

Sharp geometric rigidity of isometries on Heisenberg group

Daria Isangulova*

Abstract

We prove quantitative stability of isometries on the first Heisenberg group with sub-Riemannian geometry: every $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -quasi-isometry of the John domain of the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H} is close to some isometry with order of closeness $\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon$ in the uniform norm and with order of closeness ε in the Sobolev norm L_2^1 . An example demonstrating the asymptotic sharpness of the results is given.

Keywords: quasi-isometry, Heisenberg group, isometry, coercive estimate

1 Introduction

Geometric rigidity or, stability of isometries, states that for a deformation F the distance of DF to a suitably chosen proper rotation $Q \in SO(n)$ is dominated by the distance function of DF to $SO(n)$. Both distances can be measured in different norms. Also we can estimate distance from the mapping F to some isometry. Geometric rigidity plays a central role in models in nonlinear elasticity, it can be considered as a suitable nonlinear version of Korn's inequality.

In 1961 F. John proved geometric rigidity in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$ [14]: *for a locally $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -bi-Lipschitz mapping $F: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, where U is an open set in \mathbb{R}^n and $\varepsilon < 1$, there exist a rotation A and a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying*

$$\|DF - A\|_{p,U} \leq C_1 p \varepsilon |U|^{1/p} \quad (1)$$

*The research was carried out within the framework of a state assignment of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation for the Institute of Mathematics of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (project no. 0314-2019-0006).

and

$$\sup_{x \in U} |F(x) - (a + Ax)| \leq C_2 \operatorname{diam}(U)\varepsilon. \quad (2)$$

F. John established (2) for domain U of a special kind, now called a John domain, and (1) on cubes. Later Yu. G. Reshetnyak [19] established (1) and (2) on John domains without constraints on ε using a different method.

Friesecke, James and Müller showed geometric rigidity in L^2 -norms for arbitrary Sobolev mapping on a bounded Lipschitz domain U [8]: for each $F \in W_2^1(U, \mathbb{R}^n)$ there is an associated rotation $A \in SO(n)$ such that

$$\|DF - A\|_{2,U} \leq C_3 \|\operatorname{dist}(DF, SO(n))\|_{2,U}.$$

Recently Conti, Dolzmann and Müller established analogous estimate under mixed growth conditions [6].

The geometric rigidity problem can be formulated on any manifold with a notion of differential whose tangent space carries an action of a “model” isometry group. In this paper, we study the geometric rigidity problem on the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H} with sub-Riemannian metric.

Heisenberg group \mathbb{H} is 3-dimensional nilpotent contact Lie group. Quasiconformal analysis on the Heisenberg group was developed by A. Korányi and H. M. Reimann [15]. Theory of mappings with bounded distortion was built in the papers of S. K. Vodopyanov [22], L. Capogna [4], N. S. Dairbekov [7], et al. Introduction to Heisenberg group can be found in the book [5].

N. Arcozzi and D. Morbidelli [1] investigated the geometric rigidity problem for locally $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -bi-Lipschitz mappings of the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H} following the idea of John’s paper [14]. We should note, however, that the proximity orders ($\varepsilon^{2^{-11}}$ in the uniform norm and $\varepsilon^{2^{-12}}$ in the Sobolev norm) obtained in [1] are obviously far from being optimal.

S. K. Vodopyanov and D. V. Isangulova proved sharp quantitative geometric rigidity of isometries on Heisenberg groups \mathbb{H}^n , $n > 1$ [24, 25]. The method of their proof follows the Reshetnyak’s scheme [19] of the proof of stability in the Liouville theorem and essentially uses coercive estimates for a differential operator of the first order with constant coefficients whose kernel coincides with the Lie algebra of the isometry group. Unfortunately, on the first Heisenberg group, such an operator has terms with second-order derivatives [11], so it’s impossible to apply it to the mappings of the Sobolev class $W_{1,\text{loc}}^1$. In this work we rely on the P. P. Belinsky’s idea for proving the stability of conformal mappings in \mathbb{R}^n in the uniform norm [2].

Elements of Heisenberg group can be identified with the elements of \mathbb{R}^3 with the following group law:

$$(x, y, t) \cdot (x', y', t') = (x + x', y + y', t + t' - 2xy' + 2x'y).$$

Vector fields $X = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + 2y\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, $Y = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - 2x\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$, $T = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = -\frac{1}{4}[X, Y]$ form left-invariant basis of the Lie algebra. Subbundle $H\mathbb{H}$ of tangent bundle formed by X and Y is *horizontal*. We introduce such a scalar product on $H\mathbb{H}$ that vector fields X and Y are orthonormal. *Carnot – Carathéodory distance* d is defined as infimum of lengths of all horizontal curves joining two points (piecewise-smooth curve is *horizontal*, if its tangent vector belongs to $H\mathbb{H}$ almost everywhere).

A bounded open proper subset U of \mathbb{H} with a distinguished point $\mathbf{x}_* \in U$ is called a (metric) *John domain* [14, 3] if it satisfies the following “twisted cone” condition: there exist constants $\beta \geq \alpha > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in U$, there is a curve $\gamma : [0, l] \rightarrow U$ parameterized by arclength such that $\gamma(0) = \mathbf{x}$, $\gamma(l) = \mathbf{x}_*$, $l \leq \beta$, and $\text{dist}(\gamma(s), \partial U) \geq \frac{\alpha}{l}s$. The numbers α and β are *inner* and *outer radii* of U respectively.

For a Sobolev mapping $F = (f_1, f_2, f_3) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$, $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, a linear mapping

$$D_h F(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} X f_1(\mathbf{x}) & Y f_1(\mathbf{x}) \\ X f_2(\mathbf{x}) & Y f_2(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix} : H_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H} \rightarrow H_{F(\mathbf{x})}\mathbb{H}$$

is called an *approximate horizontal differential* and exists for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in U$. (Definition of Sobolev mappings is given in Section 2.1.)

Definition 1 ([25]). Let $L \geq 1$, U be an open set of \mathbb{H} , $F : U \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ be a nonconstant mapping of the Sobolev class $W_{1,\text{loc}}^1(U, \mathbb{H})$. The mapping F is said to be a *L-quasiisometry* ($F \in QI_L(U)$), if $L^{-1}|\xi| \leq |D_h F(\mathbf{x})\xi| \leq L|\xi|$ for all vectors $\xi \in H_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{H}$ for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in U$.

The main result of the paper is the following

Theorem 1. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, U be a John domain with inner radius α and outer radius β on the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H} . Then, for any $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(U)$, there exists an isometry φ for which*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in U} d(F(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x})) \leq N_1 \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} (\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon) \quad (3)$$

and

$$\int_U \exp\left(\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^5 \frac{N_2 |D_h F(\mathbf{x}) - D_h \varphi(\mathbf{x})|}{\varepsilon}\right) d\mathbf{x} \leq 16|U|. \quad (4)$$

Here the constants N_1 and N_2 are independent of U and F .

The example of dilations $\delta_{1+\varepsilon}(x, y, t) = ((1+\varepsilon)x, (1+\varepsilon)y, (1+\varepsilon)^2 t)$ shows that the proximity orders in Theorem 1 are asymptotically sharp.

Theorem 1 entirely closes the problem of sharp geometric rigidity on Heisenberg groups. Geometric rigidity on \mathbb{H}^n , $n > 1$, is formulated absolutely analogously, see Theorem 1 in [25].

First, we prove geometric rigidity in the uniform norm, that is inequality (3). The proof is based on the local rigidity of isometries for the following pseudometric $d^H: \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$:

$$d^H((x, y, t), (x', y', t')) = \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2}.$$

The function $d^H(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies all the axioms of the metric except that it can vanish on two different points.

Theorem 2. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))$, $B(\mathbf{0}, 4) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H} \mid d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) < 4\}$. There exists an isometry ψ for which*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \psi(\mathbf{x})) \leq N_3 \varepsilon.$$

Here the constant N_3 is independent of F .

We apply Proposition 1 from Section 2 in order to pass from local result of Theorem 2 to global inequality (3). In addition, we obtain the following

Corollary. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, U be a John domain with inner radius α and outer radius β on the Heisenberg group \mathbb{H} , $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(U)$. Then*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in U} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \varphi(\mathbf{x})) \leq N_4 \frac{\beta^2}{\alpha} \varepsilon,$$

where φ is the isometry from Theorem 1. Constant N_4 is independent of U and F .

To prove inequality (4) from Theorem 1 we establish local geometric rigidity in the Sobolev norm L_2^1 .

Theorem 3. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))$, ψ is an isometry from Theorem 2. Then*

$$\|D_h F(\mathbf{x}) - D_h \psi(\mathbf{x})\|_{2, B(\mathbf{0}, 9/10)} \leq N_5 \varepsilon.$$

Here the constant N_5 is independent of F , $\|\cdot\|_{2, B(\mathbf{0}, 9/10)}$ is L_2 -norm in $B(\mathbf{0}, 9/10)$.

The proof of Theorem 3 is based on the coercive estimate for some differential operator (Lemma 12) and self-improving integrability property of mappings with bounded oscillation (Lemma 13). Local result of Theorem 3

means that $D_h F$ is a *BMO* mapping. Proposition 2 of Section 5 helps us to deduce global inequality (4) from local one. It shows that *BMO* mapping is exponentially integrable. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.

The work is built as follows. In Section 2 we give definitions and auxiliary results. Sobolev spaces, isometries and quasi-isometries are defined there with necessary properties. Proposition 1 shows how to pass from local to global results both in Carnot–Carathéodory metric and pseudometric d^H . Section 3 is a preparatory chapter to the proof of Theorem 2. We introduce there measurement of closeness between quasi-isometry and the group of isometries. Theorem 2 is proved in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to rigidity in the Sobolev norm.

Results of the paper were announced in [12].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Professor Sergei Vodopyanov for setting the problem and permanent strong belief in success, and Professor Pierre Pansu for useful consultations back in 2005.

2 Definitions and Auxiliary Results

Homogeneous norm $\rho(x, y, t) = ((x^2 + y^2)^2 + t^2)^{1/4}$ defines a *Heisenberg metric* ρ : $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \rho(\mathbf{a}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{b})$ for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{H}$. (Further, we will denote elements of \mathbb{H} by the bold symbols.)

Metrics d and ρ are equivalent [18]: there is a constant $c_0 > 1$ such that $\frac{1}{c_0} \rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \leq c_0 \rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})$ for all $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{H}$.

For a ball $B(\mathbf{a}, r) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{H} : d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{u}) < r\}$, we have $|B(\mathbf{a}, r)| = r^4 |B(\mathbf{0}, 1)|$, where $|\cdot|$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^3 . The latter is the bi-invariant Haar measure on \mathbb{H} .

Sometimes we will use complex notation: $\mathbf{x} = (z, t)$, $z = x + iy$. In the complex notation the following vector fields

$$Z = \frac{1}{2}(X - iY) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + i\bar{z}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \quad \bar{Z} = \frac{1}{2}(X + iY) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} - iz\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$$

constitute left-invariant basis of the horizontal subbundle $H\mathbb{H}$.

2.1 Sobolev spaces on Heisenberg group

Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{H} . A *Sobolev space* $W_q^1(\Omega)$ ($L_q^1(\Omega)$), $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, consists of locally-summable functions $f: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ having generalized derivatives Xf and Yf and a finite norm (seminorm)

$$\|f\|_{W_q^1(\Omega)} = \|f\|_{q,\Omega} + \|\nabla_{\mathcal{L}} f\|_{q,\Omega} \quad (\|f\|_{L_q^1(\Omega)} = \|\nabla_{\mathcal{L}} f\|_{q,\Omega}),$$

where $\nabla_{\mathcal{L}}f = (Xf, Yf) \in H\mathbb{H}$ is a *subgradient* of the function f . If $f \in W_q^1(U)$ for each open bounded set $U, \bar{U} \subset \Omega$, then $f \in W_{q,\text{loc}}^1(\Omega)$.

Definition 2. Let Ω be a domain in \mathbb{H} . A mapping $F = (f_1, f_2, f_3): \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ belongs to the Sobolev class $W_{q,\text{loc}}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{H})$, if

- 1) f_1, f_2 and f_3 are ACL along a. e. horizontal coordinate integral lines,
- 2) f_1 and f_2 belong to the Sobolev class $W_{q,\text{loc}}^1$ and
- 3) vector fields XF, YF belong to the horizontal subbundle $H\mathbb{H}$ almost everywhere.

The requirement $XF(\mathbf{x}), YF(\mathbf{x}) \in H_{F(\mathbf{x})}\mathbb{H}$ almost everywhere yields so called *contact condition*:

$$Xf_3 = 2f_2Xf_1 - 2f_1Xf_2 \quad \text{and} \quad Yf_3 = 2f_2Yf_1 - 2f_1Yf_2. \quad (5)$$

Next lemma shows that pseudometric d^H is sufficient to measure distance between mappings in the following sense: d^H -distance from F to Φ controls the Heisenberg distance between them.

Lemma 1. Let $F, \Phi \in W_\infty^1(B(\mathbf{a}, r), \mathbb{H})$ and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) \leq \varepsilon r.$$

Then there is $\mathbf{b} = (0, 0, \beta)$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)} \rho(\mathbf{b} \cdot F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) \leq \left(\varepsilon + \sqrt{2\varepsilon \|D_h F + D_h \Phi\|_{\infty, B(\mathbf{a}, r)}} \right) r.$$

Proof. Consider $F = (f_1, f_2, f_3)$, $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3)$, and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)$. Denote $\mathbf{b} = (0, 0, \beta)$, $\beta = -((\Phi(\mathbf{a}))^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{a}))_3$ that is $(\Phi(\mathbf{a}))^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{a}) = (*, *, -\beta)$.

For the mapping $G(\mathbf{x}) = (\Phi(\mathbf{x}))^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{b} \cdot F(\mathbf{x})$ we have

$$G = (g_1, g_2, g_3) = (f_1 - \varphi_1, f_2 - \varphi_2, f_3 + \beta - \varphi_3 + 2\varphi_1 f_2 - 2\varphi_2 f_1).$$

Contact condition (5) for F and Φ yields

$$X_i g_3 = 2(X_i f_1 + X_i \varphi_1)(f_2 - \varphi_2) - 2(X_i f_2 + X_i \varphi_2)(f_1 - \varphi_1), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Thus,

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{L}} g_3 = 2(D_h F + D_h \Phi)^t J \begin{pmatrix} f_1 - \varphi_1 \\ f_2 - \varphi_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $|\nabla_{\mathcal{L}}g_3(\mathbf{x})| \leq 2\|D_h F(\mathbf{x}) + D_h \Phi(\mathbf{x})\|d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x}))$.

By construction $g_3(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ and we obviously have

$$|g_3(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)} \{|\nabla_{\mathcal{L}}g_3(\mathbf{y})|\} d(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x}) \leq 2\|D_h F + D_h \Phi\|_{\infty, B(\mathbf{a}, r)} \varepsilon r^2.$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\pi_{\mathbf{b}} \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) &= \rho(G(\mathbf{x})) \leq d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) + \sqrt{|g_3(\mathbf{x})|} \\ &\leq \left(\varepsilon + \sqrt{2\varepsilon\|D_h F + D_h \Phi\|_{\infty, B(\mathbf{a}, r)}} \right) r. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2 Isometries

In this subsection it is convenient to consider a point $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, t) \in \mathbb{H}$ as $\mathbf{x} = (z, t)$ where $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}$.

Every isometry Φ (denoted as $\Phi \in \text{Isom}$) is the finite composition of the following mappings [16, p. 35] (both in Carnot–Carathéodory and Heisenberg metrics):

- 1) left translation $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{H}$;
- 2) rotation $R_A(z, t) = (e^{iA}z, t)$, $A \in [0, 2\pi)$;
- 3) reflection $\iota(z, t) = (\bar{z}, -t)$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\Phi \in \text{Isom}$ and $d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq r\varepsilon$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)$. Then*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{a}, sr)} d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \leq (2s + 1)r\varepsilon \quad \text{for any } s \geq 1$$

and

$$|D_h \Phi(\mathbf{x}) - I| \leq 2\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}.$$

Proof. Put $\psi = \delta_{\frac{1}{r}} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{a}^{-1}} \circ \Phi \circ \pi_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \delta_r$. Obviously, a mapping ψ is an isometry, $D_h \psi(\mathbf{y}) = D_h \Phi(\mathbf{w})$ and $d^H(\psi(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{r}d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{w}), \mathbf{w}) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$ (here $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{a} \cdot \delta_r \mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)$).

The isometry ψ can be written as $\psi = (\iota \circ R_B \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}})$, where $\mathbf{b} = (b, \beta)$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $B \in [0, 2\pi)$. Obviously $|b| = d^H(\psi(\mathbf{0}), \mathbf{0}) \leq \varepsilon$.

1) Suppose $\psi = \iota \circ R_B \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}}$. Then $d^H(\psi(z, t), (z, t)) = |e^{-iB}\bar{z} + \bar{b} - z| \leq \varepsilon$ and, hence,

$$|e^{-iB}\bar{z} - z| \leq 2\varepsilon \quad \text{for any } z \in \mathbb{C}, |z| \leq 1.$$

Therefore

$$d^H(\psi(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) = d^H(\psi(\delta_s \mathbf{x}), \delta_s \mathbf{x}) = |e^{-iB}(\bar{b} + s\bar{z}) - sz| \leq \varepsilon + 2s\varepsilon$$

for all $\mathbf{y} = \delta_s \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, s)$, $\mathbf{x} = (z, t) \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$. Since

$$2\varepsilon \geq \sup_{|z| \leq 1} |e^{-iB}\bar{z} - z| = \sup_{z=e^{iA}, A \in [0, 2\pi)} |e^{-i(B+2A)} - 1| = 2$$

it follows $\varepsilon \geq 1$. We have

$$D_h \psi = \begin{pmatrix} \cos B & -\sin B \\ -\sin B & -\cos B \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad |D_h \psi - I| = 2 \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

2) Suppose now $\psi = R_B \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}}$. We have

$$d^H(\psi(1, 0), (1, 0)) = |e^{iB}(b+1) - 1| \leq \varepsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$|D_h \psi - I| \equiv |e^{iB} - 1| \leq |e^{iB}(b+1) - 1| + |b| \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Finally,

$$d^H(\psi(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) = d^H(\psi(\delta_s \mathbf{x}), \delta_s \mathbf{x}) = |e^{iB}(b + sz) - sz| \leq \varepsilon + 2s\varepsilon$$

for all $\mathbf{y} = \delta_s \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, s)$, $\mathbf{x} = (z, t) \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$.

Now we return to the initial isometry $\Phi = \pi_{\mathbf{a}} \circ \delta_r \circ \psi \circ \delta_{\frac{1}{r}} \circ \pi_{\mathbf{a}^{-1}}$ and the lemma follows. \square

2.3 Quasiisometries. Local qualitative rigidity

Every quasiisometry F of the class $QI_L(U)$ is locally L -Lipschitz on U [25, Lemma 1]. If in addition F is a local homeomorphism then F is locally L -bi-Lipschitz. Conversely, every locally L -bi-Lipschitz mapping of an open set U belongs to $QI_L(U)$.

If L equals 1 then F is an isometry. Obviously, each mapping of the class $QI_L(U)$ is a Sobolev mapping of the class $W_{p, \text{loc}}^1(U, \mathbb{H})$ for any $p \in [1, \infty)$.

Lemma 1 for quasiisometry F and identity mapping Φ is the following:

Lemma 3. *Let $F \in QI_L(B(\mathbf{a}, r))$ and*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \varepsilon r.$$

Then there is $\mathbf{b} = (0, 0, \beta)$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)} \rho(\pi_{\mathbf{b}} \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq (\varepsilon + \sqrt{2(L+1)\varepsilon})r.$$

Next lemma asserts qualitative local rigidity both in the uniform and Sobolev norms. This result is valid for all Heisenberg groups \mathbb{H}^n , $n \geq 1$ [25].

Lemma 4 ([25, Lemma 6]). *For every $q \in (0, 1)$, there exist nondecreasing functions $\mu_i(\cdot, q): [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that*

- (1) $\mu_i(t, q) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, $i = 1, 2$;
- (2) for each mapping f of class $QI_{1+\varepsilon}(B(\mathbf{0}, 1))$, where $B(\mathbf{0}, 1) \subset \mathbb{H}$, there exists an isometry Φ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) &\leq q \mu_1(\varepsilon, q) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, q), \\ \|D_h F - D_h \Phi\|_{2, B(\mathbf{0}, q)} &\leq |B(\mathbf{0}, q)|^{1/2} \mu_2(\varepsilon, q). \end{aligned}$$

Remark. For the smaller class of bi-Lipschitz mappings, Lemma 4 is an easy consequence of the results of the paper [1] where the quantitative estimates for μ_i is given. In [1] it is shown that $\mu_1 = C\varepsilon^{2-11}$ and $\mu_2 = C\varepsilon^{2-12}$.

2.4 KR-orientation

Consider Sobolev mapping $F: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$. The horizontal differential $D_h F$ is defined and generates almost everywhere a morphism Df of graded Lie algebras [23].

Since Df is a homomorphism of graded Lie algebras, it follows that for almost every $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ there exists a number $\eta(\mathbf{x}, F)$ such that

$$DF(\mathbf{x})T = \eta(\mathbf{x}, F)T.$$

Furthermore [16], $\eta(\mathbf{x}, F) = \det D_h F(\mathbf{x})$ and $\eta(\mathbf{x}, F)^2 = \det DF(\mathbf{x})$. Consequently, there are no Sobolev mappings changing the topological orientation. We now give the definition of orientation introduced by A. Korányi and H. M. Reimann in [16]. This orientation considers the sign of the determinant of horizontal differential $D_h F$ instead of the whole differential DF .

Definition 3. A mapping F of the Sobolev class $W_{1,\text{loc}}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{H})$ *preserves (changes) KR-orientation* if $\det D_h F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ ($\det D_h F(\mathbf{x}) < 0$) for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$.

Lemma 5 ([10, Proposition 3]). *There is a number $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that each quasi-isometry $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ on a connected open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ with $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ either preserves KR-orientation on the whole Ω or changes KR-orientation on Ω .*

In [10] it is proved for mappings with bounded distortion. We can use this result because quasi-isometries are mappings with bounded distortion.

Lemma 6. *Suppose $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2))$ and*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 1/4.$$

There is a number $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that F preserves KR -orientation provided $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$.

Proof. By Lemma 5 quasi-isometry F either preserves KR -orientation on the ball $B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)$ or reverses KR -orientation on the whole ball if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$.

In view of Lemma 4 there is an isometry Φ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) &\leq \mu_1(\varepsilon, 2/3) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1), \\ \|D_h F - D_h \Phi\|_{2, B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} &\leq |B(\mathbf{0}, 1)|^{1/2} \mu_2(\varepsilon, 2/3). \end{aligned}$$

Take $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ such that $\mu_1(\varepsilon_1, 2/3) \leq 1/4$ and $\mu_2(\varepsilon_1, 2/3) \leq 1$. We have

$$d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) + d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_1(\varepsilon, 2/3) + 1/4 \leq 1/2$$

if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$. Lemma 2 yields

$$|D_h \Phi - I| \leq 1.$$

Therefore, Φ preserves KR -orientation. (Here we use an easy fact that $|A - I| > 1$ for every 2×2 -matrix with $\det A < 0$.)

Suppose F reverses KR -orientation on $B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$. Then $\Phi^{-1} \circ F$ also reverses KR -orientation and

$$|D_h(\Phi^{-1} \circ F)(\mathbf{x}) - I| > 1 \quad \text{for almost all } \mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1).$$

We get a contradiction since

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_h(\Phi^{-1} \circ F) - I\|_{2, B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} &= \|D_h F - D_h \Phi\|_{2, B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \\ &\leq |B(\mathbf{0}, 1)|^{1/2} \mu_2(\varepsilon, 2/3) \leq |B(\mathbf{0}, 1)|^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$. □

2.5 John domains

In this subsection we demonstrate how to pass from local stability on balls to stability on John domains for the uniform norm (see Proposition 1). The analog of this result on Carnot groups and doubling metric spaces can be found in [17, Lemma 4.2]. We give the proof of Proposition 1 in order to control constants.

For a domain $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, denote a distance from a point $\mathbf{x} \in U$ to a boundary ∂U by $d_U(\mathbf{x}) = \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \partial U) = \inf\{d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) : \mathbf{y} \in \partial U\}$.

The following lemma is an easy technical exercise.

Lemma 7 ([13, Lemma 6]). *Suppose $\varkappa \geq 1$, U is a John domain in \mathbb{H} with inner radius α and outer radius β . Then for each point $\mathbf{x} \in U$ there is a chain of balls B_0, \dots, B_k satisfying the following conditions:*

(1) $B_i = B(\mathbf{x}_i, r_i)$, $\varkappa B_i = B(\mathbf{x}_i, \varkappa r_i) \subset U$, $i = 0, \dots, k$, $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_*$ and $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}$, and $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \frac{\varkappa\beta}{\alpha} r_i$, $i = 0, \dots, k-1$;

(2) $\frac{2\varkappa-1}{2\varkappa+1} r_{i+1} \leq r_i \leq \frac{2\varkappa+1}{2\varkappa-1} r_{i+1}$, $i = 0, \dots, k-1$, and $\sum_{i=0}^{k-2} r_i + r_k \leq 2\beta$;

(3) there is a ball $D_i = B(\mathbf{y}_i, \rho_i) \subset B_i \cap B_{i+1}$ with $\rho_i = \frac{1}{2} \min\{r_i, r_{i+1}\}$, $\mathbf{y}_i \in \frac{1}{2} B_i \cap \frac{1}{2} B_{i+1}$ and $B_k \subset (3 + 2\frac{(\varkappa+1)\beta}{\alpha}) D_i$ for all $i = 0, \dots, k-1$.

Proposition 1. *Suppose U is a John domain in \mathbb{H} with inner radius α , outer radius β and distinguished point \mathbf{x}_* , $\varkappa \geq 1$, $\sigma > 0$. Consider a mapping $F \in QI_L(U)$ such that for each ball $B = B(\mathbf{a}, r)$, $B(\mathbf{a}, \varkappa r) \subset U$, there is an isometry Φ_B meeting the condition*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} d^H(\Phi_B \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \sigma r.$$

Consider an isometry $\Phi_* = \pi_{(0,0,s)} \circ \Phi_{B_0}$ with $B_0 = B(\mathbf{x}_*, d_U(\mathbf{x}_*)/\varkappa)$ and $\Phi_*(\mathbf{x}_*) = (*, *, 0)$ ($s = -(\mathbf{x}_*^{-1} \cdot (\Phi_{B_0} \circ F(\mathbf{x}_*)))_3$). Then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in U} d^H(\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c_1 \sigma \beta \quad (6)$$

and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in U} \rho(\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq (c_1 \sigma + \sqrt{2(L+1)c_1 \sigma}) \beta \quad (7)$$

with constant $c_1 = \frac{8\varkappa}{2\varkappa-1} (4L\varkappa\frac{\beta}{\alpha} + 2L + 1)$.

Remark. Obviously, $c_1 \leq 56L\varkappa\frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ given $\varkappa, L \geq 1$.

Proof. First we prove (6). Fix a point $\mathbf{x} \in U$. Consider a chain of balls B_0, \dots, B_k from Lemma 7. Denote $\Phi_i = \Phi_{B_i}$, $G_i = \Phi_i \circ F$, $i = 0, \dots, k$, and $\Phi_{i+1} = \Psi_{i+1} \circ \Phi_i$, $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. Notice that $\Phi_0 = \Phi_{B_0}$ is independent of the choice of the point \mathbf{x} .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\Phi_0 \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) &\leq d^H(\Phi_k \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} d^H(\Phi_{i+1} \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi_i \circ F(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\leq \sigma r_k + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{x})), G_i(\mathbf{x})). \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

Estimate $d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{x})), G_i(\mathbf{x}))$, $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) &\leq d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{y})), \mathbf{y}) + d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{y})), \Psi_{i+1}(\mathbf{y})) \\ &\leq (r_i + r_{i+1})\sigma \leq 2\sigma \left(1 + \frac{2\kappa + 1}{2\kappa - 1}\right) \rho_i = \frac{8\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \sigma \rho_i \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{y} \in D_i = B(\mathbf{y}_i, \rho_i)$, Lemma 2 yields $|D_h\Psi_{i+1} - I| \leq \frac{16\kappa}{2\kappa-1}\sigma$. Denote by $g_i: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the first complex coordinate of the mapping G_i , and by $\psi_i: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the first complex coordinate of the isometry Ψ_i . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{x})), G_i(\mathbf{x})) &\leq |\psi_{i+1}(g_i(\mathbf{x})) - \psi_{i+1}(g_i(\mathbf{y}_i)) - g_i(\mathbf{x}) + g_i(\mathbf{y}_i)| + d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{y}_i)), G_i(\mathbf{y}_i)) \\ &\leq |D_h\Psi_{i+1} - I|d^H(G_i(\mathbf{x}), G_i(\mathbf{y}_i)) + d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{y}_i)), \mathbf{y}_i) + d^H(G_i(\mathbf{y}_i), \mathbf{y}_i) \\ &\leq \frac{16\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \sigma L d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_i) + \sigma(r_i + r_{i+1}) \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, k-1. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_i) \leq d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_i) + d(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \kappa r_i + \frac{r_i}{2}, \quad i = 0, \dots, k-2,$$

and

$$d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{k-1}) \leq \frac{r_k}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\Psi_{i+1}(G_i(\mathbf{x})), G_i(\mathbf{x})) &\leq \frac{16\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \sigma L \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} \kappa r_i + \frac{1}{2} r_i \right) + \frac{4\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \sigma r_i \\ &= \frac{4\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \left(4L\kappa \frac{\beta}{\alpha} + 2L + 1 \right) \sigma r_i = \frac{c_1}{2} \sigma r_i \quad \text{for } i = 0, \dots, k-2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\Psi_k(G_{k-1}(\mathbf{x})), G_{k-1}(\mathbf{x})) &\leq \frac{8\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \sigma L r_k + \frac{4\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} \sigma r_k \\ &= \frac{4\kappa}{2\kappa - 1} (2L + 1) \sigma r_k \leq \left(\frac{c_1}{2} - 1 \right) \sigma r_k. \end{aligned}$$

In view of (8) and assertion 2 of Lemma 7 we obtain

$$d^H(\Phi_0 \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \sigma r_k + \left(\frac{c_1}{2} - 1 \right) \sigma r_k + \frac{c_1}{2} \sigma \sum_{i=0}^{k-2} r_i \leq c_1 \sigma \beta.$$

Set $\Phi_* = \pi_{(0,0,s)} \circ \Phi_0$ where $s = -(\mathbf{x}_*^{-1} \cdot (\Phi_0 \circ F(\mathbf{x}_*)))_3$. Obviously,

$$d^H(\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) = d^H(\Phi_0 \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c_1 \sigma \beta$$

and (6) follows.

Now we prove (7). As in the proof of Lemma 3 denote $H = (h_1, h_2, h_3): \mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{y}^{-1} \cdot (\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{y}))$. Then

$$|\nabla_{\mathcal{L}} h_3(\mathbf{y})| \leq 2(L+1)d^H(\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \leq 2(L+1)c_1 \sigma \beta$$

for all $\mathbf{y} \in U$ and

$$|h_3(\mathbf{x})| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{y} \in \gamma} \{|\nabla_{\mathcal{L}} h_3(\mathbf{y})|\} l \leq 2(L+1)c_1 \sigma \beta^2$$

for a curve γ joining \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{x}_* from Definition ?? (Here we used $h_3(\mathbf{x}_*) = 0$). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) = \rho(H(\mathbf{x})) &\leq d^H(\Phi_* \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) + \sqrt{|h_3(\mathbf{x})|} \\ &\leq (c_1 \sigma + \sqrt{2(L+1)c_1 \sigma}) \beta. \end{aligned}$$

□

3 Measurement of closeness and normalization

In this section we build background for proving local quantitative rigidity (Theorem 2). First of all we introduce a function λ which measures the distance between quasi-isometries and isometries with respect to pseudometric d^H . Then we construct a normalized mapping F_N which is close in some sense to the “optimal” one.

Definition 4. For a mapping $F: B(\mathbf{0}, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ define

$$\lambda_F = \inf_{\Phi \in \text{Isom}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}).$$

Given $L, \gamma \geq 1$ put

$$\lambda_L^\gamma = \sup\{\lambda_F \mid F \in QI_L(B(\mathbf{0}, \gamma))\}.$$

In the rest of the paper we will estimate λ_L^4 in the terms of $L - 1$. Denote $\lambda_L = \lambda_L^4$.

Properties of λ :

- 1) If the set $F(B(\mathbf{0}, 1))$ is bounded then λ_F is obtained on some $\Phi \in \text{Isom}$;
- 2) $\lambda_L^\gamma \rightarrow 0$ as $L \rightarrow 1$ ($\lambda_L^\gamma \leq \mu_1(L - 1, 1/\gamma)$ in view of Lemma 4);
- 3) $\lambda_L^{\gamma_1} \leq \lambda_L^{\gamma_2}$ if $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$;
- 4) $\lambda_L^{\gamma_2} \leq 56L \frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2} \lambda_L^{\gamma_1}$ if $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$ by Proposition 1 (since a ball $B(\mathbf{a}, r)$ is a John domain with $\alpha = \beta = r$);
- 5) For any mapping $F \in QI_L(U)$, there is an isometry Φ such that $d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq r\lambda_L^\gamma$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{a}, r)$ if $B(\mathbf{a}, \gamma r) \subset U$.

Lemma 8. *Let $F \in QI_L(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))$ and*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c\lambda_L, \quad c \geq 1.$$

Then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq (7c + 4)\lambda_L.$$

Proof. Fix a point $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2) \setminus B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$. Consider a ball $B(\mathbf{x}_0, 1/2)$ containing \mathbf{x} such that $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \partial B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$ ($d(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{0}) = 1$). Notice that $B(\mathbf{x}_0, 2) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, 4)$. There is an isometry Φ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, 1/2)} d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_L.$$

Consider a ball G of radius $1/4$ in the intersection $B(\mathbf{0}, 1) \cap B(\mathbf{x}_0, 1/2)$. For $\mathbf{y} \in G$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) &\leq d^H(\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y}), F(\mathbf{y})) + d^H(F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \\ &= d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) + d^H(F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \leq \lambda_L \left(\frac{1}{2} + c \right) \end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma 2 it follows $d^H(\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \leq 7\lambda_L(\frac{1}{2} + c)$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in 3G$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) &\leq d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) + d^H(\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_L + 7\lambda_L \left(\frac{1}{2} + c \right) \leq (7c + 4)\lambda_L \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, 1/2) \subset 3G$. □

Lemma 9. Suppose $F \in QI_L(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))$ and $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c\lambda_L$.

Consider a number r , $0 < r < 3/8$, and a point \mathbf{x}_0 satisfying $B(\mathbf{x}_0, 4r) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)$. Then

$$d^H(\mathbf{x}^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}_0^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{x}_0)) \leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{(r+c)}{r^2} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x}_0)) \right) r\lambda_L$$

for every $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$.

Proof. Consider a ball $B_0 = B(\mathbf{x}_0, r)$, $B(\mathbf{x}_0, 4r) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)$. Then there is an isometry Φ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{y} \in B_0} d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) = r\lambda_F \leq r\lambda_L.$$

We have

$$d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) \leq d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{y}) + d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{y}), \Phi(\mathbf{y})) \leq (r+c)\lambda_L, \quad \mathbf{y} \in B_0.$$

In view of Lemma 2 it follows $|D_h\Phi - I| \leq 2\frac{r+c}{r}\lambda_L$.

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\mathbf{x}^{-1}F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}_0^{-1}F(\mathbf{x}_0)) &\leq d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) + d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{x}_0), \mathbf{x}_0) \\ &\quad + d^H(F(\mathbf{x})^{-1} \cdot \Phi(F(\mathbf{x})), F(\mathbf{x}_0)^{-1} \cdot \Phi(F(\mathbf{x}_0))) \\ &\leq 2r\lambda_L + |D_h\Phi - I| d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x}_0)) \leq 2r\lambda_L(1+r+c) \end{aligned}$$

if $d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x}_0)) \leq r^2$. \square

Consider now a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{H}$ in complex notation: $\mathbf{x} = (z, t)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 5. Suppose $F: \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is a continuous mapping, $f: \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the first complex coordinate function of F . Set $\mathbf{a} = F(\mathbf{0})^{-1}$ and $A = -\arg(f(1, 0) - f(0, 0))$.

The mapping $F_N = R_A \circ \pi_{\mathbf{a}} \circ F$ is a *normalization* of the mapping F .

Lemma 10. For each continuous mapping $F: \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$, the normalized mapping F_N satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} F_N(\mathbf{0}) &= \mathbf{0}, \\ F_N(1, 0) &= (b, \beta), \quad \operatorname{Re} b \geq 0, \quad \operatorname{Im} b = 0, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(F_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_F \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(\iota \circ F_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_F.$$

Proof. We have $F_N = R_A \circ \pi_{\mathbf{a}} \circ F$ with $\mathbf{a} = F(\mathbf{0})^{-1}$ and $A = -\arg(f(1, 0) - f(0, 0))$. Obviously, $F_N(\mathbf{0}) = R_A(F(\mathbf{0})^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{0})) = \mathbf{0}$. Put $re^{-iA} = f(1, 0) - f(0, 0)$. Then $F_N(1, 0) = (e^{iA}re^{-iA}, *) = (r, *)$.

Assume $\lambda_F = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(\Psi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x})$, $\Psi \in \text{Isom}$, and put $G = \Psi \circ F$.

Let $G_N = \Phi \circ G$. We have $\Phi = R_B \circ \pi_{\mathbf{b}}$ with $\mathbf{b} = (b, \beta) = G(\mathbf{0})^{-1}$ and $g(1, 0) - g(0, 0) = \rho e^{-iB}$. (Here g is the first complex coordinate function of the mapping G .)

Obviously, $|b| \leq \lambda_F$ and $|\rho e^{-iB} - 1| \leq 2\lambda_F$. It follows

$$|e^{-iB} - 1| \leq |\rho e^{-iB} - 1| + |\rho - 1| \leq 2|\rho e^{-iB} - 1| \leq 4\lambda_F.$$

From here $d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) = |e^{iB}(b + z) - z| \leq |b| + |e^{iB} - 1| \leq 5\lambda_F$ for any $\mathbf{x} = (z, t) \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$. Thus, for any $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$ we have

$$d^H(G_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq d^H(\Phi \circ G(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) + d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \lambda_F + 5\lambda_F = 6\lambda_F.$$

It is easy to see that $G_N = F_N$ or $G_N = \iota \circ F_N$. The lemma follows. \square

How do we know which one we should choose: F_N or $\iota \circ F_N$? The KR -orientation will help us with this.

Lemma 11. *There is a number $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(F_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_F$$

for every $F \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2))$ provided $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_2$ and F preserves KR -orientation.

Proof. Set $B = B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$. We have qualitative rigidity in view of Lemma 4:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \rho(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) \leq \mu_1(\varepsilon, 2/3), \quad \|D_h F - D_h \Phi\|_{2, B} \leq |B|^{1/2} \mu_2(\varepsilon, 2/3)$$

for some isometry Φ . Here $\mu_i(\varepsilon, 2/3) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $i = 1, 2$.

Next we show Φ preserves KR -orientation. Suppose the opposite: $\det D_h \Phi < \blacksquare$ 0. It is easy to verify that

$$|D_h F(\mathbf{x}) - D_h \Phi| = |D_h(\Phi^{-1} \circ F)(\mathbf{x}) - I| > 1 \quad \text{for almost all } \mathbf{x} \in B$$

since $\det D_h(\Phi^{-1} \circ F)(\mathbf{x}) < 0$ a. e. Consequently,

$$\|D_h F - D_h \Phi\|_{2, B} > |B|^{1/2}.$$

The latter is impossible if $\mu_2(\varepsilon, 2/3) < 1$. Recall that $\mu_2(\varepsilon, 2/3) < 1$ provided $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ from Lemma 6.

By Lemma 10 we have either

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0},1)} d^H(F_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_F \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0},1)} d^H(\iota \circ F_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_F.$$

Suppose our lemma is incorrect and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0},1)} d^H(\iota \circ F_N(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_F.$$

Denote by Ψ the isometry from normalisation: $F_N = \Psi \circ F$, $\det D_h \Psi > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d^H(\iota \circ \Psi \circ \Phi(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) &= d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), (\iota \circ \Psi)^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\leq d^H(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x})) + d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), (\iota \circ \Psi)^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\leq \rho(\Phi(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x})) + d^H(\iota \circ \Psi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \mu_1(\varepsilon, 2/3) + 6\lambda_F. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2 states

$$|D_h(\iota \circ \Psi \circ \Phi) - I| \leq 2(\mu_1(\varepsilon, 2/3) + 6\lambda_F).$$

Recall $\mu_1(\varepsilon, 2/3) \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_F \leq \lambda_{1+\varepsilon}^{3/2} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, there is $\varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1$ such that

$$\mu_1(\varepsilon_2, 2/3) + 6\lambda_F < 1/2$$

and

$$|D_h(\iota \circ \Psi \circ \Phi) - I| < 1 \quad \text{for} \quad \varepsilon < \varepsilon_2.$$

We get a contradiction since $\iota \circ \Psi \circ \Phi$ reverses KR -orientation. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 2

To prove Theorem 2 it suffices to show that $\lambda_L = O(L - 1)$ as L tends to 1. Recall

$$\lambda_L = \sup\{\lambda_F \mid F \in QI_L(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))\},$$

where

$$\lambda_F = \inf_{\Phi \in \text{Isom}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0},1)} d^H(\Phi \circ F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}).$$

Consider $G \in QI_L(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))$ with $\lambda_G = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0},1)} d^H(G(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \geq 9\lambda_L/10$.

4.1 Step 1

Let $L^m \leq \Lambda < L^{m+1}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. A number $\Lambda < \min\{1 + \varepsilon_2, 3/2\}$ is such that $\lambda_\Lambda \leq M$. Quantity $M < 1/4$ we will choose later.

We have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(G(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) = \lambda_G \leq \lambda_L \leq \lambda_\Lambda < 1/4 \quad \text{and} \quad L < 1 + \varepsilon_2 < 1 + \varepsilon_1.$$

Then by Lemma 6 G preserves KR -orientation. Denote $F = G_N$. Lemma 10 implies

$$\frac{9}{10} \lambda_L \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq 6\lambda_L. \quad (9)$$

Lemma 8 implies

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c_3 \lambda_L \quad \text{with} \quad c_3 = 46. \quad (10)$$

We have F^l is locally L^l -Lipschitz and $F^l(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore,

$$d(F^l(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{0}) = d(F^l(\mathbf{x}), F^l(\mathbf{0})) \leq L^l d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) < \Lambda d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) < \frac{3}{2} d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0})$$

for all $l \leq m$ and every $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)}$. It follows $F^l(\overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)}) \subset B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)$.

Take $\mathbf{x} \in \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)}$ and $l \leq m$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Inequality (10) implies

$$d^H(F^l(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq d^H(F^l(\mathbf{x}), F^{l-1}(\mathbf{x})) + \cdots + d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c_3 l \lambda_L \quad (11)$$

and

$$d^H(F^{l+1}(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x})) \leq d^H(F^{l+1}(\mathbf{x}), F^l(\mathbf{x})) + \cdots + d^H(F^2(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x})) \leq c_3 l \lambda_L.$$

Lemma 3 yields

$$d(F^l(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq c_0 (c_3 l \lambda_L + \sqrt{2(L^l + 1)c_3 l \lambda_L})$$

If $c_3 l \lambda_L < 1/6$ and $L^l < M_0 = (24c_0)^{-2}$ then

$$(c_3 l \lambda_L + \sqrt{2(L^l + 1)c_3 l \lambda_L}) \leq 2\sqrt{c_3 l \lambda_L}.$$

Fix some ρ , $0 < \rho < 3/8$. Suppose

$$2c_0 \sqrt{c_3 l \lambda_L} \leq \rho. \quad (12)$$

Then

$$d(F^l(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq \rho \quad \text{and} \quad d^H(F^{l+1}(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x})) \leq \frac{\rho^2}{4c_0^2}.$$

By Lemma 9 we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^H((F^l(\mathbf{x}))^{-1} \cdot F^{l+1}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{x})) \\ \leq 2 \left(1 + \frac{(\rho + c_3)}{\rho^2} d^H(F^{l+1}(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{x})) \right) \rho \lambda_L \leq N \rho \lambda_L \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $N = 2(1 + (1 + c_3)/4) = 25, 5$.

Denote by $f_l: B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the first complex coordinate function of F^l , $l = 1, \dots, m$. Set $f_l(1, 0) = r_l e^{i\theta_l}$.

Estimate now $|e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - e^{i\theta_l}|$.

4.2 Step 2

Fix $l < m$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$. In this subsection we will estimate $|e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - e^{i\theta_l}|$.

Recall $c_3 l \lambda_L \leq \frac{\rho^2}{4c_0^2} < \frac{1}{4}$ by (12). Relation (11) at the point $(1, 0)$ gives

$$|r_l e^{i\theta_l} - 1| \leq c_3 l \lambda_L < 1/4.$$

This yields

$$|r_l - 1| \leq |r_l e^{i\theta_l} - 1| \leq c_3 l \lambda_L < 1/4$$

and

$$|e^{i\theta_l} - 1| \leq |r_l e^{i\theta_l} - 1| + |r_l - 1| \leq 2c_3 l \lambda_L < 1/2.$$

Since $F_N = F$ we have $\theta_1 = 0$ and $f_1(1, 0) = r_1$. In view of (9) it follows $|r_1 - 1| \leq 6\lambda_L$.

Write down equation (13) at the point $(1, 0)$:

$$|f_{l+1}(1, 0) - f_l(1, 0) - f(1, 0) + 1| = |r_{l+1} e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - r_l e^{i\theta_l} - r_1 + 1| \leq N \rho \lambda_L. \quad (14)$$

Obviously,

$$|\operatorname{Im}(r_{l+1} e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - r_l e^{i\theta_l})| = |r_{l+1} \sin \theta_{l+1} - r_l \sin \theta_l| \leq N \rho \lambda_L$$

and

$$|r_{l+1} \sin \theta_{l+1}| \leq N r \lambda_L + |r_l \sin \theta_l| \leq \dots \leq l N \rho \lambda_L.$$

Define 3 points in the complex plane (see Figure 1):

$$\begin{aligned} A &= f_l(1, 0) = r_l e^{i\theta_l}, \\ B &= f_l(1, 0) + f_1(1, 0) - 1 = \bar{r}_l e^{i(\theta_l + \xi_l)}, \\ C &= \hat{r}_l e^{i\theta_l} \text{ such that } BC \perp OA. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1.

We have

$$|AB| = |f_1(1, 0) - 1| = |r_1 - 1| < 6\lambda_L,$$

$$|OB| = \bar{r}_l \geq r_l - |r_1 - 1| \geq 3/4 - 6\lambda_L \geq 3/4 - 6M > 1/2 \quad \text{provided } M < 1/24.$$

Our next aim is to estimate ξ_l . Considering triangles ABC and OBC we obtain

$$|BC| = |AB| \sin \angle CAB = |r_1 - 1| |\sin \theta_l| \leq 6\lambda_L \frac{N\rho(l-1)\lambda_L}{r_l} \leq \frac{2}{c_3} N\rho\lambda_L$$

and

$$\sin \angle COB = |\sin \xi_l| = \frac{|BC|}{|OB|} \leq \frac{2}{c_3 \bar{r}_l} N\rho\lambda_L < \frac{4}{c_3} N\rho\lambda_L < 4M < \frac{1}{2}$$

if $M < 1/8$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{i\xi_l} - 1| &= \sqrt{\sin^2 \xi_l + (\cos \xi_l - 1)^2} = \sqrt{2(1 - \cos \xi_l)} = 2 \left| \sin \frac{\xi_l}{2} \right| \\ &\leq 2 |\sin \xi_l| < \frac{8}{c_3} N\rho\lambda_L. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Equation (14) yields

$$|r_{l+1}e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - \bar{r}_l e^{i(\theta_l + \xi_l)}| \leq N\rho\lambda_L.$$

It follows

$$|r_{l+1} - \bar{r}_l| \leq |r_{l+1}e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - \bar{r}_l e^{i(\theta_l + \xi_l)}| \leq N\rho\lambda_L$$

and

$$|e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - e^{i(\theta_l + \xi_l)}| \leq \frac{|r_{l+1}e^{i(\theta_{l+1} - \theta_l - \xi_l)} - \bar{r}_l| + |r_{l+1} - \bar{r}_l|}{r_{l+1}} \leq \frac{4}{3} 2N\rho\lambda_L. \quad (16)$$

Finally, from (15) and (16) we derive

$$|e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - e^{i\theta_l}| \leq |e^{i\theta_{l+1}} - e^{i(\theta_l + \xi_l)}| + |e^{i\xi_l} - 1| \leq \frac{8}{3} N\rho\lambda_L + \frac{8}{c_3} N\rho\lambda_L < 3N\rho\lambda_L. \quad (17)$$

4.3 Step 3

Denote by $g_l: B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ the first complex coordinate function of $(F^l)_N$, $l = 1, \dots, m$. Since $F^l(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $f_l(1, 0) = r_l e^{i\theta_l}$, it yields $g_l = e^{-i\theta_l} f_l$. Obviously, $g_1 = f_1$.

At the point $\mathbf{x} = (z, t) \in \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) - g_l(\mathbf{x}) - f_1(\mathbf{x}) + z| &\leq |f_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) - f_l(\mathbf{x}) - f_1(\mathbf{x}) + z| \\ &\quad + |e^{-i\theta_{l+1}} f_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) - e^{-i\theta_l} f_l(\mathbf{x}) - f_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) + f_l(\mathbf{x})| \\ &\leq N\rho\lambda_L + |e^{-i\theta_l} - 1| \cdot |f_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) - f_l(\mathbf{x})| + |e^{-i\theta_{l+1}} - e^{-i\theta_l}| \cdot |f_{l+1}(\mathbf{x})| \\ &\leq N\rho\lambda_L + 2c_3 l \lambda_L c_3 \lambda_L + 3N\rho\lambda_L \frac{3}{2} \\ &\leq \left(N + \frac{2c_3\rho}{4c_0^2} + 3N\frac{3}{2} \right) \rho\lambda_L \leq K\rho\lambda_L, \quad K = 6N = 153 \end{aligned}$$

(we used here (10), (12), (13), (17) and $r < 3/8$).

Summing over integers from 1 to l we obtain

$$|g_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}) - z - l(f_1(\mathbf{x}) - z)| \leq Kl\rho\lambda_L = \frac{2}{5}l\lambda_L \quad (18)$$

provided we take $\rho = \frac{2}{5K}$.

Let a point $\mathbf{x}_0 = (z_0, t_0) \in \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)}$ be the point of maximum deviation:

$$|f_1(\mathbf{x}_0) - z_0| = d^H(F(\mathbf{x}_0), \mathbf{x}_0) = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{B(\mathbf{0}, 1)}} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{9}{10}\lambda_L.$$

Take $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l < m$. Since F preserves KR -orientation, the mapping F^{l+1} also preserves it. F^{l+1} is L^{l+1} -quasi-isometry on $B(\mathbf{0}, 3/2)$ and $L^{l+1} < \Lambda < 1 + \varepsilon_2$. Therefore, by Lemma 11 and (18) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} 6\lambda_{L^{l+1}} &\geq d^H((F^{l+1})_N(\mathbf{x}_0), \mathbf{x}_0) = |g_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}_0) - z_0| \\ &\geq l|f_1(\mathbf{x}_0) - z_0| - |g_{l+1}(\mathbf{x}_0) - z_0 - l(f_1(\mathbf{x}_0) - z_0)| \\ &\geq \frac{9}{10}l\lambda_L - \frac{2}{5}l\lambda_L = \frac{1}{2}l\lambda_L. \end{aligned}$$

We immediately obtain

$$l\lambda_L \leq 12\lambda_{L^{l+1}}, \quad l = 1, \dots, m-1. \quad (19)$$

Suppose $m \geq 3$. Since $L^m \leq \Lambda < L^{m+1}$ it follows

$$m \geq \frac{\ln \Lambda}{\ln L} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \ln \Lambda - \ln L \geq \frac{\ln \Lambda}{2}.$$

Therefore, (19) implies

$$\lambda_L \leq \frac{12\lambda_\Lambda}{\frac{\ln \Lambda}{\ln L} - 1} \leq \frac{24\lambda_\Lambda}{\ln \Lambda} \ln L \leq C(L - 1)$$

and Theorem 2 is proved provided inequality (12) is fulfilled.

4.4 Step 4

It rests to prove (12). Demonstrate by induction that inequality (12) is fulfilled provided $M = \lambda_\Lambda \leq \frac{\rho^2}{96c_3c_0^2}$.

Since λ_L tends to 0 as $L \rightarrow 1$ there is a number $\varepsilon_3 > 0$ such that $M = \lambda_\Lambda < \frac{\rho^2}{96c_3c_0^2}$ if $\Lambda = 1 + \varepsilon_3$.

Base of induction: $c_3\lambda_L \leq c_3M < \frac{\rho^2}{96c_0^2}$. Let for some l , $1 \leq l < m$, we have $c_3l\lambda_L \leq \frac{\rho^2}{4c_0^2}$. Then (19) implies

$$l\lambda_L \leq 12\lambda_\Lambda \leq 12M \leq \frac{12\rho^2}{96c_3c_0^2} \quad \text{and, hence, } c_3l\lambda_L \leq \frac{\rho^2}{8c_0^2}.$$

From here $c_3(l + 1)\lambda_L \leq \frac{\rho^2}{4c_0^2}$ and inequality (12) holds for $l + 1$. We can proceed till $l = m - 1$.

Therefore, Theorem 2 is proved for small ε (it is sufficient to consider $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_3/3$). Consider the case $L \geq 1 + \varepsilon_3/3$. We obviously have

$$d(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq d(F(\mathbf{x}), F(\mathbf{0})) + d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}) \leq (L + 1) \leq \left(1 + \frac{6}{\varepsilon_3}\right)(L - 1)$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$.

Theorem 2 is proved.

5 Rigidity in the Sobolev norm

The aim of this section is to prove inequality (4) from Theorem 1. The main difficulty is to prove local quantitative rigidity in Sobolev norm (Theorem 3). The proof is based on coercive estimate for special differential operator (Lemma 12) and the connection between this operator and quasi-isometries, see inequality (22). The already established quantitative rigidity in the uniform norm also plays an essential role in the proof. To pass from local result of Theorem 3 to global one in Theorem 1 we use Proposition 2.

5.1 Coercive estimate

Let U be a domain in \mathbb{H} . Denote by Q the homogeneous differential operator acting on a mapping $u: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by the following rule:

$$Qu = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(Zu + \overline{Z}u) \\ \overline{Z}u \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 12. *Let $p > 1$, $B = B(\mathbf{0}, 1) \subset \mathbb{H}$. Then there is a constant $C = C(p) > 0$ and a such that*

$$\|D_h u\|_{p,B} \leq C \left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B(\mathbf{0}, 1)} |u(\mathbf{x})| + \|Qu\|_{p,B} \right)$$

for every $W_p^1(B, \mathbb{R}^2)$.

Proof. By Lemma 4 of [25] the kernel of the operator Q on the Sobolev class $W_{p,\text{loc}}^1(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{C})$, $p > 1$, is 5-dimensional: $u \in \ker Q$ if and only if

$$u(z, t) = a + ikz + tb + iz^2\bar{b} + i|z|^2b, \quad \text{where } a, b \in \mathbb{C}, k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since the kernel of Q is finite-dimensional the coercive estimate of [20, 21] is valid. Let $p > 1$. There are a constant $C = C(p) > 0$ and a projection $P: W_p^1(B, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \ker Q$ such that

$$\|D_h u - D_h Pu\|_{p,B} \leq C \|Qu\|_{p,B}$$

for any $u \in W_p^1(B, \mathbb{C})$. By standard way, we can use any projection operator in the coercive estimate (see, for example, [10, Proposition 2]). Construct a projection P on the kernel of Q . Let $u_1, \dots, u_5: \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the orthonormal basis of $\ker(Q)$ with respect to the scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in the space $L_2(B(\mathbf{0}, 1), \mathbb{C})$. Then set

$$Pu = \sum_{i=1}^5 \langle u, u_i \rangle u_i.$$

Obviously,

$$\|D_h Pu\|_{p,B} \leq C \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} |u(\mathbf{x})|.$$

The lemma follows. □

5.2 Mappings with bounded specific oscillation

Here we give one result from [9] about mappings with bounded specific oscillation.

Lemma 13 ([9, Corollary to Theorem 1]). *Let $U \subset \mathbb{H}$ be open, $q > 1$. Suppose a mapping f maps U to the space of 2×2 -matrices and for every ball $B \subset U$ there is orthogonal matrix $\phi_B \in SO(2)$ such that*

$$\int_B |f(\mathbf{x}) - \phi_B|^q d\mathbf{x} \leq \sigma^q \int_B |\phi_B|^q d\mathbf{x} = \sigma^q |B| \quad (20)$$

with some constant $\sigma > 0$.

Then there is $\sigma_0 > 0$ s.t. $f \in L_{p,loc}(U)$ for all $p \in [q, 2\sigma_0/\sigma)$ if $\sigma < \sigma_0$. Moreover, if $q < p < \frac{(2-\delta)\sigma_0}{\sigma}$, $\delta > 0$, then

$$\int_{B'} |f(\mathbf{x}) - \phi_B|^p d\mathbf{x} \leq C\sigma^{p-q} \int_{B'} |f(\mathbf{x}) - \phi_B|^q d\mathbf{x}$$

for every ball $B = B(\mathbf{x}, r) \subset U$, $B' = B(\mathbf{x}, \frac{9}{10}r)$. Constant C depends on p, q, δ .

Relation (20) means that f is a mapping with bounded specific oscillation in L_q with respect to $SO(2)$ ($f \in BSO_q(SO(2))$). Mappings with bounded specific oscillation have common features with well-known BMO class. Lemma 13 shows that, similar to BMO , mappings of $BSO_q(SO(2))$ class have some self-improving integrability property.

5.3 Local quantitative Sobolev rigidity. Proof of Theorem 3

In this subsection we will prove local quantitative Sobolev rigidity formulated in Theorem 3.

We have $F = (f_1, f_2, f_3) \in QI_{1+\varepsilon}(B(\mathbf{0}, 4))$. Denote $B = B(\mathbf{0}, 1)$. Theorem 2 implies

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \psi(\mathbf{x})) \leq N_3 \varepsilon$$

for some isometry ψ . Without loss of generality we may assume that $\psi = \text{id}$. Otherwise, we take $\psi^{-1} \circ F$ instead of F .

We also have qualitative rigidity in view of Lemma 4:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \rho(F(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x})) \leq \mu_1(\varepsilon, 1/2), \quad \|D_h F - D_h \Phi\|_{2,B} \leq |B|^{1/2} \mu_2(\varepsilon, 1/2)$$

for some isometry Φ . Here $\mu_i(\varepsilon, 1/2) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $i = 1, 2$.

Since $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} d^H(\mathbf{x}, \Phi(\mathbf{x})) \leq N_3\varepsilon + \mu_1(\varepsilon, 1/2)$, Lemma 2 states

$$|D_h\Phi - I| \leq 2(N_3\varepsilon + \mu_1(\varepsilon, 1/2))$$

and, therefore,

$$\|D_hF - I\|_{2,B} \leq |B|^{1/2}(\mu_2(\varepsilon, 1/2) + 2N_3\varepsilon + 2\mu_1(\varepsilon, 1/2)) \stackrel{\text{df}}{=} |B|^{1/2}\tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon).$$

Denote $B' = B(\mathbf{0}, 9/10)$, $u(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(\mathbf{x}) - x_1, f_2(\mathbf{x}) - x_2) \in W_2^1(B', \mathbb{R}^2)$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Obviously, $D_hu = D_hF - I$ and $|u(\mathbf{x})| = d^H(\mathbf{x}, F(\mathbf{x}))$. Applying Lemma 12 to u , we obtain

$$\|D_hu\|_{2,B'} \leq C(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B'} |u(\mathbf{x})| + \|Qu\|_{2,B'}) \leq C\varepsilon + C\|Qu\|_{2,B'}. \quad (21)$$

Estimate $\|Qu\|_{2,B'}$. The inequality

$$|Q(\mathbf{x}^{-1} \cdot F(\mathbf{x}))| \leq \frac{\varepsilon(\varepsilon + 2)}{2}(|D_hF(\mathbf{x}) - I| + 2) + \frac{1}{2}|D_hF(\mathbf{x}) - I|^2 \quad (22)$$

holds almost everywhere in $B(\mathbf{0}, 4)$ [25, Lemma 3] provided F preserve KR -orientation. Lemma 6 guarantees that F preserves KR -orientation if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$ and

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B} d^H(F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}) \leq N_3\varepsilon < 1/4.$$

Take $\varepsilon < \min\{\varepsilon_1, (4N_3)^{-1}\}$. Then F preserves KR -orientation and inequality (22) is valid. Taking L_2 -norm of both sides of (22), we obtain

$$\|Qu\|_{2,B'} \leq C\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{B'} |D_hu(\mathbf{x})|^4 d\mathbf{x} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (23)$$

It rests to estimate $\|D_hu\|_{4,B'}^2$. Lemma 4 allows us to apply Lemma 13. Indeed, Lemma 4 states that for every ball $G \subset B(\mathbf{0}, 2)$ there is an isometry Ψ_G such that

$$\|D_hF - D_h\Psi_G\|_{2,G} \leq \mu_2(\varepsilon, 1/2)|G|^{1/2} \leq \tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon)|G|^{1/2}.$$

Recall $\Psi_B = I$. Lemma 13 implies

$$\|D_hu\|_{4,B'}^2 = \|D_hF - I\|_{4,B'}^2 \leq C\tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon)\|D_hF - I\|_{2,B'} = C\tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon)\|D_hu\|_{2,B'} \quad (24)$$

if $\tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon) < \sigma_0/3$.

Relations (21)–(24) imply

$$\|D_h u\|_{2,B'} \leq C_1 \varepsilon + C_2 \tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon) \|D_h u\|_{2,B'}.$$

Finally, $\|D_h u\|_{2,B'} \leq 2C_1 \varepsilon$ provided ε is close enough to 0. It suffices to take $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_4$ where $\varepsilon_4 < \min\{\varepsilon_1, (4N_3)^{-1}\}$, $C_2 \tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon_4) < 1/2$, and $\tilde{\mu}_2(\varepsilon_4) < \sigma_0/3$.

If $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_4$ then the theorem is obvious:

$$\|D_h F - I\|_{2,B'} \leq (2 + \varepsilon) |B'|^{1/2} \leq \varepsilon \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon_4} + 1 \right) |B'|^{1/2}.$$

5.4 Global quantitative Sobolev rigidity

To pass from local to global we use the following proposition.

Proposition 2 ([25]). *Suppose U is a John domain in \mathbb{H} with inner radius α , outer radius β and distinguished point \mathbf{x}_* , $\varkappa \geq 1$, $\sigma > 0$. Let a mapping $F \in QI_L(U)$ be such that for each ball $B = B(\mathbf{a}, r)$, $B(\mathbf{a}, \varkappa r) \subset U$, there is an isometry Φ_B meeting the condition*

$$\int_B |D_h F(\mathbf{x}) - D_h \Phi_B(\mathbf{x})|^2 d\mathbf{x} \leq \sigma^2 |r|^4.$$

Then

$$\int_U \exp\left(\left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha}\right)^5 \frac{c_2 |D_h F(\mathbf{x}) - D_h \Phi_0(\mathbf{x})|}{\sigma}\right) d\mathbf{x} \leq 16|U|,$$

where $\Phi_0 = \Phi_{B_0}$, $B_0 = B(\mathbf{x}_*, d_U(\mathbf{x}_*)/\varkappa)$. Constant c_2 is independent of U and F .

Proposition 2 shows that BMO function $D_h F$ is exponentially integrable. The difference from well-known result is that we follow the coefficients of John domain.

The proof of Proposition 2 follows word-by-word the part of the proof of Theorem 1 in [25, Section 5].

References

- [1] Arcozzi N., Morbidelli D., Stability of isometric maps in the Heisenberg group // Comment. Math. Helv. 2008. V. 83, No. 1. P. 101–141. DOI: 10.4171/CMH/120.
- [2] Belinskii P.P. The order of proximity of a three-dimensional quasiconformal mapping to a conformal mapping // Sib. Math. J. 1973. V. 14, no. 3. P. 325–331.

- [3] *Buckley S., Koskela P., Lu G.* Boman equals John // Proc. XVI Rolf Nevanlinna Colloquium. 1996. P. 91–99.
- [4] *Capogna L.* Regularity of quasilinear equations in the Heisenberg group // Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 1997. V. 50. P. 867–889.
- [5] *Capogna L., Danielli D., Pauls S. D., Tyson J. T.* An introduction to the Heisenberg group and the sub-Riemannian isoperimetric problem. Progress in Mathematics, 259, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007. ISBN 978-3-7643-8133-2.
- [6] *Conti S., Dolzmann G., Müller S.* Korn’s second inequality and geometric rigidity with mixed growth conditions // Calc. Var. and PDE. 2014. V. 50. P. 437–454. DOI 10.1007/s00526-013-0641-5.
- [7] *Dairbekov N. S.* The limit theorem for mappings with bounded distortion on the Heisenberg group and the local homeomorphism theorem // Siberian Math. J. 2000. V. 41, No 2. P. 257–267. DOI 10.1007/BF02674595.
- [8] *Friesecke G., James R. D., Müller S.* A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity // Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 2002. V. 55, no. 11. P. 1461–1506. DOI 10.1002/cpa.10048.
- [9] *Isangulova D. V.* The class of mappings with bounded specific oscillation, and integrability of mappings with bounded distortion on Carnot groups // Siberian Math. J. 2007. V. 48, no. 2. P. 249–267. DOI 10.1007/s11202-007-0025-1.
- [10] *Isangulova D. V.* Local stability of mappings with bounded distortion on Heisenberg groups // Siberian Math. J. 2007. V. 48, no. 6. P. 984–997. DOI 10.1007/s11202-007-0101-6.
- [11] *Isangulova D. V.* Analogues of Korn’s Inequality on Heisenberg Groups // Siberian Math. J. 2019. V. 60, no. 5, 846–860. DOI 10.1134/S0037446619050082.
- [12] *Isangulova D. V.* Sharp Estimates for Geometric Rigidity of Isometries on the First Heisenberg Group // Dokl. Math. 2019. V. 100, no. 2. P. 480–484. DOI 10.1134/S1064562419050235.
- [13] *Isangulova D. V., Vodopyanov S. K.* Coercive estimates and integral representation formulas on Carnot groups // Eurasian Math. J. 2010. V. 1, no. 3, P. 58–96.

- [14] *John F.* Rotation and strain // *Comm. Pure Appl. math.* 1961. V. 14, no. 3. P. 391–413. DOI 10.1002/cpa.3160140316.
- [15] *Korányi A., Reimann H. M.* Quasiconformal mappings on the Heisenberg group // *Invent. math.* 1985. V. 80, no. 2. P. 309–338. DOI 10.1007/BF01388609.
- [16] *Korányi A., Reimann H. M.* Foundations for the theory of quasiconformal mappings on the Heisenberg group // *Adv. Math.* 1995. V. 111, no. 1. P. 1–87. DOI 10.1006/aima.1995.1017.
- [17] *Lu G.* Polynomials, higher order Sobolev extension theorems and interpolation inequalities on weighted Folland-Stein spaces on stratified groups // *Acta Math. Sin., Engl. Ser.* 2000. V. 16, no. 3. P. 405–444. DOI 10.1007/PL00011552.
- [18] *Nagel, Alexander; Stein, Elias M.; Wainger, Stephen.* Balls and metrics defined by vector fields I: Basic properties // *Acta Math.* 1985. V. 155, no. 1. P. 103–147. <https://projecteuclid.org/euclid.acta/1485890398>. DOI 10.1007/BF02392539.
- [19] *Reshetnyak Yu. G.,* Stability Theorems in Geometry and Analysis, Mathematics and its Applications, 304. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1994. ISBN: 978-94-015-8360-2.
- [20] *Romanovskii N. N.* Integral representations and embedding theorems for functions defined on the Heisenberg groups \mathbb{H}^n // *St. Petersburg Math. J.* 2005. V. 16, no. 2. P. 349–375. DOI 10.1090/S1061-0022-05-00854-X.
- [21] *Romanovskii N. N.* Mikhlin’s problem on Carnot groups // *Siberian Math. J.* 2008. V. 49, no. 1. P. 155–165. DOI 10.1007/s11202-008-0016-x.
- [22] *Vodopyanov S. K.* Mappings with bounded distortion and with finite distortion on Carnot groups // *Siberian Math. J.* 1999. V. 40, no 4. P. 644–677. DOI 10.1007/BF02675667.
- [23] *Vodopyanov S. K.* Geometry of Carnot–Carathéodory Spaces and Differentiability of Mappings // In: *The interaction of analysis and geometry*, *Contemp. Math.*, 424, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007, 247–301. DOI 10.1090/conm/424/08105.
- [24] *Vodopyanov S. K., Isangulova D. V.* Sharp bounds for geometric rigidity of isometries on Heisenberg groups // *Dokl. Math.* 2008. V. 77, no. 3, P. 432–437. DOI 10.1134/S1064562408030307.

- [25] *Vodopyanov S. K., Isangulova D. V.* Sharp geometric rigidity of isometries on Heisenberg groups // *Math. Ann.* 2013. V. 355, no. 4. P. 1301–1329. DOI 10.1007/s00208-012-0820-2.