

HOLOGRAPHY OF GEODESIC FLOWS, HARMONIZING METRICS, AND BILLIARDS' DYNAMICS

GABRIEL KATZ

ABSTRACT. Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold with boundary, where g is a non-trapping metric. Let SM be the space of the spherical tangent to M bundle, and v^g the geodesic vector field on SM . We study the scattering maps $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+ SM \rightarrow \partial_1^- SM$, generated by the v^g -flow, and the dynamics of the billiard maps $B_{v^g, \tau} : \partial_1^+ SM \rightarrow \partial_1^+ SM$, where τ denotes an involution, mimicking the elastic reflection from the the boundary ∂M . We getting a variety of holography theorems that tackle the inverse scattering problems for C_{v^g} and theorems that describe the dynamics of $B_{v^g, \tau}$. Our main tools are a Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for v^g and a special harmonizing Riemannian metrics g^\bullet on SM , a metric in which dF is harmonic. For such metrics g^\bullet , we get a family of isoperimetric inequalities of the type $vol_{g^\bullet}(SM) \leq vol_{g^\bullet}(\partial(SM))$ and formulas for the average volume of the minimal hypesufaces $\{F^{-1}(c)\}_{c \in F(SM)}$. We investigate the interplay between the harmonizing metrics g^\bullet and the classical Sasaki metric gg on SM . Assuming ergodicity of $B_{v^g, \tau}$, we also get Santaló-Chernov type formulas for the average length of free geodesic segments in M and for the average variation of the Lyapunov function F along the v^g -trajectories.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is an extension of [K5], where we proposed “a more topological approach” to some classical inverse scattering problems. Here we take a similar view of the geometry of scattering maps and of the dynamics of billiard maps. To validate our approach, we need to build some infrastructure in the land of traversing flows on general manifolds with boundary [K1], [K2], [K7]. Then we employ this infrastructure to study the geodesic flows. This effort, in the spirit of “Integral Geometry and Geometric Probability” by Santaló ([S], Chapter 19), and works by Vidal Abascal [V]-[V2], is in the core of the present paper.

Before we describe our results, let us start with a brief review of different classes of vector fields on manifolds with boundary that occur in the paper (as a general reference, see [K7]). Let X be a connected compact smooth $(n + 1)$ -dimensional manifold with boundary. A smooth vector field v on X is called **traversing** if it admits a Lyapunov function $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $dF(v) > 0$ everywhere in X .

The trajectories of a traversing vector field are homeomorphic to closed segments or to singletons. Conversely, by [K1], Corollary 4.1, if all the v -trajectories are homeomorphic to closed segments or to singletons, then the field admits a Lyapunov function, and thus is a traversing vector field of the gradient type.

For a smooth vector field v on a smooth compact $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold X , such that $v \neq 0$ along ∂X , let us introduce an important **Morse stratification** $\{\partial_j^\pm X(v)\}_{j \in [1, \dim X]}$ of the boundary ∂X [Mo]. The stratum $\partial_j X =_{\text{def}} \partial_j X(v)$ has the following description (see [K1]) in terms of an auxiliary function $z : \hat{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the three properties:

(1.1)

- 0 is a regular value of z ,
- $z^{-1}(0) = \partial X$, and
- $z^{-1}((-\infty, 0]) = X$.

Employing z , the locus $\partial_j X =_{\text{def}} \partial_j X(v)$ is defined by the equations:

$$\{z = 0, \mathcal{L}_v z = 0, \dots, \mathcal{L}_v^{(j-1)} z = 0\},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_v^{(k)}$ stands for the k -th iteration of the Lie derivative operator \mathcal{L}_v in the direction of v . The pure stratum $\partial_j X^\circ \subset \partial_j X$ is defined by the additional constraint $\mathcal{L}_v^{(j)} z \neq 0$. The locus $\partial_j X$ is the union of two loci: **(1)** $\partial_j^+ X$, defined by the constraint $\mathcal{L}_v^{(j)} z \geq 0$, and **(2)** $\partial_j^- X$, defined by the constraint $\mathcal{L}_v^{(j)} z \leq 0$.

Definition 1.1. *The vector field v is boundary generic with respect to ∂X if the j -form*

$$(1.2) \quad dz \wedge d(\mathcal{L}_v z) \wedge \dots \wedge d(\mathcal{L}_v^{(j-1)} z)$$

represents a nonzero section of the bundle $\bigwedge^j T_ X$ along the locus $\partial_j X$ for all $j \in [1, n+1]$.*

For a boundary generic v , all the strata $\partial_j X$ are smooth $(n+1-j)$ -manifolds and the two loci, $\partial_j^+ X$ and $\partial_j^- X$, share a common boundary $\partial_{j+1} X$. If v on X is boundary generic, then each point $x \in \partial X$ belongs to a unique minimal stratum $\partial_j X \subset \partial X$ with a maximal $j = j(x) \leq n+1$.

In [K2], Definition 3.2, we introduced another class of vector fields on X which we call **traversally generic**. They are a subclass of the traversing and boundary generic vector fields. Loosely speaking, for a traversally generic v , the localized projection of ∂X on a transversal to the v -flow section S is a Thom-Boardman map ([Bo]) of the combinatorial type $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$. By Theorem 3.5 from [K2], the traversally generic vector fields form also an open and dense set in the space of all traversing fields.

Any trajectory γ of a boundary generic and traversing vector field v generates a finite sequence $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_q)$ of natural numbers, the entries of the sequence correspond to v -ordered points of the finite set $\gamma \cap \partial X$. Each point $x \in \gamma \cap \partial X$ contributes to ω a natural number $j(x)$, the **multiplicity of tangency** of γ to the boundary ∂X at x . In fact, $j(x)$ is the index j of the smallest stratum $\partial_j X(v)$ to which x belongs. The ordered list ω_γ of these multiplicities is the **combinatorial type** of γ . For boundary generic and traversing vector fields, the combinatorial types ω_γ of their trajectories belong to an universal (X -independent) poset Ω^\bullet , while for traversally generic vector fields, the combinatorial types ω_γ belong to a subposet $\Omega_{\langle n \rangle}^\bullet$ (see [K4] for its definition and properties). Remarkably, for the traversally generic vector fields, the combinatorial type ω_γ determines the smooth topological type of the v -flow in the vicinity of $\gamma \subset X$ ([K2]).

Let γ_x denote the v -trajectory through $x \in X$. Any traversing vector field v on X produces a, so called, **causality map** C_v which takes a portion $\partial_1^+ X(v)$ of the boundary ∂X to the closure $\partial_1^- X(v)$ of the complementary portion (see Fig.1). Here $\partial_1^\pm X(v)$ stands for the locus in $\partial_1 X := \partial X$, where v is directed inward/outward of X or is tangent to ∂X . By definition, $C_v(x)$ is the point $y \in \partial_1^- X(v)$ that resides in $\gamma_x \cap \partial X$ above the point $x \in \partial_1^+ X(v)$. When no such y exists, we put $C_v(x) = x$. We stress that, in general, C_v is a *discontinuous map*.

For the reader convenience, we state Theorem 3.1 from [K4], crucial for our efforts here.

Theorem 1.1. (The Holography Theorem). *Let X_1, X_2 be two smooth compact connected $(n+1)$ -manifolds with boundary, equipped with traversing boundary generic vector fields v_1, v_2 , respectively.*

- *Then any smooth diffeomorphism $\Phi^\partial : \partial X_1 \rightarrow \partial X_2$, such that*

$$\Phi^\partial \circ C_{v_1} = C_{v_2} \circ \Phi^\partial,$$

extends to a homeomorphism $\Phi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ which maps v_1 -trajectories to v_2 -trajectories so that the field-induced orientations of trajectories are preserved. The restriction of Φ to each trajectory is a smooth diffeomorphism.

- *If each v_2 -trajectory is either transversal to ∂X_2 at some point, or is simply tangent to ∂X_2 ,¹ then the homeomorphism Φ is a smooth diffeomorphism. In particular, Φ is a smooth diffeomorphism when ∂X_2 is concave with respect to the v_2 -flow. \diamond*

Remark 1.1. The hypothesis in the second bullet of Theorem 1.1 are perhaps superfluous: we conjecture that the conjugating homeomorphism $\Phi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is always a diffeomorphism. \diamond

Definition 1.2. *A Riemannian metric g on a connected compact manifold M with boundary is called **non-trapping** if (M, g) has no closed geodesics and no geodesics of an infinite length (the later are homeomorphic to an open or a semi-open interval). \diamond*

Let M be a compact connected smooth Riemannian manifold with boundary. We assume that the metric g on M is **non-trapping**. In fact, g is non-trapping if and only if the geodesic flow v^g on the spherical tangent bundle $SM = SM(g)$ admits a Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ so that $dF(v^g) > 0$ [K5]. The space $\mathcal{G}(M)$ of non-trapping Riemannian metrics on M forms an open set in the space of all Riemannian metrics.

In [K5], we introduce a class of Riemannian metrics g on M which we call **geodesically boundary generic** or **boundary generic** for short.

Definition 1.3. *A metric g on M is **boundary generic**, if the geodesic vector field v^g on SM is boundary generic with respect to $\partial(SM)$ in the sense of Definition 1.1. \diamond*

For a boundary generic metric g , the boundary ∂M is “generically curved” in g . In particular, if each component of ∂M is strictly convex or concave in g , then g is boundary

¹This is the case when the v -flow has no trajectories of the combinatorial types $\omega \in (4)_\pm \cup (33)_\pm$

generic. The metrics g in which ∂M is geodesically closed represent the extreme failure to be boundary generic.

We speculate that the space $\mathcal{G}^\dagger(M)$ of geodesically boundary generic non-trapping metrics is open and dense in the space of all non-trapping metrics $\mathcal{G}(M)$ and prove that it is indeed open ([K5]).

Here is one of the main results from [K5], which we will use on many occasions (see Fig.2).

Theorem 1.2. (The topological rigidity of the geodesic flow for the inverse scattering problem).

Let (M_1, g_1) and (M_2, g_2) be two smooth compact connected Riemannian n -manifolds with boundaries. Let the metrics g_1, g_2 be geodesically boundary generic, and let g_2 be non-trapping.

Assume that the scattering maps

$$C_{v^{g_1}} : \partial_1^+(SM_1)(v^{g_1}) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM_1)(v^{g_1}) \text{ and } C_{v^{g_2}} : \partial_1^+(SM_2)(v^{g_2}) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM_2)(v^{g_2})$$

are conjugate by a smooth diffeomorphism $\Phi^\partial : \partial_1(SM_1) \rightarrow \partial_1(SM_2)$.

Then g_1 is also non-trapping, and Φ^∂ extends to a homeomorphism $\Phi : SM_1 \rightarrow SM_2$, which takes each v^{g_1} -trajectory to a v^{g_2} -trajectory. Moreover, Φ , being restricted to any v^{g_1} -trajectory, is an orientation-preserving smooth diffeomorphism.

If the metric g_2 is such that any geodesic curve in M_2 is either transversal to ∂M_2 at some point or is simply tangent to ∂M_2 , then g_1 must have the same property, and the conjugating homeomorphism $\Phi : SM_1 \rightarrow SM_2$ is a diffeomorphism. \diamond

One of the goals of this paper is to study close relatives of the scattering maps C_{v^g} , the billiard maps B_{v^g} and their dynamics. The map B_{v^g} is obtained from C_{v^g} by composing it with the reflection diffeomorphism $\tau_g : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$ that takes any unitary vector, tangent to M at a point from ∂M , to its mirror image, the boundary ∂M being the mirror.

- *Now, let us describe some of our results in the order they appear in the paper.*

In Section 2, we show how special closed differential n -forms Θ on a compact $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold X generate a measure μ_Θ on ∂X such that the causality map $C_v : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^- X(v)$ is a measure-preserving transformation (Theorem 2.1).

In Section 3, we combine the causality maps C_v with measure-preserving involutions τ on the boundary ∂X to introduce **proto-billiard maps** $B_{v,\tau} : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v)$, dynamical measure-preserving systems (Theorem 3.1).

In Section 4, we deal with intrinsically harmonic Lyapunov functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and Lyapunov 1-forms α on X , specially adjusted to the given vector field v (Theorem 4.1). They go hand in hand with so called v -harmonizing metrics g on X (see Definition 4.3). The v -harmonizing pairs (g, α) or (g, df) each produces a pair of mutually orthogonal minimal (taut) foliations $\mathcal{F}(v), \mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ of dimensions 1 and n , respectively (Corollary 4.1).

Theorem 4.2 claims that, for a traversing boundary generic v , there exists a v -harmonizing pair (g, df) , such that the n -form $\Theta = *_g(df)$ defines a measure on ∂X with respect to which C_v is a measure-preserving map. Here “ $*$ ” denotes the Hodge star operator.

For a traversing vector field v , the differential form Θ helps also to define, in the spirit of [S], a measure μ_Θ on the space of trajectories $\mathcal{T}(v)$ (see Definition 4.4 and [K3]). For a traversing vector field v and a v -harmonizing pair (g, df) , Corollary 4.3 establishes the inequality

$$\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}_g(\partial X).$$

If, in addition, we normalize the Lyapunov function f so that it takes values in the interval $[0, 1]$, then we also get an isoperimetric inequality

$$\text{vol}_g(X) \leq \text{vol}_g(\partial X),$$

valid for any v -harmonizing g .

Assuming that the v -harmonizing metric g and differential df are v -invariant, Theorem 4.4 describes the residual structures on the boundary ∂X that allow for a reconstruction of X, v and g , up to a diffeomorphism of X . This theorem is the first among several results that we call *holographic* (see also [K5], [K8]).

In Section 5, we apply the results about general traversing vector flows from the previous sections to the geodesic flows v^g on the space of tangent spherical bundle $SM \rightarrow M$, where M is a compact manifold with boundary. The v^g -flow is generated by a non-trapping boundary generic metric g on M .

Corollary 5.1 provides numerous examples of non-trapping metrics on codimension zero compact submanifolds of hyperbolic and Euclidean spaces.

In Theorem 5.1, for a boundary generic non-trapping metric g on M , we construct a v^g -harmonizing and v^g -invariant metric g^\bullet on SM and a well-balanced (see Definition 4.5) Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so that 1-dimensional foliation $\mathcal{F}(v^g)$ and orthogonal to it $(2n - 2)$ -dimensional foliation $\mathcal{G}(F) := \{F^{-1}(c)\}_{c \in \mathbb{R}}$ are minimal in g^\bullet . Moreover, we prove that the scattering map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$ preserves the measure, defined by the harmonic form $\Theta := *_g(df)$.

Let g be as above. In Theorem 5.2, for a given v^g -invariant volume form Ω on SM and a Lyapunov function F , we use the form $\Theta := v^g \lrcorner \Omega$ to construct a v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet such that $*_{g^\bullet}(dF) = \Theta$. Let $\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g))$ denote the Θ -induced volume of the space of geodesics $\mathcal{T}(v^g)$. Then we prove the inequality

$$\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(\partial(SM)).$$

Normalizing F so that $F(SM) \subset [0, 1]$, we get the isoperimetric inequality

$$\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM) \leq \text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(\partial(SM)).$$

In holography Theorem 5.3, we reconstruct the space SM , the vector field v^g , and the v^g -invariant harmonizing metric g^\bullet , up to a diffeomorphism of SM , in terms of some enhanced scattering data.

In Section 6, we study generalized billiard maps $B_{v^g, \tau} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$ on billiard tables (M, g) , where g boundary generic and non-trapping (see Theorem 6.1 and Corollary 6.1). We employ the restrictions to SM of the fundamental Liouville 1-form β_g and the symplectic 2-form $\omega_g = d\beta_g$. In holography Theorem 6.2, we show how to reconstruct the form β_g from its restriction $\beta_g^{\partial^+}$ to the boundary $\partial(SM)$, the restriction $F|_{\partial(SM)}$ of the Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the scattering map C_{v^g} .

In Section 7, we study the dynamics of ergodic (see Definition 7.1) billiard maps $B_{v^g, \tau}$ on the billiards (M, g) , where g is boundary generic and non-trapping. We apply the classical Birkhoff Theorem [Bi] to the measure μ_Θ on $\partial(SM)$, generated by an appropriately constructed closed and v^g -invariant $(2n - 2)$ -form Θ (see Theorem 7.1).

In Theorem 7.2, we compute the spacial and time averages of the variation Δ_F of the Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ along the v^g -trajectories; for the ergodic billiards, both computations produce the same result. Theorem 7.3 is a version of these computations for a given Lyapunov function F and the form $\Theta = \omega_g^{n-1}$, the $(n - 1)^{st}$ exterior power of the symplectic 2-form ω_g on SM . It employs a v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet on the space SM . In contrast, Theorem 7.4 is a result of a similar calculation of the average length of the v^g -trajectories in the Sasaki metric gg on SM ([Sa]). It utilizes the same form $\Theta = \omega_g^{n-1}$. In this case, the results of the computation can be expressed directly in terms of the volumes $vol_g(M)$ and $vol_{g|_{\partial M}}(\partial M)$ (see formulas (7.7) and (7.8)). For any non-trapping g , this leads to the following inequality (Corollary 7.3):

$$vol_g(M) \leq c(n) \cdot \mathbf{gd}(M, g) \cdot vol_{g|_{\partial M}}(\partial M),$$

where $c(n) > 0$ is a well-known universal constant, and $\mathbf{gd}(M, g)$ denotes the maximal length of free geodesic arcs in M (see Fig.3). The later inequality resembles one classical inequality from [Cr], where $\mathbf{gd}(M, g)$ is replaced by the diameter of M .

In Theorem 7.6, we derive formulas for computing the volume $A_{g^\bullet}(c)$ of a taut slice $F^{-1}(c)$ ($c \in \mathbb{R}$) in the v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet , as well as the average value of $A_{g^\bullet}(c)$.

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to Christofer Croke, Serge Tabachnikov, and Gunther Uhlmann for very enlightening conversations.

2. CAUSALITY MAPS OF TRAVERSING FLOWS AS MEASURE-PRESERVING TRANSFORMATIONS

Let X be a connected compact smooth $(n + 1)$ -manifold with boundary, and v a smooth traversing and boundary generic vector field on X .

As the lemma below testifies, the causality maps

$$C_v : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^- X(v),$$

although discontinuous, have some “positive features”: they preserve certain n -dimensional measures on the n -manifold ∂X , the measures that are amenable to v .

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be a compact smooth oriented $(n + 1)$ -manifold with boundary, carrying a boundary generic traversing vector field v . We denote by Ω^∂ a positive volume n -form*




FIGURE 1. The set $X(v, K)$ and its boundary for a codimension zero submanifold $K \subset \partial_1^+ X$. Note the image $C_v(K)$ of K under the map C_v .

on ∂X , consistent with its orientation. Let $\Theta \in \bigwedge^n(T^*X)$ be a differential n -form on X , subject to the constraints:

- (1) $\Theta(v \wedge w) = 0$ for any polyvector $w \in \bigwedge^{n-1}(TX)$,
- (2) $d\Theta = 0$,
- (3) the function $(\Theta/\Omega^\partial) : \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nonnegative on $\partial_1^+ X(v)$ and nonpositive on $\partial_1^- X(v)$.

We denote by μ^∂ the Lebesgue measure on ∂X , induced by some Riemannian metric on ∂X . Then the following properties are valid:

- the Lie derivative $\mathcal{L}_v(\Theta) = 0$,
- restricting the n -form Θ to the boundary ∂X , for any μ^∂ -measurable set $K \subset \partial_1^+ X(v)$, we get

$$(2.1) \quad \int_K \Theta = \left| \int_{C_v(K)} \Theta \right|.$$

Proof. Using the identity $\mathcal{L}_v(\Theta) = d(v \lrcorner \Theta) + v \lrcorner d\Theta$ for the Lie derivative and properties (1) and (2) of Θ from the lemma hypotheses, we conclude that $\mathcal{L}_v(\Theta) = 0$, that is, the form Θ is invariant under the v -flow. Thanks to property (1), Θ is a “horizontal” form.

Let v be a boundary generic traversing vector field and Θ an n -form on X as in the hypotheses of the lemma. For any Lebesgue-measurable $K \subset \partial X$, we define its measure $\mu_\Theta(K)$ by the formula

$$(2.2) \quad \mu_\Theta(K) =_{\text{def}} \int_{K \cap \partial_1^+ X(v)} \Theta - \int_{K \cap \partial_1^- X(v)} \Theta.$$

Note that this formula makes sense since, for a boundary generic v , the sets $\partial_1^\pm X(v)$ are smooth manifolds, and the intersection of two Lebesgue-measurable sets is again Lebesgue-measurable.

For any set $A \subset \partial_1^+ X(v)$, we denote by $X(v, A)$ the set, formed by the v -trajectories through the points of A .

Consider the locus $\partial_2^+ X(v) \subset \partial(\partial_1^+ X(v))$, the closure of points of the boundary ∂X , where the v -flow is simply tangent to the boundary and the boundary is **concave** with respect to the flow in the sense of [K1]. For a boundary generic field v , let \mathcal{X} denote the set $X(v, \partial_2^+ X(v))$, the union of v -trajectories that contain points from the locus $\partial_2^+ X(v)$. Then $\mathcal{X} \cap \text{int}(\partial_1^+ X(v))$ is the discontinuity locus of the causality map C_v .

For a boundary generic v , Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4 from [K2] provide us with local real semi-algebraic models of the domain and range of the causality map C_v , as well as with local real analytic models of the causality map itself away from the $(n-1)$ -dimensional $\mathcal{X} \cap \text{int}(\partial_1^+ X(v))$. The word “local” here means “in the vicinity of each v -trajectory”. These local models imply, in particular, that $\mu^\partial(C_v(A)) = 0$ for any set $A \subset \partial_1^+ X$ whose Lebesgue measure $\mu^\partial(A) = 0$. They imply also that the C_v -image of a Lebesgue measurable set $K \subset \partial_1^+ X$ is Lebesgue measurable in $\partial_1^- X$.

In order to prove that the sum of the Lebesgue integrals

$$\int_K \Theta + \int_{C_v(K)} \Theta = 0$$

for any Lebesgue measurable $K \subset \partial_1^+ X(v)$, it will suffice to show that $\int_N \Theta + \int_{C_v(N)} \Theta = 0$ for all n -dimensional compact piecewise differentiable (“PD” for short) manifolds $N \subset \partial_1^+ X(v)$.

For any PD-submanifold $N \subset \partial_1^+ X$, we form the set $X(v, N)$. Again, thanks to the local models of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4 from [K2], the locus $X(v, N)$ is a piecewise differentiable manifold with boundary. Its oriented boundary $\partial X(v, N)$ is formed by the three PD-manifolds: N , $C_v(N) \subset \partial_1 X$, and the rest, which we denote $\delta X(v, N)$. The latter is built out of segments of v -trajectories (see Fig.1). So, by the Stokes Theorem,

$$\int_{X(v, N)} d\Theta = \int_N \Theta + \int_{C_v(N)} \Theta + \int_{\delta X(v, N)} \Theta.$$

Since $d\Theta = 0$, we get $\int_{X(v, N)} d\Theta = 0$. Using that Θ is vertical and $\delta X(v, N)$ consists of v -trajectories, we get

$$\int_{\delta X(v, N)} \Theta = 0,$$

which implies formula (2.1) and the measure-defining formula (2.2). \square

Definition 2.1. *Let v be a smooth non-vanishing vector field on a compact orientable $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold X and \mathcal{H} a n -dimensional distribution, transversal to v . Consider a differential n -form Θ on X .*

(1) *We say that Θ integrally dual to v , if:*

- $d\Theta = 0$
- *the kernel of Θ is a 1-dimensional distribution on X ,*
- $v \in \ker(\Theta)$,
- $\pm\Theta|_{\partial_1^\pm X(v)} \geq 0$.

- (2) We call Θ *integrally dual* to the pair (v, \mathcal{H}) , if Θ integrally dual to v and $\Theta|_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ with respect to the orientation of \mathcal{H} , induced by v and the orientation of X .² \diamond

With Definition 2.1 in place, we may rephrase Lemma 2.1 as follows:

Proposition 2.1. *For a traversing vector field v on a compact smooth $(n+1)$ -manifold X , any integrally dual to v n -form Θ is v -invariant. Moreover, Θ defines a measure μ_{Θ} on ∂X such that the causality map C_v is this measure preserving transformation.* \diamond

The rest of this section contains few elementary lemmas to be used in what follows.

Lemma 2.2. *Let X be a smooth compact oriented $(n+1)$ -manifold.*

- *For a given non-vanishing vector field v on X , an integrally dual form Θ is unique, up to the multiplication by a smooth function $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $dh \wedge \Theta = 0$ in X , and $h|_{\partial X} \geq 0$.*
- *For a given non-vanishing vector field v and a transversal to it n -distribution \mathcal{H} on X , a form Θ , integrally dual to (v, \mathcal{H}) , is unique, up to the multiplication by a smooth positive function $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $dh \wedge \Theta = 0$ in X .*

Proof. Consider the n -dimensional bundle $\bigwedge^n T^*X \rightarrow X$. The linear constraints on a form $\theta \in \bigwedge^n T^*X$, imposed by the property $\{v \in \ker(\theta)\}$, define a 1-dimensional subbundle Λ_v of the bundle $\bigwedge^n T^*X$. Let us denote by $\Gamma(\Lambda_v)$ the linear space of smooth sections-forms Θ of the line bundle $\Lambda_v \rightarrow X$. Let $\Gamma^*(\Lambda_v)$ denote the subspace of nowhere vanishing sections from $\Gamma(\Lambda_v)$. Consider the kernel \mathcal{K}_v of the differential

$$d : \Gamma(\Lambda_v) \longrightarrow \Gamma\left(\bigwedge^{n+1} T^*X\right) \approx C^\infty(X, \mathbb{R}).$$

Since $\dim(\Lambda_v) = 1$, any two sections $\Theta, \Theta' \in \Gamma(\Lambda_v)$ differ by a functional multiple, i.e., $\Theta' = h \cdot \Theta$.

When $\Theta, \Theta' \in \mathcal{K}_v \cap \Gamma(\Lambda_v)$, using that $d\Theta = 0$, we get $0 = d(h\Theta) = dh \wedge \Theta$. So the functional coefficient $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that $dh \wedge \Theta = 0$ identically in X . The requirement $\pm h \cdot \Theta|_{\partial_1^\pm X(v)} \geq 0$ implies that $h : \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ must be nonnegative on $\partial_1 X$.

When $\Theta, \Theta' \in \mathcal{K}_v \cap \Gamma^*(\Lambda_v)$ are integrally dual to (v, \mathcal{H}) , the both forms are nonsingular and $h > 0$ on X . Therefore, for a positive h , if $\pm \Theta|_{\partial_1^\pm X(v)} \geq 0$, then $\pm \Theta'|_{\partial_1^\pm X(v)} \geq 0$ as well. \square

Remark 2.1. We stress that Lemma 2.2 does not claim the *existence* of an integrally dual form Θ for a given v or (v, \mathcal{H}) . It follows from Theorem 4.1 that, for any non-vanishing vector field v , there is no *local* obstruction to the existence of integrally dual form Θ . In fact, at least for any invariant Calabi's vector field v (as in Definition 4.2, second bullet) admits such a form. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.4, the existence of an integrally dual to v form Θ is equivalent to an existence of a v -invariant volume form Ω on X . \diamond

²It follows from $\Theta|_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ that the kernel $\ker(\Theta)$ is a 1-dimensional distribution.

Lemma 2.3. *For a given non-vanishing vector field v , the space $\mathcal{D}(v)$ of n -forms Θ , integrally dual to v , is convex in the space of all n -forms, provided $\mathcal{D}(v) \neq \emptyset$.*

Similarly, for a given non-vanishing vector field v and a n -distribution \mathcal{H} , transversal to v , the space $\mathcal{D}(v, \mathcal{H})$ of n -forms Θ , integrally dual to (v, \mathcal{H}) , is convex in the space of all n -forms, provided $\mathcal{D}(v, \mathcal{H}) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Consider two integrally dual to v forms Θ_1, Θ_2 . Evidently, if Θ_1 and Θ_2 are closed, so is their linear combination, the form $\Theta = t\Theta_1 + (1-t)\Theta_2$, where $t \in [0, 1]$. Also, if $v \in \ker(\Theta_1)$ and $v \in \ker(\Theta_2)$, then $v \in \ker(\Theta)$. The positivity condition $\pm\Theta|_{\partial_1^\pm X(v)} \geq 0$ follows, since $t \geq 0$ and $1-t \geq 0$. If Θ_1 and Θ_2 are integrally dual to (v, \mathcal{H}) , then, in addition, $\Theta|_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ since $\Theta_1|_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ and $\Theta_2|_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$. \square

Definition 2.2. *Let v be a non-vanishing vector field on a smooth oriented $(n+1)$ -manifold X . We say that v is *intrinsically nildivergent* if there exists a volume $(n+1)$ -form Ω on X such that $d(v \lrcorner \Omega) = 0$.* \diamond

Let $v = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i \partial_{x_i}$ in some local coordinates (x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) on X . A volume form $\Omega = f \cdot dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{n+1}$ produces nil-divergent form $\Theta = v \lrcorner \Omega$, if the function f satisfies the equation $\langle \nabla f, v \rangle = -\text{div}(v)f$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Euclidean scalar product, ∇f the gradient of f , and $\text{div}(v) := \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{\partial a_i}{\partial x_i}$.

Let us describe one mechanism that produces Θ , integrally dual to a given v .

Lemma 2.4. *A non-vanishing vector field v on a $(n+1)$ -dimensional X is intrinsically nildivergent with the help of $(n+1)$ -form Ω if and only if Ω is v -invariant. Then the form $\Theta := v \lrcorner \Omega$ is integrally dual to v (see Definition 2.2), and Θ is v -invariant as well. Moreover, if X is oriented, then there is a n -distribution \mathcal{H} on X that is transversal to v and such that $\Theta|_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$.*

Proof. Since $d\Omega = 0$, we get $\mathcal{L}_v(\Omega) = d(v \lrcorner \Omega)$. Thus $d(v \lrcorner \Omega) = 0$ if and only if Ω is v -invariant. By Definition 2.2, an intrinsically nildivergent form $\Theta := v \lrcorner \Omega$ is closed.

Since $v \lrcorner \Theta := v \lrcorner (v \lrcorner \Omega) = 0$, we get $v \in \ker(\Theta)$. Moreover, since Ω is a volume form, $\dim(\ker(\Theta)) = 1$. As in Lemma 2.1, it follows that Θ is a v -invariant form.

Let us pick a metric g on X so that Ω is its volume form. Let ν be the unit vector field, inward normal in the metric g to ∂X in X . Then the quotient $(v \lrcorner \Omega)|_{\partial X} / (\nu \lrcorner \Omega)|_{\partial X}$ of the two n -forms, being restricted to ∂X , equals to $\cos(\angle_g(v, \nu))$, a non-negative function on $\partial_1^+ X(v)$ and non-positive on $\partial_1^- X(v)$ by the very definition of these two loci. The g -orthogonal to v subbundle $v_g^\perp \subset T_*X$ is the desired distribution \mathcal{H} . \square

Lemma 2.5. *A diffeomorphism $\phi : X \rightarrow X$ transforms any form Θ , integrally dual to a given vector field v , into the form $\phi^*(\Theta)$, integrally dual to $\phi_*^{-1}(v)$.*

In particular, if v is nildivergent with the help of a $(n+1)$ -volume form Ω , and a diffeomorphism ϕ is such that $\phi^(\Omega) = \pm\Omega$, then the vector field $\phi_*(v)$ is nil-divergent.*

Proof. If $v \lrcorner \Theta = 0$, then by naturality, $\phi_*^{-1}(v) \lrcorner \phi^*(\Theta) = 0$. Also by naturality, $d(\phi^*(\Theta)) = \phi^*(d\Theta) = 0$.

Any diffeomorphism ϕ maps $\partial_1^\pm X(v)$ to $\partial_1^\pm X(\phi_*(v))$. On the other hand, if $\pm\Theta(w) \geq 0$ for a polyvector $w \in \bigwedge^n T_*(\partial_1^\pm X(v))$, then $\pm\phi^*(\Theta)(\phi_*^{-1}(w)) \geq 0$. Thus, if $\pm\Theta|_{\partial_1^\pm X(v)} \geq 0$, then $\pm\phi^*(\Theta)|_{\partial_1^\pm X(\phi_*^{-1}(v))} \geq 0$.

If $d(v \rfloor \Omega) = 0$ and $\phi^*(\Omega) = \pm\Omega$, then $d(\phi_*^{-1}(v) \rfloor \phi^*(\Omega)) = d(v \rfloor \pm\Omega) = 0$. So $\phi_*^{-1}(v)$ is nildivergent, provided that v is and ϕ preserves, up to a sign, the volume form. Hence the group of volume-preserving/reversing diffeomorphisms $\text{Diff}(X, \Omega)$ of X acts naturally on the space of nildivergent vector fields. \square

3. ON PROTO-BILLIARDS MAPS AND POINCARÉ RETURN MAPS

In order to introduce some *dynamics* in our discussion of the causality maps of traversing flows, we will need to assume the validity of the following property.

• **The Involution Hypotheses.** *Let X be a compact connected smooth $(n+1)$ -manifold X with boundary. For a traversing boundary generic vector field v and a differential n -form Θ , integrally dual on X to v (as in Definition 2.1), we assume that there exists a diffeomorphism $\tau : \partial_1^- X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v)$ such that*

$$(3.1) \quad \tau^*(\Theta|_{\partial_1^+ X(v)}) = \Theta|_{\partial_1^- X(v)}.$$

Occasionally, we will assume that τ is the restriction to $\partial_1^+ X(v)$ of a smooth involution $\hat{\tau} : \partial X \rightarrow \partial X$, whose fixed point set is the locus $\partial_2 X(v) := \partial(\partial_1^+ X(v)) = \partial(\partial_1^- X(v))$. In the case of billiard maps on a Riemannian manifold M , τ is a smooth involution $\partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$, induced by the elastic reflection of tangent vectors from $TM|_{\partial M}$ with respect to the boundary ∂M .

Of course, in general, such $\tau : \partial_1^- X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v)$ may be unavailable (in particular, when $\partial_1^+ X(v)$ and $\partial_1^- X(v)$ are not diffeomorphic)! However, assuming its existence, the proto-billiard map

$$(3.2) \quad B_{v,\tau} := \tau \circ C_v : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v),$$

the composition of the causality map C_v with the diffeomorphism τ , by Proposition 2.1, preserves the measure μ_Θ . As a result, for such τ and Θ , it is possible to talk about the *dynamics* of μ_Θ -preserving iterations $\{(B_{v,\tau})^{\circ k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of $B_{v,\tau}$.

In what follows, we say that a property is valid **almost everywhere**, if it may be violated only for the set of points of zero measure.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a compact smooth $(n+1)$ -manifold, equipped with a traversing and boundary generic vector field v and an integrally dual to it n -form Θ . Let $\tau : \partial_1^- X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v)$ be a diffeomorphism which satisfies the Involution Hypotheses (3.1).*

Then the proto-billiard map $B_{v,\tau} : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v)$ from (3.2) has the infinite return property: any point $x \in \partial_1^+ X(v)$ has an open neighborhood $U \subset \partial_1^+ X(v)$ such that, for almost every $x' \in U$, the sets $\{(B_{v,\tau})^{\circ k}(x')\}_k$ intersect U for infinitely many k 's.

Let N be an open neighborhood of $\partial_1 X$ in X . In particular, the return property holds for an intrinsically nildivergent traversing and boundary generic v and for τ , induced by a

diffeomorphism $\tilde{\tau} : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\tilde{\tau}^*(\Omega) = -\Omega$ and $\tilde{\tau}_*(v) = -v$, where Ω is a volume form.

Proof. Combining Proposition 2.1 with the property $\tau^*(\Theta|_{\partial_1^+ X(v)}) = \Theta|_{\partial_1^- X(v)}$, we conclude that the proto-billiard map $B_{v,\tau}$ preserves the measure μ_Θ on $\partial_1^+ X(v)$. Since the volume $\mu_\Theta(\partial_1^+ X(v))$ is finite, the standard Poincaré argument (see [W]) about measure-preserving transformations leads to the infinite return property.

In the case of nildivergent v , we have $\Theta := v \rfloor \Omega$, where Ω is a v -invariant volume form. Assuming that a diffeomorphism $\tau : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^- X(v)$ admits a lifting $\tilde{\tau} : N \rightarrow N$ so that $\tilde{\tau}^*(\Omega) = -\Omega$ and $\tilde{\tau}_*(v) = -v$ and employing Lemma 2.5, we get

$$\tilde{\tau}^*(\Theta) = \tilde{\tau}^*(v \rfloor \Omega) = (-v) \rfloor (-\Omega) = v \rfloor \Omega = \Theta$$

in N . So $B_{v,\tau}$ preserves the measure μ_Θ on $\partial_1^+ X(v)$, and hence the return property follows. \square

In the sections to come, we will strive to construct involutions τ , subject to (3.1), for the geodesic vector field v^g on the tangent spherical fibration $SM \rightarrow M$ with a compact Riemannian manifold (M, g) for the base.

Definition 3.1. A smooth vector field v on X is **gradient-like**, if there are a smooth function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a Riemannian metric g in the vicinity of the zero locus $Z(v)$ of v so that: **(1)** $df(v) > 0$ in $X \setminus Z(v)$, and **(2)** v is the gradient $\nabla_g(f)$ in the vicinity of $Z(v)$. \diamond

Definition 3.2. Given a smooth vector field v on a compact manifold X , consider an open finite cover $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}$ of X such that, in each U_i , v admits a smooth Lyapunov function $f_i : U_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, satisfying the following constraints: $df_i(v) \geq 0$ in U_i , and $df_i(v) > 0$ in $U_i \setminus (U_i \cap Z(v))$.

We call the minimal cardinality of such covers \mathcal{U} the **Lyapunov genus** of v and denote it by $\text{Lyap}(v)$. \diamond

By definition, for any gradient-like vector field v , $\text{Lyap}(v) = 1$.

Lemma 3.1. Let X be a compact manifold, and v a non-vanishing vector field on X . If a smooth hypersurface $H \subset X$ bounds a domain $X_1 \subset X$ so that, for any v -trajectory γ , the connected components of $\gamma \cap X_1$ and of $\gamma \cap (X \setminus \text{int}(X_1))$ are singletons or closed intervals, then $\text{Lyap}(v) \leq 2$.

Proof. If the connected components of $\gamma \cap X_1$ and $\gamma \cap X \setminus \text{int}(X_1)$ are singletons or closed intervals, then, by Lemma 4.1 from [K1], the vector fields $v|_{X_1}$ and $v|_{X_2}$ are of the gradient type and thus each vector field admits a Lyapunov function. So we get $\text{Lyap}(v) \leq 2$. \square

Thus, to show that $\text{Lyap}(v) \leq 2$ for a non-vanishing v , it would suffice to find a separating hypersurface $H \subset X$ that chops all the v -trajectories γ into either closed segments $\{\gamma_\alpha \subset X_1\}_\alpha$ and $\{\gamma_\beta \subset X_2\}_\beta$, whose boundaries reside in H , or into isolated singletons (produced by connected components of the loci where γ is tangent to H). For example, if $Z(v)$ and the set $C(v)$ of closed v -trajectories are finite, and any trajectory that is not homeomorphic

to a closed segment asymptotically approaches $Z(v) \cup C(v)$ at least in one direction, then such a chopping hypersurface H exists.

For a non-vanishing v with $\text{Lyap}(v) = 2$, let us consider the following construction that “substitutes” for the desired proto-billiard map $\tau : \partial_1^- X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X(v)$.

Let Y be a *closed* smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold, equipped with a volume $(n+1)$ -form Ω , and a non-vanishing vector field v . All these structures on Y are presumed to be smooth. In addition, assume that the following properties hold:

(3.3)

- Y is a union of two compact manifolds, X_1 and X_2 , that share a smooth boundary $\partial X_1 = \partial X_2$ and such that $\text{int}(X_1) \cap \text{int}(X_2) = \emptyset$,
- v is boundary generic with respect to the hypersurface $\partial X_1 \subset Y$,
- For $i = 1, 2$, the restriction of v to X_i admits a Lyapunov function $f_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,
- v is nildivergent on Y , i.e., $d(v \lrcorner \Omega) = 0$ for a volume form Ω on Y .

Thanks to the existence of $f_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the third bullet in (3.3), the vector field $v_i := v|_{X_i}$ is traversing and boundary generic on X_i .

Note that $\partial_1^\pm X_1(v_1) = \partial_1^\mp X_2(v_2)$. Thus we have two causality maps:

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} C_{v_1} : \partial_1^+ X_1(v_1) &\rightarrow \partial_1^- X_1(v_1) = \partial_1^+ X_2(v_2) \quad \text{and} \\ C_{v_2} : \partial_1^+ X_2(v_2) &\rightarrow \partial_1^- X_2(v_2) = \partial_1^+ X_1(v_1). \end{aligned}$$

Their composition produces the Poincaré return map

$$(3.5) \quad P_v := C_{v_2} \circ C_{v_1} : \partial_1^+ X_1(v_1) \rightarrow \partial_1^+ X_1(v_1).$$

Note that the locus $\partial_2^- X_1(v_1) = \partial_2^+ X_2(v_2)$ is the fixed point set of the map C_{v_1} , but not of C_{v_2} ; similarly, the locus $\partial_2^+ X_1(v_1) = \partial_2^- X_2(v_2)$ is the fixed point set of the map C_{v_2} , but not of C_{v_1} . Note also that if v_1 is concave in X_1 , then v_2 is convex in X_2 ; in such a case, C_{v_1} is discontinuous, but C_{v_2} is continuous. Thus, C_{v_2} may play the role of τ .

Corollary 3.1. *Under the hypotheses (3.3), the Poincaré return map P_v preserves the measure μ_Θ on $\partial_1^+ X_1(v_1) = \partial_1^- X_1(v_2)$, induced by the closed v -invariant n -form $\Theta := v \lrcorner \Omega$.*

As a result, any point $x \in \partial_1^+ X(v_1)$ has an open neighborhood $U \subset \partial_1^+ X(v_1)$ such that, for almost every $x' \in U$, the sets $\{(P_v)^k(x')\}_k$ intersect U for infinitely many k 's.

Proof. Under the hypotheses (3.3), the closed n -form $\Theta := v \lrcorner \Omega$ has all the properties, listed in Lemma 2.1, on both manifolds, X_1 and X_2 . By this lemma, both maps, C_{v_1} and C_{v_2} , preserve the measure μ_Θ , induced by the restriction of Θ to ∂X , and so does their composition, the Poincaré return map P_v . \square

Remark 3.1. Let $\mathcal{F}(v)$ and $\mathcal{F}(v_1), \mathcal{F}(v_2)$ be the 1-dimensional oriented foliations, produced by the vector fields v and $v_1 := v|_{X_1}, v_2 := v|_{X_2}$, respectively. Although, according to Holography Theorem 1.1, the map C_{v_i} ($i = 1, 2$) allows for a reconstruction of the topological type of the pair $(X_i, \mathcal{F}(v_i))$, the Poincaré return map P_v in (3.5) *alone* seems to be insufficient for a reconstruction of the pair $(Y, \mathcal{F}(v))$.

Also, while each trajectory space $\mathcal{T}(v_i) := \partial_1^+ X_1(v_i)/\{x \sim C_{v_i}(x)\}$ is a separable compact space (actually, a CW -complex), the quotient $\mathcal{T}(v) := \partial_1^+ X_1(v_i)/\{x \sim P_v(x)\}$ typically is pathological (non-separable). \diamond

Theorem 3.2. (Double Holography) *Under the hypotheses (3.3), the two causality maps C_{v_1} and C_{v_2} from (3.4) are sufficient for a reconstruction of the topological type of the pair $(Y, \mathcal{F}(v))$.*

If each v -trajectory hits the locus $\partial X_1 = \partial X_2$ transversally at some point or is quadratically tangent to it at some point, and $df_1 = df_2$ in the vicinity of ∂X_1 , then C_{v_1} and C_{v_2} are sufficient for a reconstruction of the smooth topological type of the pair $(Y, \mathcal{F}(v))$.

Proof. Let $i = 1, 2$. Note that C_{v_i} allows for a reconstruction of the trajectory space $\mathcal{T}(v_i)$ as the quotient space $\partial X_i/\{x \sim C_{v_i}(x) \mid x \in \partial_1^+ X_i(v_i)\}$. This construction produces a continuous map $\Gamma_i^\partial : \partial X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v_i)$, the restriction of the obvious map $\Gamma_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v_i)$ to the boundary ∂X_i .

Let \mathcal{H}_i denote the 1-dimensional foliation of $\mathcal{T}(v_i) \times \mathbb{R}$ by the fibers of the obvious trivial fibration $\pi_i : \mathcal{T}(v_i) \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v_i)$.

We pick a pair Lyapunov functions $f_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$). They help to realize $(X_i, \mathcal{F}(v_i))$ as the pull-back of $(\mathcal{T}(v_i) \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{H}_i)$ under the embedding $\beta_i : X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v_i) \times \mathbb{R}$, given by the formula $\beta_i(x) = (\Gamma_i(x), f_i(x))$. Note that $\beta_i^\partial := \beta_i|_{\partial X_i} : \partial X_i \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v_i) \times \mathbb{R}$ separates $\mathcal{T}(v_i) \times \mathbb{R}$ into two regions, so that the compact region is $\beta_i(X_i)$. Therefore, the knowledge of the imbedding β_i^∂ (which is produced using C_{v_i} and $f_i|_{\partial X_i}$ only) is sufficient for a reconstruction of the topological type of the pair $(X_i, \mathcal{F}(v_i))$ ([K8], Theorem 4.1).

Recall that $Y = X_1 \bigcup_{\{\partial X_1 = \partial X_2\}} X_2$ and that $\mathcal{F}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{F}(v_2)$ match across $\partial X_1 = \partial X_2$ to form the smooth foliation $\mathcal{F}(v)$. Now, we glue $\beta_1(X_1)$ and $\beta_2(X_2)$ via the homeomorphism $\beta_2 \circ \beta_1^{-1} : \beta_1(\partial X_1) \rightarrow \beta_2(\partial X_2)$. The result of the gluing is a manifold Z , homeomorphic to Y . The two v -oriented foliations $\mathcal{H}_1 = \beta_1(\mathcal{F}(v_1))$ and $\mathcal{H}_2 = \beta_2(\mathcal{F}(v_2))$ match continuously (in fact, piecewise differentiably) in the vicinity of $\partial X_1 = \partial X_2$, thus forming topological 1-dimensional foliation on Y , which is homeomorphic to $\mathcal{F}(v)$.

If any v -trajectory is *somewhere* transversal to $\partial X_1 = \partial X_2$ or somewhere quadratically tangent to it, then by an argument as in [K4], Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.3, these data are sufficient for reconstructing the *smooth* topological types of $(X_i, \mathcal{F}(v_i))$ (basically, since the solutions of an ODE depend smoothly on the initial data). Assuming that $df_1 = df_2$ in the vicinity of ∂X_1 (this is hypotheses is restrictive: it implies the existence of a closed 1-form α on Y such that $\alpha(v) > 0$), the gluing map is the identity on ∂X_1 and on the tangent bundle $TX|_{\partial X_1}$. As a result, the foliations $\mathcal{F}(v_1)$ and $\mathcal{F}(v_2)$ match differentiably across ∂X_1 . \square

4. ON THE v -HARMONIZING METRICS AND THE ASSOCIATED MINIMAL FOLIATIONS

Any closed and co-closed nonsingular 1-form α on a compact Riemannian $(n+1)$ -manifold X produces a beautiful geometric structure: a pair of mutually orthogonal foliations \mathcal{F}_α and \mathcal{G}_α of dimensions 1 and n , respectively, both of which are minimal [K6], [Su], provided that the form α has the following global property:

- **The Calabi Condition** [Ca]: Through each point $x \in X$, there exists a smooth path γ such that either γ is a loop or a segment, with its ends residing in ∂X , and

$$(4.1) \quad \alpha(\dot{\gamma}) > 0.$$

If a closed 1-form α satisfies (4.1), it is called **transitive** [Ca]. In fact, in [Ca], Calabi studied closed 1-forms α that may have Morse type singularities (different from extrema) and are transitive. He proves that such transitive α is **intrinsically harmonic**, i.e., there exists a Riemannian metric g so that α is also co-closed in g . Moreover, the transitivity of α is also necessary for its intrinsic harmonicity.

Throughout this paper, we embed properly a given compact $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold X into an open manifold \hat{X} (when X is closed, $\hat{X} = X$) and extend v to a non-vanishing vector field \hat{v} . We treat (\hat{X}, \hat{v}) as a “germ” surrounding (X, v) .

Let θ be a closed 1 form on $S^1 \times D^n$, the pull-back of the canonical 1-form on S^1 under the obvious projection $S^1 \times D^n \rightarrow S^1$. Similarly, consider the obvious function $D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow D^1 \subset \mathbb{R}$ and denote by θ the differential of this function.

Definition 4.1. (The Calabi tubes) Assume that a compact oriented manifold X is equipped with a non-vanishing vector field v .

- We call an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism $\kappa : S^1 \times D^n \rightarrow \hat{X}$ or $\kappa : D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow \hat{X}$ a **Calabi tube**, if $\theta(\kappa_*^{-1}(v)) > 0$.
- We call a Calabi tube v -invariant, if the orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms $\kappa : S^1 \times D^n \rightarrow \hat{X}$ or $\kappa : D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow \hat{X}$ are such that v is tangent to every curve $\{\kappa(S^1 \times u)\}_{u \in D^n}$ or to every curve $\{\kappa(D^1 \times u)\}_{u \in D^n}$, respectively.
- We call a v -invariant Calabi tube **balanced** if the function $(\kappa^{-1})^*(\theta)(v)$ is constant along each v -trajectory. \diamond

Definition 4.2. (The Calabi vector fields)

- We say that a non-vanishing vector field v on X is a **Calabi field**, if X admits a cover by Calabi tubes (whose images reside in \hat{X}).
- We say that a non-vanishing vector field v on X is an **invariant Calabi field**, if X admits a cover by v -invariant Calabi tubes.
- We say that an invariant Calabi vector field v on X is an **balanced**, if X admits a cover by balanced v -invariant Calabi tubes. \diamond

Remark 4.1. It follows from Lemma 4.2 below that if v is a Calabi field, admitting a cover by a toroidal and b cylindrical v -invariant Calabi tubes, then $\text{Lyap}(v) \leq 2a + b$. \diamond

Lemma 4.1. If v is an invariant Calabi field with respect to a cover of X by Calabi tubes, then v is a balanced invariant Calabi field (with respect to a differently parametrized Calabi cover). So the second and third bullets in Definition 4.2 are equivalent requirements.

Proof. Let $x : D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow D^1$ and $y : D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow D^n$ be the obvious coordinates on the product. Let $\kappa^{-1} : U_{\hat{\gamma}^*} \rightarrow D^1 \times D^n$ be as in Definition 4.1, second bullet, and put $\theta = dx$. Our goal is to construct a new diffeomorphism $\tilde{\kappa}^{-1} : U_{\hat{\gamma}^*} \rightarrow D^1 \times D^n$ so that the image of

each v -trajectory $\gamma \subset U_{\hat{\gamma}^*}$ is still the fiber of the projection $y : D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow D^n$ and the function $[(\tilde{\kappa}^{-1})^*\theta](v)$ is constant on γ .

Let $\kappa_*^{-1}(v) = f(x, y) \partial_x$. So $\theta(\kappa_*^{-1}(v)) = dx(\kappa_*^{-1}(v))$ is the function $f(x, y) > 0$. Consider the auxiliary function

$$g(x, y) = \int_0^x \frac{dt}{f(t, y)} \Big/ \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{f(t, y)},$$

which is strictly increasing in $x \in [0, 1]$ and has the property $g(0, y) = 0$, $g(1, y) = 1$. We define the diffeomorphism $\phi : D^1 \times D^n \rightarrow D^1 \times D^n$ by the formula $(x', y') := (g(x, y), y)$. Then the ϕ transforms $f(x, y) \partial_x$ into $\partial_{x'}$.

The case of a toroidal Calabi tube $U_{\hat{\gamma}^*}$ is similar: $x : S^1 \times D^n \rightarrow S^1$ is a circular-valued map, viewed as a function with the period 1, and $f(x+1, y) = f(x, y)$ for all x, y . Under these assumptions, the same formulas deliver the desired diffeomorphism $\phi : S^1 \times D^n \rightarrow S^1 \times D^n$ such that $[(\tilde{\kappa}^{-1})^*\theta](v) = 1$. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Any traversing vector field v is an invariant balanced Calabi field. Also, $\text{Lyap}(v) = 1$.*

Proof. By the definition of a traversing vector field (see [K1]), each v -trajectory γ is a closed segment or a singleton. We consider a closed segment $\hat{\gamma} \subset \hat{X}$ of the \hat{v} -trajectory that contains γ in its interior and such that $\partial\hat{\gamma} \subset \hat{X} \setminus X$. We take a disk-shaped smooth transversal section D^n of the \hat{v} -flow at a point $o \in \gamma$ and form a small \hat{v} -invariant tubular neighborhood $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ of $\hat{\gamma}$ in \hat{X} by taking the union of \hat{v} -trajectories through D^n and “trimming” this sheaf, as described below. We denote by $V_{\hat{\gamma}}$ the trimmed set of \hat{v} -trajectories that pass through the sphere ∂D^n .

Since $\partial\hat{\gamma} \cap X = \emptyset$, we may pick the tube $U_{\hat{\gamma}} \supset \hat{\gamma}$ so narrow (equivalently, the section D^n so small), that $X \cap (\delta U_{\hat{\gamma}}) = \emptyset$, where $\delta U_{\hat{\gamma}} := \partial(U_{\hat{\gamma}}) \setminus V_{\hat{\gamma}}$. This choice helps us to introduce a product structure $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}} : I \times D^n \approx U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ in $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ so that:

- (1) $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}(I) \times o = \hat{\gamma}$, where the $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}|_I$ is an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism,
- (2) $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ consists of segments of \hat{v} -trajectories,
- (3) each slice $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}(t \times D^n)$, where $t \in I$, is transversal to the \hat{v} -flow, and
- (4) $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}$ is an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism with respect to the orientation of $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$,

induced by the preferred orientation of \hat{X} .

This choice of the tube $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ satisfies all the properties, listed in Definition 4.1, second bullet. So $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ is a v -invariant Calabi tube, which contains γ . By Lemma 4.1, there is a reparametrization of $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ so that $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ becomes balanced.

By the compactness of X , it admits a finite subcover by v -invariant balanced Calabi tubes $\{U_{\hat{\gamma}}\}_{\hat{\gamma}}$. So v is an invariant balanced Calabi field.

Since v admits a global Lyapunov function [K1], we get $\text{Lyap}(v) = 1$. \square

Given a Riemmanian metric g on a $(n+1)$ -dimensional X , we consider the Hodge star operator $*_g : T^*X \rightarrow \bigwedge^n T^*X$ which is a bundle isomorphism. In local coordinates, and with respect to a local basis $\{e_j^*\}_j$ in T^*X and some associated dual local basis $\{\eta_j^*\}_j$ in $\bigwedge^n T^*X$, the operator $*_g$ is given by the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ -matrix $G = \sqrt{\det(g)} \cdot (g)^{-1}$, where

$g = (g_{jk})$. For $n \geq 2$, since $\det(G) = \det(g)^{(n-1)/2}$, remarkably, the operator $*_g$ determines the metric g ([Ca]).

Recall that the co-derivative operator, acting on differential p -forms on X , is defined by

$$\delta =_{\text{def}} (-1)^{(n+1)(p+1)+1} (*_g) \circ d \circ (*_g).$$

We say that a p -form α is co-closed if $\delta\alpha = 0$. The closed and co-closed forms α are harmonic, i.e., they satisfy the Laplace equation $(d + \delta)^2\alpha = 0$; however, on manifolds with boundary, not any harmonic form is closed and co-closed!

Remark 4.1. Given a 1-form α on (X, g) , we denote by α_{tan} the 1-form in $TX|_{\partial X}$ that coincides with α on $T(\partial X)$ and vanishes on the normal vector field $\nu_g(\partial X, X)$. By definition, $\alpha_{\text{norm}} = \alpha - \alpha_{\text{tan}}$, as sections of $TX|_{\partial X}$.

On manifolds with boundary, the basic relation between closed and co-closed forms and the DeRham cohomology is a bit subtle, as described in [CTGM]; for 1-form α on X , the relation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H^1(X; \mathbb{R}) &\approx \{\alpha \mid d\alpha = 0, \delta\alpha = 0, \alpha_{\text{norm}} = 0\}, \\ H^1(X; \partial X; \mathbb{R}) &\approx \{\alpha \mid d\alpha = 0, \delta\alpha = 0, \alpha_{\text{tan}} = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

◇

The main ideas for proving the next theorem can be found in [K6], as a special case of Theorem C. However, in Theorem 4.1 below, the given ingredient is the vector field v , not a closed 1-form α as in [K6].

Theorem 4.1. *Let v be a Calabi vector field (see Definition 4.2, the 1st bullet) on a compact $(n+1)$ -manifold X , $n \geq 2$.*

(1) *Then there exists a smooth 1-form α and a metric g on X such that:*

- $\alpha(v) > 0$
- $d(*_g\alpha) = 0$,
- $\dim(\ker(*_g\alpha)) = 1$,
- $\alpha \wedge *_g\alpha = *_g(1)$ is a volume form on X .

(2) *Let v be a v -invariant Calabi vector field on X . Then, in addition to the properties in (1), one may choose α to be a v -invariant 1-form. The n -form $\Theta := *_g\alpha$ is integrally dual to v (see Definition 2.1), i.e., in addition to the bulleted properties above, $v \in \ker(\Theta)$. Moreover, one may choose the metric g on X to be v -invariant.*

(3) *If v is a traversing vector field, then v is a balanced v -invariant Calabi field. Moreover, $\alpha = df$, an exact 1-form. For an appropriate g , the harmonic n -form $\Theta = *_g\alpha$ is integrally dual of v , and $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a harmonic Lyapunov function for v . Furthermore, one may choose the metric g on X to be v -invariant.*

Proof. Here is a general plan for proving the theorem: **(i)** starting with the Calabi vector field v , we construct v -amenable 1-form α (in the third bullet, $\alpha = df$, where f is a Lyapunov function for v) and a closed n -form Θ so that $\alpha \wedge \Theta > 0$; **(ii)** then we construct the metric g for which $*_g(\alpha) = \Theta$.

We consider a cover $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ of X by Calabi tubes $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$, where $\hat{\gamma}$ runs over the set of all \hat{v} -trajectories that have a nonempty intersection with X . Using compactness of X , we pick a finite subcover $\{U_{\hat{\gamma}_i}\}_i$ of $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ so that $X = \bigcup_i (U_{\hat{\gamma}_i} \cap X)$.

As before, we divide Calabi tubes into two types: for the first type, the core $\hat{\gamma}$ of $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ is a closed segment, for the second type, the core is a simple loop. For each of the tubes, we fix a product structure, given by a diffeomorphism $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}$ with the properties as in Definition 4.1, the first bullet.

For each tube of the first type, we consider a function $\tilde{f}_{\hat{\gamma}} : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow I$, the pull-back by $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}^{-1}$ of the obvious function $I \times D^n \rightarrow I$. By the definition of the Calabi tube, $d\tilde{f}_{\hat{\gamma}}(v) > 0$ in $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$. Similarly, for each tube $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ of the second type, with the help of $\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}^{-1}$, we produce a 1-form $\tilde{\alpha}_{\hat{\gamma}}$ in $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}_{\hat{\gamma}}(v) > 0$.

Let $\tilde{\psi} : D^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth non-negative bell function with the support in the interior of D^n and such that all its partial derivatives vanish along ∂D^n . Using the $(\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}^{-1})$ -induced projection $p : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow D^n$, we form the pull-back function $\psi = \tilde{\psi} \circ p$ and multiply $\tilde{f}_{\hat{\gamma}}$ by ψ to get a smooth function $f_{\hat{\gamma}} : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the support in the interior of $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$. Thus $df_{\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{v}) > 0$ in the interior of $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ and $df_{\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{v}) \geq 0$ globally.

Similarly, for Calabi tubes of the toroidal kind, we put $\alpha_{\hat{\gamma}} := \psi \cdot \tilde{\alpha}_{\hat{\gamma}}$, where $\psi : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the pull-back of the bell function $\tilde{\psi} : D^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ under the $(\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}}^{-1})$ -induced projection $U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow D^n$. Thanks to the choice of $\tilde{\psi}$, this 1-form is well-defined globally. Again, $\alpha_{\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{v}) > 0$ in the interior of $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ and $\alpha_{\hat{\gamma}}(\hat{v}) \geq 0$ globally. Unfortunately, this $\alpha_{\hat{\gamma}}$ is not closed!

For Calabi tubes of both kinds, we introduce the n -form $\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}}$ on $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ as the pull-back, under the map $(\kappa_{\hat{\gamma}})^{-1}$, of the standard volume form vol_{D^n} on D^n , being multiplied by the bell function $\tilde{\psi} : D^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Evidently, $\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}}$ extends trivially on X . Since $\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}}$ depends only on the coordinates in D^n , for the dimensional reason, we get $d\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}} = 0$.

Moreover, the restriction of the function $\pm\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}}/\Omega^{\partial}$ to $\partial_1^{\pm}X(v) \setminus \partial_2X(v)$ is positive. Indeed, consider the subtube $U_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\dagger} \subset U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ that is the preimage of $\gamma \subset \hat{\gamma}$ under the projection $U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow \hat{\gamma}$, delivered by the product structure on the tube $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$. Then, in the case of $\partial_1^{-}X(v) \setminus \partial_2X(v)$ (or of $\partial_1^{+}X(v) \setminus \partial_2X(v)$), \hat{v} points outside (inside) of both domains, X and $U_{\hat{\gamma}}^{\dagger}$.

Next, we define the global 1-form α on X by the formula $\sum_i \alpha_{\hat{\gamma}_i}$, and the global n -form Θ by the formula $\sum_i \Theta_{\hat{\gamma}_i}$. Since $d\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}_i} = 0$ by its construction, Θ is a closed form. Again, since $\alpha_{\hat{\gamma}_i}(\hat{v}) > 0$ in the open set $U_{\hat{\gamma}_i}$ for all i , we conclude that $\alpha(v) > 0$ in X .

Finally, with the candidates α and Θ in place, we consider the Hodge star bundle isomorphism $*_g : T^*X \rightarrow \bigwedge^n T^*X$, where the Riemmanian metric g on X to be consructed. Recall that, for $n \geq 2$, the operator $*_g$ determines the metric g ([Ca]). Therefore, it suffices to pick any g such that $*_g(\alpha) = \Theta$. By the construction of α and Θ , we get $\alpha \wedge *_g\alpha > 0$. By Lemma 1 from [Ca], such a metric g exists. Moreover, Calabi's argument (see [Ca], pages 110-112) insures that $\alpha \wedge *_g\alpha = vol_g := *_g(1)$, the g -induced volume $(n+1)$ -form on X . (For the reader's convenience, we will sketch his argument below.)

With respect to such a choice of g , the form Θ is closed, its kernel is 1-dimensional, $\alpha(v) > 0$, and $\alpha \wedge *_g \alpha = \text{vol}_g$. So claim (1) from of the theorem is valid.

Note that, for each v -invariant Calabi tube, $v \in \ker(\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}_i})$ and $\mathcal{L}_v(\Theta_{\hat{\gamma}_i}) = 0$ for all i . Thus, for a v -invariant Calabi vector field v , in addition, we get $v \in \ker(\Theta)$ and $\mathcal{L}_v(\Theta) = 0$.

Thanks to Lemma 4.1, by choosing an appropriate parametrization of the invariant Calabi tubes from the cover $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$, we may assume that $\alpha(v)$ is constant along the v -trajectories. Therefore α is a v -invariant form (i.e., $\mathcal{L}_v \alpha = 0$).

Next, we are going to show that we may choose the metric g in (2) to be v -invariant. To achieve this, we need to revisit the argument in [Ca].

We notice that, for a given v and α and Θ as above, the choice of g is far from being unique. Using the product structure in an invariant balanced Calabi tube $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$, we introduce there local coordinates $\{x_i\}_{i \in [0, n]}$ such that: (i) $dx_0 = \alpha$, where $x_0 : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow S^1$ or $x_0 : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^1$, depending on the type of the tube, (ii) $v = \partial_{x_0}$ (using that $U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ is balanced), and (iii) $dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n = \Theta$. Then we define the dual basis in $\bigwedge^n T^*U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ as

$$\eta_0 := dx_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n, \eta_1 := -dx_0 \wedge dx_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n, \eta_2 := dx_0 \wedge dx_1 \wedge dx_3 \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_n, \dots \text{ etc.}$$

Again, following [Ca], for $n \geq 2$, this choice of bases $\{dx_i\} \in T^*U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ and $\{\eta_i\} \in \bigwedge^n T^*U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ defines a unique candidate for the local star operator $*_{g_{\hat{\gamma}}} : T^*U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow \bigwedge^n T^*U_{\hat{\gamma}}$ that takes each dx_i to $\phi_{\hat{\gamma}} \cdot \eta_i$, where the smooth functions $\{\phi_{\hat{\gamma}} : U_{\hat{\gamma}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+\}_{\hat{\gamma}}$ form a finite partition of unity, subordinate to the cover $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$, and such that $\mathcal{L}_v(\phi_{\hat{\gamma}}) = 0$.

We notice that all the forms $\{dx_i\}$ and $\{\eta_i\}$ are v -invariant. Moreover, since each $\phi_{\hat{\gamma}}$ does not depend on x_0 , we get that $\{\phi_{\hat{\gamma}} \cdot \eta_i\}_i$ are v -invariant as well. Therefore, the local star operators $*_{g_{\hat{\gamma}}}$ must be also v -invariant.

Finally, we pick the v -invariant operator $*_g := \sum_{\hat{\gamma}} *_{g_{\hat{\gamma}}}$ which has the desired properties: $*_g(\alpha) = \Theta$, $\alpha \wedge \Theta = \text{vol}_g$. Therefore, the corresponding metric g must be invariant as well.

Hence, the claim (2) is valid.

When v is traversing, by Lemma 4.2, X admits a cover by v -invariant Calabi tubes, which are cylinders only. As a result, $\alpha = df$, where $f := \sum_i f_i$. Therefore, α is exact! Moreover, since $d\alpha = 0$ and $d\Theta = 0$, both α and Θ are harmonic in g . By the constructions of α and Θ above, they satisfy all the the properties from the claim (3) of this theorem, including the property $\mathcal{L}_v g = 0$. \square

The properties of forms Θ and α , listed in Theorem 4.1, motivate the following:

Definition 4.3. *For a non-vanishing vector field v on a smooth compact $(n+1)$ -manifold X , consider the space $\mathcal{H}ar(v)$ of smooth Riemannian metrics g on X , paired with smooth 1-forms α , such that:*

- (1) $\alpha(v) > 0$,
- (2) $d\alpha = 0$,
- (3) the n -form $\Theta :=_{\text{def}} *_g(\alpha)$ is closed (and thus α is harmonic in the metric g),
- (4) $v \in K(\Theta)$, the kernel of Θ ,
- (5) $\alpha \wedge \Theta$, is the g -induced $(n+1)$ -volume form on X ,

- (6) the function $\Theta/\Omega^\partial \geq 0$ on $\partial_1^+ X(v)$ and $\Theta/\Omega^\partial \leq 0$ on $\partial_1^- X(v)$, where Ω^∂ denotes a volume n -form on ∂X , consistent with its orientation.

For a given v , we say that (g, α) is a *harmonizing pair*, if all the six properties are valid. \diamond

Remark 4.2. Note the main difference between Definition 4.3 and the list of properties in the claim (1) of Theorem 4.1: namely, the form α must be closed in Definition 4.3. The form $\Theta = *_g \alpha$ is required to be closed in both Definition 4.3 and Theorem 4.1. \diamond

Thus, by Theorem 4.1, any traversing boundary generic vector field v admits a v -harmonizing pair (g, df) .

The proof of the corollary below can be found in [K6], as a special case of Theorem C. See also [Su] and the proof of Corollary 4.2 for a sketch of the argument in Theorem C.

Corollary 4.1. *For any non-vanishing vector field v and a v -harmonizing pair (g, α) on X (as in Definition 4.3), the following properties hold:*

- the 1-foliation $\mathcal{F}(v)$, determined by v , is formed by the geodesic curves in g ,
- the n -foliation $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$, defined by the closed 1-form α , consists of leaves \mathcal{L} that minimize the g -induced n -volume among all sufficiently small perturbations of \mathcal{L} that are fixed on ∂X .
- the leaves of $\mathcal{F}(v)$ and of $\mathcal{G}(\alpha)$ are mutually orthogonal in g . \diamond

Corollary 4.2. *Let v be a traversing vector field on compact smooth $(n+1)$ -manifold X with boundary, $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Lyapunov function for v , and (g, df) a v -harmonizing pair.*

Then the Plateau problem for each of the $(n-1)$ -dimensional contours $f^{-1}(c) \cap \partial X$ has a smooth solution $f^{-1}(c)$ in (X, g) for any regular value c of $f|_{\partial X}$. If $H_n(X; \mathbb{R}) = 0$, then this n -volume minimizing solution is unique.

For all sufficiently close (in the C^∞ -topology) to v traversing vector fields \tilde{v} and the corresponding \tilde{v} -harmonizing pairs $(\tilde{g}, d\tilde{f})$, the Plateau problem for the contour $f^{-1}(c) \cap \partial X$ still has a smooth solution.

Proof. The proof may be extracted from [K6], Theorems C and D, which deal with a more general setting than the one required here. Let us sketch their main trust. Since f is a Lyapunov function for v and v is traversing, f attains its extrema on ∂X . For any non-critical for $f|_{\partial X}$ value c , the leaves $\mathcal{G}_c := f^{-1}(c)$, where $c \in f(X)$, of the foliation $\mathcal{G}(df)$ are nonsingular. By the construction of v -harmonizing g , we get $\text{vol}_g(\mathcal{G}_c) = \int_{\mathcal{G}_c} \Theta$, where $\Theta = *_g(df)$. Consider any small smooth perturbation \mathcal{H} of the hypersurface \mathcal{G}_c , supported in the interior of X so that $\partial \mathcal{H} = \partial \mathcal{G}_c$. Like \mathcal{G}_c , the hypersurface \mathcal{H} is transversal to v . By the Stokes' theorem, $\int_{\mathcal{H}} \Theta = \int_{\mathcal{G}_c} \Theta$ since $d\Theta = 0$ and \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{G}_c are cobordant. On the other hand, using orthogonality of v to \mathcal{G} , we conclude that, at each point $x \in \mathcal{H}$ where $T_x \mathcal{H}$ is not tangent to the locus $\mathcal{G}_{f(x)}$, the n -volume form $dg|_{T_x \mathcal{H}} > \Theta|_{T_x \mathcal{H}}$. Thus $\text{vol}_g(\mathcal{H}) > \int_{\mathcal{H}} \Theta = \int_{\mathcal{G}_c} \Theta = \text{vol}_g(\mathcal{G}_c)$, unless \mathcal{H} is tangent to \mathcal{G} almost everywhere, in which case, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G}_c$. Therefore, \mathcal{G}_c minimizes the g -induced n -volume locally, provided that $\mathcal{G}_c \cap \partial X$ is fixed.

If $H_n(X; \mathbb{R}) = 0$, then $\mathcal{H} \cup -\mathcal{G}_c$ is a trivial \mathbb{R} -cycle for any relative cycle \mathcal{H} that shares with \mathcal{G}_c its boundary $\mathcal{G}_c \cap \partial X$. Hence, similar arguments work for such an \mathcal{H} , namely, $\text{vol}_g(\mathcal{H}) > \text{vol}_g(\mathcal{G}_c)$. Thus the volume minimizing solution \mathcal{H} of the Plateau problem for the contour $f^{-1}(c) \cap \partial X$ is unique. \square

Combining Theorem 4.1 with Lemma 2.1 leads instantly to the following claim.

Theorem 4.2. *For any traversing boundary generic vector field v on a $(n+1)$ -manifold X , there exists a v -invariant metric g and a smooth Lyapunov function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that (g, df) is a v -harmonising pair.*

*For any such pair $(g, df) \in \text{Har}(v)$, the measure μ_Θ on ∂X , induced by the closed n -form $\Theta =_{\text{def}} *_g(df)$ on X via formula (2.2), is preserved under the causality map C_v . The forms Θ and df are v -invariant.* \diamond

In combination with Theorem 4.2, Corollary 4.1 leads to the following claim.

Corollary 4.3. *Let v be a traversing boundary generic vector field on X , and (g, df) a v -harmonizing pair. Assume that no pair of distinct points $a, b \in \partial X$ admits two distinct g -geodesics that reside in X and connect a and b .³*

Then the knowledge of the causality map $C_v : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^- X(v)$ and of the v -harmonizing metric g on X allows for the reconstruction of the foliation $\mathcal{F}(v)$.

Proof. Consider a geodesic curve $[\gamma(g)]$ that connects two points, $x \in \partial X$ and $C_v(x) \in \partial X$. By Corollary 4.1, the segment $[\gamma]$ of the v -trajectory that connects x and $C_v(x)$ is a geodesic curve. By the uniqueness hypotheses, we get $[\gamma(g)] = [\gamma]$. So the entire γ can be reconstructed from C_v and the v -harmonizing metric g . \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let v be a traversing boundary generic vector field on a compact connected smooth Riemannian $(n+1)$ -manifold (X, g) with boundary. Then the measure μ_Θ on ∂X can be recovered from the g -induced volume n -form Ω^∂ on ∂X and the function*

$$\phi^\partial =_{\text{def}} (\Theta|_{\partial X})/(\Omega^\partial) : \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

—the cos of the angle, formed by v and the inner normal ν_g to ∂X .

Proof. By the definition of the auxiliary function $\phi^\partial : \partial X \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ and using that $\Theta|_{K(df)}$ and Ω^∂ on ∂X both are the g -induced volume n -forms, we have $\Theta(w) = \phi^\partial(x) \cdot \Omega^\partial(w)$ for any $w \in \Lambda^n T_x(\partial X)$. \square

By collapsing each v -trajectory to a point, we get a quotient trajectory space $\mathcal{T}(v)$. We denote by $\Gamma : X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v)$ the quotient map, and by $\Gamma^\partial : \partial X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v)$ its restriction to ∂X .

For a traversing boundary generic vector field v , let \mathcal{Y} denotes the set of v -trajectories that pass through the tangency locus $\partial_2 X(v)$. Let $\mathcal{K}(v) =_{\text{def}} \mathcal{Y} \cap \partial_1^+ X(v)$. For such a v , the set $\mathcal{K}(v)$ is compact $(n-1)$ -dimensional CW -complex, so $\mu_\Theta(\mathcal{K}(v)) = 0$. In fact,

³For example, this is the case when (X, g) is contained in a larger Riemannian manifold (\hat{X}, \hat{g}) such that any two distinct points in \hat{X} belong to a single \hat{g} -geodesic.

$\Gamma^\partial : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v)$ is a homeomorphism on the complement to the zero-measure set $\mathcal{K}(v)$.

This observation motivates the following definition.

Definition 4.4. *Let v be a boundary generic traversing vector field on a compact connected smooth $(n+1)$ -manifold X with boundary, and let Θ be a differential n -form that is integrally dual of v (as in Lemma 2.1).*

- *We introduce a measure $\tilde{\mu}_\Theta$ on the trajectory space $\mathcal{T}(v)$ by the formula*

$$\tilde{\mu}_\Theta(A) =_{\text{def}} \mu_\Theta((\Gamma^\partial)^{-1}(A)),$$

where $A \subset \mathcal{T}(v)$ is such that its Γ^∂ -preimage is Lebesgue-measurable in the compact manifold $\partial_1^+ X(v)$.

- *Then we interpret the integral $\int_{\partial_1^+ X(v)} \Theta$ as the volume of the trajectory space $\mathcal{T}(v)$ with respect to the measure $\tilde{\mu}_\Theta$ on $\mathcal{T}(v)$, induced by Θ .* \diamond

Theorem 4.3. *Let v be a smooth traversing vector field on a smooth compact connected manifold with boundary. For any v -harmonizing pair (g, df) , the g -induced volume form Ω^∂ on ∂X , and the cos-function $\phi^\partial : \partial X \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ allow for a computation of the Θ -induced volume of the trajectory space $\mathcal{T}(v)$ via each of the following two formulas:*

$$\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v)) = \pm \int_{\partial^\pm X(v)} \phi^\partial \cdot \Omega^\partial.$$

Therefore, letting $g^\partial := g|_{\partial X}$, we get $\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v)) \leq \text{vol}_{g^\partial}(\partial^\pm X(v))$, which implies that

$$(4.2) \quad \text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}_{g^\partial}(\partial X(v)).$$

Assuming that the restriction $f^\partial : \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the Lyapunov function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ takes values in the interval $[0, 1]$,⁴ for any such v -harmonizing pair (g, df) , we get the “holographic” isoperimetric inequality

$$(4.3) \quad \text{vol}_g(X) \leq \text{vol}_{g^\partial}(\partial X).$$

Proof. Put $\Theta = *_g(df)$. Examining Definition 4.4, for each v -harmonizing pair (g, df) , the measure $\tilde{\mu}_\Theta$ on $\mathcal{T}(v)$ can be reconstructed from the following data:

- the locus $\partial_1^+ X(v)$,
- the map $\Gamma^\partial : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(v)$ (whose *generic* fiber is a singleton),
- the volume n -form Ω^∂ on $\partial_1^+ X(v)$, induced by g^∂ ,
- the “cos” function ϕ^∂ .

Thus, we conclude that $\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v)) = \int_{\partial_1^+ X(v)} \phi^\partial \cdot \Omega^\partial$, the volume of the trajectory space, can be reconstructed from the data in the first, third, and fourth bullet.

⁴which is always possible to achieve by an affine transformation of the target \mathbb{R}

Since $df(v) > 0$ in X , we notice that f attains its extrema on ∂X . Hence, if $f : \partial X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, then $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Therefore, by Stokes' Theorem, we get

$$\text{vol}_g(X) = \int_X df \wedge \Theta = \int_{\partial X} f \cdot \Theta \leq \int_{\partial X} 1 \cdot |\phi^\partial| \cdot \Omega^\partial \leq \text{vol}_{g^\partial}(\partial X).$$

Therefore, the volume of the bulk X does not exceed the surface area of its boundary. This fact may please our fellow physicists who contemplate about black holes... \square

Definition 4.5. *Let X be a compact connected smooth manifold with boundary, and v a traversing vector field on it. A Lyapunov function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well-balanced if $df(v) = 1$.* \diamond

By Theorem 4.1, any traversing vector field admits a well-balanced Lyapunov function.

Let $\text{Diff}(X, \partial X)$ be the group of the smooth diffeomorphisms of X that are identities on ∂X and whose differentials are the identities on the bundle $TX|_{\partial X}$. The group $\text{Diff}(X, \partial X)$ acts naturally on the space $\mathcal{R}(X)$ of smooth Riemannian metrics on X .

Theorem 4.4. *Let v be a boundary generic traversing vector field on a compact connected manifold X with boundary. Consider a v -harmonizing pair (g, df) (as in Definition 4.3), where the metric g is v -invariant, and the Lyapunov function is well-balanced.*

Assume that each v -trajectory γ is either transversal to ∂X at some point, or is quadratically tangent to ∂X at some point x so that $x = \gamma \cap \partial X$.⁵

Then the following boundary-confined data:

- *the causality map $C_v : \partial_1^+ X(v) \rightarrow \partial_1^- X(v)$,*
- *the restriction $g^\partial = g|_{\partial X}$ of the metric g to the boundary,*
- *the restriction $f|_{\partial X}$ of the Lyapunov function f to the boundary,*
- *the angle-function $\theta : \partial X \rightarrow S^1$, generated by v and the inner normal vector field ν to ∂X in X ,*

allow for a reconstruction of the smooth topological type of X and of the metric g on it, up to the natural $\text{Diff}(X, \partial X)$ -action on the space $\mathcal{R}(X)$ of Riemannian metrics on X .

Proof. By Theorem 4.1, there is a v -harmonizing pair (g, df) with a v -invariant g .

Let $\mathcal{M}(f)$ be the codimension one foliation on X , defined by the connected components of the hypersurfaces of f -constant level. Recall that, due to the critical points of $f : \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the leaves of $\mathcal{M}(f)$ may be singular. However, as before, we view $\mathcal{M}(f)$ as the intersection of a nonsingular foliation $\mathcal{M}(\hat{f})$ on an open manifold $\hat{X} \supset X$ with X .

Since $df(v) > 0$, every leaf of $\mathcal{M}(f)$ intersects with every leaf of $\mathcal{F}(v)$ at a singleton at most. Again, since $df(v) = 1$, f attains its extrema on the boundary. As a result, any hypersurface $f^{-1}(c)$ has a nonempty intersection with ∂X . Moreover, each point $x \in X$ is uniquely determined by a point $y \in \partial X \cap \gamma_x$, where γ_x stands for the v -trajectory through x , and by the value $f(x)$. Thus, the pair of smooth foliations $(\mathcal{M}(\hat{f}), \mathcal{F}(\hat{v}))$ delivers a “coordinate grid” for X , so that the intersections $\mathcal{M}(\hat{f}) \cap \partial X$ and $\mathcal{F}(\hat{v}) \cap \partial X$ provide the

⁵This is the case when the v -flow is strictly concave or convex with respect to each component of ∂X . We conjecture that this hypotheses is superfluous.

“holographic structure” from which X will be recovered. We notice that the *ordered* finite set $\gamma_x \cap \partial X$ may be interpreted as the C_v -trajectory of y , where $y \in \gamma_x \cap \partial X$ is the minimal element.

By Definition 4.3, the distribution $K(df) \subset TX$ by the kernels of df is the g -orthogonal complement K_v^\perp to the field v . Also $v \in K(*_g(df)) \subset TX$, the distribution by the kernels of $*_g(df)$. The leaves of $\mathcal{M}(f)$ and $\mathcal{F}(v)$ are g -orthogonal. We denote by g^\perp the restriction of g to the n -dimensional distribution K_v^\perp , and by g^\uparrow the restriction of g to the 1-dimensional distribution $K_v := K(*_g(df))$. Since the pair (df, g) is v -invariant, so are the pairs (K_v^\perp, g^\perp) and (K_v, g^\uparrow) . Therefore, knowing the v -invariant restrictions g^\perp and g^\uparrow is sufficient for determining the metric $g = g^\perp \oplus g^\uparrow$.

On the other hand, by the v -invariant property of g , if we know $g|_{f^{-1}(c)}$ in the vicinity of a v -trajectory γ for one particular value of $c \in \mathbb{R}$, then we know all the restrictions $\{g|_{f^{-1}(c')}\}_{c' \in \mathbb{R}}$ in vicinity of γ , provided $f^{-1}(c') \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset$, $f^{-1}(c) \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, by the v -invariance of (df, g) , if we know the restriction of g to the γ -tangent line at one particular point, we know the restriction of g to the γ -tangent line at any other point along γ .

By the Holography Theorem 1.1, the map C_v determines the pair $(X, \mathcal{F}(v))$, up to a diffeomorphism $\Phi : X \rightarrow X$ that is the identity on ∂X . The property of Φ being a diffeomorphism (and not just a homeomorphism) depends on the property of each v -trajectory γ being either transversal to ∂X at some point, or being quadratically tangent to ∂X at some point (so that $\gamma \cap \partial X$ is a singleton). By the proof of Theorem 1.1, the map C_v determines the triple $(X, \mathcal{F}(v), \mathcal{M}(f))$, up to a diffeomorphism $\Phi : X \rightarrow X$ that is the identity on ∂X (see [K4], Theorem 4.1).

Let $(g_\tau)^\partial$ denote the restriction of the metric g to $T_*(\partial X)$, and $(g_\nu)^\partial$ to the normal bundle $\nu(\partial X, X)$.

Since Φ is assumed to fix the boundary ∂X and the map $\theta : \partial X \rightarrow S^1$, where $\theta := \angle_g(v, \nu)$, its action on the bundle $TX|_{\partial X}$ is trivial.

Let $(g^\uparrow)^\partial$ denotes the restriction of the metric g^\uparrow to the foliation $\mathcal{F}(v)|_{\partial X}$, and let $(g^\perp)^\partial$ denotes the restriction of g^\perp to the foliation $\mathcal{M}(f)|_{\partial X}$. The knowledge of g^∂ and θ makes it possible to determine the orthogonal decomposition $g|_{\partial X} = (g^\uparrow)^\partial \oplus (g^\perp)^\partial$ along ∂X . Note that the plane, spanned by the vectors $\nu(x)$ and $v(x)$ at $x \in \partial X$, is orthogonal to the subspace $T_x(\partial X) \cap K_{v(x)}^\perp$. The orthogonal (2×2) -matrix $A(\theta)$, representing the rotation on the angle θ , connects the decomposition $g|_{\partial X} = (g^\uparrow)^\partial \oplus (g^\perp)^\partial$ to the decomposition $g|_{\partial X} = (g_\nu)^\partial \oplus (g_\tau)^\partial$. So knowing $(g_\nu)^\partial \oplus (g_\tau)^\partial$ and θ determines $(g^\uparrow)^\partial \oplus (g^\perp)^\partial$.

By the v -invariant property of (g, df) , the decomposition $g|_{\partial X} = (g^\uparrow)^\partial \oplus (g^\perp)^\partial$ spreads uniquely to an orthogonal decomposition $g = g^\uparrow \oplus g^\perp$ in X .

Therefore the quadruple $(f|_{\partial X}, g|_{\partial X}, \theta, C_v)$ determines g , up to the natural Φ -action.

□

5. THE SCATTERING MAPS, THE v^g -HARMONIZING METRICS, AND THEIR ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITIES

The lemma below describes conditions under which the scattering map C_{v^g} (see Fig.2) is a μ_Θ -measure-preserving transformation for the appropriate choice of $(2n-2)$ -form Θ on SM . In a way, this lemma it is a special case of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that a metric g on a compact connected Riemannian n -manifold M with boundary is non-trapping and boundary generic.*

Pick a $(2n-2)$ -volume form Ω^∂ on $\partial(SM)$, consistent with its orientation. Let Θ be a differential $(2n-2)$ -form on SM such that:

- $\dim(\ker(\Theta)) = 1$,
- the geodesic field $v^g \in \ker(\Theta)$,
- $d\Theta = 0$,
- the function $\Theta/\Omega^\partial : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is positive (negative) only on the interior of $\partial_1^+(SM)$ (of $\partial_1^-(SM)$).

Then the scattering map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$ preserves the Θ -induced measure μ_Θ on $\partial_1(SM)$, i.e.,

$$\left| \int_{C_{v^g}(K)} \Theta \right| = \int_K \Theta$$

for any Lebesgue-measurable set $K \subset \partial_1^+(SM)$.

Proof. Since the metric g on M is non-trapping, the geodesic field v^g is traversing on SM ([K5], Lemma 2.2). Since the metric g is boundary generic (see Definition 2.4 and Lemma 3.3 in [K5]) relative to ∂M , the field v^g is boundary generic relative to $\partial(SM)$. Thus, Lemma 2.1 is applicable to v^g . By that lemma, we get that C_{v^g} preserves the measure μ_Θ . \square




FIGURE 2. A scattering (causality) map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$ and an involution $\tau : \partial_1^-(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$, mimicking the elastic reflection from ∂M . The two bold arcs that separate $\partial_1^+(SM)$ and $\partial_1^-(SM)$ represent the locus $\partial_2(SM)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let M be a codimension zero smooth compact submanifold of a compact connected Riemannian manifold (L, g) so that $M \cap \partial L = \emptyset$. Assume that each geodesic in L that intersects with M hits ∂L transversally at a pair of distinct points⁶.*

Then the metric $g|_M$ is non-trapping, and the geodesic flow on SM admits a well-balanced Lyapunov function.

Proof. Each geodesics γ in M extends to a unique geodesic γ_L in L , which intersects with ∂L at a pair of points $a(\gamma_L)$ and $b(\gamma_L)$. The orientation of γ picks one of these two points, say $a(\gamma_L)$, as the starting point of γ_L . Consider the function $f(x) := \ell_g(x, a(\gamma_L))$, where $x \in \gamma_L$ and $\ell_g(x, a(\gamma_L))$ is the length of the geodesic arc $[x, a(\gamma_L)] \subset \gamma_L$. Let $\tilde{\gamma}_L$ be a lift of γ_L to the spherical bundle SL . Topologically, $\tilde{\gamma}_L$ is a closed interval.

For any point $(m, v) \in SM$, we take the trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_L((m, v))$ of the geodesic flow on SL through (m, v) . We define the function $F : \tilde{\gamma}_L((m, v)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as the pull-back of $f : \gamma_L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In fact, $F((n, v))$ is the length (in the Sasaki metric gg) of the segment $[(a(\gamma_L), w(\gamma_L)), (n, v)]$ of $\tilde{\gamma}_L$, where $w(\gamma_L)$ is the tangent to γ_L vector at $a(\gamma_L)$ and v is tangent to γ_L at $n \in L$. Using that $\tilde{\gamma}_L((m, v))$ is transversal to $\partial(SL)$ at the point $(a(\gamma_L), w(\gamma_L))$, we get that F is a smooth function of (n, v) . Indeed, the solutions ODEs depend smoothly on the initial data, provided that such data vary along a transversal section of the flow. Evidently, $dF(v^g) > 0$ since f is increasing along γ_L . The variation of F along any segment Δ of $\tilde{\gamma}_L$ equals to its length in gg , which, in turn, equals the length of $\pi(\Delta)$ in g . In particular, for any $\Delta \subset \tilde{\gamma}_L \cap SM$, the variation of F along Δ is the length of $\pi(\Delta)$ in g . Thus F is well-balanced in M . \square

Corollary 5.1. *Let (N, g^\dagger) be a closed hyperbolic (or flat) n -dimensional manifold, and M a compact smooth n -manifold, equipped with a submersion $p : M \rightarrow N$ such that the natural homomorphism $p_* : \pi_1(M) \rightarrow \pi_1(N)$ of the fundamental groups is trivial. Let g denote the p -induced pull-back to M of the hyperbolic (or flat) metric g^\dagger on N .*

Then g is a non-trapping metric, and (M, g) admits a well-balanced Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

In particular, any compact smooth domain M in the hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^n or Euclidean space \mathbb{E}^n admits a non-trapping hyperbolic or Euclidean metric with a well-balanced Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. And so does any sufficiently small domain M in the spherical space \mathbb{S}^n .

Proof. Since the homomorphism $p_* : \pi_1(M) \rightarrow \pi_1(N)$ is trivial, M admits a lifting $\tilde{p} : M \rightarrow \tilde{N}$ to the universal cover $\tilde{N} = \mathbb{H}^n$ (or $\tilde{N} = \mathbb{E}^n$) of N . This lifting is also a submersion. Hence, it suffices to treat the case of a submersion $\tilde{p} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^n$ (or of $\tilde{p} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{E}^n$) which pulls back the hyperbolic (or Euclidean) metric to form g .

Let us consider the hyperbolic case first. In the Poincaré model, \mathbb{H}^n is identified with the interior of the unit Euclidean ball B^n , and the geodesics in \mathbb{H}^n with the arcs of circles in B^n (or diameters through the origin) that are orthogonal to its boundary ∂B^n .

Let $B^n(r) \subset B^n$ be a concentric Euclidean ball of radius $r \in (0, 1)$. Since M is compact, we may assume that $\tilde{p}(M) \subset B^n(r_0)$ for some $r_0 < 1$. Then there is $r_* \in (r_0, 1)$ such

⁶This condition means that ∂L looks “convex”, as seen from M .

that any geodesic arc $\hat{\gamma}$ that intersects with $B^n(r_0)$ hits $\partial B^n(r_\star)$ at a pair of points and is transversal to $\partial B^n(r_\star)$ at the intersections. Let us explain informally the last claim (we leave the details to the reader): in the hyperbolic metric, as $r_\star \rightarrow 1$, $B^n(r_0)$ becomes infinitesimally small relative to $B^n(r_\star)$, and the geodesic arcs through $B^n(r_0)$ approach the diameters of B^n ; at the same time, in the Euclidean metric, $\partial B^n(r_\star)$ approaches ∂B^n .

Now, picking r_\star very close to 1 and the ball $B^n(r_\star)$ for the role of L in Lemma 5.2, we validate the corollary (in the hyperbolic case) by pulling back, with the help of the bundle map $S\tilde{p} : SM \rightarrow S\mathbb{H}^n$, the Lyapunov function on $SB^n(r_0)$, built in the lemma.

The Euclidean case is similar: we pick an Euclidean ball $B^n(r_0) \supset \tilde{p}(M)$, where the radius $r_0 \in (0, +\infty)$. Then there is $r_\star \in (r_0, +\infty)$ such that any line $\hat{\gamma}$ that intersects with $B^n(r_0)$ hits the sphere $\partial B^n(r_\star)$ at a pair of points and is transversal there to $\partial B^n(r_\star)$. Specifically, for a pair (\vec{a}, \vec{v}) , where $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{E}^n$ is such that $\|\vec{a}\| \leq r_0 < r_\star$ and $\vec{v} \in T_{\vec{a}}(\mathbb{E}^n)$ has the norm 1, we may pick the composition of the submersion $S\tilde{p}$ with the Lyapunov function

$$(5.1) \quad F(\vec{a}, \vec{v}) := -(r_\star^2 - \|\vec{a}\|^2 + \langle \vec{a}, \vec{v} \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \langle \vec{a}, \vec{v} \rangle.$$

This composition serves as a Lyapunov function on SM for any submersion p such that $\tilde{p}(M) \subset B^n(r_0)$, where $r_0 < r_\star$.

Let a finite group G act freely and smoothly on the sphere \mathbb{S}^n . Finally, the spherical case $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^n/G$ requires $\tilde{p}(M) \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ being so small that any geodesic circle that intersects with $\tilde{p}(M)$ hits transversally some fixed equator $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{S}^n$. \square

The next theorem is a direct application of Theorem 4.1, claim (3), and Theorem 4.2, together with Corollary 4.1, to the geodesic flows on Riemannian manifolds with boundary that admit a non-trapping metric g .

Theorem 5.1. *Let g be a boundary generic non-trapping Riemannian metric on a smooth compact connected n -manifold M with boundary. Then the following claims hold:*

- *The geodesic vector field v^g admits a well-balanced Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a v^g -harmonizing pair (g^\bullet, dF) , where g^\bullet is a v^g -invariant Riemannian metric on SM .*
- *In the metric g^\bullet , the leaves of the 1-foliation $\mathcal{F}(v^g)$ are geodesic curves⁷, and the leaves $\{F = c\}_{c \in \mathbb{R}}$ of the orthogonal $(2n - 2)$ -foliation $\mathcal{G}(F)$ are the volume-minimizing relative hypersurfaces in $(SM, \partial(SM))$.*
- *The $(2n - 2)$ -form $\Theta =_{\text{def}} \ast_{g^\bullet}(dF)$ has all the properties from Lemma 5.1. As a result, such a form Θ defines a measure μ_Θ on $\partial(SM)$, which is preserved by the scattering map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$.* \diamond

Theorem 5.2. *Let g be a boundary generic non-trapping Riemannian metric on a smooth compact connected n -manifold M with boundary, and let $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lyapunov function for the geodesic vector field v^g .*

⁷As they are also in the Sasaki metric gg .

Let Θ be a $(2n-2)$ -form on SM with the properties as in Lemma 5.1. In particular, we may choose a nil-divergent $\Theta := v^g \lrcorner \Omega$, where Ω is any v^g -invariant volume form on SM .

Then the following claims hold:

- There exists a Riemannian metric g^\bullet on SM such that $*_{g^\bullet}(dF) = \Theta$.
- The function F may be chosen to be well-balanced and the metric g^\bullet to be v^g -invariant.
- In the Θ -induced measure, the volume of the space $\mathcal{T}(v^g)$ of geodesics on M satisfies the inequality:

$$\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) =_{\text{def}} \int_{\partial_1^\pm(SM)} \Theta \leq \text{vol}_{(g^\bullet)^\partial}(\partial_1^\pm(SM)),$$

where $(g^\bullet)^\partial$ denotes the restriction of the metric g^\bullet to the boundary $\partial(SM)$. As a result,

$$(5.2) \quad \text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}_{(g^\bullet)^\partial}(\partial(SM)).$$

- Assuming that the Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is chosen so that $F(\partial(SM)) \subset [0, 1]$, the following isoperimetric inequality holds:

$$(5.3) \quad \text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM) \leq \text{vol}_{(g^\bullet)^\partial}(\partial(SM)).$$

Proof. By the properties of the non-trapping metric g on M , the geodesic field v^g on SM is traversing ([K5], Lemma 2.2). So there exists a smooth function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the property $dF(v^g) > 0$ ([K1], Lemma 4.1). By Theorem 4.1, F may be chosen to be well-balanced. Also by Theorem 4.1, there exists a v^g -harmonizing and v^g -invariant metric g^\bullet on SM (in which dF is co-closed). In particular, along the locus $\partial_1^+(SM)$, the field v^g points inside of SM , so that the closed form $\Theta := *_{g^\bullet}(dF)|_{\partial_1^+(SM)}$ is positively proportional to the g^\bullet -induced volume form in the interior of $\partial_1^+(SM)$. The coefficient of proportionality is $\cos(\angle(\nu, v^g))$, where ν is the inward normal (in the metric g^\bullet) to $\partial(SM)$ in SM .

By Corollary 4.1, the leaves of the 1-foliation $\mathcal{F}(v^g)$ are geodesic curves in the v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet , and the leaves of the orthogonal $(2n-2)$ -foliation $\mathcal{G}(F) =_{\text{def}} \{F^{-1}(c)\}_{c \in \mathbb{R}}$ are the volume-minimizing hypersurfaces H (among all hypersurfaces Σ with the property $\Sigma \cap \partial(SM) = H \cap \partial(SM)$). This validates the first two bullets of the theorem.

The last two bullets follow directly from Corollary 4.3 and Theorem 4.1. \square

Remark 5.1 Note that $\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) = \text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(-v^g))$, so that the volume of $\mathcal{T}(v^g)$ can be also expressed in terms of integration over the locus $\partial_1^+(SM)(-v^g) = \partial_1^-(SM)(v^g)$. \diamond

Theorem 5.3. Let g be a boundary generic non-trapping Riemannian metric on a smooth compact connected n -manifold M with boundary. Assume that any geodesic curve in M is either transversal to ∂M or is simply tangent to ∂M at some point.

We choose a v^g -invariant and v^g -harmonising pair (g^\bullet, dF) on SM with the Lyapunov function F being well-balanced⁸.

⁸By Theorem 5.1, such a pair (g^\bullet, dF) exists.

Then the scattering map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$, the restriction $F^\partial : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of F and of the metric g^\bullet to the boundary $\partial(SM)$, and the g^\bullet -induced angle map $\theta : \partial(SM) \rightarrow S^1$ allow for a reconstruction of:

- the space SM ,
- the geodesic vector field v^g ,
- and of the metric g^\bullet on SM ,

up to the natural action of diffeomorphisms $\Phi : SM \rightarrow SM$ that are the identity map on $\partial(SM)$ and whose differentials are the identity map on the bundle $T(SM)|_{\partial(SM)}$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.4, the knowledge of $F^\partial : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the metric $(g^\bullet)^\partial$ on SM , and angle map $\theta : \partial(SM) \rightarrow S^1$, allow for a reconstruction of the smooth topological type of SM , the foliation $\mathcal{F}(v^g)$, and the metric g^\bullet , provided that g^\bullet is v^g -invariant. Using that $dF(v^g) = 1$, we can reconstruct v^g from $\mathcal{F}(v^g)$. In general, by Theorem 1.2, the reconstruction is possible up to a homeomorphism $\Phi : SM \rightarrow SM$ that is fixed on $\partial(SM)$ and whose restriction to each v^g -trajectory is an orientation-preserving diffeomorphism. Under the hypotheses of Theorem 5.3, again by Theorem 1.2, Φ is a smooth diffeomorphism. With the help of the Φ -invariant map $\theta : \partial(SM) \rightarrow S^1$, we conclude that the differential $D\Phi$ must act trivially on $T(SM)|_{\partial(SM)}$.

However, assuming that the smooth topological type of SM is known, we may drop the assumption that any geodesic curve in M is either transversal to ∂M at some point or is simply tangent to ∂M : indeed, the knowledge of the metric g^\bullet on the complement to the locus $SM(v^g, (33)_\geq \cup (4)_\geq)$ of codimension 3 at least, by continuity, is sufficient for the reconstruction of g^\bullet everywhere. \square

Moving away from the non-trapping metrics, we propose the following notions.

Definition 5.1. Let N be a smooth compact manifold and let g^\bullet be a Riemmanian metric on SN such that $\|v^g\|_{g^\bullet} = 1$. Consider a 1-form $\alpha_\bullet = \alpha_\bullet(g^\bullet)$ on SN that is defined by the two properties: (1) $\ker(\alpha_\bullet) \perp_{g^\bullet} v^g$, and (2) $\alpha_\bullet(v^g) = 1$.

We say that a Riemmanian metric g on N is *geodesically harmonic*, if there exists a Riemmanian metric g^\bullet on SN as above and such that the 1-form α_\bullet is closed and co-closed.

A Riemmanian metric g on N is *invariantly geodesically harmonic*, if it is geodesically harmonic and the metric g^\bullet is v^g -invariant.

We denote by $\mathcal{Har}(N)$ ($\mathcal{Har}_{inv}(N)$) the space of (invariantly) geodesically harmonic metrics on N . \diamond

By Theorem 5.1, any non-trapping and boundary generic metric g on a connected compact M is invariantly geodesically harmonic. Indeed, just follow the well-traveled path (see the proof of Theorem 4.1): take a well-balanced Lyapunov function F , put $\alpha = dF$, construct a closed v^g -invariant n -form Θ , whose kernel is spanned by v^g and such that $\alpha \wedge \Theta > 0$, and finally, construct a v^g -invariant metric g^\bullet so that $\Theta = *_g(\alpha)$. Then $\ker(\Theta) \perp_{g^\bullet} \ker(dF)$. Thus, g is invariantly geodesically harmonic in the sense of Definition 5.1.

However, the geodesically harmonic metrics on *closed* manifolds M seem to be a rare phenomenon. For instance, if $H^1(SM; \mathbb{R}) = 0$ (for $\dim(M) \geq 3$, this is equivalent to $H^1(M; \mathbb{R}) = 0$) no such metric g^\bullet is available, since the cohomology class of α is nontrivial.

Recall also that the v^g -invariant Sasaki's metrics gg on SM are extremely rare indeed. According to [Be], Proposition 1.104, gg is v^g -invariant if and only if the sectional curvature of (M, g) is identically 1.

Remark 5.1. Note that if (N, g) is (invariantly) geodesically harmonic, then any smooth codimension zero proper submanifold $(M, g|_M) \subset (N, g)$ (with boundary generic metric $g|_M$) is automatically (invariantly) geodesically harmonic. \diamond

Let us describe numerically how far a given metric g^\bullet on SM is from being “harmonic”. Speaking informally, we would like to measure the “distance” between the standard contact structure β_g on SM (see (6.2)) and taugt foliations \mathcal{G} on SM that are transversal to v^g .

Let $\|\sim\|_2^{g^\bullet}$ denote the L_2 -norm of differential forms on SM in the metric g^\bullet . Let the 1-form α_\bullet be as in Definition 5.1. Then the quantity

$$\delta(g^\bullet) := \sqrt{(\|d\alpha_\bullet\|_2^{g^\bullet})^2 + (\|d(*_{g^\bullet}(\alpha_\bullet))\|_2^{g^\bullet})^2}$$

measures the failure of a candidate metric g^\bullet to deliver the geodesic harmonicity of g .

Evidently, if g is geodesically harmonic, then $\delta(g^\bullet) = 0$ for an appropriate g^\bullet .

Definition 5.2. Let (M, g) be a connected compact Riemannian manifold. Consider the number

$$(5.4) \quad \mathcal{D}(g) := \inf_{\{g^\bullet\}} \{\delta(g^\bullet)\},$$

where g^\bullet runs over all Riemannian metrics on SM such that $\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM) = 1$.

If g^\bullet runs over all v^g -invariant Riemannian metrics on SM such that $\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM) = 1$, we get a similar to (5.4) quantity $\mathcal{D}_{\text{inv}}(g) \geq \mathcal{D}(g)$. \diamond

Recall that $\mathcal{D}_{\text{inv}}(g) = \mathcal{D}(g) = 0$ for any non-trapping g on a compact connected manifold with boundary.

Conjecture 5.1. If $\mathcal{D}(g) = 0$, then g is geodesically harmonic. If $\mathcal{D}_{\text{inv}}(g) = 0$, then g is invariantly geodesically harmonic. \diamond

In the spirit of Conjecture 5.1, $\mathcal{D}(g)$ should measure the failure of geodesic harmonicity for a given metric g on M .

Problem 5.1.

- Estimate $\delta(gg)$ for the Sasaki metric gg on SM .
- Compute $\delta(gg)$ for the v^g -invariant Sasaki metric gg on any compact symmetric space (N, g) of rank one. By [Be], these are Riemannian manifolds \mathbb{S}^n , \mathbb{RP}^n , \mathbb{CP}^n , \mathbb{HP}^n , and \mathbb{CaP}^2 with constant sectional curvature 1. \diamond

6. ON THE HOLOGRAPHY OF BILLIARD MAPS FOR NON-TRAPPING METRICS

In this section, we will derive direct applications of the results from the previous sections to the geodesic flows of non-trapping metrics on manifolds with boundary.

Let (M, g) be a compact connected smooth Riemannian n -manifold with boundary and v^g the geodesic vector field on the tangent unitary bundle SM .

Any point on the boundary of SM is represented by a pair (x, w) , where $x \in \partial M$ and $w \in T_x M$ is a unit vector. In the local coordinates (\vec{q}, \vec{p}) on TM , the spherical fibration $SM \subset TM$ is the locus $\{H(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) = 1\}$ for the Hamiltonian

$$(6.1) \quad H(\vec{q}, \vec{p}) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} g_{ij}(q) p_i p_j.$$

It is easy to see that the loci $\partial_1^\pm(SM)(v^g)$ are g -independent (for example, $\partial_1^+(SM)(v^g)$ consists of pairs (x, w) , where $x \in \partial M$ and $w \in T_x M$ belongs to the closed half-space, whose vectors point inside of M). So we will denote these loci by “ $\partial_1^\pm(SM)$ ”.

Any tangent vector $\dot{q} \in T_q M$, where $q \in \partial M$, is a sum of $a \cdot n + b \cdot t$, where n is the inner normal to ∂M in M (with respect to the metric g), $t \in T_q(\partial M)$, and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider a smooth involution $\tau_g : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$ that takes any tangent to M vector $\dot{q} = a \cdot n + b \cdot t$ at $q \in \partial M$, to the vector $\tau_g(\dot{q}) = -a \cdot n + b \cdot t$, the orthogonal reflection of \dot{q} with respect to the hyperplane $T_q(\partial M)$. The involution τ_g induces a g -isometry of each sphere $\{S_q M \subset T_q M\}_{q \in \partial M}$ with respect to its equator. Evidently, τ_g maps $\partial_1^\pm(SM)$ to $\partial_1^\mp(SM)$ (see Fig.2).

One can generalize the construction of the mirror reflection $\tau_g : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$ in the spirit of Finsler structures [Car] as follows. Consider any smooth involution $\tau : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$ which is a map of the spherical fibration $\eta : \partial(SM) = SM|_{\partial M} \rightarrow \partial M$, which is the identity on its base ∂M and such that τ -fixed locus $\partial(SM)^\tau$ is $S(\partial M) = \partial(SM) \cap T(\partial M)$.

For example, we may consider a new smooth Riemannian metric \tilde{g} in the vector bundle $TM|_{\partial M} \rightarrow \partial M$ and the \tilde{g} -generated spherical fibration $\tilde{S}M \rightarrow \partial M$. Then, for each point $x \in \partial(SM)$, we take the ray ℓ_x in $T_x M$ through x and the origin, produce the unique point $y \in \tilde{S}M$ that belongs to ℓ_x , apply the reflection $\tau_{\tilde{g}}$ to y , and finally produce the point $\tau(x) := \ell_{\tau_{\tilde{g}}(y)} \cap SM$.

The results of this section rely on the existence of a differential $(2n-2)$ -form Θ on SM , subject to the following properties (that mirror the list in Definition 2.1):

(6.2)

- $d\Theta = 0$,
- $\dim(\ker(\Theta)) = 1$,
- $v^g \in \ker(\Theta)$,
- $\pm\Theta|_{\partial_1^\pm(SM)} \geq 0$,
- $\tau^*(\Theta|_{\partial_1(SM)}) = \Theta|_{\partial_1(SM)}$ with respect to a given involution $\tau : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$ as above.

Let us recall now few basic constructions from Symplectic Geometry. Let β be the tautological Liouville 1-form (locally, “ $p^* \cdot \vec{dq}$ ”) on the cotangent bundle T^*M , viewed as a smooth section of the bundle $T^*(T^*M) \rightarrow T^*M$. Let $\omega = -d\beta$ be the canonic symplectic form on T^*M (locally, “ $\vec{dq} \wedge d\vec{p}$ ”).

The metric g on M gives rise to a bundle isomorphism $\Phi_g : TM \rightarrow T^*M$. Consider the pull-backs $\beta_g =_{\text{def}} \Phi_g^*(\beta)$ of β and $\omega_g =_{\text{def}} \Phi_g^*(\omega)$ of ω under the diffeomorphism Φ .

Let μ be the unitary (in g) radial vector field, normal to SM in TM and tangent to the fibers of $TM \rightarrow M$. Then $\beta_g = \pm \mu \rfloor \omega_g$.

In local coordinates $(q^1, \dots, q^n, p^1, \dots, p^n)$ on TM , these forms may be written as

$$(6.3) \quad \beta_g = \sum_{i,j} g_{ij} p^i dq^j,$$

and

$$(6.4) \quad \omega_g = \sum_{i,j} g_{ij} dq^i \wedge dp^j + \sum_{i,j,k} \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial q^k} p^i dq^j \wedge dq^k.$$

By the Liouville theorem, both β_g and $\omega_g = d\beta_g$ are v^g -invariant forms, that is, $\mathcal{L}_{v^g}(\beta_g) = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{v^g}(\omega_g) = 0$. Moreover, using the formulas (6.2) and (6.1), we get $\beta_g(v^g) = 1$.

We denote by $(\omega_g)^n$, the n^{th} exterior power of the 2-form ω_g . It is a $(2n)$ -dimensional volume form on TM . Let $\Omega_g =_{\text{def}} \{\pm \beta_g \wedge (\omega_g)^{n-1}\}|_{SM}$ be a $(2n-1)$ -dimensional volume form Ω_g on SM . In fact, $\Omega_g = \mu \rfloor (\omega_g)^n$.

Next, we introduce a $(2n-2)$ -form Θ_g on SM by

$$(6.5) \quad \Theta_g =_{\text{def}} v^g \rfloor \Omega_g = (v^g \wedge \mu) \rfloor \omega_g^n.$$

Both forms, Ω_g and Θ_g , are v^g -invariant.

Recall the construction of the **Sasaki Riemannian metric** gg on the manifold TM , induced by a given metric g on M ([Sa]). For any pair of tangent vectors, $v, u \in T_m M$, we consider the germ γ_u of the geodesic curve through m in the direction of u . Using the g -induced symmetric connection ∇^g on M , we consider the Jacobi vector field \tilde{v} on γ_u , produced by the parallel transport of v along γ_u . Using the natural parameter s along γ_u , we get a germ at (m, v) of a curve $\delta_{\gamma_u, v} =_{\text{def}} \{s \rightarrow \tilde{v}(s)\}$ in TM , which projects on γ_u under the map $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$. We denote by $W(v, u) = \frac{d}{ds} \delta_{\gamma_u, v}(0)$ the velocity vector of $\delta_{\gamma_u, v}$ at the point (m, v) . Thus, $W(v, u) \in T_{(m, v)}(TM)$.

The correspondence $H_{(m, v)} : u \rightarrow W(v, u)$ produces a linear injection $H_{(m, v)} : T_m(M) \rightarrow T_{(m, v)}(TM)$. We denote by $H_{(m, v)}(TM)$ its image. Consider the **horizontal subbundle** $H(TM) \hookrightarrow TM$ of the bundle $T(TM) \rightarrow TM$ that this construction delivers. The subbundle, formed by vectors that are tangent to the fibers of $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$, is called the **vertical subbundle** of $T(TM)$ and is denoted by $V(TM)$. With its help, one splits the tangent bundle $T(TM) \rightarrow TM$ into a direct sum $H(TM) \oplus V(TM)$.

Then, by the definition of gg , this bundle isomorphism $H(TM) \oplus V(TM) \approx TM \oplus TM$ is an isometry with respect to the metric gg in the source and the metric $g \oplus g$ in the target.

Since, under the parallel transport, the norm of the vectors \tilde{v} is preserved, the curves $\{\delta_{\gamma_u, v}\}_u$ reside in SM , provided $(m, v) \in SM$. Therefore, we get a bundle decomposition $T(SM) \approx H^S(TM) \oplus V(SM)$, where the n -bundle $H^S(TM) \rightarrow SM$ is a restriction of $H(TM) \rightarrow TM$ to $SM \subset TM$, and $V(SM) \rightarrow SM$ is the $(n-1)$ -bundle, tangent to the fibers of $SM \rightarrow M$.

These constructions lead to the following, likely well-known, key lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected n -manifold with boundary. The $(2n-2)$ -form $\Theta_g := v^g \rfloor \Omega_g$ is equal to the form $\pm(\omega_g)^{n-1}|_{SM}$ and has the properties, with respect to the involution $\tau_g : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$, listed in (6.2).*

Proof. We start the validation of the properties of Θ_g in the order they are listed in (6.2). First, we notice that $v^g \in \ker((\omega_g)^{n-1}|_{SM})$, since $dH(w) = \omega_g(v^g, w)$ and $H \equiv 1$ on SM . Therefore $v^g \rfloor (\beta_g \wedge (\omega_g)^{n-1}) = (v^g \rfloor \beta_g) \wedge (\omega_g)^{n-1} = 1 \cdot (\omega_g)^{n-1}$ on SM .

Since $d\omega_g = 0$, we get that $(\omega_g)^{n-1}$ is a closed form.

Using that $\Omega_g = \pm\beta_g \wedge (\omega_g)^{n-1}$ is a volume form on SM , we conclude that the form $(\omega_g)^{n-1}$ does not vanish on SM . So we get $\dim(\ker((\omega_g)^{n-1}|_{SM})) = 1$.

In the vicinity of each point $x \in \partial M$, we may pick a local coordinate system (q^1, \dots, q^n) on M so that ∂M is given by the equation $\{q^1 = 0\}$, the gradient field ∂_{q^1} is g -orthogonal to ∂M and has length 1. In other words, we may choose q^1 to be the g -induced distance function from ∂M . The “vertical” coordinates $(p^1, \dots, p^n) = (\partial_{q^1}, \dots, \partial_{q^n})$ are correlated in the standard way with (q^1, \dots, q^n) . Then the reflection involution is given by

$$\tau_g((0, q^2, \dots, q^n, p^1, p^2, \dots, p^n)) = (0, q^2, \dots, q^n, -p^1, p^2, \dots, p^n).$$

Applying τ_g to formulas (6.3) and (6.4) and letting $q^1 = 0$, implies that $\tau_g^*(\beta_g|_{\partial(SM)}) = \pm\beta_g|_{\partial(SM)}$ and $\tau_g^*(\omega_g|_{\partial(SM)}) = \omega_g|_{\partial(SM)}$.

Let ν be the unitary vector field, normal in $gg|_{SM}$ to $\partial(SM)$ in SM , and let n be the unitary vector field, g -normal to ∂M in M .

We introduce the $(2n-2)$ -volume form $\Omega_g^\partial =_{\text{def}} \nu \rfloor \Omega_g = (\nu \rfloor (\mu \rfloor \omega_g^n))$ on $\partial(SM)$. Because the involution τ_g is an orientation reversing isometry on each spherical fiber of $SM|_{\partial M} \rightarrow \partial M$ and is an identity on the base ∂M , we conclude that $\tau_g^*(\Omega_g^\partial) = -\Omega_g^\partial$.

We notice that the normal vector $\nu = \nu(q, p)$ must be orthogonal in gg to any vector θ , tangent to the fiber of $SM \rightarrow M$ over a point $q \in \partial M$. In fact, ν is tangent to the v^g -trajectory through the point (q, n) , where $n \in T_q M$ is a g -normal unit vector to ∂M in M at $q \in \partial M$. Therefore, representing v^g in the local coordinates (q, p) on TM as (\dot{q}, \dot{p}) , we get $\langle \nu, v^g \rangle_{gg} = \langle n, \dot{q} \rangle_g$. As a result, $v^g = (\dot{q}, \dot{p})$ points inside of SM if and only if \dot{q} points inside of M . Thus, the restriction of the $(2n-2)$ -form $\Theta_g := v^g \rfloor \Omega_g$ to $\partial_1^\pm(SM)$ is nonnegative/nonpositive. Indeed, Ω_g^∂ is the volume form on $\partial(SM)$, and $\Theta_g/\Omega_g^\partial = \cos(\angle_{gg}(v^g, \nu)) = \cos(\angle_g(\dot{q}, n))$ on $\partial(SM)$. At the same time, $\tau_g^*(\Theta|_{\partial(SM)}) = \Theta|_{\partial(SM)}$ since

$$\Theta|_{\partial(SM)} / \Omega_g^\partial = \cos(\angle_{gg}(v^g, \nu)) = \cos(\angle_g(\dot{q}, n)), \text{ and}$$

$$\tau_g^*(\Theta_g|_{\partial(SM)}) / \tau_g^*(\Omega_g^\partial) = \cos(\angle_{gg}((\tau_g)_*(v^g), (\tau_g)_*(\nu))) = \cos(\angle_g(\tau_g(\dot{q}), -n)) = \cos(\angle_g(\dot{q}, n)).$$

□

The next lemma is an abstract of Lemma 6.1; unlike the latter one, its validation is on the level of definitions.

Lemma 6.2. *Let (M, g) be a n -dimensional compact Riemannian manifold such that a volume form Ω on SM is v^g -invariant. Then the $(2n - 2)$ -form $\Theta =_{\text{def}} v^g \lrcorner \Omega$, is integrally dual (see Definition 2.1) to the geodesic vector field v^g on SM . So, with the help of Ω , the vector field v^g is nil-divergent.*

Let N be a regular neighborhood of $\partial(SM)$ in SM and $\tilde{\tau} : N \rightarrow N$ a smooth involution with the properties:

- $\tilde{\tau}(\partial(SM)) = \partial(SM)$,
- $\partial(SM)^{\tilde{\tau}} = S(\partial M)$, where $S(\partial M)$ denotes the spherical tangent bundle of ∂M ,
- $(\tilde{\tau})_*(v_g) = \pm v_g$ along $\partial(SM)$, and $\tau^*(\Omega) = \pm \Omega$ along $\partial(SM)$.

Then $\tilde{\tau}^(\Theta|_{\partial_1(SM)}) = \Theta|_{\partial_1(SM)}$, and $\pm \Theta|_{\partial_1^{\pm}(SM)} \geq 0$.* \diamond

The combination of Lemma 6.2 with Lemma 5.1 leads instantly to the following result.

Theorem 6.1. *Let g be a smooth non-trapping Riemannian metric on a compact connected manifold M with boundary. Let N be a regular neighborhood of $\partial(SM)$ in SM . Choose a v^g -invariant volume form Ω on SM and put $\Theta = v^g \lrcorner \Omega$. Assume that a smooth involution $\tilde{\tau} : N \rightarrow N$ satisfies the three bullets in Lemma 6.2 with respect to the form Θ .*

Then the form Θ is integrally dual to v^g . The billiard map B_{v^g} , the composition of the the scattering map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$ with the diffeomorphism $\tau =_{\text{def}} \tilde{\tau}| : \partial_1^-(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$, preserves the Θ -induced measure μ_{Θ} on $\partial_1^+(SM)$.

*There exists a v^g -harmonizing metric g^{\bullet} on SM so that $\Theta = v^g \lrcorner \Omega$ coincides with $*_{g^{\bullet}}(dF)$.* \diamond

Corollary 6.1. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 6.1, the Billiard Map $B_{v^g, \tau} = \tau \circ C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$ has the infinite return property (as in Theorem 3.1).* \diamond

Viewing the fundamental 1-form β_g as a smooth section of the cotangent bundle $T^*(SM) \rightarrow SM$, we denote by $\beta_g^{\partial^+}$ the restriction of β_g to $\partial_1^+(SM) \subset SM$.

The next theorem claims that, for non-trapping metrics, the scattering map C_{v^g} allows to reconstruct the canonical contact structure on SM , provided we know it along the boundary $\partial(SM)$.

Theorem 6.2. *Let g be a boundary generic and non-trapping metric on a compact connected manifold M with boundary. Assume that any geodesic curve in M is either transversal to ∂M at some point or is simply tangent to ∂M at some point⁹.*

We choose a well-balanced Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Then the scattering map $C_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^-(SM)$, together with the function $F^{\partial} : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the 1-form $\beta_g^{\partial^+}$, allow for a reconstruction of SM , the geodesic field v^g , and the contact 1-form β_g , up to a diffeomorphism $\Phi : SM \rightarrow SM$ that is the identity on $\partial(SM)$ and preserves the 1-form $\beta_g^{\partial^+}$.

⁹This assumption is valid if each connected component of ∂M is strictly concave or convex in g .

Proof. The form β_g on SM is v^g -invariant. Therefore, $\beta_g^{\partial^+}$ spreads uniquely by the geodesic flow $\{x \rightarrow \phi^\theta(x)\}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}}$ along each v^g -trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ that passes through a point $x \in \partial_1^+(SM)$. Let $U(\tilde{\gamma}_x)$ be a flow-invariant tube around $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ and $a, b \in \tilde{\gamma}_x$. Because F is well-balanced, the v^g -flow ϕ is delivered by the family of local diffeomorphisms $\phi_{a,b} : U(\tilde{\gamma}_x) \rightarrow U(\tilde{\gamma}_x)$ that map the constant level set $\hat{F}^{-1}(F(a))$ to the constant level set $\hat{F}^{-1}(F(b))$. Therefore, the grid in SM , formed by the pair of transversal foliations $\mathcal{F}(v^g) = \{\tilde{\gamma}_x\}_{x \in \partial_1^+(SM)}$ and $\mathcal{G}(F) = \{F^{-1}(c)\}_{c \in F(\partial(SM))}$, allow not only to reconstruct the pair $(SM, \mathcal{F}(v^g))$, but also the vector field v^g and the geodesic flow. Moreover, by the argument above, β_g may also be recovered from these two foliations and the section $\beta_g^{\partial^+}$. In turn, the two foliations are determined by the pairs $(x \in \partial_1^+(SM), c \in F(\partial(SM)))$.

Thus, for a well-balanced Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the boundary confined data of the theorem make it possible to reconstruct, up to a diffeomorphism of SM , which is constant on its boundary, the standard contact structure $\ker(\beta_g)$ on SM and, since $\omega_g|_{SM} = d\beta_g$, to reconstruct the restriction $\omega_g|_{SM}$ of the symplectic 2-form ω_g . \square

7. ON THE AVERAGES OF ERGODIC BILLIARDS FOR NON-TRAPPING METRICS

The chaotic dynamics of billiard maps iterations has been a subject of a well-established and flourishing research industry (for example, see [Si], [Si1], [BFK], and [ChM]). Since the Euclidean billiards with strictly concave boundary are dispersing, the reader may replace in what follows any assumption about the ergodicity of a billiard (M, g) by the assumption that billiard is Euclidean and its boundary is strictly concave [ChM], [BFK].

Let us recall few standard definitions, related to the dynamics of measure-preserving maps, as they apply to the billiard maps.

Definition 7.1. *The billiard map $B_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM)(v^g) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)(v^g)$ is said to be **ergodic** with respect to a given n -form Θ on SM as in Theorem 6.1, if the invariance of a Lebesgue-measurable set $K \subset \partial_1^+(SM)$ under the billiard map B_{v^g} implies that either the measure $\mu_\Theta(K)$ or the measure $\mu_\Theta(\partial_1^+(SM) \setminus K)$ is zero.* \diamond

A natural inclination is to anticipate that, for a “random” pair (M, g) , g being non-trapping, boundary generic, and “bumpy”, the billiard map B_{v^g} is ergodic. This thinking is supported by the theory of Sinai billiards. For them, the smooth boundary ∂M is strictly concave, so that the billiard is dispersing, which implies not only ergodicity of the billiard map, but also its mixing property and positive entropy [Si], [Si1].

Let us recall now the content of the famous Birkhoff Theorem [Bi], as it applies to the environment of the billiard maps, with the measure μ_Θ on $\partial_1^+(SM)$ being induced by the appropriate $(2n - 2)$ -form Θ on SM . We assume that $\Theta|_{\partial(SM)}$ is invariant under an involution $\tau : \partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial(SM)$, a generalized billiard reflection; so the billiard map $B_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$ preserves the measure μ_Θ .

Let $f \in L^1(\partial_1^+(SM), \mu_\Theta)$ be an integrable (with respect to the measure μ_Θ) function $f : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Its **time average** is defined by the formula

$$\hat{f}(z) =_{\text{def}} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} f((B_{vg})^{\circ k}(z)).$$

In fact, the limit $\hat{f}(z)$ exists almost¹⁰ for all $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$, and $\hat{f} \in L^1(\partial_1^+(SM), \mu_\Theta)$. Moreover, \hat{f} is an invariant function (that is, if $B_{vg} \circ \hat{f} = \hat{f}$ almost everywhere) and

$$\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \hat{f} d\mu_\Theta = \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} f d\mu_\Theta.$$

The **space average** of f is defined as

$$\bar{f} =_{\text{def}} \frac{1}{\mu_\Theta(\partial_1^+(SM))} \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} f d\mu_\Theta.$$

In particular, if the billiard map B_{vg} is **ergodic**, then \hat{f} must be *constant* almost everywhere: indeed, any level set $\hat{f}^{-1}((-\infty, c))$ is B_{vg} -invariant for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. As a result, $\hat{f} = \bar{f}$ almost everywhere (for example, see [W]).

Therefore, using that $\mu_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) =_{\text{def}} \mu_\Theta(\partial_1^+(SM))$ and that, by Theorem 6.1, B_{vg} is a μ_Θ -measure-preserving transformation, we get the following version of the Birkhoff Theorem:

Theorem 7.1. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected smooth Riemannian n -manifold with boundary, the metric g being non-trapping and boundary generic. Let a $(2n - 2)$ -form Θ on SM be as in Theorem 6.1 or in the list (6.2).*

If the billiard map B_{vg} is ergodic in the measure μ_Θ , then

$$(7.1) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} f((B_{vg})^{\circ k}(z)) = \frac{1}{\mu_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g))} \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} f d\mu_\Theta$$

for any given function $f \in L^1(\partial_1^+(SM), \mu_\Theta)$ and almost all points $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$. \diamond

For ergodic billiard maps B_{vg} , some “*metric-flavored*” holographic properties hold: as Theorem 7.3 and Corollary 7.5 below claim, for boundary generic non-trapping metrics g on M , the g -induced volume of the space M can be recovered from the volume of the space of geodesics and the **average length** $\text{av}(\ell)$ of a **free geodesic**. A free geodesic in M is a segment $[\gamma]$ of a geodesic curve γ in M such that the boundary $\partial[\gamma] \subset \partial M$ and $\text{int}([\gamma]) \cap \partial M = \emptyset$.

In our treatment, we are guided by the Santalo formula [S], and [Ch], [ChM], [Tab].

For flat compact billiards M in the Euclidean space \mathbb{E}^n or in the flat torus \mathbb{T}^n , the average length $\text{av}(\ell)$ of a free trajectory is given by a beautiful formula (see [S], [Ch]):

$$(7.2) \quad \text{av}(\ell) = \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1})} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(M)}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(\partial M)} = 2\sqrt{\pi} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(M)}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(\partial M)},$$

¹⁰the exceptional z 's form a set of μ_Θ -measure 0.

in terms of the Euclidean volume $\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1})$ of the unit ball B^{n-1} and of the volume $\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})$ of the unit sphere $S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{E}^n$.

These results admit the following generalizations.

Theorem 7.2. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected Riemannian n -manifold with boundary, such that the metric g is boundary generic and non-trapping. Let $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lyapunov function for the geodesic field v^g . For each $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$, consider the variation*

$$\Delta_F(z) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(C_{v^g}(z)) - F(z)$$

of F along the segment $[z, C_{v^g}(z)]$ of the v^g -trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_z$ through z . This construction gives rise to a well-defined measurable function $\Delta_F : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Consider a differential $(2n - 2)$ -form Θ with the properties as in (6.2).

With these ingredients in place, the following statements hold:

- *The average of the variation of F along the v^g -trajectories can be calculated via the Santalo-type formula*

$$(7.3) \quad \text{av}(\Delta_F) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Delta_F \cdot \Theta}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Theta} = \frac{\int_{SM} dF \wedge \Theta}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\text{vol}_{dF \wedge \Theta}(SM)}{\text{vol}_{\Theta}(\mathcal{T}(v^g))}.$$

- *If the billiard map B_{v^g} is ergodic with respect to the measure μ_{Θ} (for example, if g is Euclidean and ∂M is strictly concave in g), then the average of the variation of F can be also calculated via the formula*

$$(7.4) \quad \text{av}(\Delta_F) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \Delta_F((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z))$$

for almost all $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$.

Proof. If the metric g is non-trapping, the vector field v^g is traversing. So there exists a Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the geodesic field v^g .

By (6.2), the billiard map B_{v^g} preserves the measure μ_{Θ} on $\partial_1^+(SM)$, and $dF \wedge \Theta$ may serve as the volume form on SM (not to be confused with the v^g -invariant volume form Ω that gave rise to Θ via the formula $\Theta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v^g \lrcorner \Omega$!).

Since the scattering map C_{v^g} is continuous and smooth away from a set of vanishing Lebesgue measure, the function Δ_F is a Lebesgue-measurable, and thus μ_{Θ} -measurable.

Thus, using that $d\Theta = 0$ and by the Stokes' formula, we get

$$\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Delta_F \cdot \Theta = \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)}^{\partial_1^-(SM)} F \cdot \Theta \stackrel{\text{Stokes}}{=} \int_{SM} dF \wedge \Theta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{vol}_{dF \wedge \Theta}(SM)$$

By definition, $\text{vol}_{\Theta}(\mathcal{T}(v^g))$ —the volume of the space of geodesics—is the integral $\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Theta$. Therefore,

$$\text{av}(\Delta_F) = \frac{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Delta_F \cdot \Theta}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Theta} = \frac{\int_{SM} dF \wedge \Theta}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Theta} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\text{vol}_{dF \wedge \Theta}(SM)}{\text{vol}_{\Theta}(\mathcal{T}(v^g))},$$

which validates formula (7.3).

When B_{v^g} is ergodic in μ_Θ , by applying Theorem 7.1 to the function $f =_{\text{def}} \Delta_F$, we prove formula (7.4). \square

For traversing flows v^g , their Lyapunov functions F attend extrema on the boundary $\partial(SM)$. Hence, the global variation $\text{var}(F)$ of F on SM is equal to its variation $\text{var}(F^\partial)$ on $\partial(SM)$. On the other hand, evidently, $\Delta_F(z) \leq \text{var}(F)$ for all z . This leads to the following direct corollary of Theorem 7.2.

Corollary 7.1. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected Riemannian n -manifold with boundary, such that the metric g is boundary generic and non-trapping. Consider the variation $\text{var}(F^\partial) =_{\text{def}} \text{var}(F|_{\partial(SM)})$ of the Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the boundary $\partial(SM)$.*

Then, for any Θ as in Theorem 7.2,

$$\text{var}(F^\partial) \cdot \text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) \geq \text{vol}_{dF \wedge \Theta}(SM).$$

In particular, if $\text{var}(F^\partial) = 1$, then $\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) \geq \text{vol}_{dF \wedge \Theta}(SM)$. \diamond

Corollary 7.2. *Under the ergodicity hypotheses from the second bullet of Theorem 7.2, knowing the Θ -induced volume of the space of geodesics $\mathcal{T}(v^g)$, together with the limit*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \Delta_F((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z))$$

for almost any $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$, allows to determine the $(dF \wedge \Theta)$ -induced volume of the space SM .

Both $\text{vol}_\Theta(\mathcal{T}(v^g))$ and the limit above may be recovered in terms of the data, confined to the boundary $\partial(SM)$. \diamond

Now we will derive two theorems, Theorem 7.3 and Theorem 7.4, that are in the spirit of Theorem 7.2, but require some additional analysis.

We denote by gg the restriction of the Sasaki metric [Sa] on TM to SM , and by $\ell_{gg}(z)$ the length (in the metric gg) of the segment $[z, C_{v^g}(z)]$ of the v^g -trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_z$ through $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$. In fact, $\ell_{gg}(z)$ is the length of the free geodesic segment $\pi([z, C_{v^g}(z)])$ in the metric g on M , where $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$ is the obvious projection.

In general, for any metric g^\bullet on SM , we denote by $\ell_{g^\bullet}(z)$ the length, in the metric g^\bullet , of the segment $[z, C_{v^g}(z)]$ of the v^g -trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_z$ through $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$. We denote by $\ell_{g^\bullet} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ the measurable function that this construction generates.

With these notations fixed, for the classical billiard maps based on the elastic reflections, we get a stronger than Theorem 7.2 claim.

Theorem 7.3. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected Riemannian n -manifold with boundary, such that the metric g is boundary generic and non-trapping.*

Let $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lyapunov function for the geodesic vector field v^g . Consider the differential $(2n-2)$ -form $\Theta_g =_{\text{def}} \omega_g^{n-1}$, where ω_g is the restriction of the symplectic form on TM to SM .

With these ingredients in place, the following statements hold:

- The measure μ_{Θ_g} on $\partial_1^+(SM)$, defined by the closed $(2n-2)$ -form Θ_g with the help of formula (2.2), is invariant under the billiard map B_{v^g} .
- There exists a v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet on SM such that $*_{g^\bullet}(dF) = \Theta_g$. Moreover, in g^\bullet , the v^g -trajectories are still geodesic curves, and the leaves of the foliation $\mathcal{G} = \{F^{-1}(c)\}_{c \in \mathbb{R}}$ are volume minimizing (in their relative to $\partial(SM) \cap F^{-1}(c)$ class) hypersurfaces.
- The average value of the length function ℓ_{g^\bullet} on the space of v^g -trajectories can be calculated via the formula

$$(7.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{av}(\ell_{g^\bullet}) &=_{\text{def}} \frac{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \ell_{g^\bullet} \cdot \omega_g^{n-1}}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1}} \\ &= \frac{\int_{SM} dF \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1}} = \frac{\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM)}{\text{vol}_{\omega_g^{n-1}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g))}. \end{aligned}$$

- If the billiard map B_{v^g} is ergodic with respect to the measure $\mu_{\omega^{n-1}}$ (say, if ∂M is strictly concave in g), then the average value of the function ℓ_{g^\bullet} can be also calculated via the formula

$$(7.6) \quad \text{av}(\ell_{g^\bullet}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \ell_{g^\bullet}((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z))$$

for almost all $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$.

Proof. Our argument is based essentially on Lemma 6.1. Thanks to that lemma, the form $\pm \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}|_{SM}$ is the volume form Ω_{gg} on SM , and the form $\Theta_g = v^g \lrcorner \Omega_{gg} = \omega_g^{n-1}|_{SM}$ on SM has all the desired properties from the list (6.2). In particular, the form $\Theta_g = \omega_g^{n-1}$ produces a measure $\mu_{\omega_g^{n-1}}$ on $\partial_1^+(SM)$, and by Theorem 6.1, the billiard map $B_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$ preserves this measure.

The second bullet is validated by Theorem 5.1, which, in particular, claims that there exists a v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet on SM such that $*_{g^\bullet}(dF) = \omega_g^{n-1}$ and $\ker(dF) \perp_{g^\bullet} \ker(\omega_g^{n-1})$. Thus $dF \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}$ is the volume form dg^\bullet , produced by g^\bullet . In the metric g^\bullet , by its construction, we have $\|dF\|_{g^\bullet}^* = 1$; hence $dF(v^g) = \|v^g\|_{g^\bullet}$.

Now we will validate formulas (7.5) in the third bullet. Since $\|dF\|_{g^\bullet}^* = 1$, the variation $\Delta_F(z) := F(C_{v^g}(z)) - F(z) = \ell_{g^\bullet}(z)$. So we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \ell_{g^\bullet} \cdot \omega_g^{n-1} &= \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Delta_F \cdot \omega_g^{n-1} = \\ &= \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)}^{\partial_1^-(SM)} F \cdot \omega_g^{n-1} \stackrel{\text{Stokes}}{=} \int_{SM} dF \wedge \omega_g^{n-1} = \text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, formula (7.8) in the last bullet follows by applying (7.1) to $f = \ell_{g^\bullet}$ and the billiard map. \square

Remark 7.1. There is a tension between Theorem 7.3, which deals with **taught foliations** \mathcal{G} on SM , and Theorem 7.2, which deals with **fillable contact structures** induced by β_g on SM (see [ET] for the relevant definitions). \diamond

Let us revisit the classical case of the Sasaki metric gg on SM (Cf. [S], [Ch]).

Theorem 7.4. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected Riemannian n -manifold with boundary, such that the metric g is boundary generic and non-trapping. We denote by gg the restriction of the Sasaki metric on TM to SM .*

Consider the measurable function $\ell_{gg} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, defined as the length in gg of the segment $[z, C_{v^g}(z)]$ of the v^g -trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_z$ through $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$.¹¹

Let $\Theta_g =_{\text{def}} \omega_g^{n-1}$, where ω_g is the restriction of the symplectic form on TM to SM .

With these ingredients in place, the following statements hold:

- *The measure μ_{Θ_g} on $\partial_1^+(SM)$, defined by the form Θ_g with the help of formula (2.2), is invariant under the billiard map B_{v^g} .*
- *The average value of the function ℓ_{gg} , which is equal to the average length of a free geodesic segment in M , can be calculated via the formula*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{av}(\ell_{gg}) &=_{\text{def}} \frac{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \ell_{gg} \cdot \omega_g^{n-1}}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1}} = \frac{\int_{SM} \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1}} \\
 &= \frac{\text{vol}_{gg}(SM)}{\text{vol}_{\omega_g^{n-1}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g))} = \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1})} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}_g(M)}{\text{vol}_g(\partial M)} \\
 (7.7) \qquad &= 2\sqrt{\pi} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}_g(M)}{\text{vol}_g(\partial M)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

- *If the billiard map B_{v^g} is ergodic with respect to the measure $\mu_{\omega^{n-1}}$, then $\text{av}(\ell_{gg})$ can be also calculated, for almost all $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$, via the formula*

$$(7.8) \qquad \text{av}(\ell_{gg}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \ell_{gg}((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z)).$$

Proof. As in Theorem 7.3, the argument is based on Lemma 6.1. Thanks to the lemma, $\pm \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}|_{SM}$ is the Sasaki volume form Ω_{gg} on SM , the form $\Theta_g = v^g \lrcorner \Omega_{gg} = \omega_g^{n-1}|_{SM}$ on SM has all the desired properties from the list (6.2). In particular, the form $\Theta_g = \omega_g^{n-1}$ produces the measure $\mu_{\omega_g^{n-1}}$ on $\partial_1^+(SM)$, and, by Theorem 6.1, the billiard map $B_{v^g} : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$ preserves this measure.

Let ν be the inner unitary normal to $\partial(SM)$ in SM (with respect to gg) vector field. Let $\Omega_{gg}^\partial =_{\text{def}} \nu \lrcorner \Omega_{gg}$ be the Sasaki volume form on $\partial(SM)$.

Recall that any v^g -trajectory $\tilde{\gamma} \subset SM$ is a geodesic curve in the metric gg ([Be], Proposition 1.106). By the definition of the Sasaki metric gg , $\tilde{\gamma}$ is horizontal (i.e., tangent to the

¹¹ $\ell_{gg}(z)$ equals the length $\ell_g(z)$ of the free geodesic segment $\pi([z, C_{v^g}(z)])$ in the metric g on M , where $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$ is the obvious projection.

horizontal distribution $H(TM)$ on TM , defined by the g -induced connection) and orthogonal to each spherical fiber of the fibration $\pi : SM \rightarrow M$. Therefore, π projects $\tilde{\gamma}$ onto a geodesic curve $\gamma \subset M$ in the metric g and the lengths of the two geodesics are equal: $\ell_{gg}(\tilde{\gamma}) = \ell_g(\gamma)$.

Consider the discontinuous map $\Pi : SM \rightarrow \partial_1^+(SM)$ that takes any point $x \in SM$ to the maximal point $\Pi(x)$ in the finite set $\tilde{\gamma}_x \cap \partial_1^+(SM)$, so that $\Pi(x)$ lies below x on the trajectory $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ (the order in $\tilde{\gamma}_x$ is defined by v^g). Away from the zero measure set $\Pi^{-1}(\partial_2(SM)(v^g))$, the map Π is a smooth fibration with the fiber being a closed segment. Thus we may integrate the 1-form β_g along the Π -fibers. This integration leads to the following equations:

$$(7.9) \quad \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \ell_{gg} \cdot \omega_g^{n-1} = \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \left(\int_z^{C_{v^g}(z)} \beta_g \right) \cdot \omega_g^{n-1} \\ \stackrel{\text{Fubini}}{=} \int_{SM} \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-1} = \pm \text{vol}_{gg}(SM).$$

The equality marked “Fubini” is a special case of the generalized Fubini formula, proven by Dieudonné [D]. Under the name of “projection formula” it can be found in [BT], Proposition 6.15.¹² In our context, the projection formula uses that $v^g \in \ker(\omega_g^{n-1})$, $\beta_g(v^g) = 1$, and $\Theta|_{\ker(\beta_g)} > 0$.

The metric gg induces the Euclidean metric g_E on the fibers of the fibration $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$. Let $\mathcal{H}_g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H(SM)$ denote the horizontal n -distribution on SM . It is the intersection with SM of the horizontal n -distribution $H(TM)$ on TM that is defined by the g -induced connection on M (as described in paragraphs that preceded Lemma 6.1). Recall that $v^g \in \mathcal{H}_g$.

Let $\rho_E(S^{n-1})$ denote the $(n-1)$ -form on SM that coincides with the Euclidean volume form on the π -fibers $\{S^{n-1}\}$ and vanishes on the polyvectors which contain vectors from the horizontal distribution \mathcal{H}_g .

Therefore, by another instance of the Fubini formula, being applied to the forms $\rho_E(S^{n-1})$ and $\pi^*(dg)$, we get

$$\text{vol}_{gg}(SM) = \text{vol}_E(S^{n-1}) \cdot \text{vol}_g(M).$$

The manifold $\partial_1^+(SM)$ fibers over the boundary ∂M with the fiber being a hemisphere $S_+^{n-1} \subset S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{E}^n$.

As in the proof of Lemma 6.1, the restriction of the form $\Theta_g = \omega_g^{n-1}$ on the boundary $\partial(SM)$, is proportional to the gg -induced volume $(2n-2)$ -form $\Omega_{gg}^\partial = \pm \nu \lrcorner (\beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-1})$ on $\partial(SM)$ with the coefficient of proportionality $\cos(\angle(v^g, \nu)) = \langle v^g, \nu \rangle_{gg}$. This function $\langle v^g, \nu \rangle_{gg} \geq 0$ exactly on the locus $\partial_1^+(SM)$.

¹²See [Her] or [S], page 349, formulas (19.64a) and (19.64b), for its generalization.

By definition, $\text{vol}_{\Theta_g}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) = \mu_{\Theta_g}(\partial_1^+(SM))$. Therefore, the gg -induced volume of the space of geodesics is given by

$$\text{vol}_{\Theta_g}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \Theta_g = \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \langle v^g, \nu \rangle_{gg} \cdot \Omega_{gg}^\partial.$$

Consider the gg -orthogonal decomposition $T(SM) \approx H(SM) \oplus V(SM)$ of the tangent bundle into horizontal and vertical distributions on SM . Then both vectors, v^g and the normal to $\partial(SM)$ vector $\nu \in T_{(m,v)}(SM)$ at the point $(m, v) \in \partial(SM)$, are horizontal. We can interpret the vector ν as a inner normal vector to the hemisphere $S_+^{n-1} \subset B^n \subset T_{(m,v)}(SM)$, pointing towards the center of the unit ball B^n . Then $\langle v^g, \nu \rangle_{gg} = \langle v, \nu \rangle_g$.

Put $dg^\partial \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} dg|_{\partial M}$. Examining the fibration $\pi : \partial_1^+(SM) \rightarrow \partial M$ with the fiber S_+^{n-1} , we get that the volume form $\Omega_{gg}^\partial = \pi^*(dg^\partial) \wedge d_{\mathbb{E}}(S_+^{n-1})$. Note that

$$\langle v, \nu \rangle_g \cdot d_{\mathbb{E}}(S_+^{n-1}) = d_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1}),$$

the Euclidean volume form on the equatorial ball $B^{n-1} \subset B^n$. Therefore,

$$\langle v^g, \nu \rangle_{gg} \cdot \Omega_{gg}^\partial = \pi^*(dg^\partial) \wedge (\langle v, \nu \rangle_g \cdot d_{\mathbb{E}}(S_+^{n-1})) = \pi^*(dg^\partial) \wedge d_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1}).$$

Let $D^\partial(SM)$ denote the space of the unit tangent disk bundle over $\partial(SM)$. Again, by the Fubini theorem, applied to the fibration $\pi^\partial : D^\partial(SM) \rightarrow \partial M$, we get

$$\text{vol}_{\Theta}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) = \int_{\partial M} \left(\int_{(\pi^\partial)^{-1}(m)} d_{\mathbb{E}} \right) dg^\partial = \text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1}) \cdot \text{vol}_g(\partial M).$$

This proves formula (7.5).

Thus formula (7.7) follows from formula (7.9):

$$\text{av}(\ell_{gg}) = \frac{\int_{SM} \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1}} = \frac{\text{vol}_{gg}(SM)}{\int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1}} = \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1})} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}_g(M)}{\text{vol}_g(\partial M)}.$$

Finally, (7.8) follows from Theorem 7.1. □

Definition 7.2. Let (M, g) be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary, where g is a non-trapping metric. We denote by $\gamma_{x,y}$ a free geodesic arc that connects a pair of points $x, y \in M$ and whose interior belongs to the interior of M ,¹³ and by $\ell_g(\gamma_{x,y})$ its length. Consider the length of the longest free geodesic segment in M :

$$\text{gd}(M, g) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\{x,y \in M\}} \{\ell_g(\gamma_{x,y})\} = \sup_{\{x,y \in \partial M\}} \{\ell_g(\gamma_{x,y})\},$$

and call it the geodesic diameter of M . ◇

The relation between the geodesic diameter $\text{gd}(M, g)$ and the ordinary diameter $\text{d}(M, g)$ is subtle due to the boundary effects, as shown in Fig.3.

If g is trapping, then $\text{gd}(M, g) = +\infty$, while $\text{d}(M, g) < \infty$. At the same time, if (M, g) is geodesically convex and a non-trapping, then $\text{gd}(M, g) = \text{d}(M, g)$.

¹³Due to possible concavity of ∂M , not any pair $x, y \in M$ can be connected by such a geodesic.




FIGURE 3. The intrinsic diameter (the length of the wavy black curve) and the geodesic diameter $\text{gd}(M, g)$ (the length of the red segment) of a Riemannian manifold $M \subset \mathbb{E}^2$ with boundary. The Riemannian metric g on M is Euclidean.

Using (7.7), we get the following inequality:

Corollary 7.3. *For any non-trapping metric g on a compact manifold M with boundary,*

$$(7.10) \quad \text{vol}_g(M) \leq \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(B^{n-1})}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})} \cdot \text{gd}(M, g) \cdot \text{vol}_g(\partial M). \quad \diamond$$

Corollary 7.3 should be compared with the following classical result of Christopher Croke [Cr]. At the first glance, Theorem 7.5 below looks very similar, but it is based on a quantity $\text{d}(M, g|_M)$ that behaves very differently from $\text{gd}(M, g)$, as illustrated in Fig.3.

Theorem 7.5. [Cr] *Let M be a codimension zero compact smooth submanifold of a closed Riemannian n -manifold (N, g) . Assume that the diameter $\text{d}(M, g|_M) < \text{inj rad}(N, g)$, the injectivity radius of (N, g) . Then*

$$\text{vol}_g(M) \leq \frac{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^n)}{2\pi \text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})} \cdot \text{d}(M, g|_M) \cdot \text{vol}_g(\partial M). \quad \diamond$$

The conjectures below, which accompany the Definitions 7.3-7.5, are quite speculative.

Definition 7.3. *Given a compact Riemannian manifold (N, g) , consider the number*

$$(7.11) \quad \Lambda(N, g) =_{\text{def}} \sup_{\{(M, g|_M) \subset (N, g) \mid g|_M \text{ being non-trapping}\}} \text{vol}_{g|_M}(M)$$

and call it the Lyapunov volume of (N, g) . Evidently, $\Lambda(N, g) \leq \text{vol}_g(N)$. \diamond

Based on the example of a flat torus and some arguments in [K5], we formulate

Conjecture 7.1. *For any compact Riemannian manifold (N, g) , $\Lambda(N, g) = \text{vol}_g(N)$.* \diamond

Definition 7.4. *For a given closed Riemannian manifold (N, g) , consider the following scale-invariant quantity:*

$$\mathbf{A}(N, g) =_{\text{def}} \sup_{\{(M, g|_M) \subset (N, g)\}} \left\{ \frac{\text{vol}_{g|_M}(M)}{\text{vol}_{g|_{\partial M}}(\partial M) \cdot \text{gd}(M, g|_M)} \right\},$$

where $(M, g|_M)$ runs over all codimension zero smooth compact submanifolds $M \subset N$ such that $g|_M$ is non-trapping. (Note that, for a very small convex M , the expression in the brackets $\{\sim\}$ approaches an universal positive constant.)

We also introduce the function of the numerical parameter $V \in [0, \Lambda(N, g))$ by

$$\mathbf{B}(N, g, V) =_{\text{def}} \inf_{\{(M, g|_M) \subset (N, g) \mid \text{vol}_{g|_M}(M) = V\}} \{\text{gd}(M, g|_M) \cdot \text{vol}_{g|_{\partial M}}(\partial M)\},$$

where $(M, g|_M)$ runs over all codimension zero smooth compact submanifolds $M \subset N$ such that $g|_M$ is non-trapping, and the volume of M is a fixed number V .

The function $\mathbf{B}(N, g, V)$ measures how “tightly” one can isometrically embed non-trapping domains $(M, g|_M)$ of volume V into a given (N, g) . \diamond

So, with Definition 7.4 in place, formula (7.10) leads instantly to the following estimate.

Corollary 7.4. *Let (N, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold. Then, for $V \in [0, \Lambda(N, g))$,*

$$\mathbf{A}(N, g) \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}, \quad \mathbf{B}(N, g, V) \geq 2\sqrt{\pi} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})} \cdot V. \quad \diamond$$

With the same mindset, we propose the following definition.

Definition 7.5. *Consider a compact n -dimensional Riemannian manifold (N, g) and a finite collection $\mathcal{B} := \{B_\alpha\}_\alpha$ of disjoint closed smooth balls B_α such that:*

- *each ball B_α is geodesically strictly convex in N ,*
- *each connected component of the intersection of any geodesic curve γ in N with the complement $M_{\mathcal{B}} =_{\text{def}} N \setminus (\bigcup_\alpha \text{int}(B_\alpha))$ is a closed segment or a singleton (so $g|_{M_{\mathcal{B}}}$ is non-trapping).*

We call the Riemannian manifold $(M_{\mathcal{B}}, g|_{M_{\mathcal{B}}})$ the geodesic Swiss cheese model of (N, g) .

We call the number $\text{SC}(N, g) =_{\text{def}} \sup_{\{M_{\mathcal{B}}\}} \text{vol}_g(M_{\mathcal{B}})$ the Swiss cheese volume of (N, g) . \diamond

Evidently, $\text{SC}(N, g) \leq \Lambda(N, g)$; we do not anticipate the two quantities to be equal.

Conjecture 7.2. *Any compact Riemannian manifold (N, g) admits a geodesic Swiss cheese model.* \diamond

For (N, \mathcal{B}, g) as in Definition 7.5, the geodesic vector field v^g on $SM_{\mathcal{B}} := \pi^{-1}(M_{\mathcal{B}})$ is traversing and boundary concave. Thus, v^g is boundary generic with respect to the union of the tori $\partial(SM_{\mathcal{B}}) = S^{n-1} \times (\bigcup_\alpha \partial B_\alpha)$ and admits Lyapunov functions both in $SM_{\mathcal{B}}$ and in $S\mathcal{B} =_{\text{def}} \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}) \approx S^{n-1} \times \mathcal{B}$. By [Si], [Si1], [ChM], and [BFK], the billiard on $M_{\mathcal{B}}$ is dispersing and thus ergodic, provided that g is Euclidean. Therefore, Corollary 7.5 is applicable to such a Swiss cheese billiard.

Assuming that we know the g -induced volume of ∂M and the *time record* of the billiard ball hitting the boundary ∂M (say, as an infinite sequence of bell rings that broadcast each collision of the billiard ball with the boundary of a curved billiard table (M, g)), for an ergodic billiard and a non-trapping g , we can “hear” the volume $\text{vol}_g(M)$!

Corollary 7.5. *For a non-trapping boundary generic g and an ergodic billiard map B_{v^g} , knowing the limit*

$$\text{av}(\ell_{gg}) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \ell_{gg}((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z)),$$

for almost any $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$, allows to determine the isoperimetric proportion $\frac{\text{vol}_g(M)}{\text{vol}_g(\partial M)}$.

The time intervals $\{\ell_{gg}((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z))\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and thus quantity $\text{av}(\ell_{gg})$ are data, accessible to an observer who is confined to the boundary ∂M . \diamond

Question 7.1. What are other metric quantities of (M, g) that can be recovered from the sequence $\{\ell_{gg}((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z))\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of time intervals (these data may be registered at ∂M) for ergodic non-trapping billiards? \diamond

Combining Theorem 7.3 with Theorem 7.4 leads to the following claim.

Corollary 7.6. *For a well-balanced Lyapunov function $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet on SM such that $*_{g^\bullet}(dF) = \omega_g^{n-1}$, we get*

$$\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM) = \text{vol}_{gg}(SM) = \text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1}) \cdot \text{vol}_g(M).$$

Thus, for an ergodic billiard map B_{v^g} and for almost any $z \in \partial_1^+(SM)$, the numerical sequence $\{\Delta_F((B_{v^g})^{\circ k}(z))\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $\text{vol}_g(\partial M)$ allow to reconstruct $\text{vol}_g(M)$. \diamond

Theorem 7.6. *Let (M, g) be a compact connected Riemannian n -manifold with boundary, such that the metric g is boundary generic and non-trapping. Let $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth Lyapunov function for v^g , and $\text{var}(F)$ its variation on SM . We denote by g^\bullet a v^g -harmonizing metric on SM such that $*_{g^\bullet}(dF) = \omega_g^{n-1}$, where ω_g is the restriction of the symplectic form on TM to SM .*

For each $t \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the minimal hypersurface $F^{-1}(t) \subset SM$ and its g^\bullet -induced $(2n-2)$ -volume $A_{g^\bullet}(t)$. This construction gives rise to a well-defined measurable function $A_{g^\bullet} : F(SM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ on the segment $F(SM) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

With these ingredients in place, the following statements hold:

•

$$(7.12) \quad A_{g^\bullet}(t) = \int_{F^{-1}(t)} \omega_g^{n-1} = \left| \int_{F^{-1}(t) \cap \partial(SM)} \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-2} \right| \leq \text{vol}_{\{\omega_g^{n-1}\}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)).$$

- *The average of the g^\bullet -induced volumes A_{g^\bullet} of the F -constant level sections can be calculated via the formula*

$$(7.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{av}(A_{g^\bullet}) &=_{\text{def}} \frac{\int_{F(SM)} \left(\int_{F^{-1}(t)} \omega_g^{n-1} \right) dt}{\text{var}(F)} \\ &= \frac{\int_{SM} dF \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}}{\text{var}(F)} = \frac{\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM)}{\text{var}(F^\partial)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For a v^g -harmonizing metric g^\bullet that satisfies the hypotheses of the theorem, $dg^\bullet|_{F^{-1}(t)} = \omega_g^{n-1}$. Thus $A_{g^\bullet}(t) = \int_{F^{-1}(t)} \omega_g^{n-1}$. Since $\omega_g^{n-1} = \pm d(\beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-2})$, by Stokes' theorem,

$$\int_{F^{-1}(t) \cap \partial(SM)} \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-2} = \int_{F^{-1}(t)} \omega_g^{n-1}.$$

Using that $F(v^g) > 0$, we conclude that $F(SM) = F(\partial(SM))$. Consider the measurable set $\mathcal{X}(t)$ of v^g -trajectories that have a nonempty intersection with the compact locus $F^{-1}(t)$, where $t \in F(\partial(SM))$. Since $\mathcal{X}(t) \subset \mathcal{T}(v^g)$, its ω_g^{n-1} -induced measure does not exceed the measure of $\mathcal{T}(v^g)$. Therefore we get the isoperimetric inequality (7.12) for all $t \in F(\partial(SM))$ and constant level hypersurfaces $F^{-1}(t)$:

$$\int_{F^{-1}(t) \cap \partial(SM)} \beta_g \wedge \omega_g^{n-2} = \int_{F^{-1}(t)} \omega_g^{n-1} \leq \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1} =_{\text{def}} \text{vol}_{\{\omega_g^{n-1}\}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)).$$

This validates the claim in the first bullet.

Since F has no critical values and the critical values of F^∂ have zero measure, we may treat $F : SM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as “almost a fibration”, whose fibers are compact $(2n-2)$ -manifolds. So the integration over the F -fibers is well-defined. Therefore the Fubini formula holds: $\int_{F(SM)} (\int_{F^{-1}(t)} \omega_g^{n-1}) dt = \int_{SM} dF \wedge \omega_g^{n-1}$, which proves (7.13). \square

Corollary 7.7. *Under the hypotheses and notations of Theorem 7.6, we get*

•

$$\text{vol}_{g^\bullet}(SM) \leq \text{var}(F^\partial) \cdot \int_{\partial_1^+(SM)} \omega_g^{n-1} = \text{var}(F^\partial) \cdot \text{vol}_{\{\omega_g^{n-1}\}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)).$$

• The proportion

$$(7.14) \quad \frac{\text{av}(A_{g^\bullet})}{\text{av}(\ell_{g^\bullet})} = \frac{\text{vol}_{\omega_g^{n-1}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g))}{\text{var}(F^\partial)},$$

and thus does not depend on the choice of the (v^g, dF) -harmonizing metric g^\bullet that satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 7.6. In fact, the proportion in (7.14) depends only on the data that are confined to the boundary $\partial(SM)$.

• If, in addition, F is well-balanced, then a g^\bullet -independent inequality is valid:

$$\text{vol}_g(M) \leq \frac{1}{\text{vol}_{\mathbb{E}}(S^{n-1})} \cdot \text{var}(F^\partial) \cdot \text{vol}_{\{\omega_g^{n-1}\}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)).$$

Proof. The claim in the first bullet of Corollary 7.7 follows from (7.12). Formula (7.14) is implied by combining (7.13) with (7.5). For a well-balanced F and the (v^g, dF) -harmonizing g^\bullet , we have $\text{av}(\ell_{gg}) = \text{av}(\ell_{g^\bullet})$. Therefore, the inequality in the third bullet follows from the inequality in the first bullet and formula (7.7). \square

Remark 8.1 Contemplating about the difference $\text{vol}_{\{\omega_g^{n-1}\}}(\mathcal{T}(v^g)) - \max_{t \in F(SM)} \{A_{g^\bullet}(t)\}$ between the volume of the trajectory space and the maximum of the volumes of the F -slices, we may view it as measuring the complexity of the geodesic flow. More accurately,

the difference measures “how slanted on average” is the geodesic flow v^g with respect to $\partial_1^+(SM)$. \diamond

REFERENCES

- [Be] Besse, A., *Manifolds all of whose Geodesics are Closed*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1978.
- [Bi] Birkhoff, G. D., *Proof of the ergodic theorem*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 17 (12): 656-660, (1931).
- [Bo] Boardman, J. M., *Singularities of Differential Maps*, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. 33 (1967), 21-57.
- [BT] Bott, R., Tu, L., *Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology*, New York: Springer, 1982, ISBN 0-387-90613-4.
- [BFK] Burago, D., Ferleger, S., Kononenko, A., *A Geometric Approach to Semi-dispersing Billiards*, Encyclopedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 101, 9-27. *Hard Ball Systems and the Lorentz Gas*, Editor D. Szász.
- [CTGM] Cappell, S., DeTurk, D., Gluck, H., Miller, E., *Cohomology of Harmonic Forms on Riemannian Manifolds With Boundary*, arXiv:math/0508372v1 [math.DG], 19 Aug 2005.
- [Ca] Calabi, E., *An Intrinsic Characterization of Harmonic 1-Forms*, Global Analysis, Papers in Honor of K. Kodaira, D.C. Spenser and S. Iyanaga, Eds., 1969, 101-117.
- [Car] Cartan, E., *Sur les espaces de Finsler*, (1933), C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 196: 582-586, Zbl 0006.22501.
- [Ch] Chernov, N., *Average Length of a Free Trajectory in the Billiard Systems*, Mathematics Education, 3rd series, issue 5, 2001, pp.100-105 (Russ.).
- [ChM] Chernov N., Markarian, R., *Chaotic Billiards*, 2006, Mathematical survey and monographs no. 127, AMS.
- [Cr] Croke, C., *Some isoperimetric inequalities and eigenvalue estimates*, Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S., 4^e série, tome 13, n°4 (1980), p. 419-435.
- [D] Dieudonné, J., *Treatise on Analysis, 3*, New York-London: Academic Press, Inc. (1972).
- [ET] Eliashberg, Y., Thurston, W., *Confoliations*, University Lecture Series, vol. 13, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1998.
- [Her] Hermann, H., *Remarks on the foundations of integral geometry*, Rend. Circ. Math. Palermo, II 9 (1960), 91-96.
- [K1] Katz, G., *Stratified Convexity & Concavity of Gradient Flows on Manifolds with Boundary*, Applied Mathematics, 2014, vol. 5, 2823-2848. <http://www.scirp.org/journal/am>
- [K2] Katz, G., *Traversally Generic & Versal Flows: Semi-algebraic Models of Tangency to the Boundary*, Asian J. of Math., vol. 21, No. 1 (2017), 127-168 (arXiv:1407.1345v1 [mathGT] 4 July, 2014).
- [K3] Katz, G., *The Stratified Spaces of Real Polynomials & Trajectory Spaces of Traversing Flows*, JP J. of Geometry and Topology, v. 19, No. 2 (2016), 95-160 (arXiv:1407.2984v3 [mathGT] 6 Aug 2014).
- [K4] Katz, G., *Causal Holography of Traversing Flows*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations (2021) 33:235-274 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10884-020-09910-y>.
- [K5] Katz G., *Causal Holography in Application to the Inverse Scattering Problem*, Inverse Problems and Imaging J., June 2019, 13(3), 597-633 (arXiv: 1703.08874v1 [Math.GT], 27 Mar 2017).
- [K6] Katz G., *Harmonic Forms and Near-minimal Singular Foliations*, Comment. Math. Helv. 77 (2002) 39-77.
- [K7] Katz G., *Morse Theory of Gradient Flows, Concavity, and Complexity on Manifolds with Boundary*, World Scientific, (2019), ISBN 978-981-4368-75-9.
- [K8] Katz G., *The ball-based origami theorem and a glimpse of holography for traversing flows*, Qual. Theory Dyn. Syst. 19, 41 (2020).
- [Mo] Morse, M. *Singular points of vector fields under general boundary conditions*, Amer. J. Math. 51 (1929), 165-178.
- [S] Santaló, L., *Integral Geometry and Geometric Probability*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press (second edition 2004).

- [Sa] Sasaki, S., *On the differential geometry of tangent bundle of Riemannian manifolds*, Tohoku Math. J., 10 (1958), 338-354.
- [Si] Sinai, Y. G., *On the foundations of the ergodic hypothesis for a dynamical system of statistical mechanics*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR (1963) (in Russian), 153 (6), 1261-1264 (in English, Sov. Math. Dokl. 4 (1963) pp. 1818-1822).
- [Si1] Sinai, Y. G., *Dynamical Systems with Elastic Reflections*, Russian Mathematical Surveys, 25, (1970) pp. 137-191.
- [Su] Sullivan, D., *A Cohomological Characterization of Foliations Consisting of Minimal Surfaces*, Comment. Math. Helvetici, 54 (1979), 218-223.
- [Tab] Tabachnikov, S., *Geometry of Billiards*, AMS, Mathematics Advanced Study Semesters (2005).
- [V] Vigdal Abascal, E., *Measures définies sur les espaces des feuilles d'un feuilletage*, Rend. Circ. Math. Palermo, (2) 15 (1966), 247-256.
- [V1] Vigdal Abascal, E., *Sur les feuilletages réguliers et les problèmes qui s'y reportent*, Acta Ci Compostelana 3 (1966), 3-12.
- [V2] Vigdal Abascal, E., *On regular foliations*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 17 (1967), 129-133.
- [W] Walters, P., *An introduction to ergodic theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 79, Springer-Verlag (1982).

5 BRIDLE PATH CIRCLE, FRAMINGHAM, MA 01701, U.S.A.

Email address: gabkatz@gmail.com