_X \) be the set of all partitions of \( X \). For each \( \xi \in P_X \), let

\[ \pi_{\xi} : X \to \xi \]

be the projection induced by \( \xi \), which associates each \( x \in X \) with the unique element \( \xi(x) \) of \( \xi \) containing \( x \). Given a partition \( \xi \in P_X \), we say that a subset \( A \subset X \) is a \( \xi \)-subset if \( A \) is a finite union of elements of \( \xi \in P_X \).

A partition \( \xi \in P_X \) is measurable if there is an at most countable collection \( (B_\alpha)_{\alpha \in I} \) of measurable \( \xi \)-subsets in \( X \) having the following property:

For any \( C, C' \in \xi \), there exists \( \alpha \in I \) for which either

- \( C \subset B_\alpha \) and \( C' \cap B_\alpha = \emptyset \), or
- \( C' \subset B_\alpha \) and \( C \cap B_\alpha = \emptyset \).

We say that a partition \( \eta \in P_X \) refines the partition \( \xi \in P_X \) if any element in \( \eta \) is contained in some element in \( \xi \). The refinement of partitions induces a partial order \( \leq \) to the set \( P_X \) of all partitions by \( \xi \leq \eta \) if \( \eta \) refines \( \xi \).

For any measurable \( \xi, \eta \in P_X \), let \( \xi \vee \eta \) be the minimal measurable \( \zeta \in P_X \) satisfying both \( \xi \leq \zeta \) and \( \eta \leq \zeta \).

The factor space \( X/\xi \) of \( X \) with respect to a measurable partition \( \xi \in P_X \) is the probability space \( (\xi, (\pi_{\xi}), \Sigma, \mu^\xi) \), where \( \mu^\xi \) is the measure

\[ \mu^\xi := (\pi_{\xi})_* \mu \] on \( \xi \).

This quotient space \( X/\xi \) is also a complete probability Lebesgue space.

A collection \( ((C, \Sigma|C, \mu_C))_{C \in \xi} \) or in short \( (\mu_C)_{C \in \xi} \), is called a canonical system of probability measures associated to a measurable partition \( \xi \in P_X \) if

(a) for \( \mu^\xi \)-a.e. \( C \in X/\xi \), \( (C, \Sigma|C, \mu_C) \) is a complete probability Lebesgue space, and
(b) for any measurable $A \subset X$, the intersection $A \cap C$ is $\mu_C$-measurable for $\mu^\xi$-a.e. $C \in X/\xi$, the function $C \mapsto \mu_C(A \cap C)$ is measurable on $X/\xi$, and
\[
\mu(A) = \int_{X/\xi} \mu_C(A \cap C) \, d\mu^\xi(C).
\]

Rokhlin’s disintegration theorem asserts that there exists an essentially unique canonical system of probability measures associated to a measurable $\xi \in P_X$, that is, for any canonical systems $(\mu_C)_{C \in \xi}$ and $(\mu'_C)_{C \in \xi}$, we have $\mu_C = \mu'_C$ for $\mu^\xi$-a.e. $C \in X/\xi$; see [29, §3] or [30, §1.7].

The entropy $H_\mu(\xi)$ of a measurable partition $\xi \in P_X$ is
\[
H_\mu(\xi) := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
- \sum_{C \in \xi_+} \mu(C) \log \mu(C), & \text{if } \mu(\cup (\xi \setminus \xi_+)) = 0, \\
\infty, & \text{if } \mu(\cup (\xi \setminus \xi_+)) > 0.
\end{array} \right.
\]
where $\xi_+ \subset \xi$ is the collection of all $\mu$-non-null elements of $\xi$. Note that $\xi_+$ is at most countable.

The conditional entropy $H(\xi|\eta)$ of a measurable partition $\xi \in P_X$ with respect to a measurable partition $\eta \in P_X$ is
\[
H(\xi|\eta) := \int_{X/\eta} H_{\mu_\eta}(\xi_C) \, d\mu_\eta(C),
\]
where $\xi_C$ is the partition of $C \in \eta$ induced by $\xi$ and $(\mu_\eta_C)_{C \in \eta}$ is a canonical system of probability measures associated to $\eta$. The function $C \mapsto H_{\mu_\eta}(\xi_C)$ is measurable on $X/\eta$. We refer to [30, §4 and §5] for this and similar details.

The Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy $h_\mu(f)$ of a measure-preserving self-map $f$ on a complete probability Lebesgue space $(X, \Sigma, \mu)$ is defined by
\[
h_\mu(f) := \sup_{\xi \in P_X: \text{measurable}} H_\mu\left(\xi \left\lfloor \bigvee_{j=1}^{\infty} f^{-j}\xi\right.\right).
\]
The Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy is already determined by finite partitions, that is,
\[
h_\mu(f) = \sup_{\xi \in P_X: \text{finite and measurable}} H_\mu\left(\xi \left\lfloor \bigvee_{j=1}^{\infty} f^{-j}\xi\right.\right).
\]
Recall that a partition $\xi \in P_X$ is finite if it has finitely many elements. For more details, see [30, §7 and §9].

4. Proof of the lower bound $h_\mu(f) \geq \log \deg f$

In this section, we prove the entropy lower bound. We formulate this goal as a proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $f : M \to M$ be a uniformly quasiregular map of degree at least 2 on a closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian $n$-manifold $M$ satisfying $H^*(M) \nmid H^*(\mathbb{S}^n)$. Then
\[
h_\mu(f) \geq \log \deg f.
\]
Recall that by the variational principle, we have that
\[ h(f) \geq \sup_{\mu} h_{\mu}(f) \geq h_{\mu_f}(f) \geq \log \deg f \]
for the topological entropy \( h(f) \) of \( f \). Thus Proposition 4.1 yield the desired lower bound in Theorem 1.1.

As already discussed, the invariant measure \( \mu_f \) is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \( M \) by [14, Theorem 1.2]. For the application of Kolmogorov–Sinai entropy, we note that in particular \((M, \mathcal{B}_M, \mu_f)\) is a complete probability Lebesgue space. By Lemma 2.1, we further have that the branch set \( B_f \) and its image \( fB_f \) have zero \( \mu_f \)-measure.

More precisely, \( \mu_f (B_f) = \mu_f (fB_f) = \mu_f (f^{-1}fB_f) = 0 \).

For the calculation of entropy, let
\[ \varepsilon_M := \{ \{x\} : x \in M \} \in P_M \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}\varepsilon_M := \{ f^{-1}\{x\} : x \in M \} \in P_M, \]
be measurable partitions of \( M \). Then
\[
(4.1) \quad \bigvee_{j=1}^{\infty} f^{-j}\varepsilon_M = f^{-1}\varepsilon_M.
\]

Indeed, let \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). Then, for each \( x \in f^{-j}\{y\} \), we have \( f^{-1}\{f(x)\} \subset f^{-j}\{y\} \), and hence
\[ f^{-j}\varepsilon_M \leq f^{-1}\varepsilon_M. \]

For the entropy estimate \( h_{\mu_f}(f) \geq \log \deg f \), it suffices to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( f : M \to M \) be a uniformly quasiregular map of degree at least \( 2 \) on a closed, oriented, and connected Riemannian \( n \)-manifold \( M \), which is not a rational cohomology sphere. Then, for \((\mu_f)^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}\)-a.e. \( C \in f^{-1}\varepsilon_M \), we have
\[
(4.2) \quad (\mu_f)^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}/\deg f = \sum_{x \in C} \delta_{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}^{x}.
\]

Indeed, once Lemma 4.2 is at our disposal, we may conclude the proof of Proposition 4.1 as follows.

**Proof of Proposition 4.1.** For \((\mu_f)^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}\)-a.e. \( C = f^{-1}\{y\} \in f^{-1}\varepsilon_M \), we have
\[
H_{\mu_C^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}}(\varepsilon_M) = - \sum_{C' \in \varepsilon_M} \mu_C^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}(C') \log \mu_C^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}(C')
\]
\[
= - \sum_{x \in f^{-1}\{y\}} \mu_C^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}(\{x\}) \log \frac{1}{\deg f}
\]
\[= \mu_C^{f^{-1}\varepsilon_M}(M) \cdot \log \deg f = \log \deg f,
\]

where \( y \in M \) is the point for which \( C = f^{-1}\{y\} \).

Thus, by (3.5) and (4.1), we have
\[ h_{\mu_f}(f) \geq H_{\mu_f}(\varepsilon_M) \left( \bigvee_{j=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}\varepsilon_M \right) = H_{\mu_f}(\varepsilon f^{-1}\varepsilon) = \log \deg f. \]
Proof of Lemma 4.2. For each $C \in f^{-1} \varepsilon_M$, let $\nu_C$ be the measure

$$\nu_C := \sum_{x \in C} \frac{i(x, f)}{\deg f} \delta_x$$

on $C$.

By Rohklin’s theorem it suffices to show that $(C, B_M | C, \nu_C)_{C \in f^{-1} \varepsilon_M}$ is a canonical system of probability measures associated to $f^{-1} \varepsilon_M \in \mathcal{P}_M$. Indeed, recall that for every $x \not\in f^{-1} f(B_f)$, we have $i(x, f) = 1$ and $\#f^{-1}(f(x)) = \deg f$. Thus, by Lemma 2.1, for $(\mu_f)^{f^{-1} \varepsilon}$-a.e. $C \in f^{-1} \varepsilon$ and any $x \in C$, we have $i(x, f) = 1$. Hence, by Rohklin’s theorem, for $(\mu_f)^{f^{-1} \varepsilon}$-a.e. $C \in f^{-1} \varepsilon$, we have

$$(\mu_f)^{f^{-1} \varepsilon} = \nu_C = \sum_{x \in C} \frac{i(x, f)}{\deg f} \delta_x = \sum_{x \in C} \frac{1}{\deg f} \delta_x,$$

which proves (4.2).

To show that $(C, B_M | C, \nu_C)_{C \in f^{-1} \varepsilon_M}$ is a canonical system of probability measures, we observe first that the condition (a) is obvious, so it suffices to prove the condition (b). To simplify the notation, let $\xi = f^{-1} \varepsilon_M$.

We observe first that, since each $C \in \xi$ is finite, the intersection $A \cap C$ is also finite for each measurable set $A \subset M$. Thus $A \cap C$ is $\nu_C$-measurable for each measurable set $A \subset M$.

We show next that, for a measurable set $A \subset M$, the function $M/\xi \to \mathbb{R}$, $C \mapsto \nu_C(A \cap C)$, is measurable. Let $A \subset M$ be a measurable set. For each $x \in M$, we have that

$$\nu_{\pi_C(x)}(A \cap C) = \sum_{z \in A \cap f^{-1}(f(x))} i(z, f) = N(f, f(x), A).$$

By the proof of [28, Proposition I.4.14 (c)], the function $y \mapsto N(f, y, A)$ is lower semicontinuous. Hence the function $x \mapsto N(f, f(x), A)$ is also lower semicontinuous and, in particular, measurable. Since $x \mapsto N(f, f(x), A)$ is a composition of $C \mapsto \nu_C(A \cap C)$ and the quotient map $\pi: M \to M/\xi$, we conclude that $C \mapsto \nu_C(A \cap C)$ is measurable.

It remains to show the disintegration property, that is, for each measurable set $A \subset M$, we have

$$(4.3) \quad \mu_f(A) = \int_{M/\xi} \nu_C(A \cap C) d\mu_C(C).$$

Let $\varphi: M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function and denote by $\varphi^\xi: M/\xi \to \mathbb{R}$ the function

$$C \mapsto \int_C (\varphi(C) d\nu_C).$$

Note that, for each $x \in M$, we have

$$\varphi^\xi(\pi_C(x)) = \int_{\pi_C(x)} \varphi(z) d\nu_C(z) = \sum_{z \in f^{-1}(x)} \frac{i(z, f)}{\deg f} \varphi(z).$$
Since $\mu_f$ is $f$-balanced, that is, $f^*\mu_f = (\deg f)\mu_f$, we have by the definition of the pull-back that
\[
\int_M \varphi \, d\mu_f = \int_M \varphi \, d\left(\frac{f^*\mu_f}{\deg f}\right) = \int_M \sum_{z \in f^{-1}(x)} \frac{i(z, f)}{\deg f} \varphi(z) \, d\mu_f(x)
\]
\[
= \int_M \varphi^\xi \circ \pi_\xi \, d\mu_f = \int_{M/\xi} \varphi^\xi \, d((\pi_\xi)_* \mu_f) = \int_{M/\xi} \varphi^\xi \, d\mu_f^\xi.
\]

Let now $A \subset M$ be a measurable set and let $X_A : M \to [0, 1]$ be the characteristic function of $A$. Then, by Lusin's theorem, there exists for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ a continuous function $\phi_j : M \to [0, 1]$ for which the set $A_j := \{x \in M : \phi_j(x) \neq X(x)\}$ has measure $\mu_f(A_j) < 1/j$. Then
\[
\int_M |X_A - \phi_j| \, d\mu_f \leq \mu_f(A_j) < 1/j
\]
and
\[
\mu_f^\xi(\pi_\xi(A_j)) = \int_{M/\xi} \chi_{\pi_\xi(A_j)} \, d(\mu_f^\xi) = \int_M \chi_{\pi_\xi(A_j)} \circ \pi_\xi \, d\mu_f
\]
\[
= \mu_f(f^{-1}f(A_j)) \leq (\deg f)\mu(A_j) \leq \frac{\deg f}{j}.
\]
Hence, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have
\[
\left| \mu_f(A) - \int_{M/\xi} \nu_C(A \cap C) \, d\mu_f^\xi(C) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \left| \mu_f(A) - \int_M \phi_j \, d\mu_f \right| + \left| \int_{M/\xi} \phi_j^\xi \, d\mu_f^\xi - \int_{M/\xi} \nu_C(A \cap C) \, d\mu_f^\xi(C) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \int_M |X_A - \phi_j| \, d\mu_f + \int_{M/\xi} \int_C |\phi_j - X_A| \, d\nu_C \, d\mu_f^\xi(C)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{j} + \int_{\pi_\xi(A_j)} \nu_C(C) \, d\mu_f^\xi(C)
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{j} + \mu_f^\xi(\pi_\xi(A_j)) = \frac{1 + \deg f}{j} \to 0
\]
as $j \to \infty$. Hence, (4.3) holds. This completes the proof. \qed

5. Preliminaries on currents

We move now to the discussion of Gromov's argument on the upper bound $h(f) \leq \log \deg f$ of the topological entropy. As a technical tool in the proof, we use Federer–Fleming currents and we recall some basic results in this section. We refer to Federer \cite{Federer} Chapter 4 for details.

5.1. Currents. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, and for each $m \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, let $C_0^\infty(\wedge^m U)$ be the space of all differential $m$-forms on $U$ having coefficients in $C_0^\infty(U)$. An $m$-current on $U$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-linear functional $T$ on $C_0^\infty(\wedge^m U)$ which is continuous in the sense of distributions. The space of all $m$-currents on $U$ is denoted by $D_m(U)$. We give $D_m(U)$ the topology of pointwise convergence.
The support of a current \( T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U) \) is
\[
\text{spt } T := U \setminus \bigcup \{ V \subset U : \text{open, and } T(\omega) = 0 \text{ for any } \omega \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^m V) \},
\]
and the boundary \( \partial_V T \in \mathcal{D}_{m-1}(U) \) of an \( m \)-current \( T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U) \) is the \((m - 1)\)-current defined by
\[
\partial_V T(\omega) = T(d\omega) \quad \text{for each } \omega \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^{m-1} U).
\]
Thus \( \partial_V \partial_V T = 0 \) for any \( T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U) \). For each \( c \in \mathbb{R} \), the multiplication \( cT \) is defined in the obvious manner. Furthermore, for each \( l \)-form \( \tau \in C^\infty(\wedge^l U) \) for \( l \in \{0, \ldots, m\} \), the interior multiplication \( T\cdot \tau \in \mathcal{D}_{m-l}(U) \) is the current defined by \( (T\cdot \tau)(\omega) = T(\tau \wedge \omega) \) for each \( \omega \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^{m-l} U) \).

5.2. The mass of currents, normal currents, and integral representations. Let \( W \) be an \( n \)-dimensional \( \mathbb{R} \)-vector space having an inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \). For each \( m \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), the \( m \)-th exterior product space (the \( m \)-vector space) \( \wedge^m W \) of \( W \) is equipped with the Grassmann inner product
\[
\langle v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m, w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_m \rangle = \det ((v_i, w_j))_{i,j} \quad \text{for } v_i, w_j \in W.
\]
We denote the induced norm on \( \wedge^m W \) by \( | \cdot | \). The \( m \)-covector space \( \wedge^m W^* \) of \( W \) also has the Grassmannian inner product and norm induced by the duality isomorphism \( W \rightarrow W^* \) given by \( v \mapsto (w \mapsto \langle v, w \rangle) \) for \( v, w \in W \).

The comass \( ||\xi||_M \) of an \( m \)-covector \( \xi \in \wedge^m W^* \) is defined by
\[
||\xi||_M := \sup \{ |\xi(w)| : w \in \wedge^m W \text{ is simple, } |w| \leq 1 \},
\]
where we say an \( m \)-vector \( w \in \wedge^m W \) is simple if it can be written as \( w = w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_m \). Similarly, the mass \( ||w||_M \) of an \( m \)-vector \( w \in \wedge^m W \) is defined by
\[
||w||_M := \sup \{ ||\xi(w)|| : \xi \in \wedge^m W^*, ||\xi||_M \leq 1 \}.
\]
These are norms on \( \wedge^m W^* \) and \( \wedge^m W \) satisfying \( ||\xi|| \geq ||\xi||_M \) for any \( \xi \in \wedge^m W^* \) and \( ||w|| \leq ||w||_M \) for any \( w \in \wedge^m W \), respectively. For more details, see [5] Section 1.8.

Let \( U \) be an open set in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( m \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \). For each open subset \( V \subset U \), the mass of an \( m \)-current \( T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U) \) over \( V \) is defined by
\[
M_V(T) := \sup \left\{ ||T(\omega)|| : \omega \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^m V), \sup_{x \in V} ||\omega_x||_M \leq 1 \right\},
\]
where \( C_0^\infty(\wedge^m V) \) is embedded in \( C_0^\infty(\wedge^m U) \) by means of zero extension on \( U \setminus V \). An \( m \)-current \( T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U) \) is said to be normal if
\[
\text{spt } T \subset U \quad \text{and} \quad M_U(T) + M_U(\partial_V T) < \infty;
\]
here, and in what follows, we denote \( A \subset B \) if \( A \) is a subset compactly contained in \( B \).

An \( m \)-current \( T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U) \) is locally normal if \( M_V(T) + M_V(\partial_V T) < \infty \) for any open subset \( V \subset U \). Let \( N_m(U) \) (resp. \( N_m^{\text{loc}}(U) \)) be the space of all normal (resp. locally normal) \( m \)-currents on \( U \).

Currents of finite mass admit an integral representation.
Lemma 5.1. For every $T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$ satisfying $M_U(T) < \infty$, there exist a measurable tangent $m$-vector field $\tilde{T}$ on $U$ and a Radon measure $\mu_T$ on $U$ such that for every $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^mU)$,

$$T(\omega) = \int_U \langle \omega, \tilde{T} \rangle \, d\mu_T.$$  

Moreover, $\mu_T(V) = M_V(T)$ for any open subset $V \subset U$.

Let $T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$ be a current of finite mass on an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\mu_T$ be a Radon measure and $\tilde{T}$ an $m$-vector field representing $T$ as in (5.1). Thus, for an open set $V \subset U$, we may define the $m$-current $T\llcorner V = T\llcorner \chi_V \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$ by

$$\langle T\llcorner V, \omega \rangle = \int_V \langle \omega, \tilde{T} \rangle \, d\mu_T = \int_U \chi_V \cdot \langle \omega, \tilde{T} \rangle \, d\mu_T$$

for each $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^mU)$, where $\chi_V$ is the characteristic function of $V$ on $U$. Moreover,

$$M_V(T) = \mu_T(V) = (\mu_T|V)(V) = (\mu_T|V)(U) = M_U(T\llcorner V).$$

For further details, we refer to [5] Sections 4.1.5 and 4.1.7.

5.3. Push-forward of currents. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ be open, $T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$, and let $h: U \to V$ be a smooth map such that the restriction $h|\text{spt} \, T : \text{spt} \, T \to V$ is proper; note that, if $\text{spt} \, T \subseteq U_0$, then $h|\text{spt} \, T$ is proper. The push-forward $h_* T$ of $T$ under the map $h$ is the $m$-current $h_* T \in \mathcal{D}_m(V)$ defined as follows. For every $\omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^mV)$, let $\psi \in C_0^\infty(U)$ be a function satisfying $\psi \equiv 1$ on some open neighborhood of $(\text{spt} \, T) \cap (h^{-1} \text{spt} \, \omega)$, and set

$$(h_* T)(\omega) = T(\psi \cdot h^* \omega).$$

The values of $h_* T$ are independent on the choice of $\psi$.

Since $h^* d\omega = dh^* \omega$ for any $\omega \in C^\infty(\Lambda^mV)$, we have

$$h_* \partial_U T = \partial_V h_* T$$

for each $T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$.

If in addition $h|\text{spt} \, T$ is $L$-Lipschitz for $L \geq 1$, then for any $T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$,

$$M_V(h_* T) \leq L^m M_U(T).$$

For more details, we refer to e.g. [5] sections 4.1.7 and 4.1.14.

5.4. Slicing of currents. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, $T \in \mathcal{D}_m(U)$ an $m$-current satisfying $M_U(T) + M_U(\partial T) < \infty$, and let $h: U \to \mathbb{R}$ be an $L$-Lipschitz function for $L \geq 1$. For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$U_{h,t} := h^{-1}(\infty, t) \subset U,$

which is open, and the slice of $T$ by $h$ at $t$ is

$$\langle T, h, t- \rangle := \partial_U(T\llcorner U_{h,t}) - (\partial_U T)|_{U_{h,t}} \in \mathcal{D}_{m-1}(U).$$

The following lemma gathers the key properties of the slices of currents used in the forthcoming discussion. The argument in the proof is similar to that in [5] Section 4.2.1 and we omit the details.
6. The Ahlfors regularity of images in Euclidean spaces

As mentioned in the introduction, the upper bound for the entropy $h(f)$ follows from an application of the uniform Ahlfors regularity estimate in Theorem 1.2 to the images of maps $(\text{id}, f, \ldots, f^k) : M \to M^{k+1}$. We begin by proving a Euclidean counterpart of Theorem 1.2. For the statement, given $\Gamma \subset (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$, we denote

$$\Gamma_{y,r} = B_{kn}(y, r) \cap \Gamma$$

for $y \in \mathbb{R}^{nk}$ and $r > 0$.

**Proposition 6.1.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open subset for $n \geq 2$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be non-constant $K$-quasiregular maps for some $K \geq 1$ such that $\max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty$. Let $g := (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to (\mathbb{R}^n)^k = \mathbb{R}^{kn}$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_g := g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{kn}$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(n) > 0$, depending only on $n$, having the property that, for each $y \in \Gamma$ and any $r > 0$ satisfying $g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \Subset \Omega$, we have

$$| \Omega \cap \Gamma_{y,r} | \leq Ck^n K \max_j N(f_j).$$

We prove Proposition 6.1 following Gromov’s argument in [8]. For the rest of this section, let $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}$ be a map as in Proposition 6.1. The map $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$ is continuous and in $W^{1,n}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{nk})$. As previously, we set

$$N(g, y, A) := |(g^{-1}(\{y\} \cap A)$$

for each $y \in \Gamma$ and each $A \subset \Omega$, $N(g, y) := N(g, y, \Omega)$ for each $y \in \Gamma$, and

$$N(g) := \sup_{y \in \Gamma} N(g, y) \leq \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty.$$

For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, let $p_j : (\mathbb{R}^n)^k \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be the $j$-th projection $(z_1, \ldots, z_k) \mapsto z_j$. Then $p_j \circ g = f_j$.

We define a measurable function $|J_g|$ on $\Omega$ by

$$|J_g|(x) = |(Dg(x)e_1^1 \wedge \cdots \wedge (Dg(x)e_n^n)|$$

for Lebesgue a.e. $x \in \Omega$, where $(e_1^1, \ldots, e_n^n)$ is the standard basis of $T_x \Omega$. Note that, for $k > 1$, the map $g : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$ does not have a well-defined Jacobian determinant $J_g$. We call the function $|J_g|$ the $n$-Jacobian of $g$. 

**Proposition 5.2.** Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be open, let $h$ be an $L$-Lipschitz function on $U$, $L \geq 1$, and let $(a, b) \subset \mathbb{R}$. If $\emptyset \neq U_{h,t} \subseteq U$ for every $t \in (a, b)$, then for every $T \in \mathcal{P}_m(U)$ satisfying $M_U(T) + m_U(\partial U T) < \infty$,

(i) $\langle T, h, t_- \rangle \in N_{m-1}(U)$ for Lebesgue a.e. $t \in (a, b)$, and

(ii) the function $t \mapsto M_U(\langle T, h, t_+ \rangle)$ on $(a, b)$ is lower semicontinuous, and

$$M_{U_{h,t}}(T) \geq \frac{1}{mL} \int_a^t M_U(\langle T, h, s_- \rangle) \, ds \quad \text{for } t \in (a, b).$$
6.1. The upper Ahlfors bound. The upper bound for $\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r})$ follows from the measures $\mathcal{H}^n(\text{pr}_j(\Gamma_{y,r}))$ of the projections $\text{pr}_j(\Gamma_{y,r})$ and the multiplicity of the restrictions $\text{pr}_j|_{\Gamma_{y,r}}$, which in turn can be estimated in terms of the multiplicity of the maps $f_j$. We formulate this as a lemma.

Lemma 6.2. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open subset, $f_1, \ldots, f_k: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be $K$-quasiregular mappings, $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k): \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$, and $\Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nk}$. Then for every open subset $U \subset \Gamma$ satisfying $g^{-1}U \subset \Omega$, we have

$$
\mathcal{H}^n(U) \leq n^{\frac{n}{2}} k^\frac{n}{2} K \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \mathcal{H}^n(\text{pr}_j(U)).
$$

The upper bound in Proposition 6.1 follows now immediately. Indeed, since $\Gamma_{y,r}$ is open in $\Gamma$, we have, by (6.2), that

$$
\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq n^{\frac{n}{2}} k^\frac{n}{2} K \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \mathcal{H}^n(\text{pr}_j(\Gamma_{y,r}))
$$

$$
\leq n^{\frac{n}{2}} k^\frac{n}{2} K \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \mathcal{H}^n(B^n(\text{pr}_j(y), r))
$$

$$
\leq C(n) k^\frac{n}{2} K \left( \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) r^n,
$$

where $C(n) > 0$ depends only on $n$. Thus it suffices to prove Lemma 6.2.

We begin by showing that the map $g$ has the Lusin property.

Lemma 6.3. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open subset, $f_1, \ldots, f_k: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be $K$-quasiregular mappings, $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k): \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$, and $\Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nk}$. If $E \subset \Omega$ is an $\mathcal{H}^n$-null subset, then $g(E) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nk}$ is also an $\mathcal{H}^n$-null subset.

Proof. For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, the $j$-th component $f_j$ of $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k)$ is quasiregular, and we may therefore fix an exponent $p_j > n$ of local higher integrability for $Df_j$. Then the proof of Bojarski and Iwaniec in [2] Section 8.1] shows that there is $C(n, p_j) > 0$ depending only on $n, p_j$ such that if $Q_i \subset \Omega$ are disjoint cubes, then

$$
\sum_i (\text{diam } f_j(Q_i))^n \leq C(n, p_j) \mathcal{H}^n \left( \bigcup_i Q_i \right)^{1 - \frac{n}{p_j}} \left( \int_{\bigcup_i Q_i} |Df_j|^{p_j} \right)^\frac{1}{p_j}.
$$

Pick a common exponent $p > n$ of higher integrability for all $Df_j$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Then by Hölder’s inequality and standard estimates, there exists $C(n, k, p) > 0$ depending only on $n, k, p$ such that if $Q_i \subset \Omega$ are cubes with disjoint interiors, then

$$
\sum_i (\text{diam } g(Q_i))^n \leq C(n, k, p) \mathcal{H}^n \left( \bigcup_i Q_i \right)^{1 - \frac{n}{p}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{\bigcup_i Q_i} |Df_j|^p \right)^\frac{n}{p}.
$$

Now the proof of the Lusin condition follows by intersecting the set of zero measure $E$ with a compact subset $A \subset \Omega$, covering $E \cap A$ with a collection of cubes with disjoint interiors and arbitrarily small total measure, and using the above estimate to show that $g(E \cap A)$ has arbitrarily small $\mathcal{H}^n$ measure. $\square$

Since the maps $f_j: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are $K$-quasiregular, we have the following estimate for the $n$-Jacobian of $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k): \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$.
Lemma 6.4. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open subset, $f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be $K$-quasiregular mappings, $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$, and $\Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nk}$. Then, for Lebesgue almost every $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$|J_g|(x) \leq \frac{n^2}{n^2} K k^{n^2 - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{k} J_{f_j}(x).$$

Proof. Since

$$|J_g|(x) = \sqrt{\det((Dg(x))^T Dg(x))},$$

we have, by the distortion bound (1.1) for $f_j$ and Hölder’s inequality, that

$$|J_g|(x) = \sqrt{\det \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} (Df_j(x))^T Df_j(x) \right)^n} \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left( \text{tr}((Df_j(x))^T Df_j(x)) \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \right)^{\frac{n^2}{2}} \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} (n \|Df_j(x)\|^2) \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \leq n^2 K \cdot \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k} (J_{f_j}(x))^{\frac{2}{n}} \right)^{\frac{n^2}{2}} k^{(1 - \frac{2}{n})} \frac{n^2}{n^2} n^2 K k^{n^2 - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{k} J_{f_j}(x)$$

for Lebesgue a.e. $x \in \Omega$. \hfill \Box

The last ingredient is the proof of Lemma 6.2 is an area formul a for $g$. For more details, see Hajlasz [8, Theorem 11].

Lemma 6.5. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open subset, $f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be $K$-quasiregular mappings, $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{nk}$, and $\Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nk}$. Then, for every open subset $A \subset \Omega$,

$$\int_A |J_g| \, d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_{g(A)} N(g, y, A) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y).$$

Proof. The map $g$ is in $W^{1, n}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{kn})$, and by Lemma 6.4 we have $|J_g| \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$. Hence, the Sobolev area formula [8, Theorem 11] implies that (6.3) holds for some $\tilde{g}$ in the Sobolev equivalence class of $g$. Moreover, since $\tilde{g}$ is Lusin (N) by Lemma 6.3, we have $\tilde{g} = g$ by the discussion in [8, p. 239]. \hfill \Box

We are now ready for the proof of Lemma 6.2

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Let $U \subset \Gamma$ be an open set satisfying $g^{-1}U \subset \Omega$. Then, for each $y \in U$, we have $N(g, y, U) \geq 1$. Thus, by Lemmas 6.5 and 6.4 we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n(U) \leq \int_U N(g, y, U) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y) = \int_{g^{-1}U} |J_g| \, d\mathcal{H}^n \leq n^2 K k^{n^2 - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{g^{-1}U} J_{f_j}(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x),$$

where $J_{f_j}(x)$ is the Jacobian of $f_j$ at $x$. The Jacobian of $f_j$ is given by

$$J_{f_j}(x) = \sqrt{\det((Df_j(x))^T Df_j(x))},$$

which is a function of $x$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n(U) \leq n^2 K k^{n^2 - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{g^{-1}U} J_{f_j}(x) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x).$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 6.2.
Since \( f_j = \text{pr}_j \circ g \), the change of variables for quasiregular mappings yields
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{g^{-1}U} f_j \, d\mathcal{H}^n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \int_{\text{pr}_j(U)} N(f_j, y', g^{-1}U) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y') 
\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} N(f_j) \mathcal{H}^n(\text{pr}_j(U)) \leq k \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \mathcal{H}^n(\text{pr}_j(U)),
\]
which completes the proof. \( \square \)

6.2. The lower Ahlfors bound. In this section, we prove the lower estimate in Proposition 6.1. The lower bound is obtained by considering a current \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) associated to \(\Gamma_{y,r}\) and two estimates which we combine in the following proposition. We define the current \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) after the statement and devote the rest of this section for the proofs of the estimates.

**Proposition 6.6.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open subset for \( n \geq 2 \), \( k \in \mathbb{N}, \) and let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps for some \( K \geq 1 \) such that \( \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty \). Let \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn} \) and \( \Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{kn} \). Then there exists a constant \( C = C(n) > 0 \) depending only on \( n \) having the property that
\[
\left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \geq M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,r}]) \geq \left( \frac{1}{Ck^n \min_j N(f_j)} \right)^{n-1} r^n
\]
for each \( y \in \Gamma \) and \( r > 0 \) for which \( g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \Subset \Omega \).

The lower bound in (6.1) follows immediately from this lemma and hence the proof of this lemma completes the proof of Proposition 6.1.

6.2.1. Current \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\). Although the notation may suggest otherwise, we do not define the current \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) directly by integration over \(\Gamma_{y,r}\), rather as the push-forward of the integration over \(g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r})\).

Let \( y \in \Gamma \) and \( r > 0 \) be such that \( \Omega_{y,r} = g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \Subset \Omega \). In this case, \( g|_{\Omega_{y,r}} : \Omega_{y,r} \to B^{kn}(y,r) \) is a proper map. Indeed, let \( S \subset B^{kn}(y,r) \) be compact. Then \( g^{-1}S \) is a closed subset of \( \Omega \). Moreover \( g^{-1}S \subset g^{-1}B^{kn}(y,r) = \Omega_{y,r} \subset \overline{\Omega}_{y,r} \). Since \( \overline{\Omega}_{y,r} \subset \Omega \), we have that \( g^{-1}S = g^{-1}S \cap \overline{\Omega}_{y,r} \) is a closed subset of \( \overline{\Omega}_{y,r} \) by relative topology. Since \( \overline{\Omega}_{y,r} \) is compact, \( g^{-1}S \) is compact.

Since \( g \in W^{1,n}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{kn}) \), the linear functional \([\Gamma_{y,r}] : C_0^\infty(\wedge^n \mathbb{R}^{kn}) \to \mathbb{R}, \)
\[
\omega \mapsto \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} g^* \omega,
\]
where \( g^* \omega \) is a measurable \( n \)-form in \( \Omega \), is well-defined.

To show that \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) is a current, denote, for every \( \omega \in C_0^\infty(\wedge^n \mathbb{R}^{kn}) \),
\[
\lambda_\omega := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{kn}} \|\omega_x\|_M < \infty.
\]
Then, for Lebesgue a.e. \( x \in \Omega \),
\[
|g^* \omega|_x = |(g^* \omega)_x, \text{vol}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(x)|
\]
(6.6)
\[
= |\omega_{g(x)} \wedge (Dg(x)e^1_x) \wedge \cdots \wedge (Dg(x)e^n_x)|
\]
\[
\leq \|\omega_{g(x)}\|_M |J_g(x)| \leq \lambda_g |J_g(x)|.
\]

We are now ready to prove the upper bound in Proposition 6.6.

**Lemma 6.7.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open subset for \( n \geq 2, k \in \mathbb{N} \), and let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps for some \( K \geq 1 \) such that \( \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty \). Let \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn} \) and \( \Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{kn} \). Let \( y \in \Gamma \) and \( r > 0 \) be such that \( g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \subset \Omega \). Then the functional \( [\Gamma_{y,r}] \) is a current in \( D_n(\mathbb{R}^{kn}) \) and
\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) < \infty.
\]

**Proof.** For every \( \omega \in C^\infty_0(\wedge^n \mathbb{R}^{kn}) \), we have, by (6.6) and Lemma 6.5, that
\[
\left| \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} g^* \omega \right| \leq \lambda_g \left| \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} J_g \right| d\mathcal{H}^n = \lambda_g \int_{\Gamma_{y,r}} N(g, y) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y)
\]
\[
\leq \lambda_g N(g) \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq \lambda_g \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}).
\]

To show that \( [\Gamma_{y,r}] \) is a current it suffices now to observe that, for a converging sequence \( \omega_j \to 0 \) in \( C^\infty_0(\wedge^n \mathbb{R}^{kn}) \), we have
\[
||[\Gamma_{y,r}](\omega_j)|| = ||[\Gamma_{y,r}](\omega_j)|| \leq \lambda_g \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}).
\]

Since differential forms are sections of covectors, we have the point-wise estimate \( \|(\omega_j)_x\|_M \leq |(\omega_j)_x| \) for almost every \( x \in \Omega \). Thus \( \lambda_g \to 0 \) as \( j \to \infty \). Since \( \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) < \infty \) by (6.7), \( [\Gamma_{y,r}] \) is continuous and hence a current. Moreover, the mass estimate (6.7) follows from the estimate (6.8).

We move now to prove the lower bound in Proposition 6.6. We begin by proving that the current \( [\Gamma_{y,r}] \) is locally normal.

**Lemma 6.8.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open subset for \( n \geq 2, k \in \mathbb{N} \), and let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps for some \( K \geq 1 \) such that \( \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty \). Let \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn} \) and \( \Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{kn} \). Let \( y \in \Gamma \) and \( r > 0 \) be such that \( g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \subset \Omega \). Then \( \partial B^{kn}(y)[\Gamma_{y,r}] = 0 \).

**Proof.** Since \( \Omega_{y,r} = g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \subset \Omega \), the map \( g|_{\Omega_{y,r}} \) is also in \( W^{1,n}(\Omega_{y,r}, \mathbb{R}^{kn}) \). Hence, by e.g. [6] Proposition 4.1, for every \( \omega \in C^\infty_0(\wedge^{n-1} B^{kn}(y), r) \), we have \( dg^* \omega = g^* d\omega \in L^1(\wedge^n \Omega_{y,r}) \) and \( g^* \omega \in L^{n/(n-1)}(\wedge^{n-1} \Omega_{y,r}) \), where \( dg^* \omega \) is defined in the weak sense, that is,
\[
\int_{\Omega_{y,r}} \psi \, dg^* \omega = - \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} d\psi \wedge g^* \omega
\]
for every \( \psi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega_{y,r}) \).

Since \( g^* \omega \) is compactly supported in \( \Omega_{y,r} \), there exists, by a standard convolution argument, a sequence \( (\omega_j) \) of \( (n-1) \)-forms in \( C^\infty_0(\wedge^{n-1} \Omega_{y,r}) \)
for which \( \omega_j \to g^* \omega \) in \( L^{n/(n-1)}(\Lambda^{n-1} \Omega_{g,r}) \) and \( d\omega_j \to dg^* \omega = g^* d\omega \) in \( L^1(\Lambda^n \Omega_{g,r}) \) as \( j \to \infty \). Thus

\[
\partial_{B^{kn}(y,r)}[\Gamma_{y,r}](\omega) = [\Gamma_{y,r}](d\omega) = \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} g^* d\omega = \lim_{j \to \infty} \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} d\omega_j = 0,
\]

that is, the boundary \( \partial_{B^{kn}(y,r)}[\Gamma_{y,r}] \) vanishes.

\[\square\]

Currents \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) restrict naturally to currents \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) for \( t \in (0, t)\).

**Lemma 6.9.** Let \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be an open subset for \( n \geq 2 \), \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), and let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps for some \( K \geq 1 \) such that \( \max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty \). Let \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k): \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^k \) and \( \Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \). Let \( y \in \Gamma \) and \( r > 0 \) be such that \( g^{-1}(\Gamma) \cap \Omega \). Then, for every \( t \in (0, r) \),

\[
[\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot B^{kn}(y, t) = [\Gamma_{y,t}].
\]

**Proof.** Let \( t \in (0, r) \) and let \((A_i)\) be an increasing sequence of compact subsets exhausting \( B^{kn}(y, t) \), that is, \( B^{kn}(y, t) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \). For every \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( \psi_i \in C_0^\infty(B^{kn}(y, t)) \) be a function for which \( 0 \leq \psi_i \leq 1 \) and \( \psi_i|_{A_i} = 1 \). Then

\[
([\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot B^{kn}(y, t)) \cdot \psi_i = [\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot \psi_i.
\]

Let

\[
[\Gamma_{y,r}](\cdot) = \int_{\Omega_{y,r}} \langle \cdot, \vec{T} \rangle \, d\mu_T
\]

be an integral representation of \( T = [\Gamma_{y,r}] \) as in (5.1).

For any \( \omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^n \mathbb{R}^k) \), by \( \Omega_{y,t} \Subset \Omega \) and the inner regularity of the Radon measure \( \mu_T \), we have

\[
|([\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot B^{kn}(y, t)) \cdot \psi_i(\omega) - ([\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot B^{kn}(y, t))(\omega)|
\]

\[
\leq |(\omega, \vec{T})| \mu_T(\Omega_{y,t} \setminus g^{-1}(A_i)) + \mu_T(\Omega_{y,t}) \to 0
\]

as \( i \to \infty \).

Since \( \int_{J_{f_j}} \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega) \) and \( \Omega_{y,t} \Subset \Omega \), we have for every \( \omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^n \mathbb{R}^k) \), by \([6.6]\) and Lemma \([6.4]\) that

\[
|([\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot \psi_i)(\omega) - [\Gamma_{y,t}](\omega)| = \left| \int_{\Omega_{y,t} \setminus g^{-1}(A_i)} g^* \omega \right|
\]

\[
\leq \lambda_n n^\frac{n}{2} k^\frac{n}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \int_{\Omega_{y,t} \setminus g^{-1}(A_i)} J_{f_j} \, d\mathcal{H}^n \to 0
\]

as \( i \to \infty \).

Having these estimates at our disposal, we conclude that, for each \( \omega \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda^n \mathbb{R}^k) \), we have

\[
\left( [\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot B^{nk}(y, t) \right)(\omega) = \lim_{i \to \infty} ([\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot B^{kn}(y, t)) \cdot \psi_i(\omega)
\]

\[
= \lim_{i \to \infty} ([\Gamma_{y,r}] \cdot \psi_i)(\omega) = [\Gamma_{y,t}](\omega).
\]

This completes the proof.

\[\square\]
6.2.2. Slicing and isoperimetric estimates for \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\). The first step towards the lower Ahlfors bound is the following slicing estimate for \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) – this is one of the key estimates in the proof of the lower Ahlfors bound.

**Lemma 6.10.** Let \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) be an open subset for \(n \geq 2\), \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), and let \(f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n\) be non-constant \(K\)-quasiregular maps for some \(K \geq 1\) such that \(\max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty\). Let \(g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}\) and \(\Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{kn}\). Let \(y \in \Gamma\) and \(r > 0\) be such that \(g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \Subset \Omega\). Then, for every \(t \in (0, r)\),

\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,t}]) \geq \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}(\partial_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}[\Gamma_{y,s}]) \, ds.
\]

**Proof.** Let \(t \in (0, r)\). By Lemma 6.9 and (5.3), we have that \(M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,t}]) = M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}(\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,t}]))\).

Similarly, by Lemmas 6.8 and 6.7 we have

\[
M_{B^{kn}(y,t)}([\Gamma_{y,r}]) + M_{B^{kn}(y,t)}(\partial B^{kn}(y,r)[\Gamma_{y,r}]) = M_{B^{kn}(y,t)}([\Gamma_{y,r}]) < \infty.
\]

Let now \(h_t : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}\) be the 1-Lipschitz function \(x \mapsto |x - y|\). Then \(h_t^{-1}(-\infty, t) = B^{nk}(y, t)\) and, by Proposition 5.2, we have

\[
M_{B^{kn}(y,t)}([\Gamma_{y,r}]) \geq \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}((\{\Gamma_{y,r}\}, h_y, s-)) \, ds.
\]

Since

\[
\langle [\Gamma_{y,r}], h_y, s- \rangle = \partial B^{kn}(y,r) \left( [\Gamma_{y,r}], B^{kn}(y,s) \right) - (\partial B^{kn}(y,r)[\Gamma_{y,r}])\cdot B^{kn}(y,s)
\]

and \(\partial B^{kn}(y,r)[\Gamma_{y,s}] = \partial_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}[\Gamma_{y,s}]\) for all \(0 \leq s \leq t < r\), we have

\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,t}]) \geq \frac{1}{n} \int_0^t M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}(\partial_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}[\Gamma_{y,s}]) \, ds
\]
as claimed. \(\square\)

We finish this section with an isoperimetric estimate for the currents \([\Gamma_{y,r}]\) – this is the other key estimate in the proof of the lower Ahlfors bound.

**Lemma 6.11.** Let \(\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n\) be an open subset for \(n \geq 2\), \(k \in \mathbb{N}\), and let \(f_1, \ldots, f_k : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n\) be non-constant \(K\)-quasiregular maps for some \(K \geq 1\) such that \(\max_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) < \infty\). Let \(g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}\) and \(\Gamma = g(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^{kn}\). Let \(y \in \Gamma\) and \(r > 0\) be such that \(g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,r}) \Subset \Omega\). Then there is a constant \(C = C(n) > 0\) depending only on \(n\) such that, for Lebesgue almost every \(t \in (0, r)\), we have

\[
\left( M_{B^{kn}(y,t)}(\partial B^{kn}(y,t)[\Gamma_{y,t}]) \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \geq \frac{M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,t}])}{C(n)K^{n+1}K \min_j N(f_j)}.
\]

**Proof.** For every \(t \in (0, r)\), by Lemmas 6.7, 6.5 and 6.4, we have

\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^{kn}}([\Gamma_{y,t}]) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2}} K K^{n-1} \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{\Omega_{y,t}} J_{f_j} d\mathcal{H}^n,
\]

where \(\Omega_{y,t} = g^{-1}(\Gamma_{y,t})\).
Let \( \psi_t \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \wedge \Omega) \) be a function satisfying \( 0 \leq \psi_t \leq 1 \) and \( \omega_t|\Omega_{g,t} = H^n|\Omega_{g,t} \) as measures, where \( \omega_t = \psi_t \text{vol}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \). Let also \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). Then
\[
\int_{\Omega_{g,t}} J f_j \, dH^n \leq \int_{\Omega_{g,t}} \psi_t(f_j(x)) J f_j(x) \, dH^n(x) = \int_{\Omega_{g,t}} f_j^* \omega_t = \int_{\Omega_{g,t}} g^* \text{pr}_j^* \omega_t
\]
\[
= [\Gamma_{g,t}] (\text{pr}_j^* \omega_t) = ((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]) (\omega_t) \leq M_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]).
\]
Thus
\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^n}([\Gamma_{g,t}]) \leq n^{\frac{n}{2}} K k^{\frac{n}{2} - 1} \left( \min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j) \right) \sum_{j=1}^n M_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]).
\]
Since
\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\partial_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}])) = M_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*\partial_{\mathbb{R}^n}[\Gamma_{g,t}]) \leq M_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\partial_{\mathbb{R}^n}[\Gamma_{g,t}])
\]
for each \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). We show that \((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]\) satisfies the assumptions for the isoperimetric inequality for \( n \)-currents in [5, 4.5.9(31)]. More precisely, we show that \((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]\) is locally normal and satisfies \((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}] = \mathcal{L}^n \perp g \), where \( g: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \) is measurable and compactly supported and \( \mathcal{L}^n \) is the Lebesgue measure in \( \mathbb{R}^n \).

Let \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). Since \( \text{pr}_j \) is 1-Lipschitz, we have
\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]) \leq M_{\mathbb{R}^n}([\Gamma_{g,t}]) < \infty.
\]
By Lemma [6.11], we also have that \( M_{\mathbb{R}^n}([\Gamma_{g,t}]) < \infty \) for almost every \( t \in (0, r) \). Thus
\[
M_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\partial_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}])) = M_{\mathbb{R}^n}((\text{pr}_j)_*\partial_{\mathbb{R}^n}[\Gamma_{g,t}]) \leq M_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\partial_{\mathbb{R}^n}[\Gamma_{g,t}]) < \infty.
\]
Hence \((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}]\) is a normal current for almost every \( t \in (0, r) \).

Let \( \omega \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \wedge \Omega) \). Then, by the change of variables,
\[
((\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}])(\omega) = [\Gamma_{g,t}](\text{pr}_j^* \omega) = \int_{\Omega_{g,t}} g^* \text{pr}_j^* \omega = \int_{\Omega_{g,t}} f_j^* \omega
\]
\[
= \int_{\Omega_{g,t}} N(f_j, z, \Omega_{g,t}) \omega(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} N(f_j, z, \Omega_{g,t}) \chi_{f_j(\Omega_{g,t})} \omega(z).
\]
Thus
\[
(\text{pr}_j)_*[\Gamma_{g,t}] = \mathcal{L}^n \perp u_t,
\]
where \( u_t: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) is the function \( z \mapsto N(f_j, z, \Omega_{g,t}) \chi_{f_j(\Omega_{g,t})} \). Since \( u_t \) has compact support, we conclude that, by the isoperimetric inequality for \( n \)-currents [5, 4.5.9(31)], there exists \( C = C(n) > 0, \) depending only on \( n \), for which \((6.9)\) holds. The claim follows. \( \square \)
6.2.3. Proof of Proposition 6.6. The final ingredient in obtaining the proof of Proposition 6.6 is a variant of the Bihari–LaSalle inequality [1], which in turn is a nonlinear generalization of Grönwall’s inequality.

**Lemma 6.12.** Let $n > 1$ be an integer, $a > 0$, and $C > 0$. Let also $g \in L^{(n-1)/n}([0, a])$ be a function for which $g > 0$ Lebesgue almost everywhere on $(0, a)$ and

$$g(t) \geq C \int_0^t g^{\frac{n-1}{n}}(s) \, ds$$

for almost every $t \in (0, a)$. Then

$$g(t) \geq \left(\frac{C}{n}\right)^n t^n$$

for almost every $t \in (0, a)$.

**Proof.** Let $G : [0, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function

$$t \mapsto C \int_0^t g^{\frac{n-1}{n}}(s) \, ds.$$

Then $G$ is absolutely continuous, non-decreasing on $[0, a]$, and positive on $(0, a)$. Thus,

$$(G^{1/n})' = \frac{G'}{nG^{\frac{n-1}{n}}} = \frac{C g^{\frac{n-1}{n}}}{nG^{\frac{n-1}{n}}} \geq \frac{C}{n}$$

almost everywhere on $[0, a]$. Since $G(0) = 0$, we have for almost every $t \in (0, a)$ that

$$g(t)^{1/n} \geq G(t)^{1/n} - G(0)^{1/n} \geq \int_0^t (G^{1/n})'(s) \, ds \geq \int_0^t \frac{C}{n} \, ds = \frac{C}{n} t.$$

□

**Proof of Proposition 6.6.** By Lemmas 6.10, 6.11, and 6.12, there exists a constant $C = C(n) > 0$, depending only on $n$, for which

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}^n}([\Gamma_{y,r}]) \geq \frac{1}{C k^{\frac{n-1}{2}} K \min_j N(f_j)} \left(\frac{1}{C k^{\frac{n-1}{2}} K \min_j N(f_j)}\right)^{n-1} r^n.$$

Since

$$\left(\min_{j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}} N(f_j)\right) \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \geq \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}^n}([\Gamma_{y,r}])$$

by Lemma 6.4, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \geq \frac{1}{C k^{\frac{n-1}{2}} K \min_j N(f_j)} \cdot \frac{1}{n^m \min_j N(f_j)} r^n$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{C' k^{\frac{n-1}{2}} K^{n-1} (\min_j N(f_j))^n}\right) r^n,$$

where $C = C(n) > 0$ and $C' = C'(n) > 0$ depend only on $n$. The proof is complete. □
7. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.2 using Proposition 6.1. We use the same notation as before. Given a Riemannian $n$-manifold $N$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and a subset $\Gamma \subset N^k$, we denote

$$\Gamma_{y,r} = B_{N^k}(y, r) \cap \Gamma$$

for $y \in N^k$ and $r > 0$.

Our first goal is to prove a small scale version of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 7.1. Let $M$ and $N$ be closed, connected, oriented Riemannian $n$-manifolds, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_k: M \to N$ be non-constant $K$-quasiregular maps $M \to N$. Let also $g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k): M \to N^k$ and $\Gamma = g(M)$. Then there exists $\lambda > 0$ depending only on $N$ and $f_1$ and having the property that, for all $y \in \Gamma$ and $r \in (0, \lambda/4)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{(C(n)k^{\frac{K}{2}}K)^{n-1}} \left( \min_j \deg f_j \right)^n \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq C(n)k^{\frac{K}{2}}K \left( \max_j \deg f_j \right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a finite cover of $M$ by smooth 2-bilipschitz charts $(U, \phi)$ of $M$. For each $x \in M$, there exists a radius $r_x > 0$ having the property that, for each $r \in (0, r_x)$, $U(f_1, x, r_x)$ is a normal neighborhood of $x$ with respect to $f_1$ satisfying $f(U(f_1, x, r)) = B_N(f(x), r)$. Thus there exists a finite cover $\mathcal{N}$ of $N$ by smooth 2-bilipschitz charts $(V, \psi)$ with the property that, for each $(V, \psi) \in \mathcal{N}$, each component of $f_1^{-1}V$ is contained in an element of $\mathcal{M}$.

Let $\lambda > 0$ be a Lebesgue number of $\mathcal{N}$, that is, for every $y \in N$, we have $B_N(y, \lambda) \subset V$ for some $(V, \psi) \in \mathcal{N}$. Note that $\lambda$ depends only on the first map $f_1$, and neither on $k$ nor the remaining maps $f_j$.

Let $x \in M$, $y = g(x)$, and $0 < r < \lambda/4$. We first consider the cube of balls $Q_\lambda = B_N(f_1(x), \lambda) \times \cdots \times B_N(f_k(x), \lambda)$. Then $B_{N^k}(y, r) \subset Q_\lambda$ and, for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, we may fix a chart $(V_j, \psi_j) \in \mathcal{N}$ for which $B_N(f_j(x), \lambda) \subset V_j$. Let also $\sigma = \psi_1 \times \cdots \times \psi_k: Q_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}$ be a 2-bilipschitz embedding.

We note that $g^{-1}Q_\lambda \subset f_1^{-1}V$. Since every component of $f_1^{-1}V$ is contained in a chart of $\mathcal{M}$, there exists a partition $\{W_i\}_{i \in I}$ of $g^{-1}Q_\lambda$ into open sets $W_i \subset U_i$, where $(U_i, \varphi_i) \in \mathcal{M}$ for each $i \in I$. Since we may further assume that the images of $\varphi_i: U_i \to \mathbb{R}^n$ are mutually disjoint, the map $\varphi: g^{-1}Q_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^n$, defined by $\varphi|W_i = \varphi_i|W_i$ for each open set $W_i$, is a locally 2-bilipschitz embedding.

We set now $\Omega = \varphi(g^{-1}Q_\lambda)$ and let $g' = (f'_1, \ldots, f'_k): \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}$ be the map $g' = \sigma \circ g \circ \varphi^{-1}$. Then $f'_j = \psi_j \circ f_j \circ \varphi^{-1}$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Since $\varphi^{-1}$ and each $\psi_j$ is locally 2-bilipschitz, the maps $f'_j$ are $2^{kn}K$-quasiregular.

We are therefore in position to apply Proposition 6.1 on $g'$. We denote $\Gamma'_{y,t} = \sigma(\Gamma \cap Q_\lambda) \cap B^{kn}(\sigma(y), t)$ for $t > 0$, and obtain a constant $C = C(n) > 0$ depending only on $n$ for which

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma'_{y,t}) \leq C(n)k^{\frac{K}{2}}K \left( \max_i \deg f_i \right) t^n.$$
and
\[ H^n(\Gamma_{y,t}) \geq \left( \frac{1}{\min_i \deg f_i} \right)^n \left( \frac{1}{C(n)k^{\frac{n}{2}}K} \right)^{n-1} t^n \]
for each \( t > 0 \) satisfying \((g')^{-1} B^{kn}(\sigma(y), t) \subseteq \Omega\).

Since \( \sigma \) is a 2-bilipschitz embedding, we have
\[ B^{kn}(\sigma(y), r/2) \subset \sigma(B_{N^k}(y, r)) \subset B^{kn}(\sigma(y), 2r). \]

Therefore,
\[ 2^{-n} H^n(\Gamma_{y,r/2}) \leq H^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq 2^n H^n(\Gamma_{y,2r}). \]

It suffices now to show that \((g')^{-1} B^{kn}(\sigma(y), 2r)\) is compactly contained in \( \varphi(U) \). For this, note first that \( \sigma^{-1} B^{kn}(\sigma(y), 2r) \subset B_{N^k}(y, 4r) \). Since \( g^{-1} B_{N^k}(y, 4r) \) is a closed subset of the closed manifold \( M \), it is compact. Since \( B_{N^k}(y, 4r) \subset Q_\lambda \), we have that \( g^{-1} B_{N^k}(y, 4r) \subset g^{-1} Q_\lambda \). Thus \((g')^{-1} B^{kn}(\sigma(y), 2r)\) is contained in the compact subset \( \varphi(g^{-1} B_{N^k}(y, 4r)) \) of \( \Omega \).

\[ \square \]

7.1. **Large scale estimates.** In order to prove Theorem 1.2, it remains to extend the estimate of Lemma 7.1 to the radii \( r \) satisfying \( \lambda/4 \leq r \leq \text{diam} \, \Gamma \).

The following lemma completes the proof of the Ahlfors lower bound in Theorem 1.2.

**Lemma 7.2.** Let \( M \) and \( N \) be closed, connected, oriented Riemannian \( n \)-manifolds, and let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k : M \to N \) be non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps \( M \to N \). Let also \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : M \to N^k \) and \( \Gamma = g(M) \). Then there exists a constant \( C = C(n, f_1, M, N) > 0 \), depending only on \( n, f_1, M, N \), with the property that, for each \( y \in \Gamma \) and all \( r \in (0, \text{diam} \, \Gamma) \),
\[ H^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \geq \frac{1}{(Ck^{\frac{n}{2}}K)^{(n-1)}(\min_j \deg f_j)^n} r^n. \]

**Proof.** Let \( \lambda > 0 \) be as in Lemma 7.1. It suffices to consider radii \( \lambda/4 \leq r \leq \text{diam} \, \Gamma \).

Since \( \text{diam} \, \Gamma \leq \text{diam} \, N^k = k^{1/2} \text{diam} \, N \), we have that \( r/(k^{1/2} \text{diam} \, N) \leq 1 \) and \( 4r/\lambda \geq 1 \). Now, by Lemma 7.1, there exist constants \( C = C(n, \lambda) > 0 \) and \( C' = C'(n, \lambda, \text{diam} \, N) > 0 \) for which
\[ H^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \geq H^n(\Gamma_{y,\lambda/8}) \]
\[ \geq C(n, \lambda)^{-1} k^{-\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} K^{-(n-1)} \left( \min_i \deg f_i \right)^{n-1} r^n \]
\[ \geq C'(n, \lambda, \text{diam} \, N)^{-1} k^{-\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} K^{-(n-1)} \left( \min_i \deg f_i \right)^{n-1} r^n. \]

Hence, we have obtained the lower bound of Theorem 1.2. Moreover, since \( \lambda \) only depends on \( f_1 \) and the Riemannian metrics on \( M \) and \( N \), we have that \( C'(n, \lambda, \text{diam} \, N) \) only depends on \( n, f_1, M, \) and \( N \), and not on \( k \) or the other maps \( f_i \). \[ \square \]
For the upper bound, a similar observation as in the proof of the lower bound yields
\[ \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma) \leq \frac{4^n}{\lambda^n} \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma) r^n. \]
Hence, the problem of the upper bound reduces to estimating the Hausdorff measure \( \mathcal{H}^n \) of the entire set \( \Gamma \), and hence to a global counterpart of Lemma 6.2 on closed manifolds. We state this as follows.

**Lemma 7.3.** Let \( M \) and \( N \) be closed, connected, oriented Riemannian \( n \)-manifolds, and let \( f_1, \ldots, f_k : M \to N \) be non-constant \( K \)-quasiregular maps \( M \to N \). Let also \( g = (f_1, \ldots, f_k) : M \to N^k \) and \( \Gamma = g(M) \). Then there exists a constant \( C = C(n) > 0 \), depending only on \( n \), for which
\[
(7.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma) \leq C k^{\frac{n}{2}} K \left( \max_j \deg f_j \right) \mathcal{H}^n(N).
\]

The upper bound for the Hausdorff measure in Theorem 1.2 follows now almost immediately using Lemma 7.3 and the same observation as in the proof of the lower bound. We record the final piece of the proof of Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** By Lemma 7.2, it remains to show that, there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) depending only on \( n, M, N, \) and \( f_1 \) for which
\[
(7.2) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma(y,r)) \leq C k^{\frac{n}{2}} K \left( \max_j \deg f_j \right) r^n.
\]
Let \( \lambda > 0 \) be as in Lemma 7.1.

We consider two cases. By Lemma 7.1 there exists a constant \( C' = C'(n) > 0 \) depending only on \( n \) for which \( C' \) holds for \( r \in (0, \lambda/4) \).

Suppose now that \( r \geq \lambda/4 \). Then by Lemma 7.3 there exists a constant \( C'' = C''(n) \), depending only on \( n \), for which
\[
\mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma_{y,r}) \leq \frac{4^n}{\lambda^n} \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma) \cdot r^n \\
\leq \frac{4^n}{\lambda^n} \cdot C'' \cdot \mathcal{H}^n(N) \cdot k^{\frac{n}{2}} K \left( \max_j \deg f_j \right) \cdot r^n \\
= C''' k^{\frac{n}{2}} K \left( \max_j \deg f_j \right) \cdot r^n,
\]
where the constant \( C''' \) depends only on \( n, \lambda, \) and \( N \). Since \( \lambda \) depends only on \( f_1 \) and the Riemannian metrics on \( M \) and \( N \), it suffices to take the maximum of the obtained constants \( C' \) and \( C'' \). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

It remains to prove Lemma 7.3. Since we were unable to locate a suitable version of the area formula for continuous Sobolev maps between closed manifolds, we give a hands-on proof based on the area formula for Sobolev functions in charts. For this reason, we begin by recalling a version of the Vitali covering theorem.

**Theorem 7.4.** Let \( M \) be a Riemannian \( n \)-manifold and, for every \( x \in M \), let \( r_x > 0 \). Then there exists an at most countable collection of disjoint open
balls $B = \{B_1, B_2, \ldots\}$ for which every ball $B_i = B_M(x_i, r_i)$ in the collection satisfies $r_i < r_{x_i}$ and the set $M \setminus \bigcup B$ has $\mathcal{H}^n$-measure zero.

Proof. A version for closed balls follows from Federer [3, Theorem 2.8.18 and Section 2.8.9] (see also Heinonen [11, Example 1.15 (c) and (f)]). An open ball version follows since every small enough closed ball on $M$ has a boundary of measure zero. \hfill \Box

We are now ready for the proof of Lemma 7.3.

Proof of Lemma 7.3. For each $x \in M$, let

$$r_x = \sup \{r > 0 : g(B_M(x, r)) \subset B_{Nk}(g(x), \lambda/4)\}.$$  

Since $g$ is continuous, we have $r_x > 0$ for every $x \in M$. Let $B$ be a countable family of balls as in the Vitali covering theorem 7.4.

Let $B \in B$. By the same construction as in Lemma 7.1 we obtain 2-bilipschitz embeddings $\varphi : B \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma = \psi_1 \times \cdots \times \psi_k : g(B) \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}$, where mappings $\psi_j$ are smooth 2-bilipschitz charts on $N$. Let also again $g' = (f'_1, \ldots, f'_k) : \varphi(B) \to \mathbb{R}^{kn}$ be the map with $2^{4n}K$-quasiregular component functions $r'_j = \psi_j \circ f_j \circ \varphi^{-1}$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Hence, we may use Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4 to obtain a constant $C = C(n) > 0$, depending only on $n$, for which

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\sigma(g(B))) \leq \int_{\sigma(g(B))} N(g', y', \varphi(B)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(y')$$

$$\leq C(n) k^{\frac{n}{2} - 1} K \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\varphi(B)} J_{f'_j}(x') \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x').$$

Since $\sigma$ is a 2-bilipschitz embedding, we have

$$\mathcal{H}^n(g(B)) \leq 2^n \mathcal{H}^n(\sigma(g(B))).$$

Moreover, we may also estimate

$$\int_{\varphi(B)} J_{f'_j}(x') \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x') = \int_{\varphi(B)} J_{\psi_j \circ f_j}(\varphi^{-1}(x')) J_{\varphi^{-1}}(x') \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x')$$

$$= \int_B J_{\psi_j \circ f_j}(z) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(z) = \int_B J_{\psi_j}(f_j(z)) J_{f_j}(z) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(z)$$

$$\leq 2^n \int_B J_{f_j}(z) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(z).$$

Now, by combining these estimates for all $B \in B$ and absorbing the constants into $C(n)$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^n(g(\bigcup B)) \leq C(n) k^{\frac{n}{2} - 1} K \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{\bigcup B} J_{f_j} \, d\mathcal{H}^n$$

$$\leq C(n) k^{\frac{n}{2}} K \left( \max_j \int_M J_{f_j} \, d\mathcal{H}^n \right)$$

$$= C(n) k^{\frac{n}{2}} K \left( \max_j \deg f_j \right) \mathcal{H}^n(N).$$
Finally, since $g$ satisfies the Lusin condition, we have that $g(\cup B)$ has full $\mathcal{H}^n$-measure in $\Gamma$, and the claim follows. \hfill \Box

8. The entropy upper bound: Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we conclude the proof of the entropy equality $h(f) = \log \deg f$. We give first the entropy upper bound in the case of quasiregular self-maps and then finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. The argument is otherwise the same as in [7, Chapter 5].

In the following theorem, we use the notation $K(f)$ for the smallest distortion constant of the quasiregular map $f : M \to M$.

**Theorem 8.1.** Let $f : M \to M$ be a $K$-quasiregular self-map on a closed, oriented, and Riemannian $n$-manifold $M$. Then

$$h(f) \leq \log \deg f + n \cdot \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log K(f^k)}{k} \leq \log \deg f + n \log K.$$

**Proof.** Let $M$ be a closed, connected, and oriented Riemannian $n$-manifold, $n \geq 2$, $K \geq 1$, and let $f : M \to M$ be a non-constant $K$-quasiregular self-map. Recall that, by Theorem 3.1,

$$h(f) = h(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)}) \leq \log(v(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)})) - \log(\log(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)})),$$

where $\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)} = (\text{id}_M, f)(M) \subset M^2$ is the graph of $f$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $g_k := (\text{id}_M, f, f^2, \ldots, f^k) : M \to M^{k+1}$ and

$$\Gamma_{g_k} := g_k(M) = \text{Chain}_k(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)}).$$

By Theorem 1.2, there exists $C = C(n) > 0$, depending only on $n$, such that, for each $y \in \text{Chain}_k(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)})$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \text{diam}(M))$,

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)}) \cap D_{k, \infty}(y, \varepsilon)) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^n}{C \cdot (k + 1)^{n+2} (K(f^k))^{n-1}}.$$

Thus

$$- \log v(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)}) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log(C \cdot (k + 1)^{n+2} (K(f^k))^{n-1} \varepsilon^{-n})}{k}$$

(8.1)

$$= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \limsup_{k \to \infty} \left( \frac{n-1}{k} \log K(f^k) \right)$$

$$= (n-1) \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log K(f^k)}{k}.$$

On the other hand, we have either by Theorem 1.2 or by Lemma 7.3 that

$$\mathcal{H}^n(\text{Chain}_k(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)})) \leq C \cdot (k + 1)^n K(f^k)(\deg f)^k \cdot (\text{diam}(M))^n.$$

Thus

$$\log v(\Gamma_{(\text{id}_M, f)}) \leq \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \log(C \cdot (k + 1)^n K(f^k)(\deg f)^k \cdot (\text{diam}(M))^n)$$

(8.2)

$$= \log \deg f + \limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log K(f^k)}{k}.$$
Combining the estimates (8.1) and (8.2), we obtain the upper bound
\[ h(f) \leq \text{lov}(\Gamma_{\text{id}_M,f}) - \text{lodn}(\Gamma_{\text{id}_M,f}) \leq \log \deg f + n \frac{\log(K(f^k))}{k}. \]

Since \( K(f^k) \leq K^k \), the proof is complete. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** The lower bound \( h(f) \geq \log \deg f \) follows from the variational principle and the lower bound \( h_{\mu_f}(f) \geq \log \deg f \) in Proposition 4.1 for the invariant measure \( \mu_f \). Thus it remains to prove the upper bound using the variant of Gromov’s argument we discussed in the previous section. Since \( K(f^k) \leq K \) for each \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), the upper bound \( h(f) \leq \log \deg f \) follows immediately from Theorem 8.1. \( \square \)
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