

REALIZATION OF MANIFOLDS AS LEAVES USING GRAPH COLORINGS

JESÚS A. ÁLVAREZ LÓPEZ AND RAMÓN BARRAL LIJÓ

ABSTRACT. It is proved that any (repetitive) Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry can be realized as a leaf of some (minimal) Riemannian matchbox manifold without holonomy. Our methods can be adapted to achieve Cantor transversals or a prescribed holonomy covering, but losing the density of our leaf.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper relates to the study of which connected manifolds can be realized as leaves of foliations on compact manifolds, a question that Sondow [46] and Sullivan [47] first posed in the seventies. A manifold is called a *leaf* or a *non-leaf* depending on whether it can be realized or not. Typically, we restrict our attention to a particular class of foliations (say, of a given codimension or differentiability class), and then the literature abounds with known results. The most prominent setting is perhaps codimension one, where Ghys [23], Inaba *et al.* [29], and Schweitzer and Souza [43] have constructed non-leaves of dimension 3 and higher; on the other hand, Cantwell and Conlon [15] have shown that any open connected surface is a leaf. More recently, Meniño Cotón and Schweitzer [34] have pioneered the use of exotic differential structures to produce novel examples of non-leaves.

One can try sprinkling some geometry on top of this question by noticing first that a leaf on a compact Riemannian manifold is of bounded geometry; moreover, its quasi-isometry type is independent of the ambient Riemannian metric. We obtain thus a variation of the original realization problem: Which connected Riemannian manifolds of bounded geometry are quasi-isometric to leaves of foliations on compact Riemannian manifolds? Again, results and techniques are plentiful, including the works of Phillips and Sullivan [37], Januszkiewicz [30], Cantwell and Conlon [12–14], Cass [16], Schweitzer [41,42], Attie and Hurder [9], and Zeghib [48].

Considering more general ambient spaces, one can also study which manifolds can be realized as leaves on compact Polish foliated spaces, where the differentiable structure and the Riemannian metric are available only in the leafwise direction. Schweitzer and Souza [44] have constructed connected Riemannian manifolds of bounded geometry that are not quasi-isometric to leaves in compact equicontinuous foliated spaces; Hurder and Lukina have used a coarse quasi-isometric invariant, the coarse entropy, to estimate the Hausdorff dimension of local transversals when applied to leaves of compact foliated spaces; and Lukina [33] has studied the Hausdorff dimension of local transversals in a foliated space.

Leaves of compact foliated spaces with leafwise Riemannian metrics are always of bounded geometry. The authors have proved that, in this setting, the converse statement is also true: every connected Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry is isometric to a leaf without holonomy in a compact Riemannian foliated space ([4, Theorem 1.1], see also [6, Theorem 1.5] and [3]).

Our main contribution is a strengthening of this last result.

Theorem 1.1. *Any (repetitive) connected Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry is isometric to a leaf in a (minimal) Riemannian matchbox manifold without holonomy.*

The improvement over [4, Theorem 1.1] is twofold: we realize our leaf in a matchbox manifold—i.e., a foliated space with totally disconnected transversals—and we manage to trivialize the holonomy group of every leaf. Our interest in minimal matchbox manifolds without holonomy stems from the work of Clark, Hurder and Lukina ([19], see also [2]), where they prove that these are inverse limits of compact branched

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 57R30. Secondary: 05C15.

Key words and phrases. foliated space, leaf, bounded geometry, limit aperiodic, repetitive.

manifolds. This description was purportedly generalized to arbitrary matchbox manifolds in [32], but it has since been acknowledged that the proof is not correct.

For example, Theorem 1.1 can be applied to any complete connected hyperbolic manifold with positive injectivity radius, or to any connected Lie group with a left invariant metric. Some of them are not coarsely quasi-isometric to any finitely generated group [17,22], yielding compact, minimal, Riemannian matchbox manifolds without holonomy whose leaves are isometric to each other, but not coarsely quasi-isometric to any finitely generated group.

Since any smooth C^∞ manifold admits a metric of bounded geometry [25], Theorem 1.1 implies that any C^∞ connected manifold can be realized as a leaf of a C^∞ matchbox manifold without holonomy. This includes, for instance, the exotic non-leaves in codimension one constructed in [34].

In the following consequences of Theorem 1.1, the realization of a Riemannian manifold as a leaf is achieved with some additional properties, but losing the density of that leaf.

Corollary 1.2. *Any non-compact connected Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry is isometric to a leaf in some Riemannian matchbox manifold without holonomy with a complete transversal homeomorphic to a Cantor space.*

Note that, since minimal matchbox manifolds have complete Cantor transversals, Corollary 1.2 is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 if the manifold is repetitive, but not in the general case (Section 3.3).

Corollary 1.3. *Let M be a connected Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry, and let \widetilde{M} be a regular covering of M . Then M is isometric to a leaf with holonomy covering \widetilde{M} in a compact Riemannian matchbox manifold.*

Describing the pairs (M, \widetilde{M}) that satisfy the statement of Corollary 1.3 with a minimal compact foliated space seems less feasible. In this regard, Cass [16] has given a quasi-isometric property satisfied by the leaves of compact minimal foliated spaces with no restriction on the holonomy.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 proceeds in two steps. We begin in Theorem 3.1 by realizing M as a dense leaf of a (minimal) compact Riemannian foliated space \mathfrak{X} without holonomy. This step mirrors the techniques used in [4, Theorem 1.1], where we realize manifolds in a universal space $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*$ consisting of triples $[M, x, f]$, where M is a connected Riemannian n -manifold, $x \in M$ and $f: M \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is a smooth function taking values in a separable Hilbert space. The idea is, given a candidate manifold M , to find a suitable f so that the closure of $\{[M, x, f] \mid x \in M\}$ is the desired foliated space containing M as a leaf. In the construction of f (Proposition 3.3), an important role is played by a Delone subset $X \subset M$, which becomes a (repetitive) connected graph of finite degree by attaching an edge between any pair of close enough points. Then f is defined using normal coordinates at the points of X , and a (repetitive) limit aperiodic coloring ϕ of X by finitely many colors. The existence of ϕ is guaranteed by [5, Theorem 1.4].

The second step of the proof constructs a (minimal) matchbox manifold \mathfrak{M} without holonomy and a foliated projection $\pi: \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ whose restrictions to the leaves are diffeomorphisms (Theorem 3.4). Then \mathfrak{X} can be replaced with \mathfrak{M} by considering the lift of the Riemannian metric of \mathfrak{X} to \mathfrak{M} . To obtain \mathfrak{M} , we introduce a totally disconnected extension of the transversal dynamical system associated to \mathfrak{M} , a technique that is most commonly used in the context of actions of countable groups on compact spaces (see [20] and the references therein¹). This idea is implemented by using again the space $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*$.

The proofs of Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3 use the following common procedure: Let $E \rightarrow M$ be a Polish flat bundle with non-compact, locally compact fibers. Realize the manifold M in \mathfrak{M} as above, and then glue E to \mathfrak{M} , obtaining a new compact foliated space \mathfrak{M}' (Section 3.3); choosing E appropriately in each case, \mathfrak{M}' satisfies the property stated in the corresponding corollary.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Partitioned spaces. If X is a topological space equipped with an equivalence relation \mathcal{R} , then we call (X, \mathcal{R}) a *partitioned space*.

Lemma 2.1. *If the saturation of any open subset of X is open, then the closure of any saturated subset of X is saturated.*

¹We thank an anonymous referee for pointing out this connection

Proof. For any saturated $A \subset X$, let $x \in \overline{A}$ and $y \in \mathcal{R}(x)$. For every open neighborhood U of y , its saturation $\mathcal{R}(U)$ is an open neighborhood of x , and therefore $\mathcal{R}(U) \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Since A is saturated, it follows that $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$. This shows that $y \in \overline{A}$, and therefore \overline{A} is saturated. \square

The properties indicated in Lemma 2.1 are well known for the equivalence relations defined by continuous group actions or foliated structures.

Like in the case of group actions or foliations, a *minimal set* A in X is a non-empty closed saturated subset that is minimal among the sets with these properties. Minimality is achieved just when every equivalence class in A is dense in A .

Given another partitioned space (Y, \mathcal{S}) , a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be *relation-preserving* if $f(\mathcal{R}(x)) \subset \mathcal{S}(f(x))$ for all $x \in X$. The notation $f : (X, \mathcal{R}) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{S})$ is used in this case.

2.2. Metric spaces. Let X be a metric space. For $x \in X$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $S(x, r) = \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) = r\}$, $B(x, r) = \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) < r\}$ and $D(x, r) = \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) \leq r\}$ (the sphere, and the open and closed balls of center x and radius r). For $x \in X$ and $0 \leq r \leq s$, let $C(x, r, s) = B(x, s) \setminus D(x, r)$ (The *open corona* of inner radius r and outer radius s). We may add X as a subindex to all of this notation if necessary. It is said that Q is *(K-) separated* if there is some $K > 0$ such that $d(x, y) \geq K$ for all $x \neq y$ in Q . On the other hand, Q is said to be *(C-) relatively dense*² in X if there is some $C > 0$ such that $\text{CPen}(Q, C) = X$. A separated relatively dense subset is called a *Delone* subset.

Lemma 2.2. *If $X = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_n$, where $Q_0 \subset Q_1 \subset \dots$ and every Q_n is K -separated, then X is K -separated.*

Proof. Given $x \neq y$ in X , we have $x, y \in Q_n$ for some n , and therefore $d(x, y) \geq K$. \square

Lemma 2.3 (Álvarez-Candel [7, Proof of Lemma 2.1]). *A maximal K -separated subset of X is K -relatively dense.*

Lemma 2.3 has the following easy consequence using Zorn's lemma.

Corollary 2.4 (Cf. [8, Lemma 2.3 and Remark 2.4]). *Any K -separated subset of X is contained in some maximal K -separated K -relatively dense subset.*

Recall that X is said to be *proper* if its bounded sets are relatively compact; i.e., the map $d(x, \cdot) : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is proper for any $x \in X$.

Definition 2.5. For $A \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, a subset $B \subset X$ is called an ε -*perturbation* of A if there is a bijection $h : A \rightarrow B$ such that $d(x, h(x)) \leq \varepsilon$ for every $x \in A$.

The following result is an elementary consequence of the triangle inequality.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $A \subset X$ and let $B \subset X$ be an ε -perturbation of A . If A is η -relatively dense in X for $\eta > 0$, then B is $(\eta + \varepsilon)$ -relatively dense in X . If A is τ -separated for $\tau > 2\varepsilon$, then B is $(\tau - 2\varepsilon)$ -separated.*

2.3. Riemannian manifolds. Let M be a connected complete Riemannian n -manifold, g its metric tensor, d its distance function, ∇ its Levi-Civita connection, R its curvature tensor, $\text{inj}(x)$ its injectivity radius at $x \in M$, and $\text{inj} = \inf_{x \in M} \text{inj}(x)$ (its injectivity radius). If necessary, we may add “ M ” as a subindex or superindex to this notation, or the subindex or superindex “ i ” when a family of Riemannian manifolds M_i is considered. Since M is complete, it is proper as metric space.

Let $T^{(0)}M = M$, and $T^{(m)}M = TT^{(m-1)}M$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. If $l < j$, then $T^{(l)}M$ is sometimes identified with a regular submanifold of $T^{(m)}M$ via zero sections. Any C^m map between Riemannian manifolds, $h : M \rightarrow M'$, induces a map $h_*^{(m)} : T^{(m)}M \rightarrow T^{(m)}M'$ defined by $h_*^{(0)} = h$ and $h_*^{(m)} = (h_*^{(m-1)})_*$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

The Levi-Civita connection determines a decomposition $T^{(2)}M = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{V}$, as direct sum of the horizontal and vertical subbundles. Consider the *Sasaki metric* $g^{(1)}$ on TM , which is the unique Riemannian metric such that $\mathcal{H} \perp \mathcal{V}$ and the canonical identities $\mathcal{H}_\xi \equiv T_\xi M \equiv \mathcal{V}_\xi$ are isometries for every $\xi \in TM$. For $m \geq 2$, consider the *Sasaki metric* $g^{(m)} = (g^{(m-1)})^{(1)}$ on $T^{(m)}M$. The notation $d^{(m)}$ is used for the corresponding distance function, and the corresponding open and closed balls of center $v \in T^{(m)}M$ and radius $r > 0$ are denoted by $B^{(m)}(v, r)$ and $D^{(m)}(v, r)$. For $l < j$, $T^{(l)}M$ is totally geodesic in $T^{(m)}M$ and $g^{(m)}|_{T^{(l)}M} = g^{(l)}$.

²A C -net is similarly defined with the penumbra. If reference to C is omitted, both concepts are equivalent.

Let $D \subset M$ be a compact domain³ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The C^m tensors on D of a fixed type form a Banach space with the norm $\| \cdot \|_{C^m, D, g}$ defined by

$$\|A\|_{C^m, D, g} = \max_{0 \leq l \leq m, x \in D} |\nabla^l A(x)|.$$

By taking the projective limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$, we get the Fréchet space of C^∞ tensors on D of that type equipped with the C^∞ topology (see e.g. [28]). Similar definitions apply to the space of C^m or C^∞ functions on M with values in a separable Hilbert space (of finite or infinite dimension).

Recall that a C^1 map between Riemannian manifolds, $h: M \rightarrow M'$, is called a (λ) -quasi-isometry if there is some $\lambda \geq 1$ such that $\lambda^{-1}|v| \leq |h_*(v)| \leq \lambda|v|$ for all $v \in TM$.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, a partial map $h: M \rightarrow M'$ is called a C^m local diffeomorphism if $\text{dom } h$ and $\text{im } h$ are open in M and M' , respectively, and $h: \text{dom } h \rightarrow \text{im } h$ is a C^m diffeomorphism. If moreover $h(x) = x'$ for distinguished points, $x \in \text{dom } h$ and $x' \in \text{im } h$, then h is said to be *pointed*, and the notation $h: (M, x) \rightarrow (M', x')$ is used. The term (*pointed*) *local homeomorphism* is used in the C^0 case.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R > 0$ and $\lambda \geq 1$, an (m, R, λ) -pointed partial quasi-isometry⁴ (or simply an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i.) is a pointed partial map $h: (M, x) \rightarrow (M', x')$, with $\text{dom } h = D(x, R)$, which can be extended to a C^{m+1} -diffeomorphism \tilde{h} between open subsets such that $D_M^{(m)}(x, R) \subset \text{dom } \tilde{h}_*^{(m)}$ and $\tilde{h}_*^{(m)}$ is a λ -quasi-isometry of some neighborhood of $D_M^{(m)}(x, R)$ in $T^{(m)}M$ to $T^{(m)}M'$. The following result has an elementary proof.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $h: (M, x) \rightarrow (M, y)$ be an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. and $h': (M, x) \rightarrow (M, y')$ an (m', R', λ') -p.p.q.i. Then $h^{-1}: (M, y) \rightarrow (M, x)$ is an $(m, \lambda^{-1}R, \lambda)$ -p.p.q.i. If $m' \geq m$ and $R\lambda + d(x, y) \leq R'$, then $h'h: (M, x) \rightarrow (M, h'(y))$ is an $(m, R, \lambda\lambda')$ -p.p.q.i.*

In the following two results, E is a (real) Hilbert bundle over M , equipped with an orthogonal connection ∇ . Let $C^m(M; E)$ denote the space of its C^m sections ($m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$), and E_x its fiber over any $x \in M$.

Proposition 2.8 (Cf. [6, Proposition 3.11]). *Let $\mathcal{S} \subset C^{m+1}(M; E)$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $x_0 \in M$. Then \mathcal{S} is precompact in $C^m(M; E)$ if*

- (i) $\sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sup_D |\nabla^k s| < \infty$ for every compact subset $D \subset M$ and $1 \leq k \leq m+1$; and
- (ii) $\{(\nabla^k s)(x_0) \mid s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ is precompact in⁵ $E_{x_0} \otimes \bigotimes_k T_{x_0}^* M$ for all $0 \leq k \leq m$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on m . Consider the case $m = 0$. From (i) for $k = 1$, it follows that \mathcal{S} is equicontinuous on the interior of D , and therefore on M because D is an arbitrary compact subset. Moreover (ii) for $k = 0$ states that $\{s(x_0) \mid s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ is precompact in E_{x_0} . So \mathcal{S} is precompact in $C(M; E)$ by the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem.

Now assume that $m \geq 1$ and the result is true for $m-1$. Given $x \in M$, $0 \leq t, u \leq 1$ and a piecewise smooth path $c: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ from x_0 to x , let $P_{c,t}^u: E_{c(t)} \rightarrow E_{c(u)}$ be the ∇ -parallel transport along c from u to t . For any $e \in E_{x_0}$ and $\alpha \in C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M)$, let

$$Q_c(e, \alpha) = P_{c,0}^1(e) + \int_0^1 P_{c,t}^1 \alpha(c'(t)) dt \in E_x.$$

This expression defines a continuous map $Q_c: E_{x_0} \times C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M) \rightarrow E_x$. In particular, for any $s \in C^m(M; E)$, we have

$$Q_c(s(x_0), \nabla s) = s(x) \tag{2.1}$$

because

$$P_{c,t}^1 \nabla_{c'(t)} s = P_{c,t}^1 \frac{d}{du} P_{c,u}^t s c(u)|_{u=t} = \frac{d}{du} P_{c,u}^1 s c(u)|_{u=t}$$

if c is smooth at t .

Let

$$T: C^m(M; E) \rightarrow E_{x_0} \times C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M)$$

³A regular submanifold of the same dimension as M , possibly with boundary.

⁴The extension \tilde{h} is an (m, R, λ) -pointed local quasi-isometry, as defined in [4]. On the other hand, any (m, R, λ) -pointed local quasi-isometry defines an (m, R, λ) -pointed partial quasi-isometry by restriction. Thus both notions are equivalent.

⁵ $E_{x_0} \otimes \bigotimes_k T_{x_0}^* M \equiv \text{Hom}(\bigotimes_k T_{x_0} M, E_{x_0})$ is endowed with the topology of uniform convergence over bounded subsets, induced by the operator norm. It agrees with the topology of pointwise convergence because $\dim \bigotimes_k T_{x_0} M < \infty$.

be defined by $T(s) = (s(x_0), \nabla s)$, and let $\Omega(M, x_0)$ denote the set of piecewise smooth loops $d : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ based at x_0 .

Claim 1. The following properties hold:

(a) We have

$$\text{im } T = \{ (e, \alpha) \in E_{x_0} \times C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M) \mid Q_d(e, \alpha) = e \ \forall d \in \Omega(M, x_0) \}.$$

(b) T is a closed embedding, and $T^{-1} : \text{im } T \rightarrow C^m(M; E)$ is given by $T^{-1}(e, \alpha)(x) = Q_c(e, \alpha)$, where $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is any piecewise smooth path from x_0 to x .

If $(e, \alpha) \in \text{im } T$, then $Q_d(e, \alpha) = e$ for all $d \in \Omega(M, x_0)$ by (2.1).

Now suppose that $Q_d(e, \alpha) = e$ for all $d \in \Omega(M, x_0)$. Then a section $s \in C^m(M; E)$ is well defined by $s(x) = Q_c(e, \alpha)$, where $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is any piecewise smooth path from x_0 to x . By choosing the constant path at x_0 , it follows that $s(x_0) = e$. On the other hand, given $x \in M$ and $X \in T_x M$, there is a piecewise smooth path $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ from x_0 to x with $c'(1) = X$. Hence, using the path $c_u : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$, $c_u(r) = c(ur)$, and the change of variable $t = ur$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_X s &= \frac{d}{du} P_{c,u}^1 s(c(u)) \Big|_{u=1} = \frac{d}{du} P_{c,u}^1 \left(P_{c_u,0}^u(e) + \int_0^1 P_{c_u,r}^u \alpha(c'_u(r)) dr \right) \Big|_{u=1} \\ &= \frac{d}{du} P_{c,u}^1 \left(P_{c,0}^u(e) + \int_0^u P_{c,t}^u \alpha(c'(t)) dt \right) \Big|_{u=1} = \frac{d}{du} \left(P_{c,0}^1(e) + \int_0^u P_{c,t}^1 \alpha(c'(t)) dt \right) \Big|_{u=1} = \alpha(X). \end{aligned}$$

So $\nabla s = \alpha$, and therefore $Ts = (e, \alpha)$. Thus $(e, \alpha) \in \text{im } T$, completing the proof of (a).

The above argument also shows that T is injective, and $T^{-1} : \text{im } T \rightarrow C^m(M; E)$ is given by $T^{-1}(e, \alpha)(x) = Q_c(e, \alpha)$, where $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ is any piecewise smooth path from x_0 to x . Thus $T^{-1} : \text{im } T \rightarrow C^m(M; E)$ is continuous, showing that T is an embedding.

Finally, $\text{im } T$ is closed by (a) and the continuity of $Q_d : E_{x_0} \times C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M) \rightarrow E_{x_0}$ for every $d \in \Omega(M, x_0)$. Thus T is also a closed map, and the proof of Claim 1 is finished.

By Claim 1, it is enough to prove that $T(\mathcal{S})$ is precompact in $E_{x_0} \times C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M)$. But

$$T(\mathcal{S}) \subset \{ s(x_0) \mid s \in \mathcal{S} \} \times \nabla(\mathcal{S}),$$

where the first factor is already known to be precompact in E_{x_0} . On the other hand, we have $\nabla(\mathcal{S}) \subset C^m(M; E \otimes T^*M)$, and this subspace satisfies (i) for $1 \leq k \leq m$ and (ii) for $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. So $\nabla(\mathcal{S})$ is precompact in $C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M)$ by the induction hypothesis. Thus $T(\mathcal{S})$ is precompact in $E_{x_0} \times C^{m-1}(M; E \otimes T^*M)$ because it is contained in a precompact subspace. \square

Corollary 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{S} \subset C^\infty(M; E)$ and $x_0 \in M$. Then \mathcal{S} is precompact in $C^\infty(M; E)$ if and only if conditions (i) and (ii) in Proposition 2.8 are satisfied for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. The “only if” part follows from the continuity of the operators

$$\nabla^k : C^\infty(M; E) \rightarrow C^\infty\left(M; E \otimes \bigotimes_k T^*M\right).$$

The “if” part is true by Proposition 2.8 since $C^\infty(M; E) = \bigcap_m C^m(M; E)$ with the inverse limit topology. \square

Recall that M is said to be of *bounded geometry* if $\text{inj}_M > 0$ and $\sup_M |\nabla^m R_M| < \infty$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For a given manifold M of bounded geometry, the optimal bounds of the previous inequalities will be referred to as the *geometric bounds* of M . Let $B_r = B_{\mathbb{R}^n}(0, r)$ ($r > 0$).

Proposition 2.10 (See [39, Theorem A.1], [40, Theorem 2.5], [38, Proposition 2.4], [21]). *M is of bounded geometry if and only if there is some $0 < r_0 < \text{inj}_M$ such that, for normal parametrizations $\kappa_x : B_{r_0} \rightarrow B_M(x, r_0)$ ($x \in M$), the corresponding metric coefficients, g_{ij} and g^{ij} , as a family of C^∞ functions on B_{r_0} parametrized by x , i and j , lie in a bounded subset of the Fréchet space $C^\infty(B_{r_0})$.*

Proposition 2.11 (See the proof of [40, Proposition 3.2], [45, A1.2 and A1.3]). *Suppose that M is of bounded geometry. For every $\tau > 0$, there is some map $c : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, depending only on τ and the geometric bounds of M , such that, for any τ -separated subset $X \subset M$, and all $x \in M$ and $\delta > 0$, we have $|D(x, \delta) \cap X| \leq c(\delta)$.*

Proposition 2.12. *Let X be a τ -separated η -relatively dense subset of a manifold of bounded geometry M for some $0 < \tau < \eta$. Given $0 < \varepsilon < \tau/2$ and $\sigma > 0$, let $\tau' = \tau - 2\varepsilon$ and $\eta' = \eta + \varepsilon$. Then there is some $0 < P = P(\varepsilon) < \sigma$, depending only on $\tau, \varepsilon, \sigma$ and the geometric bounds of M , such that $P(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and, for every $0 < \rho < P$ and $A \subset X$ satisfying $d(a, b) \notin (\sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho)$ for all $a, b \in A$, there is an ε -perturbation $X' \subset M$ of X satisfying $A \subset X'$ and $d(x', y') \notin (\sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho)$ for all $x', y' \in X'$. In particular, X' is τ' -separated and η' -relatively dense.*

Proof. By Propositions 2.10 and 2.11, the following properties hold:

- (a) There are $C, P_0 > 0$ such that every τ' -separated subset $Y \subset M$ satisfies $|Y \cap D(y, \sigma + \rho + \tau/2)| \leq C$ for all $y \in Y$ and $0 < \rho < P_0$.
- (b) There is some $K = K(\varepsilon) > 0$, with $K(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, such that $\text{vol } B(x, \varepsilon) \geq K$ for all $x \in M$.
- (c) With the notation of (a) and (b), given $0 < L < K/C$, there is some $0 < P = P(\varepsilon) \leq P_0$, with $P(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, such that $\text{vol } C(x, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) \leq L$ for $x \in M$ and $0 < \rho < P$.

Take any $0 < \rho < P$.

Claim 2. Let $Y \subset M$ be a τ' -separated subset, and let

$$B = \{x \in Y \mid d(x, y) \notin (\sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) \ \forall y \in Y\}.$$

Then, for all $x \in Y \setminus B$, there is some $\hat{x} \in M$ such that $d(x, \hat{x}) < \varepsilon$ and

$$((Y \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{\hat{x}\}) \cap C(\hat{x}, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) = \emptyset.$$

By (a), the subset

$$Z := \{z \in X \mid B(x, \varepsilon) \cap C(z, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) \neq \emptyset\} \subset X \cap D(x, \sigma + \rho + \tau/2)$$

has cardinality at most C . Thus, by (c) and (b), for all $x \in Y \setminus B$,

$$\text{vol} \left(B(x, \varepsilon) \cap \bigcup_{z \in Z} C(z, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) \right) \leq \sum_{z \in Z} \text{vol } C(z, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) \leq CL < K \leq \text{vol } B(x, \varepsilon).$$

So there is some $\hat{x} \in B(x, \varepsilon)$ such that $\hat{x} \notin C(y, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho)$ for every $y \in Z$. Therefore $\hat{x} \notin C(y, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho)$ for all $y \in Y$, and Claim 2 follows.

Let x_1, x_2, \dots be a (finite or infinite) sequence enumerating the elements of $X \setminus A$. Then X' is defined as the union of A and a sequence of elements x'_i such that $d(x'_i, x_i) < \varepsilon$ for all i . In particular, X' will be an ε -perturbation of X . Let us define x'_i by induction on i as follows. We use the notation $X_0 = X$ and $X_i = (X_{i-1} \setminus \{x_i\}) \cup \{x'_i\}$ ($i \geq 1$). Note that X_i is also an ε -perturbation of X and therefore τ' -separated. Assume that X_{i-1} is defined for some $i \geq 1$. By Claim 2, we can take some $x'_i \in X \setminus X_{i-1}$ such that $d(x_i, x'_i) < \varepsilon$ and $X_i \cap C(x'_i, \sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) = \emptyset$. The resulting set X' satisfies the desired properties; in particular, it is a τ' -separated η' -relatively dense subset of M by Lemma 2.6. \square

Proposition 2.13. *Let X be an ε -relatively dense subset of M for some $\varepsilon > 0$, and let h be an isometry of M . If ε is small enough and $h = \text{id}$ on X , then $h = \text{id}$ on M .*

Proof. Fix any $x_0 \in M$ and $0 < r_0 < \text{inj}_M(x_0)$. For $0 < r \leq r_0$, let $\check{B}(r)$ denote the open ball $B(0, r)$ in $T_{x_0}M$. Moreover let $\check{X} = \exp_{x_0}^{-1}(X) \subset T_{x_0}M$. There is some $\lambda \geq 1$ such that $\exp_{x_0} : \check{B}(r_0) \rightarrow B_M(x_0, r_0)$ is a λ -bi-Lipschitz diffeomorphism. Since X is an ε -relatively dense subset of M , for all $x \in B_M(x_0, r_0 - \varepsilon)$, there is some $y \in X \cap B_M(x_0, r_0)$ with $d_M(x, y) < \varepsilon$. Hence, for all $v \in \check{B}(r_0 - \varepsilon)$, there is some $w \in \check{X} \cap \check{B}(r_0)$ with $|v - w| < \lambda\varepsilon$. If ε is small enough, it follows that $\check{X} \cap \check{B}(r_0)$ generates the linear space $T_{x_0}M$. Since $h_* = \text{id}$ on $\check{X} \cap \check{B}(r_0)$ because $h = \text{id}$ on X , we get $h_* = \text{id}$ on $T_{x_0}M$, yielding $h = \text{id}$ on M . \square

2.4. Foliated spaces. A *foliated space* (or *lamination*) $\mathfrak{X} \equiv (\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{F})$ of *dimension* n is a Polish space \mathfrak{X} equipped with a partition \mathcal{F} (a *foliated* or *laminated structure*) into injectively immersed manifolds (*leaves*) so that \mathfrak{X} has an open cover $\{U_i\}$ with homeomorphisms $\phi_i : U_i \rightarrow B_i \times \mathfrak{T}_i$, for some open balls $B_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and Polish spaces \mathfrak{T}_i , such that the slices $B_i \times \{*\}$ correspond to open sets in the leaves (*plaques*); every (U_i, ϕ_i) is called a *foliated chart* and $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i, \phi_i\}$ a *foliated atlas*. The corresponding changes of foliated coordinates are locally of the form $\phi_i \phi_j^{-1}(y, z) = (f_{ij}(y, z), h_{ij}(z))$. Let $p_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}_i$ denote the projection defined by every ϕ_i , whose fibers are the plaques. The subspaces transverse to the leaves are called *transversals*; for instance, the subspaces $\phi_i^{-1}(\{*\} \times \mathfrak{T}_i) \equiv \mathfrak{T}_i$ are local transversals. A transversal is said to be *complete* if it

meets all leaves. \mathfrak{X} is called a *matchbox manifold* if it is compact and connected, and its local transversals are totally disconnected.

We can assume that \mathcal{U} is *regular* in the sense that it is locally finite, every ϕ_i can be extended to a foliated chart whose domain contains $\overline{U_i}$, and every plaque of U_i meets at most one plaque of U_j . In this case, the maps h_{ij} define unique homeomorphisms $h_{ij} : p_j(U_i \cap U_j) \rightarrow p_i(U_i \cap U_j)$ (*elementary holonomy transformations*) so that $p_i = h_{ij}p_j$ on $U_i \cap U_j$, which generate a pseudogroup \mathcal{H} on $\mathfrak{T} := \bigsqcup_i \mathfrak{T}_i$. This \mathcal{H} is unique up to Haefliger's equivalences [26,27], and its equivalence class is called the *holonomy pseudogroup*. The \mathcal{H} -orbits are equipped with a connected graph structure so that a pair of points is joined by an edge if they correspond by some h_{ij} . The projections p_i define an identity between the leaf space \mathfrak{X}/\mathcal{F} and the orbit space \mathfrak{T}/\mathcal{H} . Moreover we can choose points $y_i \in B_i$ so that the corresponding local transversals $\phi_i^{-1}(\{y_i\} \times \mathfrak{T}_i)$ are disjoint. Then their union is a complete transversal homeomorphic to \mathfrak{T} , and the \mathcal{H} -orbits are given by the intersection of the complete transversal with the leaves. If \mathfrak{X} is compact, then \mathcal{U} is finite, and therefore the vertex degrees of the \mathcal{H} -orbits is bounded by the finite number of maps h_{ij} . Moreover the coarse quasi-isometry class of the \mathcal{H} -orbits is independent of \mathcal{U} in this case.

If the functions $y \mapsto f_{ij}(y, z)$ are C^∞ with partial derivatives of arbitrary order depending continuously on z , then \mathcal{U} defines a C^∞ structure on \mathfrak{X} , and \mathfrak{X} becomes a C^∞ foliated space with such a structure. Then C^∞ bundles and their C^∞ sections also make sense on \mathfrak{X} , defined by requiring that their local descriptions are C^∞ in a similar sense. For instance, the tangent bundle $T\mathfrak{X}$ (or $T\mathcal{F}$) is the C^∞ vector bundle over \mathfrak{X} that consists of the vectors tangent to the leaves, and a *Riemannian metric* on \mathfrak{X} consists of Riemannian metrics on the leaves that define a C^∞ section on \mathfrak{X} . This gives rise to the concept of *Riemannian foliated space*. If \mathfrak{X} is a compact C^∞ foliated space, then the differentiable quasi-isometry type of every leaf is independent of the choice of the Riemannian metric on \mathfrak{X} , and is coarsely quasi-isometric to the corresponding \mathcal{H} -orbits (see e.g. [8, Section 10.3]).

Many of the concepts and properties of foliated spaces are direct generalizations from foliations. Several results about foliations have obvious versions for foliated spaces, like the holonomy group and holonomy cover of the leaves, and the Reeb's local stability theorem. This can be seen in the following standard references about foliated spaces: [35], [10, Chapter 11], [11, Part 1] and [24].

2.5. Space of pointed connected complete Riemannian manifolds and their smooth functions.

Let us recall some concepts and properties used in our main results and their proofs, and already used in [4]. Consider triples (M, x, f) , where M is a complete connected Riemannian n -manifold, $x \in M$, and $f : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is a C^∞ function to a fixed separable (real) Hilbert space (of finite or infinite dimension). An equivalence $(M, x, f) \sim (M', x', f')$ is defined when there is a pointed isometric bijection $\phi : (M, x) \rightarrow (M', x')$ with $\phi^* f' = f$. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ be the Polish space of equivalence classes $[M, x, f]$ of triples (M, x, f) , with the topology induced by the C^∞ convergence of pointed Riemannian manifolds and C^∞ topology on smooth functions (Section 2.6). For any M and f as above, there is a map $\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : M \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ defined by $\hat{\iota}_{M,f}(x) = [M, x, f]$. The images $[M, f]$ of all possible maps $\hat{\iota}_{M,f}$ form a canonical partition of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, which is considered when using saturations or minimal sets in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. The saturation of any open subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is open, and therefore the closure of any saturated subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is saturated. It is said that (M, f) (or f) is:

aperiodic: if $\hat{\iota}_{M,f}$ is injective (id_M is the only isometry of M that preserves f);

limit aperiodic: if (M', f') is aperiodic for all $[M', x', f'] \in \overline{[M, f]}$; and

repetitive: if, roughly speaking, every ball with f is approximately repeated uniformly in M (Section 2.6).

When $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact, the repetitivity of (M, f) means that $\overline{[M, f]}$ is minimal (Proposition 2.16).

If we only use immersions $f : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, we get a subspace $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, which is a Riemannian foliated space with the canonical partition such that the maps $\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : M \rightarrow [M, f]$ are local isometries. Moreover these maps are the holonomy covers of the leaves.

If \mathfrak{H} is of finite dimension, then $\overline{[M, f]}$ is a compact subspace of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n$ if and only if M is of bounded geometry, $|\nabla^m f|$ is uniformly bounded for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $|\nabla f|$ is uniformly bounded away from 0 (Propositions 2.18 and 2.21).

Different versions of this space can be defined with other structures, with similar basic properties. For instance, by forgetting the functions f in the construction of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, we get a partitioned Polish space \mathcal{M}_*^n . In [1], a partitioned Polish space \mathcal{CM}_*^n is defined like \mathcal{M}_*^n by using distinguished closed subsets of the

Riemannian manifolds, whose topology also involves the Chabauty (or Fell) topology on the families of closed subsets. An easy refined version $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n$ of \mathcal{CM}_*^n can be defined by using locally constant colorings of closed subsets. In [5], we have also used similar partitioned Polish spaces, \mathcal{G}_* and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$, defined with connected simple (colored) graphs. In this sense, we will also use (limit) aperiodicity and repetitiveness for complete connected Riemannian manifolds, for their (colored) Delone subsets, and for (colored) graphs.

2.6. The spaces \mathcal{M}_*^n and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider triples (M, x, f) , where (M, x) is a pointed complete connected Riemannian n -manifold and $f : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is a C^∞ function to a (separable real) Hilbert space (of finite or infinite dimension). Two such triples, (M, x, f) and (M', x', f') , are said to be *equivalent* if there is a pointed isometry $h : (M, x) \rightarrow (M', x')$ such that $h^* f' = f$. Let⁶ $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(\mathfrak{H})$ be the set⁷ of equivalence classes $[M, x, f]$ of the above triples (M, x, f) . A sequence $[M_i, x_i, f_i] \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is said to be C^∞ *convergent* to $[M, x, f] \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ if, for any compact domain $D \subset M$ containing x , there are pointed C^∞ embeddings $h_i : (D, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$, for large enough i , such that $h_i^* g_i \rightarrow g_M|_D$ and $h_i^* f_i \rightarrow f|_D$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ in the C^∞ topology⁸. In other words, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$, there is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h_i : (M, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$, for i large enough, with $|\nabla^l(f - h_i^* f_i)| < \varepsilon$ on $D_M(x, R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$ [6, Propositions 6.4 and 6.5]. The C^∞ convergence describes a Polish topology on $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ [4, Theorem 1.3]. The evaluation map $\text{ev} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, $\text{ev}([M, x, f]) = f(x)$, is continuous.

For any connected complete Riemannian n -manifold M and any C^∞ function $f : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, there is a canonical continuous map $\widehat{\iota}_{M,f} : M \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ defined by $\widehat{\iota}_{M,f}(x) = [M, x, f]$, whose image is denoted by $[M, f]$. We have $[M, f] \equiv \text{Iso}(M, f) \backslash M$, where $\text{Iso}(M, f)$ denotes the group of isometries of M preserving f . All possible sets $[M, f]$ form a canonical partition of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, which is considered when using saturations or minimal sets in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Any bounded linear map between Hilbert spaces, $\Phi : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}'$, induces a relation-preserving continuous map $\Phi_* : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(\mathfrak{H}) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(\mathfrak{H}')$, given by $\Phi_*([M, x, f]) = [M, x, \Phi f]$, which defines a functor.

Lemma 2.14. *The saturation of any open subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is open, and therefore the closure of any saturated subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is saturated.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{V} be the saturation of some open $\mathcal{U} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, and let $[M, x, f] \in \mathcal{V}$. Then there is some $y \in M$ such that $[M, y, f] \in \mathcal{U}$. Since \mathcal{U} is open, there are $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$ so that, for all $[M', y', f'] \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, if there is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h : (M, y) \rightarrow (M', y')$ with $|\nabla^l(f - h^* f')| < \varepsilon$ on $D_M(y, R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$, then $[M', y', f'] \in \mathcal{U}$. We can assume that $R > d_M(x, y)$. Take any convergent sequence $[M_i, x_i, f_i] \rightarrow [M, x, f]$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. For i large enough, there is some $(m, 2R, \lambda)$ -p.p.q.i. $h_i : (M, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$ with $|\nabla^l(f - h_i^* f_i)| < \varepsilon$ on $D_M(x, 2R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$. Since $D_M(y, R) \subset D_M(x, 2R)$, it follows that $[M_i, h_i(y), f_i] \in \mathcal{U}$ for i large enough. Therefore $[M_i, x_i, f_i] \in \mathcal{V}$ for i large enough, showing that \mathcal{V} is open.

The last part of the statement follows from the first part and Lemma 2.1. \square

Let $\hat{d} : (\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n)^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be the metric with possible infinite values induced by d_M on every equivalence class $[M, f] \equiv \text{Iso}(M, f) \backslash M$, and equal to ∞ on non-related pairs.

Lemma 2.15. *For every open $\mathcal{U} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, the map $\hat{d}(\cdot, \mathcal{U}) : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is upper semicontinuous.*

Proof. To prove the upper semicontinuity of $\hat{d}(\cdot, \mathcal{U})$ at any point $[M, x, f]$, we can assume that $\hat{d}([M, x, f], \mathcal{U}) < \infty$, and therefore there is some $y \in M$ such that $[M, y, f] \in \mathcal{U}$. Take a convergent sequence $[M_i, x_i, f_i] \rightarrow [M, x, f]$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. We can also suppose that

$$\hat{d}([M, x, f], [M, y, f]) < \hat{d}([M, x, f], \mathcal{U}) + \varepsilon/3, \quad d_M(x, y) < \hat{d}([M, x, f], [M, y, f]) + \varepsilon/3.$$

Since \mathcal{U} is open, there are $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R > d_M(x, y) + \varepsilon$, $1 < \lambda < (d_M(x, y) + \varepsilon/3)/d_M(x, y)$ and $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ so that, for all $[M', y', f'] \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, if there is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h : (M, y) \rightarrow (M', y')$ with $|\nabla^l(f - h^* f')| < \delta$

⁶In [4, 6, 8], the notation $\mathcal{M}_*(n)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*(n)$ was used instead of \mathcal{M}_*^n and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, adding the superindex “ ∞ ” when equipped with the topology defined by the C^∞ convergence.

⁷The cardinality of each complete connected Riemannian n -manifold is less than or equal to the cardinality of the continuum, and therefore it may be assumed that its underlying set is contained in \mathbb{R} . With this assumption, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is a well defined set.

⁸The C^{m+1} embeddings and C^m convergence of [6, Definition 1.1] and [4, Definition 1.2], for arbitrary order m , can be assumed to be C^∞ embeddings and C^∞ convergence [28, Theorem 2.2.7].

on $D_M(y, R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$, then $[M', y', f'] \in \mathcal{U}$. By the convergence $[M_i, x_i, f_i] \rightarrow [M, x, f]$, for i large enough, there is some $(m, 2R, \lambda)$ -p.p.q.i. $h_i : (M, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$ with $|\nabla^l(f - h_i^* f_i)| < \delta$ on $D_M(x, 2R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$. Since $D_M(y, R) \subset D_M(x, 2R)$, it follows that $[M_i, y_i, f_i] \in \mathcal{U}$ for $y_i = h_i(y)$, and

$$\hat{d}([M_i, x_i, f_i], [M_i, y_i, f_i]) \leq d_i(x_i, y_i) \leq \lambda d_M(x, y) < d_M(x, y) + \varepsilon/3 < \hat{d}([M, x, f], \mathcal{U}) + \varepsilon.$$

Hence $\hat{d}([M_i, x_i, f_i], \mathcal{U}) < \hat{d}([M, x, f], \mathcal{U}) + \varepsilon$ for i large enough. \square

It is said that (M, f) (or f) is (*locally non-periodic* (or (*locally aperiodic*)) if $\hat{\iota}_{M,f}$ is (locally) injective; i.e., aperiodicity means $\text{Iso}(M, f) = \{\text{id}_M\}$, and local aperiodicity means that the canonical projection $M \rightarrow \text{Iso}(M, f) \backslash M$ is a covering map. More strongly, (M, f) (or f) is said to be *limit aperiodic* if (M', f') is aperiodic for all $[M', x', f'] \in \overline{[M, f]}$. On the other hand, (M, f) (or f) is said to be *repetitive* if, given any $p \in M$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$, the points $x \in M$ such that

$$\exists \text{ an } (m, R, \lambda)\text{-p.p.q.i. } h : (M, p) \rightarrow (M, x) \text{ with } |\nabla^l(f - h^* f)| < \varepsilon \text{ on } D_M(p, R) \forall l \leq m \quad (2.2)$$

form a relatively dense subset of M . Clearly, this property is independent of the choice of p .

Proposition 2.16. *The following holds for any connected complete Riemannian n -manifold M :*

- (i) *If (M, f) is repetitive, then $\overline{[M, f]}$ is minimal.*
- (ii) *If $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact and minimal, then (M, f) is repetitive.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.14, $\overline{[M, f]}$ is saturated, and therefore its minimality can be considered.

Item (i) follows by showing that $[M, f] \subset \overline{[M', f']}$ for every equivalence class $[M', f'] \subset \overline{[M, f]}$. In fact, it is enough to prove that $[M, f] \cap \overline{[M', f']} \neq \emptyset$ because $\overline{[M', f']}$ is saturated. Fix any $p \in M$, and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$. By the repetitiveness of (M, f) , for some $c > 0$, there is a c -relatively dense subset $X \subset M$ such that, for all $x \in X$, there is an $(m, R, \lambda^{1/2})$ -p.p.q.i. $h_x : (M, p) \rightarrow (M, x)$ with $|\nabla^l(f - h_x^* f)| < \varepsilon/2$ and $|\nabla^l h_x^* \phi| < \frac{3}{2} h_x^* |\nabla^l \phi|$ on $D_M(x, R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$ and $\phi \in C^\infty(M)$. On the other hand, since $[M', f'] \subset \overline{[M, f]}$, given any $y' \in M'$, there are some $y \in M$ and an $(m, \lambda^{1/2}c + \lambda R, \lambda^{1/2})$ -p.p.q.i. $h : (M', y') \rightarrow (M, y)$ so that $|\nabla^l(f - (h^{-1})^* f')| < \varepsilon/3$ on $h(D_{M'}(y', \lambda^{1/2}c + \lambda R))$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$. Take some $x \in X$ with $d_M(x, y) \leq c$. We have $D_M(y, c) \subset h(D_{M'}(y', \lambda^{1/2}c))$, and therefore there is some $x' \in D_{M'}(y', \lambda^{1/2}c)$ with $h(x') = x$. By Proposition 2.7, the composite $h^{-1}h_x$ defines an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $(M, p) \rightarrow (M', x')$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^l(f - (h^{-1}h_x)^* f')| &\leq |\nabla^l(f - h_x^* f)| + |\nabla^l(h_x^* f - (h^{-1}h_x)^* f')| \\ &\leq |\nabla^l(f - h_x^* f)| + \frac{3}{2} h_x^* |\nabla^l(f - (h^{-1})^* f')| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\varepsilon}{3} = \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

on $D_M(p, R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$. Since m, R, ε and λ are arbitrary, we get $[M, p, f] \in [M, f] \cap \overline{[M', f']}$.

To prove (ii), fix any $p \in M$, and take $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$. The set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U} = \{ [M', x', f'] \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \mid \exists \text{ an } (m, R, \lambda)\text{-p.p.q.i. } h : (M, p) \rightarrow (M', x') \\ \text{with } |\nabla^l(f - h^* f')| < \varepsilon \text{ on } D_M(p, R) \forall l \leq m \} \end{aligned}$$

is an open neighborhood of $[M, p, f]$ in $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. By Lemma 2.15, and the compactness and minimality of $\overline{[M, f]}$, we have $\hat{d}(\cdot, \mathcal{U}) \leq c$ on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ for some $c > 0$. It follows that the points $x \in M$ satisfying (2.2) form a c -relatively dense subset of M . Since m, R, ε and λ are arbitrary, we get that (M, f) is repetitive. \square

The non-periodic and locally non-periodic pairs (M, f) define saturated subspaces $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{np}}^n \subset \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n \subset \hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. The pairs (M, f) , where f is an immersion, define a saturated Polish subspace $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n \subset \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n$. The following properties hold [4, Theorem 1.4]:

- $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n$ is open and dense in $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$.
- $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n$ is a foliated space with the restriction of the canonical partition.
- The foliated space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n$ has unique C^∞ structure such that $\text{ev} : \hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is C^∞ . Furthermore $\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : M \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is also C^∞ for all pairs (M, f) where f is an immersion.
- Every map $\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : M \rightarrow [M, f] \equiv \text{Iso}(M, f) \backslash M$ is the holonomy covering of the leaf $[M, f]$. Thus $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{np}}^n \cap \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n$ is the union of leaves without holonomy.

- The C^∞ foliated space $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n$ has a Riemannian metric so that every map $\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : M \rightarrow [M, f] \equiv \text{Iso}(M, f) \backslash M$ is a local isometry.

By forgetting the functions f , we get a Polish space \mathcal{M}_*^n [6, Theorem 1.2]. We have $\mathcal{M}_*^n \equiv \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(0)$, using the zero Hilbert space. The forgetful or underlying map $\mathbf{u} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*^n$, $\mathbf{u}([M, x, f]) = [M, x]$, is continuous. We also have a canonical partition defined by the images $[M]$ of canonical continuous maps $\iota_M : M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*^n$, $\iota_M(x) = [M, x]$, giving rise to the conditions on M of being *(locally) non-periodic* (or *(locally) aperiodic*), and the subspaces $\mathcal{M}_{*,\text{np}}^n \subset \mathcal{M}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n \subset \mathcal{M}_*^n$. The condition on M to be *repetitive* is also defined by forgetting about the functions, and the obvious version without functions of Proposition 2.16 is true. Then the following properties hold for $n \geq 2$ [6, Theorem 1.3]:

- $\mathcal{M}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n$ is open and dense in \mathcal{M}_*^n .
- $\mathcal{M}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n$ is a foliated space with the restriction of the canonical partition.
- The foliated space $\mathcal{M}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n$ has a unique C^∞ and Riemannian structures such that every map $\iota_M : M \rightarrow [M] \equiv \text{Iso}(M) \backslash M$ is a local isometry. Furthermore $\mathbf{u} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*,\text{imm}}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{*,\text{lnp}}^n$ is a C^∞ foliated map.
- Every map $\iota_M : M \rightarrow [M] \equiv \text{Iso}(M) \backslash M$ is the holonomy covering of the leaf $[M]$. Thus $\mathcal{M}_{*,\text{np}}^n$ is the union of leaves without holonomy.

Moreover $\overline{[M]}$ is compact if and only if M is of bounded geometry [6, Theorem 12.3] (see also [18], [36, Chapter 10, Sections 3 and 4]).

Now consider quadruples (M, x, f, v) , where (M, x, f) is like in the definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ and $v \in T_x M$. An equivalence between such quadruples, $(M, x, f, v) \sim (M', x', f', v')$, means that there is an isometry $h : M \rightarrow M'$ defining an equivalence $(M, x, f) \sim (M', x', f')$ with $h_* v = v'$. The corresponding equivalence classes, denoted by $[M, x, f, v]$, define a set $\mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, like in the case of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Moreover the C^∞ convergence $[M_i, x_i, f_i, v_i] \rightarrow [M, x, f, v]$ in $\mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ means that, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$, there is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h_i : (M, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$, for i large enough, such that $|\nabla^l(f - h_i^* f_i)| < \varepsilon$ on $D_M(x, R)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$ and $(h_i^{-1})_* v_i \rightarrow v$. Like in the case of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, it can be proved that this convergence defines a Polish topology on $\mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Moreover there are continuous maps $T\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : T^*M \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, defined by $T\hat{\iota}_{M,f}(x, v) = [M, x, f, v]$, whose images $\mathcal{T}[M, f]$ form a canonical partition of $\mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ satisfying the same basic properties as the canonical partition of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. We also have a continuous forgetful or underlying map $\mathbf{u} : \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ given by $\mathbf{u}([M, x, f, v]) = [M, x, f]$.

The above definition can be modified in obvious ways, giving rise to other partitioned spaces with the same basic properties. For instance, by using cotangent spaces T_x^*M instead of the tangent spaces $T_x M$, we get a partitioned space $\mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, where the partition is defined by the images $\mathcal{T}^*[M, f]$ of maps $T^*\hat{\iota}_{M,f} : T^*M \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, given by $T^*\hat{\iota}_{M,f}(x, \xi) = [M, x, f, \xi]$. Actually, the metrics of the manifolds M define identities $T_x M \equiv T_x^* M$, yielding an identity $\mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \equiv \mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Next, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we can also use the tensor products $\bigotimes_k T_x M$ or $\bigotimes_k T_x^* M$, giving rise to partitioned spaces $\bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ and $\bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Also, we can only take vectors v in the disks $D_r T_x M \subset T_x M$ of center zero and radius $r \geq 0$, producing a partitioned subspace $\mathcal{D}_r \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ of $\mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Similarly, we get partitioned subspaces $\mathcal{D}_r \mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, $\mathcal{D}_r \bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ and $\mathcal{D}_r \bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}^*\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. A continuous forgetful or underlying map \mathbf{u} is defined in all of these spaces with values in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. We will use the notation $\mathbf{u}_{r,k} = \mathbf{u} : \mathcal{D}_r \bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$.

Proposition 2.17. *The map $\mathbf{u}_{r,k} : \mathcal{D}_r \bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ is proper.*

Proof. For any compact subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$, take a sequence $[M_i, x_i, f_i, v_i]$ in $(\mathbf{u}_{r,k})^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$. Since \mathcal{K} is compact, after taking a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $[M_i, x_i, f_i]$ converges to some element $[M, x, f]$ in \mathcal{K} . Thus there are sequences, $m_i \uparrow \infty$ in \mathbb{N} , $0 < R_i \uparrow \infty$, $0 < \varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ and $1 < \lambda_i \downarrow 1$, such that, for every i , there is some an (m_i, R_i, λ_i) -p.p.q.i. $h_i : (M, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$ with $|\nabla^l(f - h_i^* f_i)| < \varepsilon_i$ on $D_M(x, R_i)$ for $0 \leq l \leq m_i$. Since $\lambda_i^{-k} \leq |(h_i^{-1})_* v_i| \leq \lambda_i^k$ for all i , some subsequence $(h_{i_k}^{-1})_* v_{i_k}$ is convergent in $\bigotimes_k T_x^* M$ to some v with $|v| \leq r$. Using h_{i_k} , it follows that the subsequence $[M_{i_k}, x_{i_k}, f_{i_k}, v_{i_k}]$ converges to $[M, x, f, v]$ in $(\mathbf{u}_{r,k})^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$, showing that $(\mathbf{u}_{r,k})^{-1}(\mathcal{K})$ is compact. \square

For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, a well-defined continuous map $\nabla^k : \bigotimes_k \mathcal{T}\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is given by $\nabla^k([M, x, f, v]) = (\nabla^k f)(x, v)$.

Proposition 2.18. *Let M be a complete connected Riemannian n -manifold, and let $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H})$, $x_0 \in M$ and $r > 0$. Then $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact if and only if M is of bounded geometry and $\nabla^k((u_{r,k})^{-1}([M, f]))$ is precompact in \mathfrak{H} for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Assume that $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact to prove the “only if” part. The map $u : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*^n$ defines a map $u : \overline{[M, f]} \rightarrow \overline{[M]}$ with dense image because $\iota_M = u\hat{\iota}_{M, f}$. By the compactness of $\overline{[M, f]}$, it follows that this map is surjective, and therefore $\overline{[M]}$ is compact. So M is of bounded geometry. Furthermore $\nabla^k((u_{r,k})^{-1}(\overline{[M, f]}))$ is compact in \mathfrak{H} for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ by Proposition 2.17.

The “if” part follows by showing that any sequence $[M, f, x_p]$ in $[M, f]$ has a subsequence that is convergent in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. Since $\overline{[M]}$ is compact and $u : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*^n$ continuous, we can suppose that $[M, x_p]$ converges to some point $[M', x']$ in \mathcal{M}_*^n . Take a sequence of compact domains D_q in M' such that $B_{M'}(x', q+1) \subset D_q$. For every q , there are pointed C^∞ embeddings $h_{q,p} : (D_q, x') \rightarrow (M, x_p)$, for p large enough, such that $h_{q,p}^* g_M \rightarrow g_N$ on D_q as $p \rightarrow \infty$ with respect to the C^∞ topology. Let $f'_{q,p} = h_{q,p}^* f$ on D_q . From the compactness of $\nabla^k((u_{r,k})^{-1}(\overline{[M, f]}))$, it easily follows that, for every q and k , we have $\sup_p \sup_{D_q} |\nabla^k f'_{q,p}| < \infty$, and the elements $(\nabla^m f'_{q,p})(x', v')$ form a precompact subset of \mathfrak{H} for any fixed $v' \in D_r \otimes_k T_{x'} M'$. Since $\otimes_k T_{x'} M'$ is of finite dimension, it follows that the elements $(\nabla^m f'_{q,p})(x')$ form a precompact subset of $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \otimes_k T_{x'}^* M'$. Hence the functions $f'_{q,p}$ form a precompact subset of $C^\infty(D_q, \mathfrak{H})$ with the C^∞ topology by Corollary 2.9. So some subsequence $f'_{q,p(q,\ell)}$ is convergent to some $f'_q \in C^\infty(D_q, \mathfrak{H})$ with respect to the C^∞ topology. In fact, arguing inductively on q , it is easy to see that we can assume that each $f'_{q+1,p(q+1,\ell)}$ is a subsequence of $f'_{q,p(q,\ell)}$, and therefore f'_{q+1} extends f'_q . Thus the functions f'_q can be combined to define a function $f' \in C^\infty(M', \mathfrak{H})$. Take sequences $\ell_q, m_q \uparrow \infty$ in \mathbb{N} so that

$$\|f' - h_{q,p(q,\ell_q)}^* f\|_{C^{m_q}, D_q, g_N} = \|f'_q - f'_{q,p(q,\ell_q)}\|_{C^{m_q}, D_q, g_N} \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence $[M, f, x_{p(q,\ell_q)}] \rightarrow [M', f', x']$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. \square

The following is an elementary consequence of Proposition 2.18.

Corollary 2.19. *Let M be a complete connected Riemannian n -manifold, and let $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H})$. Suppose that $\dim \mathfrak{H} < \infty$. Then $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact if and only if M is of bounded geometry and $\sup_M |\nabla^m f| < \infty$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Corollary 2.20. *Let M be a complete connected Riemannian n -manifold, let $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{H}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{H}_2$ be a direct sum decomposition of Hilbert spaces, and let*

$$f \equiv (f_1, f_2) \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H}) \equiv C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H}_1) \oplus C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H}_2).$$

Then $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact if and only if $\overline{[M, f_1]}$ and $\overline{[M, f_2]}$ are compact.

Proof. Assume that $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact to prove the “only if” part. Let $\Pi_a : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_a$ ($a = 1, 2$) denote the factor projections. The induced maps $\Pi_{a*} : \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(\mathfrak{H}) \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(\mathfrak{H}_a)$ define continuous maps $\Pi_{a*} : \overline{[M, f]} \rightarrow \overline{[M, f_a]}$, whose images are dense because $\hat{\iota}_{M, f_a} = \Pi_{a*} \hat{\iota}_{M, f}$. By the compactness of $\overline{[M, f]}$, it follows that these maps are surjective and the spaces $\overline{[M, f_a]}$ are compact.

Now assume that every space $\overline{[M, f_a]}$ ($a = 1, 2$) is compact to prove the “if” part. By Proposition 2.18, this means that M is of bounded geometry and every set $\nabla^m(u^{-1}([M, f_a]))$ is precompact in \mathfrak{H}_a for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$\nabla^m(u^{-1}([M, f])) \subset \nabla^m(u^{-1}([M, f_1])) \times \nabla^m(u^{-1}([M, f_2]))$$

for every m because $(\nabla^m f)(x, \xi) = ((\nabla^m f_1)(x, \xi), (\nabla^m f_2)(x, \xi))$ for all $x \in M$ and $\xi \in \otimes_m T_x^* M$, we get that $\nabla^m(u^{-1}([M, f]))$ is precompact in \mathfrak{H} for all m . Hence $\overline{[M, f]}$ is compact by Proposition 2.18. \square

Proposition 2.21. *Let M be a complete connected Riemannian n -manifold, and let $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H})$. Then the following properties hold:*

- (i) *If $\overline{[M, f]}$ is a compact subspace of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n$, then $\inf_M |\nabla f| > 0$.*
- (ii) *If $\inf_M |\nabla f| > 0$, then $\overline{[M, f]} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n$.*

Proof. This holds because the mapping $[M', x', f'] \mapsto |(\nabla f')(x')|$ is well defined and continuous on $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n$. \square

Proposition 2.22. *In any minimal compact Riemannian foliated space, all leaves without holonomy are repetitive.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the Reeb's local stability theorem and the fact that $L \cap U$ is relatively dense in L for all leaf L and open $U \neq \emptyset$ in a minimal compact foliated space [8, Second proof of Theorem 1.13, p. 123]. \square

Example 2.23. For any compact C^∞ foliated space \mathfrak{X} , there is a C^∞ embedding into some separable Hilbert space, $h : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ [10, Theorem 11.4.4]. Suppose that \mathfrak{X} is transitive and without holonomy, and endowed with a Riemannian metric. Let M be a dense leaf of \mathfrak{X} , which is of bounded geometry, and let $f = h|_M \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H})$. We have $\inf_M |\nabla f| = \min_{\mathfrak{X}} |\nabla h| > 0$. So $\mathfrak{X}' := \overline{[M, f]}$ is a Riemannian foliated subspace of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n$ (Proposition 2.21 (ii)). Since \mathfrak{X} is compact and without holonomy, and M is dense in \mathfrak{X} , it follows from the Reeb's local stability theorem that the leaves of \mathfrak{X}' are the subspaces $[L, h|_L]$, for leaves L of \mathfrak{X} , and the combination of the corresponding maps $\hat{\iota}_{L, h|_L}$ is an isometric foliated surjective map $\hat{\iota}_{\mathfrak{X}, h} : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}'$. Using that $\text{ev} \hat{\iota}_{\mathfrak{X}, h} = h$, we get that $\hat{\iota}_{\mathfrak{X}, h} : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}'$ is an isometric foliated diffeomorphism, and $\text{ev} : \mathfrak{X}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is a C^∞ embedding whose image is $h(\mathfrak{X})$. Thus \mathfrak{X}' is compact and without holonomy, and (M, f) is limit aperiodic. If moreover \mathfrak{X} is minimal, then (M, f) is repetitive by Proposition 2.22.

2.7. The spaces \mathcal{G}_* and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$. As auxiliary objects, we will use connected (simple) graphs with finite vertex degrees, as well as their (vertex) colorings. For convenience, these graphs are identified with their vertex sets equipped with the natural \mathbb{N} -valued metric. This metric is defined as the minimum length of graph-theoretic paths (finite sequences of contiguous vertices) between any pair of points. The existence of geodesic segments (minimizing graph-theoretic paths) between any two vertices is elementary. For such a graph X , the degree of a vertex x is denoted by $\deg_X x$ (or $\deg x$). The supremum of the vertex degrees is called the *degree* of X , denoted by $\deg X \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Given a countable set F , any map $\phi : X \rightarrow F$ is called an (F) -coloring of X , and (X, ϕ) is called an (F) -colored graph. We will take $F = \mathbb{Z}^+$ or $F = \{1, \dots, c\}$ ($c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$). For a connected subgraph $Y \subset X$, we will use the notation $(Y, \phi) = (Y, \phi|_Y)$. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_* = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*(F)$ be the set⁹ of isomorphism classes $[X, x, \phi]$ of pointed connected F -colored graphs (X, x, ϕ) with finite vertex degrees. For $R \geq 0$, let $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_R$ be the set of pairs $([X, x, \phi], [Y, y, \psi]) \in (\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*)^2$ such that there is a pointed color-preserving graph isomorphism $(D_X(x, R), x, \phi) \rightarrow (D_Y(y, R), y, \psi)$. These sets form a base of entourages of a uniformity on $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$, which is metrizable because this base is countable since $\widehat{\mathcal{U}}_R = \widehat{\mathcal{U}}_{[R]}$. Moreover it is easy to see that this uniformity is complete. Equip $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ with the corresponding underlying topology. The evaluation map $\text{ev} : \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_* \rightarrow F$, $\text{ev}([X, x, \phi]) = \phi(x)$, and the degree map $\deg : \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\deg([X, x, \phi]) = \deg_X x$, are well defined and locally constant. The space $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ is also separable; in fact, a countable dense subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ is defined by the finite pointed colored graphs because F is countable. Therefore $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ is a Polish space.

Let (X, ϕ) be a connected colored graph with finite vertex degrees, whose group of color-preserving graph automorphisms is denoted by $\text{Aut}(X, \phi)$. There is a canonical map $\hat{\iota}_{X, \phi} : X \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ defined by $\hat{\iota}_{X, \phi}(x) = [X, x, \phi]$. Its image, denoted by $[X, \phi]$, can be identified with $\text{Aut}(X, \phi) \backslash X$, and has an induced connected colored graph structure. All possible sets $[X, \phi]$ form a canonical partition of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$. Like in Lemma 2.14, it follows that the saturation of any open subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ is open, and therefore the closure of any saturated subset of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ is saturated; in particular, $\overline{[X, \phi]}$ is saturated. It is said that (X, ϕ) (or ϕ) is *aperiodic* (or *non-periodic*) if $\text{Aut}(X, \phi) = \{\text{id}_X\}$, which means that $\hat{\iota}_{X, \phi}$ is injective. More strongly, (X, ϕ) (or ϕ) is called *limit aperiodic* if (Y, ψ) is aperiodic for all $[Y, y, \psi] \in \overline{[X, \phi]}$. On the other hand, (X, ϕ) (or ϕ) is called *repetitive* if, for any $p \in X$ and $R \geq 0$, the points $x \in X$ such that there is a pointed color-preserving graph isomorphism $(D_X(p, R), p, \phi) \rightarrow (D_X(x, R), x, \psi)$ form a relatively dense subset of X . Clearly, this property is independent of the choice of p . Like in Proposition 2.16, if (X, ϕ) is repetitive, then $\overline{[X, \phi]}$ is minimal, and the reciprocal also holds when $\overline{[X, \phi]}$ is compact.

There are obvious versions without colorings of the above definitions and properties, which can be also described by taking $F = \{1\}$. Namely, we get: a Polish space \mathcal{G}_* , canonical continuous maps $\iota_X : X \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_*$,

⁹Each connected graph with finite vertex degrees is countable, and therefore it may be assumed that its underlying set is contained in \mathbb{N} . With this assumption, $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*$ is a well defined set.

$\iota_X(x) = [X, x]$, whose images, denoted by $[X]$, define a canonical partition of \mathcal{G}_* , and the concepts of *non-periodic* (or *aperiodic*), *limit aperiodic* and *repetitive* graphs. The forgetful (or underlying) map $u : \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_* \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_*$, $u([X, x, \phi]) = [X, x]$, is continuous. If X is repetitive, then $[X]$ is minimal, and the reciprocal also holds when $\overline{[X]}$ is compact. The closure $\overline{[X]}$ is compact if and only if $\deg X < \infty$. Then, like in Proposition 2.18, we obtain that $\overline{[X, \phi]}$ is compact if and only if $\deg X < \infty$ and $\text{im } \phi$ is finite.

We will use the following graph version of (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. (Section 2.3). For $R \geq 0$ and $\lambda \geq 1$, an (R, λ) -pointed partial quasi-isometry (shortly, an (R, λ) -p.p.q.i.) between pointed graphs, (X, x) and (Y, y) , is a λ -bilipschitz pointed partial map $h : (X, x) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ such that $D(x, R) = \text{dom } h$, and therefore $D(y, R/\lambda) \subset \text{im } h$. This definition satisfies the obvious analogue of Proposition 2.7. The following is a simple consequence of the fact that graph metrics take integer values.

Proposition 2.24. *Let $1 \leq \lambda < 2$ and $R \geq 0$. Any (R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h : (X, x) \rightarrow (Y, y)$ between pointed graphs defines a pointed graph isomorphism $h : (\text{dom } h, x) \rightarrow (\text{im } h, y)$. In particular, it defines an $(R/\lambda, 1)$ -p.p.q.i. $(X, x) \rightarrow (Y, y)$.*

Corollary 2.25. *A colored graph (X, ϕ) is repetitive if and only if, given any $p \in X$, for all $R > 0$ and $1 < \lambda < 2$, the set*

$$\{x \in X \mid \exists \text{ a color preserving } (R, \lambda)\text{-p.p.q.i. } h : (X, p, \phi) \rightarrow (M, x, \phi)\}$$

is relatively dense in M .

2.8. The spaces \mathcal{CM}_*^n and $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n$. Like in Section 2.6, using distinguished closed subsets $C \subset M$ instead of C^∞ functions $f : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, we get set \mathcal{CM}_*^n of equivalence classes $[M, x, C]$ of triples (M, x, C) , where the equivalence $(M, x, C) \sim (M', x', C')$ means that there is a pointed isometry $h : (M, x) \rightarrow (M', x')$ with $h(C) = C'$. A sequence $[M_i, x_i, C_i] \in \mathcal{CM}_*^n$ is said to be *C^∞ -Chabauty convergent* to $[M, x, C] \in \mathcal{CM}_*^n$ if, for any compact domain $D \subset M$ containing x , there are pointed C^∞ embeddings $h_i : (D, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$, for large enough i , such that $h_i^* g_i \rightarrow g_M|_D$ in the C^∞ topology and $h_i^{-1}(C_i) \rightarrow C \cap D$ in the Chabauty (or Fell) topology [1, Section A.4]. In other words, this convergence also means that, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $R > \varepsilon > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$, there is some (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h_i : (M, x) \rightarrow (M_i, x_i)$, for i large enough, such that:

- (a) for all $y \in D_M(x, R - \varepsilon) \cap C$, there is some $y_i \in h_i^{-1}(C_i) \subset D_M(x, R)$ with $d_M(y, y_i) < \varepsilon$; and,
- (b) for all $y_i \in D_M(x, R - \varepsilon) \cap h_i^{-1}(C_i)$, there is some $y \in C \cap D_M(x, R)$ with $d_M(y, y_i) < \varepsilon$.

The C^∞ -Chabauty convergence describes a Polish topology on \mathcal{CM}_*^n [1, Theorem A.17], and the forgetful or underlying map $u : \mathcal{CM}_*^n \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*^n$, $u([M, x, C]) = [M, x]$, is continuous. There are also canonical continuous maps $\iota_{M, C} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{CM}_*^n$, $\iota_{M, C}(x) = [M, x, C]$, whose images, denoted by $[M, C]$, form a canonical partition of \mathcal{CM}_*^n . We have $[M, C] \equiv \text{Iso}(M, C) \backslash M$, where $\text{Iso}(M, C)$ denotes the group of isometries of M preserving C . There are obvious versions of Lemmas 2.14 and 2.15 in this setting, as well as obvious versions of (*limit*) *aperiodicity* for (M, C) . Similarly, the *repetitivity* of (M, C) can be defined like in the case of (M, f) in Section 2.6, using (a) and (b) instead of the condition on f in (2.2). The obvious version of Proposition 2.16 holds in this setting.

Now fix some countable set F like in Section 2.7. A set $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n = \widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n(F)$ can be defined like \mathcal{CM}_*^n , using equivalence classes $[M, x, C, \phi]$ of quadruples (M, x, C, ϕ) , for closed subsets $C \subset M$ with locally constant colorings $\phi : C \rightarrow F$, where the equivalence $(M, x, C, \phi) \sim (M', x', C', \psi')$ means that there is a pointed isometry $h : (M, x) \rightarrow (M', x')$ with $h(C) = C'$ and $h^* \phi' = \phi$. The convergence $[M_i, x_i, C_i, \phi_i] \rightarrow [M, x, C, \phi]$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n$ can be defined like in the case of \mathcal{CM}_*^n , adding the condition $\phi(y) = \phi_i h_i(y_i)$ in (a) and (b). Like in [1, Theorem A.17], it can be proved that this convergence defines a Polish topology on $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n$, and the forgetful or underlying map $u : \widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n \rightarrow \mathcal{CM}_*^n$, $u([M, x, C, \phi]) = [M, x, C]$, is continuous. There are also canonical continuous maps $\hat{\iota}_{M, C, \phi} : M \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n$, $\hat{\iota}_{M, C, \phi}(x) = [M, x, C, \phi]$, whose images, denoted by $[M, C, \phi]$, form a canonical partition of $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n$ satisfying the obvious versions of Lemmas 2.14 and 2.15. Similarly, the concepts of (*limit*) *aperiodicity* and *repetitivity* have obvious versions for (M, C, ϕ) , satisfying the obvious version of Proposition 2.16.

3. REALIZATION OF MANIFOLDS AS LEAVES

3.1. Realization in compact foliated spaces without holonomy.

Theorem 3.1. *For any (repetitive) connected Riemannian manifold M of bounded geometry, there is a (minimal) compact Riemannian foliated space \mathfrak{X} without holonomy with a leaf isometric to M .*

To prove this theorem, the construction of \mathfrak{X} begins with the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *Let M be a (repetitive) connected Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry. For every $\eta > 0$, there is some separated η -relatively dense subset $X \subset M$, and some coloring ϕ of X by finitely many colors such that (M, X, ϕ) is (repetitive and) limit aperiodic.*

Proof. Let $0 < \tau < \eta$. When M is not assumed to be repetitive, choose $0 < \varepsilon < \eta - \tau$ and take any $(\tau + 2\varepsilon)$ -separated $(\eta - \varepsilon)$ -relatively dense subset $\widehat{X} \subset M$ (Corollary 2.4). By Proposition 2.12, there are $\rho > 0$, $\sigma \geq 3\eta$, and a τ -separated η -relatively dense subset X such that

$$d_M(x, y) \notin (\sigma - \rho, \sigma + \rho) \quad \forall x, y \in X. \quad (3.1)$$

The set X becomes a graph by declaring that there is an edge connecting points x and y if $0 < d_M(x, y) \leq \sigma$.

Claim 3. The graph X is connected, and $X \cap D_M(x, r) \subset D_X(x, \lfloor r/\eta \rfloor + 1)$ for all $x \in X$ and $r > 0$.

Let $x, y \in X$ and $k = \lfloor d(x, y)/\eta \rfloor + 1$. Since M is connected, there is a finite sequence $x = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k = y$ such that $d_M(u_{i-1}, u_i) < \eta$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$). Using that X is η -relatively dense in M , we get another finite sequence $x = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k = y$ in X so that $d_M(u_i, z_i) < \eta$ for all i . Then

$$d_M(z_{i-1}, z_i) \leq d_M(z_{i-1}, u_{i-1}) + d_M(u_{i-1}, u_i) + d_M(u_i, z_i) < 3\eta \leq \sigma.$$

So, either $z_{i-1} = z_i$, or there is an edge between z_{i-1} and z_i . Thus, omitting consecutive repetitions, z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k gives rise to a graph-theoretic path between x and y in X . This shows that X is a connected graph and $d_X(x, y) \leq k$, as desired.

By Proposition 2.11, there is some $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $x \in M$, the disk $D_M(x, \sigma) \cap X$ has at most c points, obtaining that $\deg X \leq c$. Now [5, Theorem 1.4] ensures that there exists a limit aperiodic coloring $\phi : X \rightarrow \{1, \dots, c\}$. By the definition of the graph structure of X , we also get

$$D_X(x, r) \subset D_M(x, r\sigma) \quad (3.2)$$

for all $x \in X$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

For $n = \dim M$, take a class $[M', X', \phi'] \subset \overline{[M, X, \phi]}$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n(\{1, \dots, c\})$ (Section 2.8). Consider the graph structure on X' defined by declaring that there is an edge connecting points x' and y' if $0 < d_{M'}(x', y') \leq \sigma$.

Claim 4. We have that:

- (a) X' is τ -separated and η -relatively dense in M' ,
- (b) X' is a connected graph and $X' \cap D_{M'}(x', r) \subset D_{X'}(x', \lfloor r/\eta \rfloor + 1)$ for all $x' \in X'$ and $r > 0$,
- (c) $\deg X' \leq c$, and
- (d) $[X', \phi'] \subset \overline{[X, \phi]}$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_*(\{1, \dots, c\})$.

Given $x' \in X'$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $R > \delta > 0$ and $\lambda > 1$, there are some $x \in X$ and an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. $h : (M', x') \rightarrow (M, x)$ such that:

- for all $u \in D(x', R - \delta) \cap X'$, there is some $v \in h^{-1}(X) \subset D(x', R)$ with $d(u, v) < \delta$ and $\phi'(u) = \phi h(v)$; and,
- for all $v \in D(x', R - \delta) \cap h^{-1}(X)$, there is some $u \in X' \cap D(x', R)$ with $d(u, v) < \delta$ and $\phi'(u) = \phi h(v)$.

For the sake of simplicity, let $\bar{y} = h^{-1}(y)$ for every $y \in \text{im } h$. Since $X \cap h(D_{M'}(x', R))$, $X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R)$ and $h(D_{M'}(x', R))$ are compact, given any $0 < \tau' < \tau$, we can assume that $\lambda - 1$ and δ are so small that

$$2\lambda\delta < \tau. \quad (3.3)$$

For any $y' \in X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta)$, there is some $y \in X \cap h(D_{M'}(x', R))$ such that $d_{M'}(y', \bar{y}) < \delta$ and $\phi'(y') = \phi(y)$. If $z \in X \cap h(D_{M'}(x', R))$ also satisfies $d_{M'}(y', \bar{z}) < \delta$, then, by (3.3),

$$d_M(y, z) \leq \lambda d_{M'}(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \leq \lambda(d_{M'}(y', \bar{z}) + d_{M'}(y', \bar{y})) < 2\lambda\delta < \tau,$$

yielding $y = z$ because X is τ -separated. So y is uniquely associated to y' , and therefore the assignment $y' \mapsto y$ defines a color-preserving map

$$\tilde{h} : X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta) \rightarrow X \cap h(D_{M'}(x', R));$$

in particular, $\tilde{h}(x') = h(x') = x$. Since h is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i., for all $y', z' \in X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta)$,

$$(d_{M'}(y', z') - 2\delta)/\lambda < d_M(\tilde{h}(y'), \tilde{h}(z')) < \lambda(d_{M'}(y', z') + 2\delta). \quad (3.4)$$

Furthermore, either $d_M(\tilde{h}(y'), \tilde{h}(z')) = 0$, or $d_M(\tilde{h}(y'), \tilde{h}(z')) \geq \tau$ because X is τ -separated. So, either $d_{M'}(y', z') < 2\delta$, or $d_{M'}(y', z') > \tau/\lambda - 2\delta$ by (3.4). Since the choice of δ , λ and R was arbitrary, we infer that X' is a τ -separated subset of M' . In particular, \tilde{h} is injective by (3.3) and (3.4).

By taking δ and $\lambda - 1$ small enough, we can also assume that

$$\lambda(\sigma - \rho + 2\delta) < \sigma < (\sigma + \rho - 2\delta)/\lambda. \quad (3.5)$$

Given $y', z' \in X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta)$, let $y = \tilde{h}(y')$ and $z = \tilde{h}(z')$ in $X \cap h(D_{M'}(x', R))$. If $d_{M'}(y', z') < \sigma - \rho$, then, by (3.5),

$$d_M(y, z) \leq \lambda d_{M'}(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) < \lambda(d_{M'}(y', z') + 2\delta) < \sigma.$$

If $d_{M'}(y', z') \geq \sigma + \rho$, then, by (3.5),

$$d_M(y, z) \geq d_{M'}(\bar{y}, \bar{z})/\lambda > (d_{M'}(y', z') - 2\delta)/\lambda > \sigma.$$

These inequalities, (3.4) and the injectivity of \tilde{h} show that

$$\tilde{h} : X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta) \rightarrow \tilde{h}(X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta)) \quad (3.6)$$

is a color-preserving graph isomorphism.

Like in (3.4), for all $y' \in X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta)$,

$$(d_{M'}(x', y') - \delta)/\lambda < d_M(x, \tilde{h}(y')) < \lambda(d_{M'}(x', y') + \delta). \quad (3.7)$$

We use these inequalities to show that

$$X \cap D_M(x, (R - 2\delta)/\lambda) \subset \tilde{h}(X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta)) \subset X \cap D_M(x, \lambda R). \quad (3.8)$$

Here, the second inclusion is a direct consequence of (3.7). To show the first inclusion, observe that $D_M(x, (R - 2\delta)/\lambda) \subset h(D_{M'}(x, R - 2\delta))$ because $h : (M', x') \mapsto (M, x)$ is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. Thus, for any $y \in X \cap D_M(x, (R - 2\delta)/\lambda)$, we have $\bar{y} \in D_{M'}(x', R - 2\delta)$ with $h(\bar{y}) = y$. Moreover there is some $y' \in X'$ such that $d_{M'}(y', \bar{y}) \leq \delta$. Then $d_{M'}(x', y') \leq d_{M'}(x', \bar{y}) + \delta \leq R - \delta$, and $\tilde{h}(y') = y$ by the definition of \tilde{h} . So $y \in \tilde{h}(X' \cap D_{M'}(x', R - \delta))$, completing the proof of (3.8).

Now, for any $y' \in D_{M'}(x', (R - 2\delta)/(\lambda - \eta)\lambda)$, we get $h(y') \in D_M(x, (R - 2\delta)/(\lambda - \eta))$ because $h : (M', x') \mapsto (M, x)$ is an (m, R, λ) -p.p.q.i. Since X is η -relatively dense, there is some $y \in M$ such that $d(h(y'), y) \leq \eta$. We have $y \in D_M(x, (R - 2\delta)/\lambda)$ by the triangle inequality. Moreover $y \in \text{im } \tilde{h}$ by (3.8). So $\tilde{h}^{-1}(y) \in X'$ and

$$d(y', \tilde{h}^{-1}(y)) < d(y', \bar{y}) + \delta \leq \lambda d(h(y'), y) + \delta \leq \lambda\eta + \delta.$$

Since R is arbitrarily large, and δ and $\lambda - 1$ are arbitrarily small, it follows that X' is η -relatively dense in M' , completing the proof of (a).

Item (b) follows from (a) with the same argument as in Claim 3. Finally, (c) and (d) follow using (3.8) and the color-preserving graph isomorphisms (3.6). This completes the proof of Claim 4.

Claim 5. If η is small enough, then (M, X, ϕ) is limit aperiodic.

Consider any class $[M', X', \phi'] \subset \overline{[M, X, \phi]}$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n(\{1, \dots, c\})$, and let h be an isometry of M' preserving X' and ϕ' . Then h defines a color-preserving graph automorphism (X', ϕ') with the above graph structure. By Claim 4 and since (X, ϕ) is limit aperiodic, we get that $h = \text{id}$ on X' . By Proposition 2.13, it follows that $h = \text{id}$ on M' if η is small enough. So (M', X', ϕ') is aperiodic, completing the proof of Claim 5.

To finish the proof, let us show that we can get (M, Z, χ) repetitive if M is repetitive. Define X and ϕ as above, then the closure $\overline{[M, X, \phi]}$ is compact, so it contains some $[N, Y, \psi]$ with minimal closure. The image of $\overline{[N, Y, \psi]}$ by the forgetful map $\widehat{\mathcal{CM}}_*^n(\{1, \dots, c\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_*^n$ is a compact, saturated subset of $\overline{[M]}$, so it is in fact all of $\overline{[M]}$ because this set is minimal. Hence, $\overline{[M, Z, \chi]} = \overline{[N, Y, \psi]}$ for some Z and χ , and (M, Z, χ) is repetitive because $\overline{[M, Z, \chi]}$ is minimal. Finally, (M, Z, χ) is limit aperiodic because $[M, Z, \chi] \in \overline{[M, X, \phi]}$. \square

As explained in Section 2.6, Theorem 3.1 holds with the Riemannian foliated subspace $\mathfrak{X} = \overline{[M, f]} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n$ ($n = \dim M$), where $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H})$ is given by the following result.

Proposition 3.3 (Cf. [4, Proposition 7.1]). *Let M be a (repetitive) connected Riemannian manifold. There is some (repetitive) limit aperiodic $f \in C^\infty(M, \mathfrak{H})$, where \mathfrak{H} is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, so that $\sup_M |\nabla^m f| < \infty$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\inf_M |\nabla f| > 0$.*

Proof. Take $r_0 > 0$ and normal parametrizations $\kappa_x : B_{r_0} \rightarrow B_M(x, r_0)$ ($x \in M$) like in Proposition 2.10. For any $0 < r < r_0$, take X , c and ϕ like in Proposition 3.2 with $\eta = 2r/3$. Write $X = \{x_i \mid i \in I\}$ for some index set I , and let $\kappa_i = \kappa_{x_i} : B_r \rightarrow B_M(x_i, r)$ and $\phi_i = \phi(x_i)$ ($i \in I$). Consider the graph structure on X defined in the proof of Proposition 3.2, using $\sigma = 3\eta = 2r$. Since $\deg X \leq c$, there is a coloring $\alpha : X \rightarrow \{1, \dots, c+1\}$ such that adjacent vertices have different colors. Let $X_k = \alpha^{-1}(k)$ and $I_k = \{i \in I \mid x_i \in X_k\}$ ($k = 1, \dots, c+1$).

For $n = \dim M$, let S be an isometric copy in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} of the standard n -dimensional sphere so that $0 \in S$. Choose some function $\rho \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\rho(x)$ depends only on $|x|$, $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$, $\rho(x) = 1$ if $|x| \leq r/2$, and $\rho(x) = 0$ if $|x| \geq r$. Take also some C^∞ map $\tau : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ that restricts to a diffeomorphism $B_r \rightarrow S \setminus \{0\}$ and maps $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r$ to 0. Let $V = \tau(B_{r/2}) \subset S$ and $y_0 = \tau(0) \in V$. Let $\rho_i = \rho \kappa_i^{-1}$ and $\tau_i = \tau \kappa_i^{-1}$. For $k = 1, \dots, c+1$, let $f^k = (f_1^k, f_2^k) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+2} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be the extension by zero of the combination of the compactly supported functions $(\rho_i \cdot \phi_i, \rho_i \cdot \tau_i)$ on the disjoint balls $B_M(x_i, r)$, for $i \in I_k$. Let $f = (f^1, \dots, f^{c+1}) : M \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{n+2})^{c+1} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{(c+1)(n+2)} =: \mathfrak{H}$. Note that $\sup_M |\nabla^m f| < \infty$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\inf_M |\nabla f| > 0$. We can write $f = (f_1, f_2) : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H} \equiv \mathfrak{H}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{H}_2$, where $f_1 = (f_1^1, \dots, f_1^{c+1}) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{c+1} =: \mathfrak{H}_1$ and $f_2 = (f_2^1, \dots, f_2^{c+1}) : M \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{n+1})^{c+1} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{(c+1)(n+1)} =: \mathfrak{H}_2$.

Claim 6. If r is small enough, then f is limit aperiodic.

Take any class $[M', f'] \in \overline{[M, f]}$. Then $[M'] \in \overline{[M]}$, obtaining that $\text{inj}_{M'} \geq \text{inj}_M > r_0$ and M' satisfies the property stated in Proposition 2.10. We can consider $f' = (f'^1, \dots, f'^{c+1}) : M' \rightarrow (\mathbb{R}^{n+2})^{c+1} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{(c+1)(n+2)} = \mathfrak{H}$ with $f'^k = (f'_1{}^k, f'_2{}^k) : M' \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$. Given $x' \in M'$, there are sequences, $0 < R_p \uparrow \infty$ and $\eta_p \downarrow 0$ in \mathbb{R} , $m_p \uparrow \infty$ in \mathbb{N} , of smooth compact domains $D_p \subset M'$ with $B_{M'}(x', R_p) \subset D_p \subset B_{M'}(x', R_{p+1})$, and of C^∞ embeddings $h_p : D_p \rightarrow M$, such that

$$q \geq p \implies \|h_q^* g_M - g_{M'}\|_{C^{m_q, D_p, g_{M'}}}, \|h_q^* f - f'\|_{C^{m_q, D_p, g_{M'}}} < \eta_q.$$

Let $X'_k = (f_2'^k)^{-1}(y_0) \subset M'$ and $X' = X'_1 \cup \dots \cup X'_{c+1}$. Write $X' = \{x'_a \mid a \in A\}$ for some index set A , and let $A_k = \{a \in A \mid x'_a \in X'_k\}$. For any $a \in A_k$, we have $D_{M'}(x'_a, r) \subset D_p$ for p large enough. Let $\bar{x}_{a,q} = h_q(x'_a)$ for $q \geq p$. Then $f_2^k(\bar{x}_{a,q}) \rightarrow f_2^k(x'_a) = y_0$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. By the definition of f_2^k , it follows that there is a sequence $i_{a,q} \in I_k$ such that $d_M(x_{i_{a,q}}, \bar{x}_{a,q}) \rightarrow 0$. Given $0 < \theta < r/2$, we get $h_q(D_{M'}(x'_a, \theta)) \subset B_M(x_{i_{a,q}}, r/2)$ for $q \geq p$ large enough, and $\kappa_{i_{a,q}}^{-1} h_q = \tau^{-1} f_2^k h_q \rightarrow \tau^{-1} f_2^k$ with respect to the C^∞ topology on $D_{M'}(x'_a, \theta)$. Thus there is some normal parametrization $\kappa'_a : B_r \rightarrow B_{M'}(x'_a, r)$ such that $\tau^{-1} f_2^k = \kappa'_a{}^{-1}$ on $D_{M'}(x'_a, \theta)$. Since θ is arbitrary, we get $f_2^k = \tau \kappa'_a{}^{-1}$ on $B_{M'}(x'_a, r/2)$; in particular, $f_2^k : B_{M'}(x'_a, r/2) \rightarrow V$ is a diffeomorphism.

Now, using the properties of X and the convergence $d_M(x_{i_{a,q}}, \bar{x}_{a,q}) \rightarrow 0$, it easily follows that X' is also separated and η -relatively dense in M' , and, for all $x' \in M'$, the ball $B_{M'}(x', \sigma) \cap X'$ has at most c points. Hence, like in the case of X , the set X' becomes a connected graph with $\deg X' \leq c$ by attaching an edge between x'_a and x'_b ($a, b \in A$) if $0 < d_{M'}(x'_a, x'_b) < \sigma$. Let \tilde{D}_p denote the set of points x'_a in X' such that $D_{M'}(x'_a, r) \subset D_p$. From the convergence $d_M(x_{i_{a,q}}, \bar{x}_{a,q}) \rightarrow 0$, we also get that, if p and q are large enough with $q \geq p$, then, for all $a, b \in A$ with $x'_a, x'_b \in \tilde{D}_p$, there is an edge in X between $x_{i_{a,q}}$ and $x_{i_{b,q}}$ if and only if there is an edge in X' between x'_a and x'_b . Thus an injection $\tilde{h}_{p,q} : \tilde{D}_p \rightarrow X$ is defined by $\tilde{h}_{p,q}(x'_a) = x_{i_{a,q}}$, and $\tilde{h}_{p,q} : \tilde{D}_p \rightarrow \tilde{h}_{p,q}(\tilde{D}_p)$ is a graph isomorphism. Moreover, for any $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $a \in A$, we have $D_{X'}(x'_a, N) \subset \tilde{D}_p$ if $D_{M'}(x'_a, 2Nr) \subset D_p$, which holds for p large enough. Then there is a pointed isomorphism $(B_{X'}(x'_a, N), x'_a) \rightarrow (B_X(x_{i_{a,q}}, N), x_{i_{a,q}})$ if p and q are large enough with $q \geq p$, yielding $[X', x'_a] \in \overline{[X]}$, and therefore $\overline{[X']} \subset \overline{[X]}$. Furthermore, $f_1^k(\bar{x}_{a,q}) = f_1^k(x_{i_{a,q}}) = \phi_{i_{a,q}} = (\tilde{F}_{p,q}^* \phi)(x'_a)$ if $d_M(x_{i_{a,q}}, \bar{x}_{a,q}) < r/2$ and $i_{a,q} \in I_k$, and $f_1^k(\bar{x}_{a,q}) = (h_q^* f_1^k)(x'_a) \rightarrow f_1^k(x'_a)$ as $q \rightarrow \infty$. So a coloring $\phi' : X' \rightarrow \{1, \dots, c\}$ is defined by taking $\phi' = f_1^k$ on every X'_k , and we have $\tilde{h}_{p,q} \phi = \phi'$ on $D_{X'}(x'_a, N)$. Hence $[X', x'_a, \phi'] \in \overline{[X, \phi]}$, and therefore $\overline{[X', \phi']} \subset \overline{[X, \phi]}$. Moreover (X', ϕ') is aperiodic because (X, ϕ) is limit aperiodic.

Let us prove that (M', f') is aperiodic. Let h be an isometry of M' such that $h^* f' = f'$. Then $h^* f_j^k = f_j^k$ for all $k = 1, \dots, c+1$ and $j = 1, 2$. So $h(X') = X'$ and $h : X' \rightarrow X'$ is a graph isomorphism preserving ϕ' .

Since (X', ϕ') is aperiodic, it follows that h is the identity on X' . So $h = \text{id}$ on M' if r is small enough by Proposition 2.13. This completes the proof of Claim 6.

When M is repetitive, the repetitivity of f is a direct consequence of the repetitivity of (M, X, ϕ) . \square

3.2. Replacing compact foliated spaces with matchbox manifolds.

Theorem 3.4. *For any (minimal) transitive compact C^∞ foliated space \mathfrak{X} without holonomy, there is a C^∞ (minimal) matchbox manifold \mathfrak{M} without holonomy, and there is a C^∞ surjective foliated map $\pi : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ that restricts to diffeomorphisms between the leaves of \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{X} .*

Proof. Fix any dense leaf M of \mathfrak{X} , an auxiliary Riemannian metric on \mathfrak{X} , and a C^∞ embedding into some separable Hilbert space, $h : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_1$. Let $f_1 = h|_M$ and $\mathfrak{M}_1 = \overline{[M, f_1]}$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^n(\mathfrak{H}_1)$ ($n = \dim M$). Then (M, f_1) is limit aperiodic, \mathfrak{M}_1 is compact, and we have an induced isometric diffeomorphism between Riemannian foliated spaces, $\hat{\iota}_{\mathfrak{X}, h} : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_1$ (Example 2.23).

There are regular foliated atlases $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i, \phi_i\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} = \{\tilde{U}_i, \tilde{\phi}_i\}$ of \mathfrak{X} ($i = 1, \dots, c$), with foliated charts $\phi_i : U_i \rightarrow B_i \times \mathfrak{T}_i$ and $\tilde{\phi}_i : \tilde{U}_i \rightarrow \tilde{B}_i \times \mathfrak{T}_i$, such that $\overline{U_i} \subset \tilde{U}_i$ and $\phi_i = \tilde{\phi}_i|_{U_i}$. Thus $\overline{B_i} \subset \tilde{B}_i$ in \mathbb{R}^n ($n = \dim \mathfrak{X}$), and every \mathfrak{T}_i is a relatively compact subspace of $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}_i$. Moreover the projections $\tilde{p}_i = \text{pr}_2 \tilde{\phi}_i : \tilde{U}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}_i$ extend the projections $p_i = \text{pr}_2 \phi_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}_i$, and the elementary holonomy transformations $\tilde{h}_{ij} : \tilde{p}_i(\tilde{U}_i \cap \tilde{U}_j) \rightarrow \tilde{p}_j(\tilde{U}_i \cap \tilde{U}_j)$ defined by $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ extend the elementary holonomy transformations $h_{ij} : p_i(U_i \cap U_j) \rightarrow p_j(U_i \cap U_j)$ defined by \mathcal{U} . Let \mathcal{I} denote the set of all finite sequences of indices in $\{1, \dots, c\}$. For every $I = (i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \in \mathcal{I}$, let $\tilde{h}_I = \tilde{h}_{i_{k-1}i_k} \cdots \tilde{h}_{i_1i_0}$ and $h_I = h_{i_{k-1}i_k} \cdots h_{i_1i_0}$, which may be empty maps. There are points $y_i \in B_i$ such that the local transversals $\tilde{\phi}_i^{-1}(\{y_i\} \times \mathfrak{T}_i) \equiv \tilde{\mathfrak{T}}_i$ have disjoint closures in \mathfrak{X} , and therefore we can realize $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}} := \bigsqcup_i \tilde{\mathfrak{T}}_i$ as a complete transversal in \mathfrak{X} (Section 2.4). Hence $\phi_i^{-1}(\{y_i\} \times \mathfrak{T}_i) \equiv \mathfrak{T}_i$ and $\mathfrak{T} := \bigsqcup_i \mathfrak{T}_i$ also have these properties.

Since \mathfrak{X} is Polish and compact, it is locally compact and second countable, and therefore $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$ is also locally compact and second countable. Then there is a countable base of relatively compact open subsets V_k ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) of $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$. Fix any relatively compact open subset \mathfrak{S}_i of every $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}_i$ containing $\overline{\mathfrak{T}}_i$, and let $\mathfrak{S} = \bigsqcup_i \mathfrak{S}_i$. Given a metric on $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$ inducing its topology, we can suppose that there is a sequence $0 = k_0 < k_1 < \dots$ in \mathbb{N} such that the sets $V_{k_m}, \dots, V_{k_{m+1}-1}$ cover \mathfrak{S} and have diameter $< 1/(m+1)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Using $K = \{0, 1\}^\mathbb{N}$ as a model of the Cantor space, let $\psi : \tilde{\mathfrak{T}} \rightarrow K$ be defined by

$$\psi(x)(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin V_k \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in V_k \end{cases}.$$

Since \mathcal{I} is countable, $K^\mathcal{I}$ is homeomorphic to K . Let $\Psi : \tilde{\mathfrak{T}} \rightarrow K^\mathcal{I}$ be the map defined by

$$\Psi(x)(I) = \begin{cases} \psi \tilde{h}_I(x) & \text{if } x \in \text{dom } \tilde{h}_I \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin \text{dom } \tilde{h}_I, \end{cases}$$

where $0 \equiv (0, 0, \dots) \in K$. Observe that $\Psi(x)$ determines $\psi \tilde{h}_I(x)$ for all $x \in \tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $x \in \text{dom } \tilde{h}_I$.

Claim 7. For any sequence x_a in \mathfrak{S} , if $\psi(x_a)$ is convergent in K , then x_a is convergent in $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$, and $\lim_a x_a$ depends only on $\lim_a \psi(x_a)$.

The convergence of $\psi(x_a)$ in K means that, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is some $a_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\psi(x_a)(k) = \psi(x_{a_m})(k)$ for all $k < k_{m+1}$ and $a, a_m \geq a_m$. Since the sets $V_{k_m}, \dots, V_{k_{m+1}-1}$ cover \mathfrak{S} , it follows that there is a sequence $l_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_m \leq l_m < k_{m+1}$ and $x_a \in V_{l_m}$ for all $a \geq a_m$. Thus the limit set $\bigcap_k \overline{\{x_a \mid a \geq a_m\}}$ is a nonempty subset of $\bigcap_m \overline{V_{l_m}}$, which consists of a unique point of \mathfrak{S} because every $\overline{V_{l_m}}$ is compact with diameter $< 1/(m+1)$. Thus x_a is convergent in $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$.

Now let y_a be another sequence in \mathfrak{S} such that $\psi(y_a)$ is convergent in K and $\lim_a \psi(y_a) = \lim_a \psi(x_a)$. We have already proved that y_a is convergent in $\tilde{\mathfrak{T}}$. Moreover, taking a_m large enough in the above argument, we also get $\psi(y_a)(k) = \psi(x_a)(k)$ for all $k < k_{m+1}$ and $a \geq a_m$. This yields $y_a \in V_{l_m}$ for all $a \geq a_m$, and therefore $\lim_a y_a = \lim_a x_a$. This completes the proof of Claim 7.

According to Claim 7, a continuous map $\varpi : \overline{\psi(\mathfrak{S})} \rightarrow \overline{\mathfrak{S}}$ is defined by $\varpi(\xi) = x$ if $\{x\} = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{V_k}$, and we have $\varpi\psi = \text{id}$ on \mathfrak{S} . Let $X_i = \mathfrak{T}_i \cap M$ and $X = \bigcup_i X_i = \mathfrak{T} \cap M$, which is a Delone set in M (see e.g. [8, Proposition 10.5]).

For every i , let $\lambda_i : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^∞ function with $\lambda_i = 1$ on \mathfrak{T}_i and $\lambda_i = 0$ on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{T}} \setminus \overline{\mathfrak{S}_i}$. Fix an embedding $\sigma : K^J \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and let $f_2 = (f_2^1, \dots, f_2^c) : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^c =: \mathfrak{H}_2$, where $f_2^i(x) = \lambda_i(x) \cdot \sigma \Psi \tilde{p}_i(x)$. We have $\sup_M |\nabla^m f_2| = \max_i \sup_{\mathfrak{X}} |\nabla^m \lambda_i| < \infty$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. So $\mathfrak{M}_2 := \overline{[M, f_2]}$ is compact by Corollary 2.19.

Consider the C^∞ function $f = (f_1, f_2) : M \rightarrow \mathfrak{H} := \mathfrak{H}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{H}_2$, and $\mathfrak{M} = \overline{[M, f]}$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_*^n(\mathfrak{H})$. Since \mathfrak{M}_1 and \mathfrak{M}_2 are compact, we get that \mathfrak{M} is also compact by Corollary 2.20. We have $\inf_M |\nabla f| \geq \inf_M |\nabla f_1| = \inf_{\mathfrak{X}} |\nabla \tilde{h}| > 0$, and therefore $\mathfrak{M} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n(\mathfrak{H})$ by Proposition 2.21 (ii). The function (M, f) is limit aperiodic because (M, f_1) is limit aperiodic, and therefore \mathfrak{M} has no holonomy (Section 2.6).

For $a = 1, 2$, let $\Pi_a : \mathfrak{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}_a$ denote the corresponding factor projection. Then $\Pi_{1*} : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_1$ is a surjective C^∞ foliated map restricting to isometries between the leaves, and therefore $\pi := (\hat{\iota}_{\mathfrak{X}, h_1})^{-1} \Pi_{1*} : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ is also a surjective C^∞ foliated map restricting to isometries between the leaves. Thus every leaf of \mathfrak{M} is of the form $[M', f']$, where M' is a leaf of \mathfrak{X} and $f' = (f'_1, f'_2) : M' \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$, where $f'_1 = h|_{M'}$ and $[M', f'_2] \subset \mathfrak{M}_2$.

Let $p'_i : U'_i := \pi^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}'_i := \pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{T}_i)$ be defined by $p'_i([M', x', f']) = [M', p_i(x'), f']$, for leaves M' of \mathfrak{X} , and let $\phi'_i = (\text{pr}_1 \phi_i \pi, p'_i) : U'_i \rightarrow B_i \times \mathfrak{T}'_i$, where $\text{pr}_1 : B_i \times \mathfrak{T}_i \rightarrow B_i$ is the first factor projection. Using the description of the C^∞ foliated structure of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{*, \text{imm}}^n(\mathfrak{H})$ given in [4, Section 5], it is easy to check that $\{U'_i, \phi'_i\}$ is a C^∞ foliated atlas of \mathfrak{M} . Thus $\mathfrak{T}' = \bigcup_i \mathfrak{T}'_i \equiv \bigsqcup_i \mathfrak{T}'_i$ is a complete transversal of \mathfrak{M} .

Claim 8. The map $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathfrak{T}'} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is an embedding whose image is $\overline{f(X)}$.

Since $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathfrak{T}'} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is a continuous map defined on a compact space, and $\{[M, x, f] \mid x \in X\}$ is dense in $\overline{\mathfrak{T}'}$, it is enough to prove that $\text{ev} : \overline{\mathfrak{T}'} \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}$ is injective. Let $[M', x', f'], [M'', x'', f''] \in \overline{\mathfrak{T}'}$ with $f'(x') = f''(x'')$. We can assume that M' and M'' are leaves of \mathfrak{X} , $x' \in M' \cap \overline{\mathfrak{T}}$, $x'' \in M'' \cap \overline{\mathfrak{T}}$, $f' = (f'_1, f'_2)$ with $f'_1 = h|_{M'}$, and $f'' = (f''_1, f''_2)$ with $f''_1 = h|_{M''}$. Then $h(x') = h(x'')$, yielding $x' = x''$ and $M' = M''$. On the other hand, there are sequences x'_m and x''_m in $M \cap \mathfrak{T}$ converging to x' in $\overline{\mathfrak{T}}$ such that (M, x'_m, f_2) and (M, x''_m, f_2) are C^∞ -convergent to (M', x', f'_2) and (M', x', f''_2) , respectively. If $x' \in \overline{\mathfrak{T}_i}$, we can assume that $x'_m, x''_m \in M \cap \mathfrak{T}_i$ for all m . Writing $f'_2 = (f'^1_2, \dots, f'^c_2)$ and $f''_2 = (f''^1_2, \dots, f''^c_2)$, we get

$$\lim_m \sigma \Psi(x'_m) = f'^i(x') = f''^i(x') = \lim_m \sigma \Psi(x''_m).$$

So $\lim_m \Psi(x'_m) = \lim_m \Psi(x''_m)$, yielding $\lim_m \Psi h_I(x'_m) = \lim_m \Psi h_I(x''_m)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $h_I(x'_m)$ and $h_I(x''_m)$ converge to $\tilde{h}_I(x')$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{T}}$, using the Reeb's local stability theorem and the definition of f_2 , it follows that both (M, x'_k, f_2) and (M, x''_k, f_2) are C^∞ -convergent to the same triple with first components (M', x') . Therefore $f'_2 = f''_2$, yielding $[M', x', f'] = [M'', x'', f'']$, as desired.

According to Claim 8, $\overline{\mathfrak{T}'}$ is homeomorphic to the subspace

$$\overline{f(X)} = \overline{\{(f_1(x), f_2(x)) \mid x \in X\}} \subset f_1(\overline{\mathfrak{T}}) \times (\sigma(K^J))^c.$$

By the conditions on the functions λ_i , this subspace is homeomorphic to the subspace

$$\begin{aligned} \bigsqcup_i \overline{\{(x, \Psi(x)) \mid x \in X_i\}} &= \bigsqcup_i \overline{\{(\varpi(\xi), \xi) \mid \xi \in \Psi(X_i)\}} \\ &= \bigsqcup_i \{(\varpi(\xi), \xi) \mid \xi \in \overline{\Psi(X_i)}\} \subset \bigsqcup_i \overline{\mathfrak{T}_i} \times K^J \equiv \overline{\mathfrak{T}} \times K^J, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn is homeomorphic to the subspace $\bigcup_i \overline{\Psi(X_i)} \subset K^J$ because ϖ is continuous. So $\overline{\mathfrak{T}'}$ and \mathfrak{T}' are zero-dimensional, obtaining that \mathfrak{M} is a matchbox manifold.

Now suppose that \mathfrak{X} is minimal. Then (M, f_1) is repetitive (Example 2.23). A simple refinement of the proof of Proposition 2.22 also shows that (M, f_2) is repetitive. In both cases, this property can be described with the same partial pointed quasi-isometries given by the Reeb's local stability theorem. So (M, f) is also repetitive, and therefore \mathfrak{M} is minimal by Proposition 2.16 (i). \square

Theorem 1.1 now follows from Theorems 3.1 and 3.4.

3.3. Attaching flat bundles to foliated spaces. Let $\mathfrak{X} \equiv (\mathfrak{X}, \mathcal{F})$ be a compact C^∞ foliated space of dimension n , and let M be a leaf of \mathfrak{X} . On the other hand, let $\rho : E \rightarrow M$ be a locally compact flat bundle with typical fiber F and horizontal foliated structure \mathcal{H} . It can be described as the suspension of its holonomy homomorphism $h : \pi_1 M \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(F)$, whose image is its holonomy group G ; they are well defined up to conjugation in $\text{Homeo}(F)$. Any foliated concept of E refers to \mathcal{H} . The C^∞ differentiable structure of M induces a C^∞ differentiable structure of \mathcal{H} . Assume that F is a non-compact locally compact Polish space; then E also has these properties. The notation $E_x = \rho^{-1}(x)$ and $E_X = \rho^{-1}(X)$ will be used for $x \in M$ and $X \subset M$.

The one-point compactifications $E_x^+ = \{x\} \sqcup E_x$ of the fibers E_x ($x \in M$) are the fibers of another C^∞ flat bundle $\rho^+ : E^+ \rightarrow M$; thus $E^+ \equiv M \sqcup E$ as sets. Its typical fiber is the one-point compactification $F^+ = \{\infty\} \cup F$ of F , the leaves of its horizontal foliation \mathcal{H}^+ are M and the leaves of \mathcal{H} , its holonomy homomorphism $h^+ : \pi_1 M \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(F^+)$ is induced by h , and its holonomy group is denoted by G^+ . The more specific notation $h_x : \pi_1(M, x) \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(F)$, $h_x^+ : \pi_1(M, x) \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(F^+)$, G_x and G_x^+ will be used to indicate the base point x .

Let us topologize $\mathfrak{X}' = \mathfrak{X} \sqcup E \cong \mathfrak{X} \cup_{\text{id}_M} E^+$ as follows: Take any foliated chart $U \equiv B \times \mathfrak{T}$ of \mathfrak{X} with ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and local transversal \mathfrak{T} . We have $M \cap U \equiv B \times D$ for some countable subset $D \subset \mathfrak{T}$. Since the plaques of U are contractible, ρ has a local trivialization $E_{M \cap U} \equiv (M \cap U) \times F$. Consider the topology on $\mathfrak{T}' = \mathfrak{T} \sqcup (D \times F)$ with basic open sets of the form

$$\mathfrak{V} = \emptyset \sqcup \{d\} \times V_d \equiv \{d\} \times V_d,$$

where $d \in D$ and $V_d \subset F$ is open, and

$$\mathfrak{W} = W_{\mathfrak{T}} \sqcup \left(\bigcup_z (\{z\} \times (F \setminus K_z)) \right),$$

where $W_{\mathfrak{T}} \subset \mathfrak{T}$ is open, $z \in W_{\mathfrak{T}} \cap D$, and $K_z \subset F$ is compact. Then \mathfrak{X} has a topology with basic open sets of the form

$$V \equiv \emptyset \sqcup \left(B \times \bigcup_z (\{z\} \times R_z) \right) \equiv B \times \mathfrak{V}, \quad W \equiv U \sqcup \left(B \times \bigcup_z (\{z\} \times S_z) \right) \equiv B \times \mathfrak{W},$$

for all possible foliated charts $U \equiv B \times \mathfrak{T}$ of \mathfrak{X} . Using these basic open sets, it is easy to check that \mathfrak{X}' is Hausdorff, second countable and compact. So \mathfrak{X}' is metrizable [31, Proposition 4.6], and hence Polish. In particular, the sets

$$U' = U \sqcup E_{M \cap U} \equiv (B \times \mathfrak{T}) \sqcup (B \times D \times F) = B \times \mathfrak{T}'$$

are open in \mathfrak{X}' , and the fibers $B \times \{*\}$ correspond to open subsets of leaves of \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{H} . Thus these identities are foliated charts of a foliated structure \mathcal{F}' on \mathfrak{X}' , and its leaves are the leaves of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{H} . As sets, we can write $\mathfrak{X}' \equiv \mathfrak{X} \cup_{\text{id}_M} E^+$ and $\mathfrak{T}' \equiv \mathfrak{T} \cup_{\text{id}_D} (D \times F^+)$, where we consider $D \equiv D \times \{\infty\} \subset D \times F^+$; we can also write $\mathfrak{T}' = \mathfrak{T} \sqcup E_D \equiv \mathfrak{T} \cup_{\text{id}_D} E_D^+$.

Consider a regular foliated atlas of \mathfrak{X} consisting of charts $U_i \equiv B_i \times \mathfrak{T}_i$, for balls $B_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and local transversal \mathfrak{T}_i . As before, take local trivializations $E_{M \cap U_i} \equiv (M \cap U_i) \times F$ of the flat bundle ρ , write $M \cap U_i \equiv B_i \times D_i$ for countable subsets $D_i \subset \mathfrak{T}_i$, and consider the induced foliated charts $U'_i \equiv B_i \times \mathfrak{T}'_i$ of \mathcal{F}' , where $U'_i = U_i \sqcup E_{M \cap U_i}$ and $\mathfrak{T}'_i = \mathfrak{T}_i \sqcup (D_i \times F)$, endowed with Polish topologies. The changes of coordinates of the foliated charts $U_i \equiv B_i \times \mathfrak{T}_i$ are of the form $(y, z) \mapsto (f_{ij}(y, z), h_{ij}(z))$, where every mapping $y \mapsto f_{ij}(y, z)$ is C^∞ with all of its partial derivatives of arbitrary order depending continuously on z . Using local trivializations of E and foliated charts of \mathcal{F} , we get $E_{M \cap U_i} \equiv (M \cap U_i) \times F \equiv B_i \times D_i \times F$. The changes of these local descriptions are of the form $(y, z, u) \mapsto (f_{ij}(y, z), h_{ij}(z), g_{ij}(z, u))$, where the maps g_{ij} are independent of y because E^+ is flat. Then the changes of coordinates of the foliated charts $U'_i \equiv B_i \times \mathfrak{T}'_i$ are of the form

$$(y, z') \mapsto \begin{cases} (f_{ij}(x, z'), h_{ij}(z')) \in B_j \times \mathfrak{T}_j & \text{if } z' \in \mathfrak{T}_i \\ (f_{ij}(x, z), (h_{ij}(z), g_{ij}(z, u))) \in B_j \times (D_j \times F) & \text{if } z' = (z, u) \in D_i \times F. \end{cases}$$

Thus the charts $U'_i \equiv B_i \times \mathfrak{T}'_i$ define a C^∞ structure on $\mathfrak{X}' \equiv (\mathfrak{X}', \mathcal{F}')$. The corresponding elementary holonomy transformations h'_{ij} are combinations of maps h_{ij} and g_{ij} . Using these foliated charts, it also follows that \mathfrak{X} and E are embedded C^∞ foliated subspaces of \mathfrak{X}' , E^+ is an injectively immersed C^∞ foliated

subspace of \mathfrak{X}' , and the combination $\pi : \mathfrak{X}' \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ of $\text{id}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ and ρ (or ρ^+) is a C^∞ foliated retraction. The fibers of π are

$$\pi^{-1}(x) = \begin{cases} \{x\} \sqcup \emptyset \equiv \{x\} & \text{if } x \in \mathfrak{X} \setminus M \\ \{x\} \sqcup E_x = E_x^+ & \text{if } x \in M. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that the restrictions of ρ to the leaves of \mathcal{H} are regular coverings of the leaves of \mathcal{F} , and that the leaf M of \mathcal{F} has no holonomy. Then the holonomy group of the leaf M of \mathcal{F}' is isomorphic to the group of germs at ∞ of the elements of the subgroup $G^+ \subset \text{Homeo}(F^+)$.*

Proof. With the above notation, fix an index i_0 and some point $x_0 \in D_{i_0} \equiv \mathfrak{T}_{i_0} \cap M \equiv \mathfrak{T}'_{i_0} \cap M$, considering $\mathfrak{T}_{i_0} \subset \mathfrak{X}$ and $\mathfrak{T}'_{i_0} \subset \mathfrak{X}'$. Let $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a loop based at x_0 . Since the holonomy group of M in \mathfrak{X} is trivial, there is a family of leafwise loops $c_x : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$, depending continuously on x in some open neighborhood \mathfrak{T}_0 of x_0 in \mathfrak{T}_{i_0} , such that $c_{x_0} = c$. Let $D_0 = D_{i_0} \cap \mathfrak{T}_0$. From the above description of the elementary holonomy transformations h'_{ij} , it follows that the holonomy of \mathcal{F}' defined by $[c] \in \pi_1(M, x_0)$ is the germ at $x_0 \equiv (x_0, \infty)$ of the homeomorphism g_c of $\mathfrak{T}'_{i_0} = \mathfrak{T}_{i_0} \sqcup (D_{i_0} \times F)$ given by

$$g_c(z') = \begin{cases} z' & \text{if } z' \in \mathfrak{T}_0 \\ (x, h_x([c_x])(u)) & \text{if } z' = (x, u) \in D_0 \times F, \end{cases}$$

using $[c_x] \in \pi_1(M, x)$. Since the restrictions of ρ to the leaves of \mathcal{H} are regular coverings of M , we easily get that $h_x^+([c_x])(u) = u$ for some $x \in D_0$ and $u \in F^+$ close enough to ∞ if and only if $h_{x_0}^+([c])(u) = u$ for $u \in F^+$ close enough to ∞ . So, by restricting every g_c to $\{x_0\} \times F^+ \equiv F^+$, we get an isomorphism from the holonomy group of the leaf M of \mathcal{F}' at x_0 to the group of germs of the elements of $G_{x_0}^+$ at ∞ . \square

Proofs of Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3. Let M be non-compact connected Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry. By Theorem 1.1, M is isometric to a leaf in some Riemannian matchbox manifold \mathfrak{M} without holonomy. Now Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3 follow by considering the foliated space \mathfrak{M}' constructed as above with \mathfrak{M} and an appropriate flat bundle E over M , and lifting the Riemannian metric of \mathfrak{M} to \mathfrak{M}' .

In the case of Corollary 1.2, we can use the trivial flat bundle $E = M \times K$ over M , where K is the Cantor space. By the density of M in \mathfrak{M} , it follows that \mathfrak{M}' has a compact zero-dimensional complete transversal \mathfrak{T}' without isolated points, and therefore \mathfrak{T}' is homeomorphic to the Cantor space.

In the case of Corollary 1.3, let Γ denote the group of deck transformations of the given regular covering \widetilde{M} of M , equipped with the discrete topology. If Γ is infinite, we can take $E = \widetilde{M}$, whose typical fiber is $F = \Gamma$. If Γ is finite, we can take $E = \widetilde{M} \times \mathbb{Z}$, whose typical fiber is $F = \Gamma \times \mathbb{Z}$. In any case, F is non-compact, and the action of Γ on itself by left translations induces a canonical action of Γ on F , which in turn induces an action on F^+ . By Lemma 3.5 and the regularity of the covering \widetilde{M} of M , the holonomy group of M in \mathfrak{M}' is isomorphic to the group of germs at ∞ of the action of the elements of Γ on F^+ , which is itself isomorphic to Γ . \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During this research, the authors were partially supported by the grants FEDER/Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades/AEI/MTM2017-89686-P, and Xunta de Galicia/ED431C 2019/10. The second author was also supported by a Canon Foundation in Europe Research Grant.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Abert and I. Biringer, *Unimodular measures on the space of all Riemannian manifolds*, *Geom. Topol.* **26** (2022), 2295–2404.
- [2] F. Alcalde Cuesta, Á. Lozano Rojo, and M. Macho Stadler, *Transversely Cantor laminations as inverse limits*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **139** (2011), 2615–2630. MR 2784831
- [3] S. Alvarez, J. Brum, M. Martinez, and R. Potrie, *Topology of leaves for minimal laminations by hyperbolic surfaces*, *J. Topol.* **15** (2022), 302–346.
- [4] J.A. Álvarez López and R. Barral Lijó, *Bounded geometry and leaves*, *Math. Nachr.* **290** (2017), no. 10, 1448–1469. MR 3672890
- [5] ———, *Limit aperiodic and repetitive colorings of graphs*, arXiv:1807.09256, 2018.
- [6] J.A. Álvarez López, R. Barral Lijó, and A. Candel, *A universal Riemannian foliated space*, *Topology Appl.* **198** (2016), 47–85. MR 3433188

- [7] J.A. Álvarez López and A. Candel, *Algebraic characterization of quasi-isometric spaces via the Higson compactification*, Topology Appl. **158** (2011), no. 13, 1679–1694. MR 2812477
- [8] ———, *Generic coarse geometry of leaves*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2223, Springer, Heidelberg-New York, 2018. MR 3822768
- [9] O. Attie and S. Hurder, *Manifolds which cannot be leaves of foliations*, Topology **35** (1996), 335–353. MR 1380502
- [10] A. Candel and L. Conlon, *Foliations. I*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 23, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. MR 1732868
- [11] ———, *Foliations. II*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 60, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. MR 1994394
- [12] J. Cantwell and L. Conlon, *Leaves with isolated ends in foliated 3-manifolds*, Topology **16** (1977), no. 4, 311–322. MR 0645739
- [13] ———, *Leaf prescriptions for closed 3-manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **236** (1978), 239–261. MR 0645738
- [14] ———, *Endsets of leaves*, Topology **21** (1982), no. 4, 333–352. MR 670740
- [15] ———, *Every surface is a leaf*, Topology **26** (1987), no. 3, 265–285. MR 899049
- [16] D.M. Cass, *Minimal leaves in foliations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **287** (1985), no. 1, 201–213. MR 766214
- [17] B. Chaluleau and C. Pittet, *Exemples de variétés riemanniennes homogènes qui ne sont pas quasi isométriques à un groupe de type fini*, <https://www.overleaf.com/project/6453e3d95cbe506799e77258/detacher> C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **332** (2001), 593–595. MR 1841890
- [18] J. Cheeger, *Finiteness theorems for Riemannian manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **92** (1970), 61–74. MR 0263092
- [19] A. Clark, S. Hurder, and O. Lukina, *Shape of matchbox manifolds*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **25** (2014), no. 4, 669–712. MR 3217031
- [20] T. Downarowicz and G.H. Zhang, *The symbolic extension theory in topological dynamics*, Acta. Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.), **38** (2022), 107–136.
- [21] J. Eichhorn, *The boundedness of connection coefficients and their derivatives*, Math. Nachr. **152** (1991), 145–158. MR 1121230
- [22] A. Eskin, D. Fisher, and K. Whyte, *Coarse differentiation of quasi-isometries I: Spaces not quasi-isometric to Cayley graphs*, Ann. of Math. (2) **176** (2012), 221–260. MR 2925383
- [23] É. Ghys, *Une variété qui n'est pas une feuille*, Topology **24** (1985), 67–73. MR 790676
- [24] ———, *Laminations par surfaces de Riemann*, Panoramas & Synthèses **8** (2000), 49–95. MR 1760843
- [25] R.E. Greene, *Complete metrics of bounded curvature on noncompact manifolds*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **31** (1978), 89–95. MR 510080
- [26] A. Haefliger, *Pseudogroups of local isometries*, Differential geometry (Santiago de Compostela, 1984), Res. Notes in Math., vol. 131, Pitman, Boston, MA, 1985, pp. 174–197. MR 864868
- [27] ———, *Leaf closures in Riemannian foliations*, A fête of topology, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1988, pp. 3–32. MR 928394
- [28] M.W. Hirsch, *Differential topology*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. 33, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976. MR 0448362
- [29] T. Inaba, T. Nishimori, M. Takamura, and N. Tsuchiya, *Open manifolds which are nonrealizable as leaves*, Kodai Math. J. **8** (1985), 112–119. MR 776712
- [30] T. Januszkiewicz, *Characteristic invariants of noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, Topology **23** (1984), no. 3, 289–301. MR 770565
- [31] A.S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 156, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. MR 1321597
- [32] Á. Lozano Rojo, *Codimension zero laminations are inverse limits*, Topology Appl. **160** (2013), no. 2, 341–349. MR 3003331
- [33] O. Lukina, *Hausdorff dimension in graph matchbox manifolds*, arXiv:1407.0693v4, 2016.
- [34] C. Meniño Cotón and P.A. Schweitzer, *Exotic open 4-manifolds which are nonleaves*, Geom. Topol. **22** (2018), no. 5, 2791–2816. MR 3811771
- [35] C.C. Moore and C. Schochet, *Global analysis on foliated spaces*, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications, vol. 9, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988, With appendices by S. Hurder, Moore, Schochet and Robert J. Zimmer. MR 0918974
- [36] P. Petersen, *Riemannian geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 171, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. MR 1480173
- [37] A. Phillips and D. Sullivan, *Geometry of leaves*, Topology **20** (1981), no. 2, 209–218. MR 605659
- [38] J. Roe, *An index theorem on open manifolds. I*, J. Differential Geom. **27** (1988), 87–113. MR 918459
- [39] T. Schick, *Analysis on ∂ -manifolds of bounded geometry, Hodge-De Rham isomorphism and L^2 -index theorem*, Ph.D. thesis, Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz, Mainz, 1996.
- [40] ———, *Manifolds with boundary and of bounded geometry*, Math. Nachr. **223** (2001), 103–120. MR 1817852
- [41] P.A. Schweitzer, *Surfaces not quasi-isometric to leaves of foliations of compact 3-manifolds*, Analysis and geometry in foliated manifolds, Proceedings of the VII International Colloquium on Differential Geometry, Santiago de Compostela, Spain, July 26–30, 1994, World Sci. Publ., Singapore, 1995, pp. 223–238. MR 1414206
- [42] ———, *Riemannian manifolds not quasi-isometric to leaves in codimension one foliations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **61** (2011), 1599–1631. MR 2951506

- [43] P.A. Schweitzer and F.S. Souza, *Manifolds that are not leaves of codimension one foliations*, Int. J. Math. **24** (2013), 14 pp. MR 3163616
- [44] ———, *Non-leaves of foliated spaces with transversal structure*, Differential Geom. Appl. **51** (2017), 109–111. MR 3625764
- [45] M.A. Shubin, *Spectral theory of elliptic operators on noncompact manifolds*, Astérisque **207** (1992), 35–108, Méthodes semi-classiques, Vol. 1 (Nantes, 1991). MR 1205177
- [46] J.D. Sondow, *When is a manifold a leaf of some foliation?*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1975), 622–625. MR 0365591
- [47] D. Sullivan, *Inside and outside manifolds*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Vancouver, B. C., 1974) (Montreal, Quebec), vol. 1, Canad. Math. Congress, 1975, pp. 201–207. MR 0425966
- [48] A. Zeghib, *An example of a 2-dimensional no leaf*, Geometric study of foliations (Tokyo, 1993), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1994, pp. 475–477. MR 1363743

DEPARTAMENTO DE XEOMETRÍA E TOPOLOXÍA, FACULDADE DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDADE DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA, CAMPUS VIDA, 15782 SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA, SPAIN
Email address: `jesus.alvarez@usc.es`

E.T.S. INGENIEROS INFORMÁTICOS, UNIVERSIDAD POLITÉCNICA DE MADRID, 28660 MADRID, ESPAÑA
Email address: `ramon.barral@upm.es`