

# RECONSTRUCTION AND INTERPOLATION OF MANIFOLDS II: INVERSE PROBLEMS FOR RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS WITH PARTIAL DISTANCE DATA

CHARLES FEFFERMAN, SERGEI IVANOV, MATTI LASSAS,  
JINPENG LU, HARIHARAN NARAYANAN

DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF YAROSLAV V. KURYLEV

**ABSTRACT.** We consider how a closed Riemannian manifold and its metric tensor can be approximately reconstructed from local distance measurements. In the part 1 of the paper, we considered the construction of a smooth manifold in the case when one is given the noisy distances  $\tilde{d}(x, y) = d(x, y) + \varepsilon_{x, y}$  for all points  $x, y \in X$ , where  $X$  is a  $\delta$ -dense subset of  $M$  and  $|\varepsilon_{x, y}| < \delta$ . In this paper we consider a similar problem with partial data, that is, the approximate construction of the manifold  $(M, g)$  when we are given  $\tilde{d}(x, y)$  for  $x \in X$  and  $y \in U \cap X$ , where  $U$  is an open subset of  $M$ . As an application, we consider the inverse problem of determining the manifold  $(M, g)$  with non-negative Ricci curvature from noisy observations of the heat kernel  $G(y, z, t)$  with separated observation points  $y \in U$  and source points  $z \in M \setminus \overline{U}$  on the time interval  $0 < t < 1$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n \geq 2$ . We consider  $(M, g)$  in the following class of Riemannian manifolds with bounded geometry given by

$$(1.1) \quad \text{diam}(M) \leq \Lambda, \quad \text{inj}(M) \geq \Lambda^{-1}, \quad |\text{Sec}_M| \leq \Lambda^2,$$

where  $\Lambda \geq 1$ ,  $\text{diam}(M)$  denotes the diameter of  $M$ ,  $\text{inj}(M)$  denotes the injectivity radius of  $M$ , and  $\text{Sec}_M$  denotes the sectional curvature of  $M$ .

Let  $U \subset M$  be an open subset, and assume that  $U$  contains an open ball  $B(x_0, R)$  of radius  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$  centered at some  $x_0 \in U$ . We call the subset  $U$  the measurement domain. We say that  $Y \subset U$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -net in  $U$  if the  $\varepsilon$  neighborhood of  $Y$  in  $M$  contains the set  $U$ . We also say that a set  $Y$  is  $\varepsilon$ -dense in  $U$  when it is an  $\varepsilon$ -net in  $U$ .

The goal of this paper is to show that when  $Y$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -net in  $U$  and  $X$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -net in  $M$ , then the approximate distances  $d(x, y)$  between the points  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$  determine an approximation of the whole manifold  $M$ . The part 1 of the paper, [29], considers the case when the observation domain  $U$  is the whole manifold  $M$ .

**1.0.1. Formulation of data for the inverse problem: distance vector data.** Let  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  be a small parameter and let  $Y$  be a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net in  $U$ ,

$$(1.2) \quad Y = \{y_j \in U : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}.$$

Assume  $y_0 \in Y$  is such that  $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon_0$ , where  $d(x, y) = \text{dist}_M(x, y)$  is the distance between points  $x, y \in M$ .

The *distance vector data* consist of a finite set of vectors  $\vec{R}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , given by

$$(1.3) \quad \vec{R}_i = [\hat{R}_{i,j}]_{j \in \{0, \dots, J\}} \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}.$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35R30, 53C20, 58J35.

*Key words and phrases.* Inverse problems, Riemannian manifolds, heat kernel.




FIGURE 1. On a closed manifold  $(M, g)$ , we consider the distances  $d(x_i, y_j)$  from the blue points  $y_j \in Y$  in the open subset  $U \subset M$  to the red points  $x_i$  filling the manifold  $M$ . These distances with measurement errors  $\varepsilon_{i,j}$  define the noisy distance vectors  $\vec{R}_i = [\hat{R}_{i,j}]$ , where  $\hat{R}_{i,j} = d(x_i, y_j) + \varepsilon_{i,j}$  and  $|\varepsilon_{i,j}| < \varepsilon_1$ . The inverse problem is to construct an approximation of the manifold  $(M, g)$  from these data.

We assume that the vectors  $\vec{R}_i$  satisfy the following conditions for some small parameter  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ :

(a1) For any  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , there exists a point  $x \in M$  such that

$$|\hat{R}_{i,j} - d(x, y_j)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \text{for all } j = 0, 1, \dots, J.$$

(a2) For any  $x \in M$ , there is  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$  such that

$$|\hat{R}_{i,j} - d(x, y_j)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \text{for all } j = 0, 1, \dots, J.$$

1.0.2. *An alternative formulation of data: approximate interior distance function data.* For  $x \in M$ , we consider the distance function  $r_x^U : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$(1.4) \quad r_x^U(y) = d(x, y), \quad y \in U.$$

Let  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  and the set  $Y$  given in (1.2) be a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net in  $U$ . Let

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{R}_Y(M) := \{r_x^U|_Y : x \in M\} \subset \ell^\infty(Y) = \mathbb{R}^{J+1}$$

be the set of the restrictions of distance functions  $r_x^U$  onto the finite subset  $Y$ . The motivation of these functions is that they are discretizations of the distance functions

$$(1.6) \quad \mathcal{R}_U(M) := \{r_x^U : x \in M\} \subset C(U)$$

defined on the open set  $U$ .

The *approximate interior distance function data* consist of the finite set  $Y$ , and a finite set of functions on  $Y$  given by

$$(1.7) \quad \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y := \{\hat{r}_i : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, I\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{J+1}.$$

We assume that the family  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  satisfies

$$(1.8) \quad d_H(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y, \mathcal{R}_Y(M)) < \varepsilon_1$$

for some small parameter  $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ , that is,  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  is an approximation of the set  $\mathcal{R}_Y(M)$ . Here  $d_H$  stands for the Hausdorff distance on  $\mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ , see [12]. The following lemma motivates the conditions (a1)-(a2).

**Lemma 1.1.** *Let  $U \subset M$  be an open subset and  $Y$  be a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net in  $U$ . Then the approximate interior distance function data  $\{Y, \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y\}$  satisfy the condition (1.8) if and only if the distance vector data  $\vec{R}_i = [\hat{R}_{i,j}]$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , defined by  $\hat{R}_{i,j} = \hat{r}_i(y_j)$ , satisfy the conditions (a1) and (a2).*

The proof of Lemma 1.1 is given in Section 3.

**1.1. Main result.** Our main result is a global result on the determination of a smooth manifold from the distance vector data.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\Lambda \geq 1$ ,  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$ . Then there exist  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_1 > 0$ ,  $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 1$  explicitly depending only on  $n, \Lambda$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \widehat{\varepsilon}_1$  and  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ .*

*Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold satisfying the bounds (1.1) and  $U \subset M$  be an open subset containing a ball  $B(x_0, R)$ . Let*

$$Y = \{y_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\} \subset U$$

*be a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net in  $U$ ,  $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon_0$ , and  $\varepsilon_2 = C_0 \varepsilon_1^{1/2}$ .*

*Assume that we are given vectors  $\vec{R}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , such that conditions (a1) and (a2) are valid with parameter  $\varepsilon_1$ . Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *We can compute the numbers  $\widehat{d}_{i,i'}$ ,  $i, i' \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$  directly from the given data  $\vec{R}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , such that there exists an  $\varepsilon_2$ -net  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_I\}$  in  $M$  for which*

$$|\widehat{d}_{i,i'} - d(x_i, x_{i'})| \leq C_1 \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{8}}, \quad \text{for all } i, i' \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\}.$$

- (2) *The given data  $\vec{R}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , determine a smooth Riemannian manifold  $(\widehat{M}, \widehat{g})$  that is diffeomorphic to  $M$ . Moreover, there is a diffeomorphism  $F : \widehat{M} \rightarrow M$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{L} \leq \frac{d_M(F(x), F(x'))}{d_{\widehat{M}}(x, x')} \leq L, \quad \text{for } x, x' \in \widehat{M},$$

$$\text{where } L = 1 + C_2 \varepsilon_1^{1/12}.$$

We will focus on proving the claim (1) in this paper, as the claim (2) essentially follows from the claim (1) and the part 1 of the paper, [29].

## 2. RECONSTRUCTIONS IN LOCAL COORDINATES AND APPLICATIONS

**2.1. Application to an inverse problem for the heat kernel.** Let  $G(x, z, t)$  be the heat kernel of a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ , i.e., it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t - \Delta_g)G(x, z, t) &= 0, \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ G(x, z, t)|_{t=0} &= \delta_z(x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta_g$  is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on  $(M, g)$  that operates in the  $x$ -variable and  $\delta_z$  is a point source at the point  $z \in M$ . Let

$$(2.1) \quad \widetilde{G}(x, z, t) = \eta(x, z, t) G(x, z, t)$$

be the values of the heat kernel with multiplicative noise  $\eta(x, z, t)$  satisfying

$$(2.2) \quad |\log \eta(x, z, t)| \leq \frac{\sigma}{t}, \quad \text{for } 0 < t < 1,$$

where  $\sigma \in (0, 1)$  is small. We consider the stability of the following inverse problem on Riemannian manifolds with non-negative Ricci curvature.

**Inverse problem for heat kernel with separated sources and observations.** *Let  $(M, g)$  be a compact Riemannian manifold and  $U \subset M$  be a non-empty open subset. Assume that we are given the set  $(U, g|_U)$  as a Riemannian manifold and the heat kernel  $G(y, z, t)$  at observation points  $y \in U$  at all times  $t \in (0, 1)$  with the source points  $z \in M \setminus \overline{U}$ . Do these data uniquely determine the topology, differential structure and Riemannian metric of the manifold  $(M, g)$ ?*

In the case when the heat kernel  $G(y, z, t)$  is sampled on the set  $M \times M \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , that is, sources and observations are on the whole manifold  $M$ , this problem is studied in the embedding of a manifold into an Euclidean space using the heat kernel [8, 71, 84], in diffusion distances in manifold learning [20, 21], and in manifold registration in shape theory [66, 67]. Also, an inverse problem where  $G(y, z, t)$  is assumed to be known in the set  $U \times U \times \mathbb{R}_+$  for an open subset  $U \subset M$  was studied in [37, 38, 50], see also related studies [5, 7, 9, 24, 45, 77] for manifolds with boundary. In the methods used to study these problems, it is essential that the set which contains the sources intersects the set where the solutions are observed. For partial data problems with separated sources and observations, the inverse problem for the wave equation on a non-trapping manifold was considered in [60]. Inverse problems for elliptic equations, where the sources and the observations are on sets that are small but intersect, have been studied under geometric convexity assumptions, see e.g. [25, 47, 51] and in the 2-dimensional case, see e.g. [36, 62, 63].

The following result proves that for manifolds with non-negative Ricci curvature, the Riemannian manifold structure depends in a stable way on the heat kernel with separated sources and observations when the data have multiplicative errors.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  be two closed Riemannian manifolds of dimension  $n$  satisfying the bounds (1.1) with parameter  $\Lambda$ , and let  $U_l = B_{g_l}(y_0^l, R) \subset M_l$  be open balls of radius  $R \geq \Lambda^{-1}$ . Suppose the Ricci curvatures of the manifolds  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are non-negative. Then there exist constants  $\hat{\sigma}, C_3 > 0$  explicitly depending only on  $n, \Lambda$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \sigma < \hat{\sigma}$  and  $0 < h \leq \sigma^{1/2}$ .*

*For  $l = 1, 2$ , let  $\{z_i^l : i = 1, 2, \dots, I\}$  be an  $h$ -net in  $M_l \setminus \overline{U}_l$ , and  $\{y_j^l : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$  be an  $h$ -net in the ball  $U_l$ . Suppose  $|d_{M_1}(y_j^1, y_{j'}^1) - d_{M_2}(y_j^2, y_{j'}^2)| < h$  for all  $j, j' = 0, 1, \dots, J$ , and the heat kernels of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  satisfy*

$$(2.3) \quad e^{-\frac{\sigma}{\tau}} \leq \frac{G_2(y_j^2, z_i^2, t)}{G_1(y_j^1, z_i^1, t)} \leq e^{\frac{\sigma}{\tau}},$$

*for all  $i = 1, \dots, I$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$  and  $0 < t < 1$ . Then  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are diffeomorphic, and there is a diffeomorphism  $F : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{L} \leq \frac{d_{M_2}(F(x), F(x'))}{d_{M_1}(x, x')} \leq L, \quad \text{for } x, x' \in M_1,$$

*where  $L = 1 + C_3 \sigma^{1/24}$ .*

As a corollary we obtain the unique solvability of the inverse problem.

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  be two closed Riemannian manifolds of dimension  $n$  with non-negative Ricci curvature. For  $l = 1, 2$ , let  $U_l = B_{g_l}(y_0^l, R) \subset M_l$  be open balls of radius  $R > 0$ . If  $\Phi : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$  is an isometry and  $\Psi : M_1 \setminus U_1 \rightarrow M_2 \setminus U_2$  is a bijection such that*

$$G_1(y, z, t) = G_2(\Phi(y), \Psi(z), t), \quad \text{for all } y \in U_1, z \in M_1 \setminus U_1, 0 < t < 1,$$

*then the Riemannian manifolds  $(M_1, g_1)$  and  $(M_2, g_2)$  are isometric.*

We emphasize that in Corollary 2.2, the map  $\Psi : M_1 \setminus U_1 \rightarrow M_2 \setminus U_2$  is only assumed to be a bijection and thus we do not a priori assume that  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are homeomorphic.

Theorem 2.1 is proved by using the Cheeger-Yau asymptotics for heat kernel [17] that generalizes Varadhan's classical formula [81].

**2.2. Reconstruction of local coordinates and metric tensor from partial distance data.** In this subsection, we consider how the local coordinates and the distances near a point  $x_{i_0} \in M$  can be approximately constructed, using the approximate distance functions  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \subset \mathbb{R}^{J+1}$  that are in a neighborhood of the function  $\hat{r}_{i_0}$  corresponding to the point  $x_{i_0}$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Consider the set  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  satisfying (1.8). We say that  $x_i \in M$  is a point corresponding to  $\widehat{r}_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  if (3.3) holds. For each element  $\widehat{r}_i$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ , we choose one corresponding point  $x_i \in M$  and denote the obtained set by  $X$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad X := \{x_i \in M : i = 1, 2, \dots, I\}.$$

Note that the set  $X$  of points are just known to exist, and they are not directly determined by the data  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ .

Let  $U \subset M$  be an open subset and  $Y = \{y_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$  be a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net in  $U$ . In the space of real-valued functions on  $Y$ , we denote the  $\ell^\infty$ -neighborhood of a function  $\widehat{r} : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{B}_\infty(\widehat{r}, \rho) = \{f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \|f - \widehat{r}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} < \rho\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{J+1},$$

where  $\rho > 0$  is the radius of the neighborhood. Suppose that we are given numbers  $\widehat{d}_{j,j'}^Y$ ,  $j, j' = 0, 1, \dots, J$  such that

$$(2.6) \quad |\widehat{d}_{j,j'}^Y - d(y_j, y_{j'})| \leq 2\varepsilon_1, \quad \text{for all } j, j' = 0, 1, \dots, J.$$

For  $x_{i_0} \in M$ , the map  $\exp_{x_{i_0}} : T_{x_{i_0}}M \rightarrow M$  is the Riemannian exponential map at  $x_{i_0}$ . Let  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^n$  be unit vectors that form a basis in  $T_{x_{i_0}}M$ , and  $x_\ell \in B(x_{i_0}, r)$ ,  $r < \text{inj}(M)$ . Then we say that

$$(2.7) \quad X(x_\ell) = (X_k(x_\ell))_{k=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad X_k(x_\ell) = \langle \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_\ell), v_k \rangle_g,$$

is the coordinate of the point  $x_\ell$  in the Riemannian normal coordinates centered at the point  $x_{i_0}$ , associated to the (possibly non-orthogonal) basis  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^n$ . Moreover,

$$(2.8) \quad g_{jk}(x_{i_0}) = \langle v_j, v_k \rangle_g, \quad j, k = 1, \dots, n,$$

are the components of the metric tensor in these Riemannian normal coordinates at the point  $x_{i_0}$ .




FIGURE 2. The Riemannian normal coordinates on the manifold  $M$  when  $\dim(M) = 2$ . These coordinates are centered at the point  $x_{i_0}$  and are associated to the basis  $\{v_1, v_2\}$ . We compute approximately the coordinates of the points  $x_\ell = \exp_{x_{i_0}}(\xi_\ell)$ , that is,  $X(x_\ell) = (X_1(x_\ell), X_2(x_\ell)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and the metric tensor  $g_{jk}$  at the point  $x_{i_0}$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\Lambda \geq 1$ ,  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$ . Then there exist  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_1 > 0$ ,  $\rho_0 > 0$ ,  $c_1 > 0$  and  $C_4 > 1$ , explicitly depending only on  $n$  and  $\Lambda$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \widehat{\varepsilon}_1$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ .

Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold satisfying the bounds (1.1) with parameter  $\Lambda$ , and  $U \subset M$  be an open subset containing a ball  $B(x_0, R)$ . Assume that  $Y$  is a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net in  $U$ ,  $\widehat{d}_{j,j'}^Y$  are numbers satisfying (2.6), and  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  is an  $\varepsilon_1$ -approximation of  $\mathcal{R}_Y(M)$  in the

sense of (1.8). Let  $x_i \in M$  be the points corresponding to  $\hat{r}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  in the sense of Definition 2.3. Fix any  $\hat{r}_{i_0} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ . Then in the tangent space  $T_{x_{i_0}}M$ , there exist unit vectors  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^n$  satisfying  $\det([\langle v_j, v_k \rangle_g]_{j,k=1}^n) \geq c_1$ , such that the following holds in the Riemannian normal coordinates centered at  $x_{i_0}$  and associated to the basis  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^n$ .

Assume that we are given  $Y$ ,  $\{\hat{d}_{j,j'}^Y\}$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\hat{r}_{i_0}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$ , and any element  $\hat{r}_\ell \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  that satisfies

$$(2.9) \quad \hat{r}_\ell \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\hat{r}_{i_0}, \rho_0),$$

see (2.5). Then we can compute, directly from these data, numbers  $\hat{X}(x_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\hat{g}_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(2.10) \quad |\hat{X}(x_\ell) - X(x_\ell)| \leq C_4(d(x_\ell, x_{i_0})^{\frac{4}{3}} + \varepsilon_1),$$

where  $X(x_\ell)$  is the coordinate of the point  $x_\ell$  in the Riemannian normal coordinates given in (2.7), and  $\hat{g}_{jk}$  satisfies

$$(2.11) \quad |\hat{g}_{jk} - g_{jk}(x_{i_0})| \leq C_4 \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{8}}, \quad j, k = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $g_{jk}(x_{i_0})$  are the components of the metric tensor in the Riemannian normal coordinates at  $x_{i_0}$  given in (2.8).

The basis vectors  $v_k \in T_{x_{i_0}}M$  in Theorem 2.4 are the directions to nearby points  $x_{i(k)}$  such that the geodesics  $\gamma_{x_{i_0}, v_k}$  can be continued as distance-minimizing geodesics to points  $y_{j(k)} \in U$ , see Figure 2.

Theorem 2.4 has the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.5.** *Let  $n, \Lambda, R, \hat{\varepsilon}_1, \rho_0, c_1$  be as in Theorem 2.4. Then there exists  $C_5 > 1$  explicitly depending only on  $n, \Lambda$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \hat{\varepsilon}_1$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ .*

*Let  $(M, g), U, Y, \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y, \hat{r}_{i_0} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  and  $\hat{r}_\ell \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\hat{r}_{i_0}, \rho_0)$  be as in Theorem 2.4. Then we can compute a number  $\hat{d}_{\ell, i_0}$  directly from the given data  $Y, \{\hat{d}_{j,j'}^Y\}, \hat{r}_\ell$ , and  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\hat{r}_{i_0}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$  such that*

$$(2.12) \quad |\hat{d}_{\ell, i_0} - d(x_\ell, x_{i_0})| \leq C_5(d(x_\ell, x_{i_0})^{\frac{4}{3}} + \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{2}}),$$

where  $x_{i_0}, x_\ell \in M$  are the points in  $X$  corresponding to  $\hat{r}_{i_0}, \hat{r}_\ell$  in the sense of Definition 2.3. More explicitly, the number  $\hat{d}_{\ell, i_0}$  can be computed as

$$(2.13) \quad \hat{d}_{\ell, i_0} := \left( \sum_{j,k=1}^n \hat{g}^{jk} \hat{X}_j(x_\ell) \hat{X}_k(x_\ell) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where  $\hat{X}(x_\ell) = (\hat{X}_k(x_\ell))_{k=1}^n$  and the inverse  $(\hat{g}^{jk})$  of the matrix  $(\hat{g}_{jk})$  are determined in Theorem 2.4.

Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.5 show that in a neighborhood of  $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ , we can approximately find the local coordinates of nearby points  $x_\ell \in \mathcal{X}$  and the distances  $d(x_\ell, x_i)$ . We use this result to reconstruct distances on a finite net of  $M$  to prove Theorem 1.2(1). Similar results for manifolds with boundary have been studied in [46], assuming bounded derivative of the curvature tensor, but do not give explicit dependency on geometric parameters. We emphasize that in Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.5 all the estimates can be made completely explicit in terms of  $\Lambda$  and  $n$ .

A situation considered in Theorem 2.4 is encountered in imaging applications, where the wave speed (the metric tensor  $g$ ) needs to be reconstructed near a point  $x_i$  using the travel times of waves from nearby points  $x_\ell$  to the points  $y_j \in Y$ . For example, consider the case when a measurement device located at the point  $y_j$  sends a wave at time  $t = 0$  which reflects from a small scatterer (e.g. a detail in the material) at the point  $x_\ell$ . If the reflected wave is observed at the point  $y_j$  at the time  $t_{\ell, j}$ , then the distance  $d(x_\ell, y_j)$  is equal to  $t_{\ell, j}/2$ .

**2.3. Other applications and the stability of inverse problems under geometric a priori bounds.** The inverse problem of determining a Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  from the distance functions  $r_x : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $r_x(y) = d(x, y)$ , defined on an open subset  $U \subset M$ , is encountered in imaging problems that arise in geosciences, medical imaging and non-destructive testing. In these applications, the speed of waves defines a Riemannian metric on  $M$  so that the travel time of the waves from a point  $x$  to  $y$  is equal to the Riemannian distance  $d(x, y)$ . For instance, in the seismic imaging of the Earth, the inverse problem of finding the Riemannian metric in normal coordinates corresponds to finding the physical material parameters of the Earth in the travel time coordinates.

Geometric inverse problems have been studied on closed manifolds with data measured on an open subset of the manifold, see [37, 38, 50], as it is geometrically simpler to formulate the problems on a closed manifold than on a manifold with boundary. For the methods used to solve inverse problems for a Riemannian manifold with boundary or its metric, see e.g. [5, 7, 44, 48, 49, 52, 56, 62, 63, 68, 77]. In many cases, it is also possible to reduce an inverse problem for a manifold with boundary to an inverse problem for a closed manifold, by means of extending the manifold with boundary to a closed manifold and extending measured boundary data to data on an open set.

**2.3.1. Inverse problems for linear equations.** Let us review a classical inverse problem that is related to the inverse problem studied in this paper.

*1. Inverse interior spectral problem:* Let  $(M, g)$  be a (unknown) Riemannian manifold and  $U \subset M$  be an open set. Assume that we are given the following data,

$$(2.14) \quad \{U, (\lambda_j)_{j=1}^\infty, (\phi_j|_U)_{j=1}^\infty\}.$$

Here  $\lambda_j$  are the eigenvalues of the Laplace-Beltrami operator  $\Delta_g$  on  $M$  and  $\phi_j$  are the corresponding orthonormal eigenfunctions. Do data (2.14) determine uniquely (up to an isometry) the Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$ ?

The methods used to solve the inverse problem 1 consist of two steps. First, the given data is used to construct the local distance function representation  $\mathcal{R}_U(M)$  (for a detailed exposition, see e.g. [37, 45]). Second, the manifold  $(M, g)$  is reconstructed from  $\mathcal{R}_U(M)$ .

Analogous inverse problems for the wave equation and also for the Maxwell and Dirac systems are studied in [5, 6, 45, 53, 55].

**2.3.2. Inverse problems for non-linear equations.** The reconstruction of a manifold from partial distance measurements arises also in the study of the inverse problems for non-linear partial differential equations.

*2. Inverse problem for a non-linear wave equation:* Let  $(M, g)$  be a (unknown) Riemannian manifold and  $U \subset M$  be an open set. Assume that we are given the source-to-solution map  $L_U : C_0^\infty(U \times \mathbb{R}_+) \rightarrow C^\infty(U \times \mathbb{R}_+)$ ,  $L_U(f) = v|_{U \times \mathbb{R}_+}$ , where  $f \in C_0^\infty(U \times \mathbb{R}_+)$  is a source and  $v$  is the solution of the following non-linear equation

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial_t^2 - \Delta_g)v(x, t) + a(x, t)v(x, t)^2 &= f(x, t), \quad \text{in } M \times \mathbb{R}_+, \\ v|_{t=0} &= 0, \quad \partial_t v|_{t=0} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $a(x, t) > 0$ . Do the set  $U$  and the map  $L_U$  determine uniquely (up to an isometry) the Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  and the coefficient  $a(x, t)$ ?

In the study of this problem, the non-linear interaction of linearized waves produced by suitable sources in  $U \times \mathbb{R}_+$  can be used to produce “artificial” microlocal point sources at the points  $y \in M$ , including the unknown region  $M \setminus U$  where the original source  $f$  vanishes, see [40, 54, 57, 59, 64, 80, 83]. The wave fronts that are produced by these point sources and are observed in  $U$  determine the distances  $d(x, y)$  for the points  $x \in M$  and  $y \in U$ . Thus



the inverse problem 2 for the non-linear wave equation is reduced to the reconstruction of a manifold from partial distance measurements.

2.3.3. *Manifold learning.* In machine learning, a (invariant) manifold learning problem can be formulated as follows.

3. *A manifold learning problem:* Let  $(M, g)$  be a Riemannian manifold and  $x_i \in M$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , be an  $\varepsilon$ -dense set of sample points. We consider a small subset of these points,  $x_1, \dots, x_J$ ,  $J < I$ , as the marker points. Assume that we are given the distances  $d(x_i, x_j)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ , between the sample points and the marker points. Can we obtain an approximation of the manifold  $(M, g)$  from these data?

In the case when the marker points  $x_1, \dots, x_J$  belong in an open set  $U \subset M$  and form a  $\delta$ -dense set in  $U$ , this problem reduces to the problem studied in this paper. Machine learning problems analogous to the problem 3 were studied e.g. in [19, 20, 21, 30, 33, 72, 78, 86].

2.3.4. *A priori bounds and conditional stability of inverse problems.* In the inverse problems above, the problem of determining the metric from partial data measured on a subset is generally ill-posed in the sense of Hadamard: the map from the partial data to the metric is not continuous so that small change in the data can lead to huge errors in the reconstructed metric. One way out of this fundamental difficulty is to assume a priori bounds on the norms of the higher derivatives of coefficients. Results under this type of conditions are called conditional stability results and were known mostly for conformally Euclidean metric tensors (see e.g. [1, 2, 75, 76]). However, for inverse problems for general metric, this approach bears significant difficulties. The reason is that the usual  $C^m$ -norm bounds on coefficients are not invariant, and thus this type of conditions does not suit the invariance of the problems under diffeomorphisms. Moreover, if the structure of the manifold is not known a priori, this traditional approach cannot be used.

A natural way to overcome these difficulties is to impose a priori constraints in an invariant form and consider a class of manifolds that satisfy invariant a priori bounds, for instance on curvature, second fundamental form, injectivity radius, etc. Under such type of conditions, invariant stability results for various inverse problems have been proven in [5, 29, 75, 76]. In particular, for the inverse interior spectral problem on manifolds with non-trivial topology, stability results have been obtained in [5, 9], see also [14] for analogous results for manifolds with boundary. In the latter, it was shown that the convergence of the boundary spectral data implies the convergence of the manifolds with respect to the Gromov-Hausdorff distance. However, the stability for this problem is of log log type.

In addition to being contaminated with errors, actual measurements typically provide only a finite set of data. An example of this is the classical Whitney problem on the extension of a function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined on  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , in an optimal way to a function  $F \in C^m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , see [85]. This problem has been answered in the works of E. Bierstone, Y. Brudnyi, C. Fefferman, P. Milman, W. Pawlusi, P. Shvartsman and others (see [10, 11, 26, 27, 28, 31]).

This paper is organized as follows. We review a few corollaries of Toponogov's theorem in Section 3. In Section 4, we derive the first variation type of estimates for almost minimizing paths as our main tool. Sections 5 and 6 are technical preparations for the reconstruction of local coordinates. Section 7 is devoted to proving the local result on the reconstruction of local coordinates and components of the metric tensor, that is, Theorem 2.4. We prove the global results, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 2.1, in Sections 8 and 9.

**Acknowledgement.** C. Fefferman was partially supported by AFOSR, grant DMS-1265524, and NSF, grant FA9550-12-1-0425. S. Ivanov was partially supported by RFBR, grants 14-01-00062 and 17-01-00128-A. M. Lassas and J. Lu were partially supported by AF, grants 284715 and 312110. H. Narayanan was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1620102 and a Ramanujan Fellowship.



## 3. PRELIMINARY CONSTRUCTIONS

**3.1. Notations.** Let  $(M, g)$  be a closed (that is, compact without boundary) connected Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n \geq 2$  satisfying the bounds (1.1) with parameter  $\Lambda$ . Let  $U \subset M$  be an open subset containing a ball  $B(x_0, R)$  of radius  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$  centered at  $x_0 \in U$ . By e.g. [15, Thm IX.6.1], if  $r < \min\{\text{inj}(M)/2, \pi/(2K^{1/2})\}$  where  $K$  is the upper bound for the absolute value of sectional curvatures, the (open) metric balls  $B(x, r)$  of  $(M, g)$  having radius  $r$  and center  $x$  are convex. Thus by making the ball  $B(x_0, R) \subset U$  smaller, we can assume that the ball  $B(x_0, R)$  is geodesically convex. We denote

$$\Sigma_r := \partial B(x_0, r).$$

Pairs  $(x, v)$ ,  $(y, u)$ , etc. stand for points in the tangent bundle  $TM$  with  $v, u$ , etc. being tangent vectors. We identify the vector space  $T_v(T_x M)$  with  $T_x M$  and  $T_{(x,v)}(TM)$  with  $T_x M \times T_x M$ , denoting by  $(u, w) \in T_x M \times T_x M$  a tangent vector in  $T_{(x,v)}(TM)$ . We denote by  $\gamma_{x,v}(t) = \exp_x(tv)$  the geodesic emanating from  $x$  in the direction  $v \in S_x M = \{v \in T_x M : |v|_g = 1\}$ . Geodesics as well as other rectifiable curves are parametrized by the arclength.

Let  $Y = \{y_j\}_{j=0}^J$  be a finite  $\varepsilon_0$ -net of  $U$ . Suppose we are given finite number of data

$$(3.1) \quad \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y := \{\widehat{r}_i : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid i = 1, \dots, I\},$$

such that  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  is an  $\varepsilon_1$ -approximation of  $\mathcal{R}_Y(M)$  in the sense of (1.8). The given data essentially consists of  $I(J+1)$  numbers. To shorten notations, we sometimes denote

$$(3.2) \quad \widehat{r}_{ij} := \widehat{r}_i(y_j), \quad y_j \in Y.$$

Next, using the above notations, we prove Lemma 1.1

*Proof.* (of Lemma 1.1) By the definition of the Hausdorff distance on  $\mathbb{R}^{J+1}$ , the condition (1.8) holds if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied.

(i) For any  $\widehat{r}_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ , there exists a point  $x_i \in M$  such that

$$(3.3) \quad |\widehat{r}_i(y_j) - r_{x_i}^U(y_j)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \text{for all } j = 0, 1, \dots, J.$$

(ii) For any  $x \in M$ , there is  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, I\}$  such that

$$|\widehat{r}_i(y_j) - r_x^U(y_j)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \text{for all } j = 0, 1, \dots, J.$$

Since we define  $\widehat{R}_{i,j} = \widehat{r}_i(y_j)$ , the conditions (i),(ii) are the same as the conditions (a1),(a2).  $\square$

In the proof of Theorem 1.2, we need to approximately determine the distances of the points in  $Y$ . To do that, we define approximate distances for points in  $Y$  as follows:

$$(3.4) \quad D_Y^a(y_j, y_k) = \inf_{i \in I} (\widehat{r}_{ij} + \widehat{r}_{ik}), \quad y_j, y_k \in Y.$$

Then by the triangular inequality and (3.3), we see that

$$(3.5) \quad D_Y^a(y_j, y_k) \geq d(y_j, y_k) - 2\varepsilon_1.$$

Let  $x$  be a point on the shortest geodesic from  $y_j$  to  $y_k$ . By (1.8), there is  $i$  such that  $\|\widehat{r}_i - r_x^U\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} < \varepsilon_1$ . Then

$$D_Y^a(y_j, y_k) \leq \widehat{r}_{ij} + \widehat{r}_{ik} \leq d(y_j, x) + d(x, y_k) + 2\varepsilon_1.$$

Thus we see that

$$(3.6) \quad D_Y^a(y_j, y_k) \leq d(y_j, y_k) + 2\varepsilon_1.$$

The above yields that

$$(3.7) \quad |D_Y^a(y_j, y_k) - d(y_j, y_k)| \leq 2\varepsilon_1.$$

Note that (3.7) is independent of  $Y$  being a net of  $U$ . This shows we can find, up to an error of  $2\varepsilon_1$ , the distances between points in  $Y$  using only the given data  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ .

By (3.7), the numbers  $D_Y^a(y_j, y_k)$  satisfy the inequality (2.6) that we required for the approximate distances  $\widehat{d}_{j,k}^Y$  in the set  $Y$ . Thus, instead of using the notation  $\widehat{d}_{j,k}^Y$  in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we identify these two notations and denote below

$$(3.8) \quad \widehat{d}_{j,k}^Y = D_Y^a(y_j, y_k).$$

In this paper,  $C_1, C_2, \dots \in [1, \infty)$  and  $c_1, c_2, \dots \in (0, 1)$  denote uniform constants that explicitly depend only on  $n$  and  $\Lambda$ , unless specified. We also use a generic uniform constant  $C > 0$  that denotes a number that explicitly depends only on  $n, \Lambda$ , unless specified, but its exact value can be different in each appearance even inside one single formula.

**3.2. Implications of Toponogov's theorem.** To begin with, we introduce some notations that we will frequently use. We denote by  $[ab]$  a minimizing geodesic (i.e. distance-minimizing curve) connecting the points  $a$  and  $b$ , and let  $|ab| = d(a, b)$  denote the distance between the points  $a, b$ . Let  $\beta$  be the angle between the geodesics  $[ab]$  and  $[bc]$  at point  $b$  and  $\theta = \pi - \beta$ .

Let  $H$  be the rescaled hyperbolic plane with the constant sectional curvature  $-\Lambda^2$ , and  $\bar{d}(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$  denotes the distance between the points  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$  in  $H$ . Denote by  $[\bar{a}\bar{b}]$  a minimizing geodesic connecting the points  $\bar{a}$  and  $\bar{b}$ . For our considerations, we usually take  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$  in the following way. Let  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ , and  $\bar{c}$  be points of  $H$  such that  $\bar{d}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = d(a, b)$ ,  $\bar{d}(\bar{b}, \bar{c}) = d(b, c)$  and the angle between the geodesics  $[\bar{a}\bar{b}]$  and  $[\bar{b}\bar{c}]$  at  $\bar{b}$  is  $\beta$ . Then by Toponogov's theorem, the above triangle  $abc$  on  $M$  and the corresponding triangle  $\bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c}$  on  $H$  satisfy  $d(a, c) \leq \bar{d}(\bar{a}, \bar{c})$ .

Now we present a corollary of Toponogov's theorem. The analogous results to the first variation inequality (3.9) considered below are well-known in Alexandrov geometry. Similar types of formulae are used in Section 4.5 of [12] or Section 4 of [74] or Section 3.6 of [70]. However, we present the results in the form needed later and give the proof for the convenience of the reader.

**Lemma 3.1.** *There exist uniform constants  $C_6, C_7 > 1$  such that the following holds.*

*Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\text{Sec}_M \geq -\Lambda^2$ . Let  $a, b, c \in M$  and  $\beta$  be the angle of the distance-minimizing geodesics  $[ab]$  and  $[bc]$  at  $b$ .*

(i) *Then*

$$(3.9) \quad |ac| \leq |ab| - |bc| \cos \beta + C_6 |bc|^2 / \min\{\Lambda^{-1}, |ab|\}.$$

(ii) *In addition to the assumptions above, assume that  $|ab| = |bc|$ ,  $|ab| \leq \Lambda$ . Then*

$$(3.10) \quad |ac| \leq 2|ab|(1 - C_7 \theta^2), \quad \text{where } \theta = \pi - \beta.$$

**Proof.** (i) See Lemma A.2.

(ii) Denote  $|ab| = |bc| = A \leq \Lambda$  so that also  $\bar{d}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = d(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = A$ . Let  $B = d(a, c)$  and  $\bar{B} = d(\bar{a}, \bar{c}) \leq 2\Lambda$ . Then by Toponogov's theorem  $B \leq \bar{B}$ . Moreover, using the law of cosines (A.5), we can estimate  $B$  as follows: We have

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(\Lambda B) &\leq \cosh(\Lambda \bar{B}) = \cosh^2(\Lambda A) - \sinh^2(\Lambda A) \cos(\beta) \\ &\leq 1 + \sinh^2(\Lambda A)(1 - \cos(\beta)) \end{aligned}$$

and as  $\cosh(2t) = 1 + 2\sinh^2 t$ , or

$$\cosh(\Lambda B) = 1 + 2\sinh^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\Lambda B\right),$$

we have,

$$(3.11) \quad 2\sinh^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\Lambda B\right) \leq \sinh^2(\Lambda A)(1 - \cos(\beta)).$$

Using the fact that there exists a uniform constant  $C > 1$  so that

$$\frac{u}{w} - \frac{\sinh(u)}{\sinh(w)} \leq C \left(1 - \frac{u}{w}\right), \quad \text{for all } u, w \in (0, \Lambda^2], \quad u \leq w,$$

we see using (3.11) that

$$(3.12) \quad \frac{B}{2A} \leq \frac{1}{C+1} \left(C + \sqrt{\frac{(1 - \cos(\beta))}{2}}\right).$$

Let  $\theta = \pi - \beta$ . Using (3.12), we see that there exists a uniform constant  $C_7 > 1$  such that

$$(3.13) \quad \frac{B}{2A} \leq 1 - \frac{1 - \sin(\beta/2)}{C+1} = 1 - \frac{1 - \cos(\theta/2)}{C+1} \leq 1 - C_7 \theta^2.$$

This proves (ii).  $\square$

The following lemma is a variation of Lemma 3.1 when  $|ab|$  is small.

**Lemma 3.2.** *There exists a uniform constant  $C_8 > 0$  such that the following holds.*

*Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\text{Sec}_M \geq -\Lambda^2$ . Let  $a, b, c \in M$  be such that  $|ab| \geq |bc|$ . Let  $\beta$  be the angle at  $b$  between (any pair of) shortest paths  $[ab]$  and  $[bc]$ . If  $|ab| \leq 1$  and  $|bc| \leq \frac{1}{2}|ab|$ , then*

$$(3.14) \quad |ac| \leq |ab| - |bc| \cos \beta + C_8 \beta \frac{|bc|^2}{|ab|}.$$

**Proof.** Let us first prove the claim in the case when  $|ab| = 1$ ,  $|bc| \leq 1/2$ .

As above, let  $H$  be a rescaled hyperbolic plane of curvature  $-\Lambda^2$  and  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c} \in H$  be such that  $|\bar{a}\bar{b}| = |ab|$ ,  $|\bar{b}\bar{c}| = |bc|$  and  $\angle \bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c} = \beta$ . Here by  $|xy|$ , we denote the distance between points  $x$  and  $y$  in whatever space they belong. Then by Toponogov's theorem,  $|ac| \leq |\bar{a}\bar{c}|$ .

It remains to prove (3.14) for  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c} \in H$  in place of  $a, b, c \in M$  and under the assumption that  $|\bar{a}\bar{b}| = 1$ . Let  $e_1, e_2$  be an orthonormal basis of  $T_{\bar{b}}H$  such that  $e_1$  is tangent to the geodesic segment  $[\bar{b}\bar{a}]$ , i.e.,  $\bar{a} = \exp_{\bar{b}}(e_1)$ . Let  $r_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ . For every  $r \in [-r_0, r_0]$  and  $\eta \in [-\pi, \pi]$  define a point  $\xi(r, \eta) \in H$  by

$$\xi(r, \eta) = \exp_{\bar{b}}(r \cos(\eta)e_1 + r \sin(\eta)e_2).$$

Note that  $\bar{c} = \xi(|bc|, \beta)$ . Define

$$f(r, \eta) = \bar{d}(\bar{a}, \xi(r, \eta)) - 1 + r \cos(\eta).$$

Clearly  $\xi : [-r_0, r_0] \times [-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow H$  is a smooth map and its image does not cover  $\bar{a}$ . Therefore  $f$  is a smooth function. (It can be written explicitly using the cosine law of the hyperbolic plane.) Observe that  $f(r, 0) = 0$  for all  $r$ , hence

$$\left| \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} f(r, \eta) \right| \leq 2C_8 |\eta|, \quad r \in [-r_0, r_0],$$

where

$$C_8 = \frac{1}{2} \max_{r, \eta} \left| \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \eta \partial r^2} f(r, \eta) \right|.$$

By the first variation formula we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \bar{d}(\bar{a}, \xi(r, \eta)) \Big|_{r=0} = -\cos \eta,$$

and therefore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} f(r, \eta) \Big|_{r=0} = 0.$$

This and the above estimate on  $\partial^2 f / \partial r^2$  imply that

$$|f(r, \eta)| \leq C_8 |\eta| r^2$$

for all  $\eta \in [-\pi, \pi]$  and  $r \in [-r_0, r_0]$ . Substituting  $\eta = \beta$  and  $r = |\bar{b}\bar{c}|$  yields that

$$|\bar{a}\bar{c}| - 1 + |\bar{b}\bar{c}| \cos \beta \leq C_8 \beta |\bar{b}\bar{c}|^2$$

or, equivalently,

$$|\bar{a}\bar{c}| \leq |\bar{a}\bar{b}| - |\bar{b}\bar{c}| \cos \beta + C_8 \beta |\bar{b}\bar{c}|^2.$$

As explained above, the claim follows from this inequality, Toponogov's theorem and the triangle inequality in  $M$ .

Thus we have proven the claim in the case when  $|ab| = 1$ . For the case when  $|ab| < 1$  we can scale the metric  $g$  with the constant factor  $|ab|^{-2}$ . Observe that after this scaling the curvature is still bounded from below by  $-\Lambda^2$ . As the inequality (3.14) is invariant under metric scaling by a constant factor, we obtain the inequality (3.14) also on the case when  $|ab| < 1$ .  $\square$

#### 4. FIRST VARIATION FOR ALMOST MINIMIZING PATHS

In this section, let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold satisfying the bounds (1.1). We consider the first variation type of estimates for geodesics, with the help of corollaries of Toponogov's theorem in Section 3.2. To explain the idea of constructions we use, we first warm up by proving an improved version of the first variation formula for geodesics that can be continued as a minimizing geodesic.




FIGURE 3. **Left:** Setting of Lemma 4.1. The green line corresponds to the boundary of the set  $U$  when the lemma is applied. **Right:** Setting of Lemma 4.2.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold satisfying the bounds (1.1). Let  $\gamma_{q,v}([0, \ell])$ ,  $\ell = d(q, x) > \Lambda^{-1}$  be a distance-minimizing geodesic, parametrized by arc length, connecting  $q, x \in M$ . Assume that  $p = \gamma_{q,v}(-\tau)$  and  $\gamma_{q,v}([-\tau, \ell])$  is a distance-minimizing geodesic connecting  $p$  and  $x$ , where  $\tau > \Lambda^{-1}/2$ . Let  $z = \gamma_{q,v}(\ell + r)$  be the point on the continuation of the geodesic  $\gamma_{q,v}$ , and  $\alpha$  be the angle of  $\gamma_{q,v}$  and  $[qz]$  at  $q$ . Then there are uniform constants  $c_2, C_9$  such that for all  $0 < r < c_2$ , we have*

$$(4.1) \quad \alpha \leq C_9 r.$$

**Remark.** Lemma 4.1 can also be formulated in a scaling-invariant form. For example, assume that  $\tau < \ell/2$  and  $r < \ell/4$ . Then we have

$$(4.2) \quad \alpha \leq C_9 \frac{r}{\tau}.$$

This is also the case for the other two lemmas in this section. We note that an estimate of  $\alpha \leq Cr^{1/2}$  can be obtained if one only assumes the lower sectional curvature bound.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, let us assume  $\tau > 1/2$ ,  $\ell > 1$ , since this only changes the constants by a factor of  $\Lambda$  due to scaling. Let  $\beta$  be the angle of  $\gamma_{q,v}$  and  $[zq]$  at  $z$  and denote by  $\alpha$  the angle of  $[qx]$  and  $[qz]$  at  $q$ , that is,  $\alpha = \angle xqz$ . Let  $q'$  be a point on  $[zq]$  such that  $|zq'| = 2r$ . Lemma 3.2, applied for the triangle  $xzq'$ , implies that for  $r < \min\{1/4, \text{inj}(M)/4\}$ ,

$$|xq'| \leq |zq'| - r \cos \beta + C_8 \beta r.$$

Let  $z_1 \in [qp]$  and  $z_2 \in [qz]$  be points such that  $|z_1q| = 1/4$  and  $|z_2q| = 1/4$ . Then using a shortcut argument near the point  $q$ , see Fig. 3(Left) where the shortcut is the red segment, we can compare the distances of  $|z_1q| + |qz_2|$  and  $|z_1z_2|$ , and using (3.10), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |px| &\leq |pz_1| + |z_1z_2| + |z_2q'| + |q'x| \\ &\leq |pz_1| + (|z_1q| + |qz_2| - \frac{1}{2}C_7\alpha^2) + |z_2q'| + (|q'z| - r\cos\beta + C_8r\beta). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $|pz_1| + |z_1q| = |pq|$  and  $|qz_2| + |z_2q'| + |q'z| = |qz|$  due to  $\tau > 1/2$ ,  $\ell > 1$ ,  $r < 1/4$ . Thus

$$(4.3) \quad |px| \leq |pq| + |qz| - \frac{1}{2}C_7\alpha^2 - r\cos\beta + C_8r\beta.$$

As  $|px| = |pq| + |qx|$ , this yields

$$(4.4) \quad |qx| \leq |qz| - \frac{1}{2}C_7\alpha^2 - r\cos\beta + C_8r\beta.$$

Using (4.4) and the fact that  $|qz| \leq |qx| + r$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |qx| &\leq |qx| + (1 - \cos\beta)r - \frac{1}{2}C_7\alpha^2 + C_8r\beta \\ (4.5) \quad &\leq |qx| + \frac{1}{2}\beta^2r - \frac{1}{2}C_7\alpha^2 + C_8r\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (4.5) yields only  $\alpha^2 \leq Cr$ . We need the following improvement to obtain the desired estimate.

Pick the points  $x_1 \in [qx]$ ,  $x_2 \in [qz]$  such that  $|zx_1| = |zx_2| = \Lambda^{-1}/2 \leq \text{inj}(M)/2$ . Lemma A.1 yields that

$$d(x_1, x_2) \leq C_A(\alpha + r).$$

On the other hand, by the Rauch comparison theorem for  $\text{Sec}_M \leq \Lambda^2$ ,

$$C_A(\alpha + r) \geq d(x_1, x_2) \geq C(n, \Lambda) \sin \frac{\beta}{2} \geq \frac{1}{4}C(n, \Lambda)\beta.$$

This shows that for suitable  $C_{10} > 1$ , we have

$$(4.6) \quad \beta \leq C_{10}(\alpha + r).$$

If  $\alpha \leq r$ , the claim is proven. Thus we may assume that  $r \leq \alpha$ . Then (4.6) becomes

$$(4.7) \quad \beta \leq 2C_{10}\alpha.$$

Hence by (4.5), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{2}4C_{10}^2\alpha^2r - \frac{1}{2}C_7\alpha^2 + C_8r\beta \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(4C_{10}^2r - C_7)\alpha^2 + 2C_8C_{10}r\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Assuming that  $r < c_2$  where  $c_2 \leq C_7C_{10}^{-2}/8$  we have  $C_7 - 4C_{10}^2r > \frac{1}{2}C_7$ , and hence

$$0 \leq -\frac{1}{4}C_7\alpha^2 + 2C_8C_{10}r\alpha$$

or

$$(4.8) \quad \alpha \leq 8C_7^{-1}C_8C_{10}r =: C_9r.$$

□

Next we modify the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 by replacing the minimizing geodesic by an almost minimizing path.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold satisfying the bounds (1.1). Let  $\gamma_{q,v}([0, \ell])$ ,  $\ell = d(q, x) > \Lambda^{-1}$  be a distance-minimizing geodesic, parametrized by arc length, connecting  $q, x \in M$ . Assume that there is a curve from  $p$  to  $x$  that going through  $q$  that is almost distance-minimizing in the sense that*

$$(4.9) \quad |pq| + |qx| \leq |px| + \delta.$$

*Assume  $|pq| > \Lambda^{-1}/2$ . Let  $z = \gamma_{q,v}(\ell + r)$  be the point on the continuation of the geodesic  $\gamma_{q,v}$ , and  $\alpha$  be the angle of  $\gamma_{q,v}$  and  $[qz]$  at  $q$ . Then there are uniform constants  $c_2, C_{11}, C_{12} > 1$  such that for all  $0 < r, \delta < c_2$ , we have*

$$(4.10) \quad \alpha \leq C_{11}(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}.$$

*Moreover,*

$$(4.11) \quad |qx| + |xz| \leq |qz| + C_{12}r(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}.$$

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, let us assume  $|pq| > 1/2$ ,  $|qx| > 1$ , since this only changes the constants by a factor of  $\Lambda$  due to scaling. Let  $\beta$  be the angle of  $\gamma_{q,v}$  and  $[zq]$  at  $z$  and let  $\eta$  be the angle of the (distance-minimizing) geodesic segments  $[qp]$  and  $[qx]$  at  $q$ . Denote  $\alpha = \angle xqz$ . Let  $q'$  be a point on  $[zq]$  such that  $|zq'| = 2r$ . Then Lemma 3.2, applied for the triangle  $xzq'$  implies that for  $r < \min\{1/4, \text{inj}(M)/4\}$ ,

$$(4.12) \quad |xq'| \leq |zq'| - r \cos \beta + C_8 \beta r.$$

Let  $z_1 \in [qp]$ ,  $z_2 \in [qz]$ ,  $z'_2 \in [qx]$  be the points such that  $|z_1q| = 1/4$ ,  $|z_2q| = 1/4$ ,  $|qz'_2| = 1/4$ , see Figure 3(Right). Then (3.10) applied to the triangle  $z_1z_2z'_2$  gives

$$(4.13) \quad |z_1z'_2| \leq |z_1q| + |qz'_2| - 2|z_1q|C_7(\pi - \eta)^2.$$

Then we use a shortcut argument as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |px| &\leq |pz_1| + |z_1z'_2| + |z'_2x| \\ &\leq |pz_1| + (|z_1q| + |qz'_2| - 2|z_1q|C_7(\pi - \eta)^2) + |z'_2x| \\ &= |pq| + |qx| - \frac{1}{2}C_7(\pi - \eta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

As  $|px| \geq |pq| + |qx| - \delta$ , this yields

$$(4.14) \quad (\pi - \eta)^2 \leq 2C_7^{-1}\delta.$$

We use a shortcut argument near the point  $q$ , see Fig. 3(Right) where the shortcut is the red segment  $[z_1z_2]$ . We compare the distances of  $|z_1q| + |qz_2|$  and  $|z_1z_2|$  using (3.10), and see that

$$(4.15) \quad |z_1z_2| \leq |z_1q| + |qz_2| - 2|z_2q|C_7(\pi - \omega)^2,$$

where  $\omega$  denotes the angle between  $[qp]$  and  $[qz]$  at  $q$ .

Inequality (4.15) implies then that

$$\begin{aligned} |px| &\leq |pz_1| + |z_1z_2| + |z_2q'| + |q'x| \\ &\leq |pz_1| + (|z_1q| + |qz_2| - \frac{1}{2}C_7(\pi - \omega)^2) + |z_2q'| + \\ &\quad + (|q'z| - r \cos \beta + C_8 r \beta). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $|pz_1| + |z_1q| = |pq|$  and  $|qz_2| + |z_2q'| + |q'z| = |qz|$ . Thus

$$(4.16) \quad |px| \leq |pq| + |qz| - \frac{1}{2}C_7(\pi - \omega)^2 - r \cos \beta + C_8 r \beta.$$

As  $|px| \geq |pq| + |qx| - \delta$ , this yields

$$(4.17) \quad |qx| - \delta \leq |qz| - \frac{1}{2}C_7(\pi - \omega)^2 - r \cos \beta + C_8 r \beta.$$

Using (4.17) and the fact that  $|qz| \leq |qx| + r$ , we see that

$$(4.18) \quad |qx| - \delta \leq |qx| + (1 - \cos \beta)r - \frac{1}{2}C_7(\pi - \omega)^2 + C_8r\beta.$$

Note that (4.18) already implies  $(\pi - \omega)^2 \leq C(r + \delta)$ , which combining with (4.14) yields  $\alpha \leq |\pi - \eta| + |\pi - \omega| \leq C(r + \delta)^{1/2}$ . We still need the following improvement to obtain the desired estimate.

Similar as in Lemma 4.1, by using the Rauch comparison theorem in a ball of radius  $\Lambda^{-1}/2$  centered at  $z$ , for sufficiently small  $r, \delta$ , we have

$$(4.19) \quad \beta \leq C_{10}(\alpha + r).$$

If  $\alpha \leq r$ , the claim is proven. Thus we may assume that  $r \leq \alpha$ . Then (4.19) becomes

$$(4.20) \quad \beta \leq 2C_{10}\alpha.$$

Hence using (4.18) and  $\alpha \leq |\pi - \omega| + (2C_7^{-1}\delta)^{1/2}$  by (4.14), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta &\leq \frac{1}{2}4C_{10}^2\alpha^2r - \frac{1}{2}C_7(\pi - \omega)^2 + 2C_8C_{10}r\alpha \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(8C_{10}^2r - C_7)(\pi - \omega)^2 + 2C_8C_{10}r|\pi - \omega| + C'_{10}r\delta + C'_{10}r\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C'_{10} > 0$  depending on  $C_7, C_8, C_{10}$ . Assuming that  $r < c_2$  where  $c_2 \leq C_7C_{10}^{-2}/16$ , we have  $C_7 - 8C_{10}^2r > \frac{1}{2}C_7$ . Hence,

$$\frac{1}{4}C_7(\pi - \omega)^2 - 2C_8C_{10}r|\pi - \omega| - (1 + C'_{10}r)\delta - C'_{10}r\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leq |\pi - \omega| + 2C_7^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{2C_8C_{10}r + \sqrt{(2C_8C_{10}r)^2 + C_7(1 + C'_{10}r)\delta + C_7C'_{10}r\delta^{1/2}}}{C_7/2} + 2C_7^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_{11}(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

with some uniform constant  $C_{11} > 1$ . This proves the first claim (4.10) of the lemma.

For the second claim, let  $q' \in M$  be a point on  $[zq]$  such that  $|zq'| = 2r$ . Lemma 3.2, applied for the triangle  $xzq'$  and its angle at  $z$  implies that

$$(4.21) \quad |q'x| \leq |q'z| - |xz|\cos \beta + C_8r\beta.$$

Adding  $|qq'|$  on both sides of (4.21) and using the facts that  $|qx| \leq |qq'| + |q'x|$  and  $|qz| = |qq'| + |q'z|$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (4.22) \quad |qx| &\leq |qq'| + |q'x| \\ &\leq (|qq'| + |q'z|) - |xz|\cos \beta + C_8r\beta \\ &= |qz| - |xz|\cos \beta + C_8r\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Using the triangle inequality, (4.19), (4.10), and the facts that  $|1 - \cos \beta| \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta^2$  and  $|xz| = r$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.23) \quad 0 \leq |qx| + |xz| - |qz| &\leq C_8\beta r + \frac{1}{2}r\beta^2 \\ &\leq C_{12}r(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

with some suitable uniform constant  $C_{12} > 1$ . □



**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold satisfying the bounds (1.1). Then there is a uniform constant  $\widehat{\delta} \in (0, c_2^2)$  such that the following holds for all  $0 < \delta < \widehat{\delta}$ .*

*Let  $p, q, x \in M$  such that  $|pq| > \Lambda^{-1}/2$ ,  $|qx| > \Lambda^{-1}$  and*

$$(4.24) \quad |pq| + |qx| \leq |px| + \delta.$$

*Denote by  $\theta$  the angle of  $\gamma_{q,v}$  and  $[xy]$  at  $x$ . Let  $y \in M$  be such that  $d(y, x) < c_2^2$ . Then there is a uniform constant  $C_{13} > 1$  such that*

$$\left| |xy| \cos \theta - (|xq| - |yq|) \right| \leq C_{13}(|xy|\delta^{1/4} + |xy|^{4/3}).$$

Note that here  $|xy| \cos \theta$  is the inner product of the vector  $\xi \in T_x M$  for which  $\exp_x \xi = y$  and the unit vector  $v \in S_x M$  for which  $\gamma_{x,v}$  coincides with the geodesic  $[xq]$ .




FIGURE 4. An auxiliary figure for Proposition 4.3.

**Proof.** Let  $v \in T_q M$  be the unit vector such that  $[qx]$  is the path  $\gamma_{q,v}([0, \ell])$ ,  $\ell = |qx|$ . Pick a number  $r$  such that  $|xy| \leq r < c_2$ . Let  $z = \gamma_{q,v}(\ell + r)$  and  $q' = \gamma_{q,v}(\ell - r)$ , so that  $|xz| = r$  and  $|xq'| = r$ . Next we use Toponogov's theorem for the triangles  $q'xy$  and  $zxy$ .

Below in this proof, we use the notation  $C$  denoting a generic constant whose exact value can change even inside one formula. The value of each  $C$  can be computed as an explicit function of  $\Lambda$  and  $n$ . Consider the triangle  $q'xy$ , and we see from (3.9) that for  $r < \Lambda^{-1}$ ,

$$|q'y| \leq |xq'| - |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r},$$

where  $C$  is a uniform constant. Then, as  $|qq'| + |xq'| = |qx|$ ,

$$(4.25) \quad |qy| \leq |qq'| + |q'y| \leq |qx| - |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r}.$$

Now considering triangle  $xyz$ , we see from (3.9) that

$$(4.26) \quad |yz| \leq |xz| - |xy| \cos(\pi - \theta) + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r} = |xz| + |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r}.$$

By (4.11),

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} |qx| + |xz| &\leq |qz| + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2} \\ &\leq |qy| + |yz| + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now (4.26) and (4.27) yield

$$\begin{aligned} |qx| + |xz| &\leq |qy| + |yz| + Cr(r^2 + \delta^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq |qy| + (|xz| + |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r}) + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

yielding that, after cancelation of  $|xz|$ ,

$$|qx| \leq |qy| + |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r} + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2},$$

or

$$(4.28) \quad |qx| - |qy| \leq |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r} + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}.$$

Comparing this with (4.25), we obtain

$$|xy| \cos \theta - C \frac{|xy|^2}{r} \leq |qx| - |qy| \leq |xy| \cos \theta + C \frac{|xy|^2}{r} + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}$$

and hence

$$(4.29) \quad \left| (|qx| - |qy|) - |xy| \cos \theta \right| \leq C \frac{|xy|^2}{r} + Cr(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2} =: E.$$

Now we optimize the value of  $r$  so that  $|xy|^2/r \approx r(r^2 + \delta)^{1/2}$  under the requirements that  $|xy| \leq r$  and  $r < c_2$ . First, we consider the case when  $|xy| > \delta^{3/4}$ . Then a good choice is  $|xy|^2 = r^3$ , or  $r = |xy|^{2/3}$  so that  $|xy| < r$ . Then with some uniform constant  $C$ , we have

$$E \leq C \frac{|xy|^2}{|xy|^{2/3}} + C|xy|^{2/3}(2|xy|^{4/3})^{1/2} \leq 4C|xy|^{4/3}.$$

As for the case when  $|xy| \leq \delta^{3/4}$ , a good choice is  $|xy|^2/r = r\delta^{1/2}$ , or  $r = |xy|\delta^{-1/4}$  so that  $|xy| = r\delta^{1/4} < r$  and  $r \leq \delta^{1/2}$ . Then we see that with some uniform constant  $C$ ,

$$E \leq C \frac{|xy|^2}{|xy|\delta^{-1/4}} + C(|xy|\delta^{-1/4})\delta^{1/2} = 2C|xy|\delta^{1/4}.$$

Note that the requirement  $|xy| \leq r$  is valid in both cases above. The requirement that  $r < c_2$  is validated either by the condition  $|xy| < c_2^2$  in the former case, or by the choice  $\delta < c_2^2$  in the latter case. Thus using the above choices of  $r$ , we obtain the estimate

$$E \leq C_{13}(|xy|\delta^{1/4} + |xy|^{4/3}) = C_{13}|xy|(\delta^{1/4} + |xy|^{1/3})$$

with some uniform constant  $C_{13} > 1$ . □

## 5. FINDING DIRECTIONS OF MINIMIZING PATHS

Let  $U \subset M$  be an open subset of a closed Riemannian manifold  $M$  containing a ball  $B(x_0, R)$ , and  $Y = \{y_j\}_{j=0}^J$  be an  $\varepsilon_0$ -net of  $U$ . Suppose we are given an  $\varepsilon_1$ -approximation  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  of  $\mathcal{R}_Y(M)$  in the sense of (1.8). By the definition of Hausdorff distance, for any  $\widehat{r}_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  there exists  $x_i \in M$  such that

$$(5.1) \quad |\widehat{r}_i(y_j) - d(x_i, y_j)| < \varepsilon_1, \quad \text{for all } y_j \in Y.$$

We choose for all  $\widehat{r}_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  some point  $x_i$  satisfying (5.1), and call  $x_i$  a corresponding point to the approximate distance function  $\widehat{r}_i$  (c.f. Definition 2.3). We denote by  $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^I \subset M$  a set of points chosen so that each point  $x_i$  is a corresponding point to an approximate distance function  $\widehat{r}_i \in \ell^\infty(Y)$ . We also denote  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y = \{\widehat{r}_i\}_{i=1}^I$ .

First, we prove a result that improves [46, Lemma 5.1]. Roughly speaking, the lemma states that we can identify the directions of the distance-minimizing path from  $y_1 \in M$  to  $x_1 \in M$  up to a small error, by considering the approximate distance function  $\widehat{r}_1$  corresponding to the point  $x_1$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\text{Sec}_M \geq -\Lambda^2$ . Let  $Y \subset U \subset M$  and  $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ . Suppose we are given an  $\varepsilon_1$ -approximation  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  of  $\mathcal{R}_Y(M)$  in the sense of (1.8). Let  $\widehat{r}_i \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  and let  $x_i \in M$  be the points corresponding to  $\widehat{r}_i$  (c.f. Definition 2.3). Denote by  $\gamma_i(t)$  some distance-minimizing path from  $y_1$  to  $x_i$ , parametrized by arclength. Assume that*

$$(5.2) \quad d(y_1, y_2) \geq \Lambda^{-1}, \quad d(y_1, x_i) \geq \Lambda^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$




FIGURE 5. **Left:** Distance-minimizing paths  $\gamma_i$  in Lemma 5.1; the angles of  $\mu$  and  $\gamma_i$  at  $y_1$  are close to  $\pi$ . **Right:** Setting of Lemma 6.1.

Suppose the following is true for some  $\delta \in (0, 1]$  satisfying  $\delta^2 \geq \varepsilon_1$ :

$$(5.3) \quad |\widehat{r}_i(y_2) - \widehat{r}_i(y_1) - D_Y^a(y_1, y_2)| \leq \delta^2, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Then there are uniform constants  $C_{14}, C_{15} > 1$  such that

$$(5.4) \quad |\dot{\gamma}_1(0) - \dot{\gamma}_2(0)| \leq C_{14}\delta,$$

and

$$(5.5) \quad \left| d(x_1, x_2) - |\widehat{r}_1(y_1) - \widehat{r}_2(y_1)| \right| \leq C_{15}\delta.$$

**Proof.** Due to (5.1) and (3.7) and  $\varepsilon_1 \leq \delta^2$ , the condition (5.3) implies that

$$(5.6) \quad |d(x_i, y_2) - d(x_i, y_1) - d(y_1, y_2)| \leq 5\delta^2, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Let  $\mu(t)$  be a distance-minimizing geodesic of  $M$  from  $y_1$  to  $y_2$ , i.e.  $\mu(0) = y_1$ ,  $\mu(d(y_1, y_2)) = y_2$ . Denote by  $\alpha_i > 0$  the angle between  $\dot{\gamma}_i(0)$  and  $\dot{\mu}(0)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Now we show that  $\alpha_i$  is close to  $\pi$ .

We restrict our attention to  $i = 1$ ; the case of  $i = 2$  follows in the same way. Let us use a shortcut argument. Pick  $z_1 \in [y_1 x_1]$ ,  $z_2 \in [y_1 y_2]$  such that  $d(y_1, z_1) = d(y_1, z_2) = \Lambda^{-1}/2$ . Applying Toponogov's theorem (3.10), we have

$$(5.7) \quad d(z_1, z_2) \leq d(z_1, y_1) + d(y_1, z_2) - \Lambda^{-1}C_7(\pi - \alpha_1)^2.$$

Then by the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_1, y_2) &\leq d(x_1, z_1) + d(z_1, z_2) + d(z_2, y_2) \\ &\leq d(x_1, z_1) + d(z_2, y_2) + d(z_1, y_1) + d(y_1, z_2) - \Lambda^{-1}C_7(\pi - \alpha_1)^2 \\ &= d(x_1, y_1) + d(y_1, y_2) - \Lambda^{-1}C_7(\pi - \alpha_1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, (5.6) gives

$$d(x_1, y_1) + d(y_1, y_2) \leq d(x_1, y_2) + 5\delta^2.$$

Hence,

$$(5.8) \quad |\pi - \alpha_i| \leq (5\Lambda C_7^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Denote by  $\alpha$  the angle between  $\dot{\gamma}_1(0)$  and  $\dot{\gamma}_2(0)$ . Then for suitable  $C_{14} > 1$ ,

$$(5.9) \quad |\dot{\gamma}_1(0) - \dot{\gamma}_2(0)| \leq \alpha \leq |\pi - \alpha_1| + |\pi - \alpha_2| \leq C_{14}\delta.$$

For the second claim, since  $\gamma_i(d(x_i, y_1)) = x_i$ , Lemma A.1 and (5.9) yield that

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_1, x_2) &\leq |d(x_1, y_1) - d(x_2, y_1)| + C_A \alpha \\ (5.10) \quad &\leq |d(x_1, y_1) - d(x_2, y_1)| + C_A C_{14} \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Then the second claim follows from (5.1) and the choice  $\varepsilon_1 \leq \delta^2$ .  $\square$

Observe that if there are several distance-minimizing paths from  $y_1$  to  $x_i$ , the estimate (5.4) remains valid for each pair.

Let  $\hat{r}_{i_0}$  be given and let  $x_{i_0}$  be such that  $\|r_{x_{i_0}} - \hat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} < \varepsilon_1$ . We consider the elements  $\hat{r}_\ell \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ ,  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, L$  for which

$$(5.11) \quad \|\hat{r}_\ell - \hat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} \leq \rho_0,$$

where  $\rho_0$  is a sufficiently small uniform constant to be determined later.

We will frequently use the following notation

$$(5.12) \quad N_\epsilon(r) := B(x_0, r + \epsilon) \setminus B(x_0, r - \epsilon).$$

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\text{Sec}_M \geq -\Lambda^2$ , and  $U \subset M$  be an open subset containing  $B(x_0, R)$  with  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$ . Let  $Y$  be an  $\varepsilon_0$ -net of  $U$ , and  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  be an  $\varepsilon_1$ -approximation of  $\mathcal{R}_Y(M)$  in the sense of (1.8). Then the following statements hold for  $0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1 < \min\{1/16, \Lambda^{-1}/32\}$ .*

- (1) *Let  $x_{i_0}, x_\ell$  be the points corresponding to  $\hat{r}_{i_0}, \hat{r}_\ell$  (c.f. Definition 2.3). Suppose  $\hat{r}_{i_0}, \hat{r}_\ell$  satisfies the following conditions:*

$$(5.13) \quad \|\hat{r}_\ell - \hat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} < \rho_0 < \min\left\{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{\Lambda^{-1}}{16}\right\}.$$

*Assume we are given  $y_0 \in Y$  such that  $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon_0$ . Then there is a uniform constant  $C_{15} > 1$  such that*

$$d(x_\ell, x_{i_0}) \leq 3C_{15} \left( \|\hat{r}_\ell - \hat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} + 3\varepsilon_1 \right)^{1/2}.$$

- (2) *The set  $X$  is an  $\varepsilon_2$ -net of  $M$ , where  $\varepsilon_2 = C_0 \varepsilon_1^{1/2}$  for some uniform constant  $C_0 > 1$ .*

**Proof.** (1) Let us keep the parameter  $R$  in the proof for clarity, and note that any dependency of  $R$  in the constants can be replaced by  $\Lambda$  using the condition  $\Lambda^{-1} < R \leq \Lambda$ . We divide into two cases depending on where  $x_{i_0}$  lies.

- *Case 1:  $\hat{r}_{i_0}(y_0) > R/2$ .*

Since  $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ , then  $d(x_{i_0}, x_0) > R/2 - 2\varepsilon_1$ . We take an arbitrary point  $p \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$ . The minimizing geodesic from  $x_{i_0}$  to  $p$  intersects with  $\Sigma_{R/4}$  at some point  $q'$ , and we take a point  $q \in Y$  such that  $d(q, q') < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ . As a consequence,  $q \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/4) \cap Y$ . Thus (5.13) and  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$  yield

$$(5.14) \quad d(p, q) > \frac{R}{16}, \quad d(q, x_{i_0}) > \frac{R}{8}, \quad d(q, x_\ell) > \frac{R}{16}.$$

Moreover, by the triangle inequality,

$$(5.15) \quad d(p, x_{i_0}) = d(p, q') + d(q', x_{i_0}) \geq d(p, q) + d(q, x_{i_0}) - 2\varepsilon_1.$$

From (5.15), (5.1) and (3.7), we see that

$$(5.16) \quad |\hat{r}_{i_0}(p) - \hat{r}_{i_0}(q) - D_Y^a(p, q)| < 6\varepsilon_1.$$

Then pass to  $\hat{r}_\ell$ ,

$$(5.17) \quad |\hat{r}_\ell(p) - \hat{r}_\ell(q) - D_Y^a(p, q)| < 2\|\hat{r}_\ell - \hat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} + 6\varepsilon_1.$$

Hence the assumptions of Lemma 5.1 are satisfied with

$$\delta^2 = 2\|\widehat{r}_\ell - \widehat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} + 6\varepsilon_1,$$

which satisfies  $\delta^2 > \varepsilon_1$  and  $\delta < 1$  when  $\rho_0 < 1/4$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{i_0}, x_\ell) &\leq |\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q)| + C_{15}(2\|\widehat{r}_\ell - \widehat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} + 6\varepsilon_1)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 3C_{15}(\|\widehat{r}_\ell - \widehat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} + 3\varepsilon_1)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

• *Case 2:*  $\widehat{r}_{i_0}(y_0) \leq R/2$ .

In this case,  $d(x_{i_0}, x_0) \leq R/2 + 2\varepsilon_1$ . To keep distances bounded away from zero, one can choose points  $p, q$  from the outer layer  $B(x_0, R) \setminus B(x_0, 3R/4)$ . More precisely, we take an arbitrary point  $p \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R) \cap Y$ . The minimizing geodesic from  $x_{i_0}$  to  $p$  intersects with  $\Sigma_{3R/4}$  at some point  $q'$ , and we take a point  $q \in Y$  such that  $d(q, q') < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ . As a consequence,  $q \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(3R/4) \cap Y$ . Thus the bounds in (5.14) still hold. Then the exact proof of Case 1 works in this case. This concludes the proof of the first claim.

(2) For any  $x \in M$ , there exists  $\widehat{r} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  such that  $\|r_x - \widehat{r}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} \leq \varepsilon_1$  by (1.8). Let  $x' \in M$  be a point corresponding to  $\widehat{r}$ , i.e. satisfying  $\|r_{x'} - \widehat{r}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} \leq \varepsilon_1$ . Then it follows that

$$(5.18) \quad \|r_x - r_{x'}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} \leq 2\varepsilon_1.$$

If  $x \in U$ , then there exists  $y \in Y$  such that  $d(x, y) < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ , and hence  $d(x', y) < 3\varepsilon_1$  by (5.18). Thus  $d(x, x') < 4\varepsilon_1$ .

If  $x \in M \setminus U$ , we take an arbitrary point  $p \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/4) \cap Y$ . The minimizing geodesic from  $x$  to  $p$  intersects with  $\Sigma_{R/2}$  at some point  $q'$ , and we take a point  $q \in Y$  such that  $d(q, q') < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$ . As a consequence,  $q \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/2) \cap Y$ . Similarly as (1), by the triangle inequality,

$$(5.19) \quad d(p, x) \geq d(p, q) + d(q, x) - 2\varepsilon_1,$$

and by (5.18),

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} d(p, x') &\geq d(p, x) - 2\varepsilon_1 \geq d(p, q) + d(q, x) - 4\varepsilon_1 \\ &\geq d(p, q) + d(q, x') - 6\varepsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the condition (5.6) is satisfied. Since  $d(p, q)$ ,  $d(q, x)$ ,  $d(q, x')$  are all bounded below by  $R/8$  by construction, one can repeat the proof of Lemma 5.1 from (5.19) and (5.20). In the end, we get the same conclusion as (5.10), namely

$$(5.21) \quad d(x, x') \leq |d(x, q) - d(x', q)| + C_{15}\varepsilon_1^{1/2},$$

which shows  $d(x, x') \leq 2\varepsilon_1 + C_{15}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}$  by (5.18).  $\square$

**Remark.** One also has the other direction of Proposition 5.2(1):

$$(5.22) \quad \|\widehat{r}_\ell - \widehat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} \leq d(x_\ell, x_{i_0}) + 2\varepsilon_1,$$

which holds without any assumption on the parameters. The proof is straightforward by the triangle inequality.

## 6. EXISTENCE OF A FRAME ASSOCIATED WITH MEASUREMENT POINTS

We start with the following observation on geodesics connecting a point  $x \in M$  to points near spheres  $\Sigma_r := \partial B(x_0, r)$ . We denote

$$(6.1) \quad N_\epsilon(r) := B(x_0, r + \epsilon) \setminus B(x_0, r - \epsilon).$$

For  $x, y \in M$ , we denote  $|xy| = d(x, y)$ , and denote by  $[xy]$  a distance-minimizing geodesic from  $x$  to  $y$ . The angle between  $[xy]$  and  $[xz]$  at  $x$  is denoted by  $\angle yxz$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded by  $\text{Sec}_M \geq -\Lambda^2$ . Let  $B(x_0, R)$  be an open ball with  $R < \text{inj}(M)/2$ . Then there exist uniform constants  $\widehat{\varepsilon}, c_3, C_{16} > 0$  explicitly depending on  $\Lambda, R$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon < \widehat{\varepsilon}$ .*

*Given a point  $x$  with  $d(x, x_0) \geq 2R$ , take  $p_0$  to be a nearest point in  $B(x_0, R)$  from  $x$ . Let  $p_1, p_2 \in N_\varepsilon(R)$  such that*

$$(6.2) \quad |p_1 p_2| \geq C_{17} \varepsilon, \quad |p_0 p_1| < c_3, \quad |p_0 p_2| < c_3,$$

*for some  $C_{17} \geq 5$ . Then*

- (1)  $\angle p_1 x p_2 > C_{16} C_{17} \varepsilon$ .
- (2) Let  $q_1 \in [xp_1]$ ,  $q_2 \in [xp_2]$  such that  $|xq_1| > R/2$  and  $|xq_2| > R/2$ . Then  $|q_1 q_2| > RC_{16} C_{17} \varepsilon/4$ .

**Proof.** (1) Suppose  $|xp_1| \leq |xp_2|$ . By the triangle inequality,

$$|xx_0| = |xp_0| + R \geq |xp_1| - c_3 + |x_0 p_1| - \varepsilon.$$

Then by a shortcut argument using Lemma 3.1(2), similar to (4.14), we have

$$(6.3) \quad (\pi - \eta_1)^2 \leq C_7^{-1}(c_3 + \varepsilon),$$

where  $\eta_1 \in [0, \pi]$  is the angle between  $[p_1 x]$  and  $[p_1 x_0]$  at  $p_1$ . We choose  $c_3, \varepsilon$  such that  $\pi - \eta_1 \in [0, \pi/6]$ .

Moreover, we can choose sufficiently small  $c_3$  depending on  $\Lambda, R$ , such that the angle  $\angle x_0 p_1 p_2$  is bounded below by  $\pi/3$ . This can be proved as follows. Applying Lemma 3.1(1) to the triangle  $x_0 p_1 p_2$ , one has

$$2\varepsilon \geq |x_0 p_1| - |x_0 p_2| \geq |p_1 p_2| \cos(\angle x_0 p_1 p_2) - C_6 \max\{\Lambda, R^{-1}\} |p_1 p_2|^2.$$

Then using the condition (6.2),

$$(6.4) \quad \cos(\angle x_0 p_1 p_2) \leq 2\varepsilon |p_1 p_2|^{-1} + C_6 \max\{\Lambda, R^{-1}\} |p_1 p_2| < \frac{2}{5} + C(\Lambda, R) 2c_3.$$

The above shows that we can choose sufficiently small  $c_3, \varepsilon$ , such that the angle  $\angle x p_1 p_2$  satisfies

$$(6.5) \quad \angle x p_1 p_2 \leq \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \pi - \eta_1\right) + \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\pi}{3}\right) \leq \frac{5}{6}\pi.$$

Next, we apply Lemma 3.1(1) to the triangle  $x p_1 p_2$  and use (6.5) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |xp_2| &\leq |xp_1| - |p_1 p_2| \cos(\angle x p_1 p_2) + C_6 \max\{\Lambda, R^{-1}\} |p_1 p_2|^2 \\ &\leq |xp_1| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |p_1 p_2| + C_6 \max\{\Lambda, R^{-1}\} |p_1 p_2|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $|p_1 p_2| < 2c_3$ , we obtain for sufficiently small  $c_3$ ,

$$(6.6) \quad |xp_2| - |xp_1| \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |p_1 p_2| + C_6 \max\{\Lambda, R^{-1}\} |p_1 p_2|^2 < \frac{9}{10} |p_1 p_2|.$$

Thus by Lemma A.1 and (6.6), we obtain

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} |p_1 p_2| &\leq |xp_2| - |xp_1| + C_A \angle p_1 x p_2 \\ &< \frac{9}{10} |p_1 p_2| + C_A \angle p_1 x p_2, \end{aligned}$$

which proves part (1) due to  $|p_1 p_2| \geq C_{17} \varepsilon$ , with  $C_{16} = (10C_A)^{-1}$ .

(2) Consider the triangle  $x p_1 p_2$  and denote its comparison triangle in the hyperbolic plane of constant sectional curvature  $-\Lambda^2$  by  $\overline{x p_1 p_2}$ , i.e.  $|xp_1| = |\overline{x p_1}|$ ,  $|xp_2| = |\overline{x p_2}|$ ,  $|p_1 p_2| = |\overline{p_1 p_2}|$ . The angle at  $\overline{x}$  of this comparison triangle is denoted by  $\angle \overline{p_1 x p_2}$ . Since the inequalities (6.6) and (6.7) are also valid for the comparison triangle  $\overline{x p_1 p_2}$ , it also holds that  $\angle \overline{p_1 x p_2} > C_{16} C_{17} \varepsilon$

in the comparison triangle. By the angle-sidelength monotonicity version of Toponogov's theorem (e.g. [4, Theorem 7.3.2]), the function  $(|xq_1|, |xq_2|) \mapsto \overline{Z}_{q_1}xq_2$  is decreasing in both arguments. Hence

$$(6.8) \quad \overline{Z}_{q_1}xq_2 \geq \overline{Z}_{p_1}xp_2 > C_{16}C_{17}\varepsilon.$$

Then in the comparison triangle  $\overline{xq_1q_2}$ , by (A.5) and (6.8),

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh(\Lambda|\overline{q_1q_2}|) &= \cosh(\Lambda|\overline{xq_1}|) \cosh(\Lambda|\overline{xq_2}|) - \sinh(\Lambda|\overline{xq_1}|) \sinh(\Lambda|\overline{xq_2}|) \cos(\overline{Z}_{q_1}xq_2) \\ &= \cosh(\Lambda|xq_1| - \Lambda|xq_2|) + \sinh(\Lambda|xq_1|) \sinh(\Lambda|xq_2|) (1 - \cos(\overline{Z}_{q_1}xq_2)) \\ &> 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2 R^2}{4} (1 - \cos(C_{16}C_{17}\varepsilon)) \\ &\geq 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2 R^2}{4} \frac{1}{4} (C_{16}C_{17}\varepsilon)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\cosh(\Lambda|\overline{q_1q_2}|) = \cosh(\Lambda|q_1q_2|) \leq 1 + \Lambda^2|q_1q_2|^2$  for small  $|q_1q_2|$ , the second claim follows.  $\square$

Given a point  $x \in M$  bounded away from the ball  $B(x_0, R)$  and an  $\varepsilon$ -net of  $N_\varepsilon(R)$ , we consider all the unit initial vectors of minimizing geodesics from  $x$  to points in the  $\varepsilon$ -net. The following lemma shows that there exist  $n$  such unit vectors so that the corresponding determinant is bounded away from zero.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded by  $|Sec_M| \leq \Lambda^2$ . Let  $B(x_0, R)$  be an open ball for  $R < \text{inj}(M)/2$ , and  $Y$  be an  $\varepsilon$ -net of  $B(x_0, R)$ . Given a point  $x$  with  $d(x, x_0) \geq R$ , take  $p_0$  to be a nearest point in  $B(x_0, R/2)$  from  $x$ . Then for every  $C_{17} \geq 5$ , there are uniform constants  $\hat{\varepsilon}, c_1, c_3 > 0$  explicitly depending on  $n, \Lambda, R, C_{17}$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon < \hat{\varepsilon}$ .*

*We can find a separated set  $\{p_{j(l)} : l = 1, 2, \dots, L\} \subset Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2)$  satisfying*

$$(6.9) \quad |p_{j(l)}p_{j(m)}| \geq C_{17}\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } l \neq m, \text{ and } |p_0p_{j(l)}| < c_3,$$

*such that the following statement is true: there exist  $n$  unit vectors  $w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_n}$  such that the volume of the simplex in  $T_x M$  with the vertices  $0, w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_n}$  is larger than  $c_1$ , where  $w_l \in S_x M$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$  is the unit initial vector of a minimizing geodesic in  $M$  from  $x$  to  $p_{j(l)}$ .*

**Proof.** Let us take  $C_{17} = 10$  for the sake of argument. First, we choose a suitable separated set. We can choose a separated set of  $Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2)$  satisfying the condition (6.9) such that it is also a  $11\varepsilon$ -net. Namely, first pick any point, say  $p_1$ , from  $Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2)$ , and then take all points  $p_2, \dots, p_l$  in  $Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2)$  with distance at least  $10\varepsilon$  away from  $p_1$ . For the second step, pick all points with distance at least  $10\varepsilon$  from all of  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_l$ . Repeat this procedure and the procedure stops in finite steps. The chosen points form a  $11\varepsilon$ -net of  $N_\varepsilon(R/2)$ . Indeed, for any  $z \in N_\varepsilon(R/2)$ , there exists a point  $y \in Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2)$  such that  $d(y, z) < \varepsilon$  by the  $\varepsilon$ -net condition for  $Y$ . If  $y$  is also chosen by our procedure above, then we are done. If  $y$  is not chosen, it means that there must be at least one chosen point  $p_m$  such that  $d(y, p_m) < 10\varepsilon$  otherwise  $y$  would have been chosen. In such case, we have  $d(z, p_m) \leq d(z, y) + d(y, p_m) < 11\varepsilon$ .

The separated set of our choice above satisfying the condition (6.9) has cardinality at least

$$(6.10) \quad L \geq C(n, \Lambda)c_3\varepsilon^{-(n-1)}.$$

Indeed, the separated set that we chose above is a  $11\varepsilon$ -net of the set  $N_\varepsilon(R/2) \cap B(p_0, c_3)$ , and the latter set has volume bounded below. More precisely,

$$C(n)(11\varepsilon)^n L \geq \text{vol}_n(N_\varepsilon(R/2) \cap B(p_0, c_3)) \geq C(n, \Lambda)c_3\varepsilon,$$

which yields the lower bound (6.10).



On the other hand, by Lemma 6.1(1), the set  $\{w_l\}_{l=1}^L \subset S_x M$  of unit vectors is  $C_{16}\varepsilon$ -separated. We claim that we can choose sufficiently small  $h$  explicitly depending on  $n, \Lambda, c_3$ , such that for any unit vector  $\xi \in S_x M \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$(6.11) \quad \{w_l\}_{l=1}^L \not\subset \{v \in S_x M : \langle v, \xi \rangle_g \in (-h, h)\}.$$

The claim (6.11) can be proved as follows. Suppose (6.11) is not true: there exists  $\xi$  such that  $\{w_l\}_{l=1}^L \subset A(\xi, h)$ , where  $A(\xi, h)$  denotes the set on the right-hand side of (6.11). Since  $\{w_l\}_{l=1}^L \subset S_x M$  is  $C_{16}\varepsilon$ -separated, this implies

$$C(n)(C_{16}\varepsilon)^{n-1}L \leq \text{vol}_{n-1}(A(\xi, h)).$$

However, the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional volume of  $A(\xi, h)$  is bounded above by  $C(n)h$ . Hence (6.10) yields

$$C(n, \Lambda)c_3 \leq C(n)(C_{16}\varepsilon)^{n-1}L \leq \text{vol}_{n-1}(A(\xi, h)) \leq C(n)h,$$

which cannot be true if  $h < C(n, \Lambda)c_3$ . The claim (6.11) is proved.

Thus we can construct the desired  $w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_n}$  as follows. Let  $w_{l_1}$  be chosen arbitrarily. Then when  $w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_k}$  are chosen, let  $\xi$  be a unit vector orthogonal to  $w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_k}$ . From the claim (6.11), there exists  $w_{l_{k+1}}$  such that  $w_{l_{k+1}} \notin A(\xi, h)$  with  $h$  properly chosen as above. In other words, the angle between  $w_{l_{k+1}}$  and the linear subspace spanned by  $w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_k}$  is bounded below by  $h$ . Hence the simplex with vertices  $0, w_{l_1}, \dots, w_{l_k}, w_{l_{k+1}}$  has volume bounded below by  $C(n, h)$ .  $\square$

In other words, there exist  $n$  unit vectors in  $\{w_l\}_{l=1}^L$  such that the corresponding determinant  $\det([\langle w_k, w_m \rangle_g]_{k,m=1}^n) > c_1$ .

The next lemma is a technical modification of the previous lemma.

**Lemma 6.3.** *Under the setting of Lemma 6.2, there are uniform constants  $\widehat{\varepsilon}, c_1, c_3, c_4 > 0$  explicitly depending on  $n, \Lambda, R$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon < \widehat{\varepsilon}$ .*

*Let  $\{p_{j(l)} : l = 1, 2, \dots, L\} \subset Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2)$  be a choice of points satisfying the condition (6.9) for sufficiently large  $C_{17}$ . For each  $l$ , suppose a minimizing geodesic  $[xp_{j(l)}]$  intersects with  $\partial B(R/2 + c_4)$  at  $q'_{j(l)}$ , and we take  $q_{j(l)} \in Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R/2 + c_4)$  to be a point in  $Y$  such that  $|q'_{j(l)}q_{j(l)}| < \varepsilon$ .*

*Then we have*

$$(6.12) \quad |q_{j(l)}q_{j(m)}| \geq 10\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } l \neq m, \text{ and } |p_0q_{j(l)}| < 2c_3.$$

*As a consequence, there exist  $n$  unit vectors  $v_{l_1}, \dots, v_{l_n}$  such that the volume of the simplex in  $T_x M$  with the vertices  $0, v_{l_1}, \dots, v_{l_n}$  is larger than  $c_1$ , where  $v_l \in S_x M$ ,  $l = 1, 2, \dots, L$  is the unit initial vector of a minimizing geodesic in  $M$  from  $x$  to  $q_{j(l)}$ .*

**Proof.** Fix the parameters  $\widehat{\varepsilon}, c_3$  as chosen in Lemma 6.2. Let us consider two points  $p_1, p_2$  in the maximal set constructed in Lemma 6.2 with  $C_{17}$  to be determined later. The intersection of  $[xp_1], [xp_2]$  with  $\partial B(R/2 + c_4)$  is  $q'_1, q'_2$ . By Lemma 6.1(2),  $|q'_1q'_2| > RC_{16}C_{17}\varepsilon/4$ . When we take the points  $q_1, q_2$  in the  $\varepsilon$ -net, we have

$$(6.13) \quad |q_1q_2| > \left(\frac{RC_{16}C_{17}}{4} - 2\right)\varepsilon.$$

Then we can choose  $C_{17} = 48R^{-1}C_{16}^{-1}$  so that  $|q_1q_2| > 10\varepsilon$ . Furthermore, since the incident angle is bounded by (6.3), we can choose sufficiently small  $c_4 > 0$  such that  $|p_1q'_1|$  is bounded by  $c_3/2$ . Hence  $|p_0q_1| < 2c_3$ . This proves the claim (6.12).

Let  $q_0$  be the intersection of  $[xp_0]$  with  $\partial B(R/2 + c_4)$ , and hence  $q_0$  is a nearest point in  $B(R/2 + c_4)$  from  $x$ . Moreover,  $|q_0q_1| < 3c_3$  if we choose  $c_4 < c_3$ . Thus the condition (6.2) in Lemma 6.1 is satisfied by the triangle  $xq_1q_2$ , which gives  $\angle q_1xq_2 > C_{16}\varepsilon$ . Observe that the total number of points  $\{q_{j(l)}\}$  is equal to the total number  $L$  of points  $\{p_{j(l)}\}$ , because of  $\{q_{j(l)}\}$  being  $10\varepsilon$ -separated. The total number  $L$  is bounded below by (6.10). Then the

same argument yields (6.11) for  $\{v_l\}_{l=1}^L$ , and the second claim follows from the last part of the proof of Lemma 6.2.  $\square$

**Remark 5.4.** Lemma 6.1(1) is also true if  $x$  is inside the ball, say  $x \in B(x_0, R/2)$ , assuming two-side bounds on the sectional curvature  $|\text{Sec}_M| \leq \Lambda^2$ . The proof is similar and can be found in Lemma A.3. As a consequence, Lemma 6.2 is still valid by the same argument if  $x \in B(x_0, R/2)$ , in which case we can find the desired separated set in  $Y \cap N_\varepsilon(R)$ . We will use this observation in the next section.

## 7. LOCAL RECONSTRUCTIONS FROM PARTIAL DISTANCE DATA

This section is the proof of Theorem 2.4 and consequently Corollary 2.5. Let  $x_i \in M$  be the points corresponding to  $\hat{r}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, I$ , i.e. satisfying (5.1). Let us fix one element  $\hat{r}_{i_0} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  and the corresponding point  $x_{i_0} \in M$ . The basic idea of the proof is to find appropriate points in  $B(x_0, R) \subset U$ , and apply geometric lemmas in previous sections to approximate the inner product. One important point is to keep distances of points bounded away from zero, as required by previous lemmas. This is possible because we assumed the knowledge of a point  $y_0 \in Y$  such that  $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon_0$ . This assumption enables us to determine where  $x_{i_0}$  lies in reference to  $B(x_0, R)$  up to a small error. Furthermore, it is possible to use only part of all measurement points in the ball. This allows us to simply take, for example  $R = (4\Lambda)^{-1}$ , and only consider the measurement points in  $Y$  within this smaller ball. In the proof, we keep the parameter  $R$  for clarity, and note that any dependency of  $R$  in the constants can be replaced by  $\Lambda$ .

We divide the proof of Theorem 2.4 into two cases depending on where  $x_{i_0}$  lies, in a similar way as we considered in Proposition 5.2(1). We will focus on the first case, as the second case is a simple modification from the first case.

**Case 1:**  $\hat{r}_{i_0}(y_0) > R/2$ .

Let us set

$$(7.1) \quad 0 < \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1 < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{16}, \frac{R}{32} \right\}.$$

We consider the elements  $\hat{r}_\ell \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  in the neighborhood of  $\hat{r}_{i_0}$ ,

$$(7.2) \quad \|\hat{r}_\ell - \hat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} < \rho_0, \quad \rho_0 < \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{R}{16} \right\},$$

with the parameter  $\rho_0$  to be determined later. Let  $x_\ell \in M$  be a point corresponding to  $\hat{r}_\ell$ .

• *Step 1: Applying first variation formula.*

The condition  $\hat{r}_{i_0}(y_0) > R/2$  implies that  $d(x_{i_0}, x_0) > R/2 - 2\varepsilon_1$ . For an arbitrary point  $p \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$ , we pick a point  $q \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/4) \cap Y$  such that

$$(7.3) \quad |\hat{r}_{i_0}(p) - \hat{r}_{i_0}(q) - D_Y^a(p, q)| < 6\varepsilon_1.$$

Recall  $D_Y^a$  defined in (3.4). It is clear that condition (7.3) can be tested using the given data  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  only. Observe that the set of points  $q$  (for each  $p$ ) satisfying (7.3) is nonempty. This is because the point in  $Y$  within  $\varepsilon_0$ -distance from the intersection of a minimizing geodesic  $[x_{i_0}p]$  with  $\Sigma_{R/4}$  satisfies the condition (7.3) due to (5.15) and (5.16). In particular, the following bounds are valid:

$$(7.4) \quad d(p, q) > \frac{R}{16}, \quad d(q, x_{i_0}) > \frac{R}{8}, \quad d(q, x_\ell) > \frac{R}{16}.$$

Moreover, by (7.3), (5.1), (3.7), and (3.8) we see that

$$(7.5) \quad |d(x_{i_0}, p) - d(x_{i_0}, q) - d(p, q)| \leq 10\varepsilon_1.$$

Hence the assumptions of Proposition 4.3 are satisfied when  $\varepsilon_1 < \widehat{\delta}/10$ .

By Proposition 5.2(1), we know

$$(7.6) \quad d(x_\ell, x_{i_0}) \leq 3C_{15}(\|\widehat{r}_\ell - \widehat{r}_{i_0}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} + 3\varepsilon_1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence if we choose  $\rho_0$  in (7.2) such that

$$(7.7) \quad 3C_{15}(\rho_0 + 3\varepsilon_1)^{1/2} < c_2^2,$$

we can apply Proposition 4.3 (with  $x = x_{i_0}$ ,  $y = x_\ell$ ) and obtain

$$(7.8) \quad \left| \langle \xi_\ell, v \rangle_g - (|x_{i_0}q| - |x_\ell q|) \right| \leq C_{13}|x_{i_0}x_\ell|(\varepsilon_1^{1/4} + |x_{i_0}x_\ell|^{1/3}),$$

where  $\xi_\ell = \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_\ell)$  (of length  $|x_{i_0}x_\ell|$ ), and  $v$  is the unit initial vector of  $[x_{i_0}q]$ . Then using (5.1), we have

$$(7.9) \quad \left| \langle \xi_\ell, v \rangle_g - (\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q)) \right| \leq C_{13}|x_{i_0}x_\ell|(\varepsilon_1^{1/4} + |x_{i_0}x_\ell|^{1/3}) + 2\varepsilon_1.$$

• *Step 2: Finding the length  $|x_{i_0}x_\ell|$ .*

We aim to construct an approximate inner product to the actual one, i.e. the first term in (7.9). However, the first term  $\langle \xi_\ell, v \rangle_g$  involves the length  $|\xi_\ell|_g = |x_{i_0}x_\ell|$ , which cannot be exactly computed from the data  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$ . What we can do is to use Lemma 5.1 to approximate it.

Let us take a small parameter  $s$  whose value is determined later:

$$(7.10) \quad s \in (\varepsilon_1^{1/2}, \frac{\rho_0}{2}).$$

Let  $p \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$  be arbitrary, and let  $q \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/4) \cap Y$  be chosen according to the condition (7.3). Now we choose an element  $\widehat{r}_\ell \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  satisfying (7.2) such that the following conditions (7.11) and (7.12) hold:

$$(7.11) \quad |\widehat{r}_\ell(p) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q) - D_Y^a(p, q)| \leq 9\varepsilon_1,$$

$$(7.12) \quad |\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - (\widehat{r}_\ell(q) + s)| \leq 9\varepsilon_1.$$

In fact, as we will later specify our choice  $s = \varepsilon_1^{3/8}$ , we can actually choose this  $\widehat{r}_\ell$  from  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\widehat{r}_{i_0}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$ . Indeed, considering (5.22), it is straightforward to check that the element in  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\widehat{r}_{i_0}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$  corresponding to  $\gamma_{x_{i_0}, w}(s)$  satisfies these two conditions above, where  $w$  is the unit initial vector of  $[x_{i_0}p]$ . Essentially, these conditions can be understood as a test to search for  $\gamma_{x_{i_0}, w}(s)$  up to a small error, see Figure 6.

Next, let us discuss the properties of such  $\widehat{r}_\ell$  satisfying the criteria (7.11) and (7.12). Due to Lemma 5.1, (7.3) and (7.11) imply that

$$(7.13) \quad \left| |x_{i_0}x_\ell| - |\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q)| \right| \leq 3C_{15}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

Hence (7.13), (7.12) and (5.1) yield for some suitable  $C_{18} > 1$ ,

$$(7.14) \quad \left| |x_{i_0}x_\ell| - s \right| \leq C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2},$$

$$(7.15) \quad \left| |x_{i_0}x_\ell| - (|x_{i_0}q| - |x_\ell q|) \right| \leq C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore, let  $\gamma_{x_{i_0}, v}(\cdot)$  be a minimizing geodesic from  $x_{i_0}$  to  $q$ , and  $\xi_\ell = \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_\ell)$ . We claim that for some uniform constant  $C'_{19} > 1$ ,

$$(7.16) \quad d(\gamma_{x_{i_0}, v}(s), x_\ell) \leq C'_{19}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

This claim can be proved as follows. Denote  $z' = \gamma_{x_{i_0}, v}(s)$  and observe that  $z'$  is on a minimizing geodesic from  $x_{i_0}$  to  $q$ . Due to the fact that

$$d(x_{i_0}, p) - d(x_{i_0}, q) \leq d(x_{i_0}, z') + d(z', p) - d(x_{i_0}, z') - d(z', q) = d(z', p) - d(z', q),$$

the inequality (7.5) is still valid after replacing  $x_{i_0}$  with  $z' = \gamma_{x_{i_0}, v}(s)$ , that is,

$$(7.17) \quad |d(z', p) - d(z', q) - d(p, q)| \leq 10\varepsilon_1.$$

Thus Lemma 5.1 (with  $x_1 = z'$ ,  $x_2 = x_\ell$ ) and (7.11) yield that

$$|d(z', x_\ell) - |d(z', q) - d(x_\ell, q)|| \leq C_{15}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} d(z', q) - d(x_\ell, q) &= |z'q| + |x_{i_0}z'| - (|x_\ell q| + |x_{i_0}x_\ell|) + |x_{i_0}x_\ell| - |x_{i_0}z'| \\ &= |x_{i_0}q| - (|x_\ell q| + |x_{i_0}x_\ell|) + (|x_{i_0}x_\ell| - s), \end{aligned}$$

then the claim (7.16) follows from (7.14) and (7.15).

As a consequence, by applying the Rauch comparison theorem (see e.g. [69]) for  $\text{Sec}_M \leq \Lambda^2$  (in a neighborhood of  $x_{i_0}$ ), (7.16) yields that for some  $C_{19} > 1$ ,

$$(7.18) \quad |\xi_\ell - sv| \leq C_{19}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

• *Step 3: Approximating the inner product.*

Denote by  $s_0, s_1$  the lower and upper bounds for  $|x_{i_0}x_\ell|$ . From (7.14), we set

$$(7.19) \quad s_0 := s - C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}, \quad s_1 := s + C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

We require that  $s > 2C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}$  so that  $s_0 > 0$  and  $s_1 < 2s$ . Observe that (7.14) yields

$$(7.20) \quad \left| \langle \xi_\ell, v \rangle_g - s \langle \frac{\xi_\ell}{|\xi_\ell|_g}, v \rangle_g \right| = \left| |x_{i_0}x_\ell| \langle \frac{\xi_\ell}{|\xi_\ell|_g}, v \rangle_g - s \langle \frac{\xi_\ell}{|\xi_\ell|_g}, v \rangle_g \right| \leq C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

Then (7.9) gives

$$(7.21) \quad \left| s \langle \frac{\xi_\ell}{|\xi_\ell|_g}, v \rangle_g - (\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q)) \right| \leq C_{13}s_1(\varepsilon_1^{1/4} + s_1^{1/3}) + (C_{18} + 2)\varepsilon_1^{1/2}.$$

Hence dividing by  $s$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \frac{\xi_\ell}{|\xi_\ell|_g}, v \rangle_g - \frac{1}{s}(\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q)) \right| &\leq C_{13}s_1(\varepsilon_1^{1/4} + s_1^{1/3})s^{-1} + (C_{18} + 2)\varepsilon_1^{1/2}s^{-1} \\ &\leq 4(C_{13} + C_{18} + 2)s^{-1}(\varepsilon_1^{1/2} + \varepsilon_1^{1/4}s + s^{4/3}). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain a good estimate when we choose

$$(7.22) \quad s = \varepsilon_1^{3/8}.$$

Note that when  $\varepsilon_1$  is sufficiently small, the requirement that  $s > 2C_{18}\varepsilon_1^{1/2}$  is satisfied. In such case, we have the estimate

$$(7.23) \quad \left| \langle \frac{\xi_\ell}{|\xi_\ell|_g}, v \rangle_g - \frac{1}{s}(\widehat{r}_{i_0}(q) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q)) \right| \leq C_{20}\varepsilon_1^{1/8}.$$

• *Step 4: Approximating the metric.*

Let us find a proper frame in  $T_{x_{i_0}}M$  and apply the estimate (7.23) to each vector in the frame to approximate the metric. First, we search for a point  $p_0 \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$  such that

$$(7.24) \quad \widehat{r}_{i_0}(p_0) = \min_{y \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y} \widehat{r}_{i_0}(y).$$

Let  $p_{j(k)} \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$ ,  $j(k) \in \{0, \dots, J\}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , be arbitrary  $n$  points in  $Y$  satisfying the condition (6.9) (with  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$ ), which we will vary later. For each  $p_{j(k)}$ , we search for  $q_{j(k)} \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/4) \cap Y$  such that (7.3) hold, i.e.

$$(7.25) \quad |\widehat{r}_{i_0}(p_{j(k)}) - \widehat{r}_{i_0}(q_{j(k)}) - D_Y^a(p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)})| < 6\varepsilon_1.$$




FIGURE 6. The geodesic  $[x_{i_0} p_{j(k)}]$  intersects  $\Sigma_{R/4} = \partial B(x_0, R/4)$  at a green point that is close to the red point  $q_{j(k)}$ . The other red point is  $y' = \gamma_{x_{i_0}, w}(s)$ , where  $w \in S_{x_{i_0}} M$  is the direction vector of the geodesic  $[x_{i_0} p_{j(k)}]$  and  $s = d(x_{i_0}, y')$ . When the criteria (7.11) and (7.12) are satisfied for  $p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)}$ , the point  $x_{i(m)}$  corresponding to  $\hat{r}_{i(m)}$  is close to  $y'$ . The blue curve is the geodesic  $[x_{i_0} x_{i(m)}]$  and  $\xi_{i(m)} = \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_{i(m)})$ . Similarly, the red curve is the geodesic  $[x_{i_0} x_{i_0}]$  and  $\xi_{i_0} = \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_{i_0})$ . In the proof we show that we can find indexes  $i(m)$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , such that the unit vectors  $\bar{\xi}_{i(m)} := |\xi_{i(m)}|_g^{-1} \xi_{i(m)}$  form a good basis of  $T_{x_{i_0}} M$ . Moreover, we show that we can approximately compute the inner product of the vectors  $\bar{\xi}_{i(m)}$  and  $\xi_{i_0}$ , that is, approximately find the coordinates of the points  $x_{i_0}$  in the normal coordinates at  $x_{i_0}$ .

Then we choose an element  $\hat{r}_{i(k)} \in \hat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\hat{r}_{i_0}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$ ,  $i(k) \in \{1, \dots, I\}$  such that (7.2), (7.11) and (7.12) hold for  $p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)}$ , namely

$$(7.26) \quad |\hat{r}_{i(k)}(p_{j(k)}) - \hat{r}_{i(k)}(q_{j(k)}) - D_Y^a(p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)})| \leq 9\varepsilon_1,$$

$$(7.27) \quad |\hat{r}_{i_0}(q_{j(k)}) - (\hat{r}_{i(k)}(q_{j(k)}) + s)| \leq 9\varepsilon_1.$$

By the discussion following (7.12), the set of  $\hat{r}_{i(k)}$  satisfying the conditions above is non-empty, as we set  $s = \varepsilon_1^{3/8}$ .

Now we apply the estimate (7.23) for each index  $j(k)$ . Denote by  $v_{j(k)}$  the unit initial vectors of minimizing geodesics  $[x_{i_0} q_{j(k)}]$ . For every  $k, m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have

$$(7.28) \quad \left| \left\langle \frac{\xi_{i(m)}}{|\xi_{i(m)}|_g}, v_{j(k)} \right\rangle_g - \frac{1}{s} (\hat{r}_{i_0}(q_{j(k)}) - \hat{r}_{i(m)}(q_{j(k)})) \right| \leq C_{20} \varepsilon_1^{1/8},$$

where  $\xi_{i(m)} = \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_{i(m)})$ . By (7.18),

$$(7.29) \quad |\langle \xi_{i(m)}, v_{j(k)} \rangle_g - s \langle v_{j(m)}, v_{j(k)} \rangle_g| \leq C_{19} \varepsilon_1^{1/2}, \quad \forall k, m = 1, \dots, n.$$

Hence (7.20), (7.22) and (7.28) yield

$$(7.30) \quad \left| \langle v_{j(m)}, v_{j(k)} \rangle_g - \frac{1}{s} (\hat{r}_{i_0}(q_{j(k)}) - \hat{r}_{i(m)}(q_{j(k)})) \right| \leq C_{21} \varepsilon_1^{1/8}, \quad \forall k, m = 1, \dots, n.$$

The formula (7.30) shows that we can compute the numbers

$$(7.31) \quad G_{k,m} := \frac{1}{s} (\hat{r}_{i_0}(q_{j(k)}) - \hat{r}_{i(m)}(q_{j(k)})), \quad \text{where } s = \varepsilon_1^{3/8},$$

such that

$$(7.32) \quad |\langle v_{j(k)}, v_{j(m)} \rangle_g - G_{k,m}| \leq C_{21} \varepsilon_1^{1/8}, \quad \forall k, m = 1, \dots, n.$$

As above, we have considered any  $n$  indices  $j(k)$ , the points  $p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)}$  and the unit initial vectors  $v_{j(k)} \in S_{x_{i_0}} M$  for geodesics  $[x_{i_0} q_{j(k)}]$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . In view of Lemma 6.3<sup>1</sup>, the formula (7.32) shows that when  $\varepsilon_1$  is smaller than some uniform constant, there exist some indices  $j(k)$  and points  $p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)}$  such that

$$(7.33) \quad \det([G_{k,m}]_{k,m=1}^n) > \frac{3}{4} c_1.$$

Hence we can search for such indices so that (7.33) is satisfied by computing the determinant  $\det([G_{k,m}]_{k,m=1}^n)$  for each choice of indices.

**Reconstruction of metric.** Now let us summarize our procedure for the reconstruction of metric using the given data  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  only. Let  $\widehat{r}_{i_0}$  be given satisfying  $\widehat{r}_{i_0}(y_0) > R/2$ . Fix sufficiently small  $\varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_1$  explicitly depending only on  $n, \Lambda$ . First, we search for a point  $p_0 \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$  by (7.24). Due to (3.7), see also (3.8), and the assumption that  $d(x_0, y_0) < \varepsilon_0$ , the point  $p_0$  can be chosen using the given data (up to an error of  $3\varepsilon_1$ ).

For  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , we arbitrarily choose  $n$  points  $p_{j(k)} \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8) \cap Y$  satisfying the condition (6.9). The points  $q_{j(k)} \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/4) \cap Y$  are chosen according to (7.25). For each  $k$ , choose one element  $\widehat{r}_{i(k)} \in \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\widehat{r}_{i_0}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$  such that (7.26) and (7.27) are satisfied. Thus we can compute the numbers  $G_{k,m}$  defined by (7.31). We test all possible choices of  $n$  points  $p_{j(k)}$  satisfying (6.9), and find one choice such that (7.33) is satisfied. Note that by (7.32), we know that the metric corresponding to the basis that  $G_{k,m}$  approximates must satisfy  $\det([\langle v_{j(k)}, v_{j(m)} \rangle_g]_{k,m=1}^n) > c_1/2$ .

The discussion above shows that in the Riemannian normal coordinates, denoted below by  $X : B(x_{i_0}, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , at  $x_{i_0}$  associated with the specific basis  $\{v_{j(k)}\}_{k=1}^n$  that  $G_{k,m}$  approximates, we can find the metric tensor  $g_{km}(x_{i_0}) = \langle v_{j(k)}, v_{j(m)} \rangle_g$  up to a uniformly bounded error, that is, we can find numbers  $\widehat{g}_{km} := G_{k,m}$  such that

$$(7.34) \quad |g_{km}(x_{i_0}) - \widehat{g}_{km}| \leq C_{21} \varepsilon_1^{1/8}, \quad \forall k, m = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

In particular, since the basis  $\{v_{j(k)}\}_{k=1}^n$  are unit, we have  $|g_{km}| \leq 1$ ,  $|\widehat{g}_{km}| \leq 2$  for all  $k, m$ .

**Reconstruction of normal coordinates.** Suppose we have already picked indices  $j(k)$  and points  $p_{j(k)}, q_{j(k)}$  such that the metric is approximated as above. We can also find the coordinates of the points corresponding to elements  $\widehat{r}_\ell$  in a neighborhood of  $\widehat{r}_{i_0}$  in the normal coordinate  $X : B(x_{i_0}, r) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , up to a uniformly bounded error. Indeed, for any  $\widehat{r}_\ell$  satisfying (7.2), we can compute the numbers

$$(7.35) \quad \widehat{X}_k(x_\ell) := \widehat{r}_{i_0}(q_{j(k)}) - \widehat{r}_\ell(q_{j(k)}), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Note that due to Proposition 5.2, we can choose sufficiently small  $\rho_0$  such that  $d(x_\ell, x_{i_0}) < \text{inj}(M)$ . Then by (7.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |X_k(x_\ell) - \widehat{X}_k(x_\ell)| &\leq C_{13} |x_{i_0} x_\ell| (\varepsilon_1^{1/4} + |x_{i_0} x_\ell|^{1/3}) + 2\varepsilon_1 \\ &\leq 3C_{13} (|x_{i_0} x_\ell|^{4/3} + \varepsilon_1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(7.36) \quad X_k(x_\ell) := \langle \xi_\ell, v_{j(k)} \rangle_g = \langle \exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_\ell), v_{j(k)} \rangle_g$$

<sup>1</sup>Note that Lemma 6.3 is applicable here if  $R/8 \leq c_4$ . However if  $R/8 > c_4$ , one can replace the radius  $R/4$  with  $R/8 + c_4$ , and instead find  $q_{j(k)} \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R/8 + c_4) \cap Y$ . All relevant distances would be bounded below depending on  $c_4$ , which again depends on  $n, \Lambda, R$ .

are the true values of the coordinates of the point  $x_\ell$  in the  $X$ -coordinates. Here we have used Young's inequality  $ab \leq a^{4/3} + b^4$  in the last inequality. This concludes the proof for Case 1.




FIGURE 7. When  $x_{i_0} \in B(x_0, R/2)$ , we choose measurement points  $p, q$  from the blue region such that the distances between  $x_{i_0}, p, q$  are bounded away from zero. When  $x_{i_0} \notin B(x_0, R/2)$ , we choose measurement points in the red region.

• **Case 2:**  $\hat{r}_{i_0}(y_0) \leq R/2$ .

In this case,  $d(x_{i_0}, x_0) \leq R/2 + 2\varepsilon_1$ . To keep distances bounded away from zero, one can choose points  $q_{j(k)}, p_{j(k)}$  from the outer layer  $B(x_0, R) \setminus B(x_0, 3R/4)$ , see Figure 7. More precisely, we first choose arbitrary  $n$  points  $\{q_{j(k)}\}$  in  $N_{\varepsilon_1}(3R/4) \cap Y$  satisfying (6.9). Note that Lemma 6.2 still holds in this case due to Lemma A.3, see Remark 5.4. For each  $q_{j(k)}$ , we can choose one point  $p_{j(k)} \in N_{\varepsilon_1}(R) \cap Y$  such that (7.25) is valid. Observe that the set of points satisfying (7.25) (for each  $q_{j(k)}$ ) is nonempty. This is because one can extend the minimizing geodesic  $[x_{i_0} q_{j(k)}]$  further until it intersects with  $\Sigma_R$ , since we are within the injectivity radius. Thus the point in  $N_{\varepsilon_1}(R) \cap Y$  within  $\varepsilon_0$ -distance from the intersection point satisfies (7.25). In particular, the bounds in (7.4) still hold. From this point, the exact proof of Case 1 works in this case.

Now we prove Corollary 2.5.

**Proof of Corollary 2.5.** Let us fix the basis  $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^n$  for which the metric has been approximated in Theorem 2.4. Observe that

$$d(x_\ell, x_{i_0}) = |\exp_{x_{i_0}}^{-1}(x_\ell)|_g = \left( \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} X_j X_k \right)^{1/2},$$

where  $X_k$  is defined in (2.7) and  $(g^{jk})$  is the matrix inverse of  $(g_{jk})$ . Hence we define an approximate distance by

$$(7.37) \quad \hat{d}_{\ell, i_0} = \left( \sum_{j,k=1}^n \hat{g}^{jk} \hat{X}_j \hat{X}_k \right)^{1/2}.$$

We use the following notation for convenience:

$$(7.38) \quad |\xi|_g^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^n g^{jk} X_j X_k, \quad |\xi|_{\hat{g}}^2 = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \hat{g}^{jk} X_j X_k, \quad \xi = (X_1, \dots, X_n).$$



Denote  $\widehat{\xi} = (\widehat{X}_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_n)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{d}_{\ell, i_0} - d(x_\ell, x_{i_0})| &\leq ||\widehat{\xi}|_{\widehat{g}} - |\xi|_{\widehat{g}}| + ||\xi|_{\widehat{g}} - |\xi|_g| \\ &\leq |\widehat{\xi} - \xi|_{\widehat{g}} + |\xi|_g^{-1} ||\xi|_{\widehat{g}}^2 - |\xi|_g^2|. \end{aligned}$$

Due to (2.11) and  $\det([\langle v_j, v_k \rangle_g]_{j,k=1}^n) \geq c_1$ , all components  $g^{jk}, \widehat{g}^{jk}$  are bounded above by  $C(n, c_1)$ . Hence by (2.10),

$$(7.39) \quad |\widehat{\xi} - \xi|_{\widehat{g}} \leq C(n, c_1) C_4 (d(x_{i_0}, x_\ell)^{4/3} + \varepsilon_1).$$

Moreover, the largest eigenvalue of the matrix  $(g_{jk})$  is bounded above by  $C(n)$ , and thus the eigenvalues of  $(g^{jk})$  are bounded below by  $C(n)^{-1}$ . Hence by (2.11),

$$(7.40) \quad |\xi|_g^{-1} ||\xi|_{\widehat{g}}^2 - |\xi|_g^2| \leq C(n) |X|_{\mathbb{R}^n}^{-1} \sum_{j,k=1}^n (\widehat{g}_{jk} - g_{jk}) X_j X_k \leq n C(n) C_4 \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{8}} |\xi|_g.$$

Thus by (7.39) and (7.40), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{d}_{\ell, i_0} - d(x_\ell, x_{i_0})| &\leq C(n, c_1) C_4 (d(x_{i_0}, x_\ell)^{4/3} + \varepsilon_1) + n C(n) C_4 \varepsilon_1^{\frac{1}{8}} d(x_{i_0}, x_\ell) \\ &\leq C_5 (d(x_{i_0}, x_\ell)^{4/3} + \varepsilon_1^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

## 8. GLOBAL CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** (1) The first claim has been proved in Proposition 5.2(2), and we prove the second claim here. Let  $\rho > 0$  be a parameter which is determined later. Given two indices  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, I\}$ , we consider the following minimization problem

$$(8.1) \quad \widehat{d}_{i,j} := \min \left( \widehat{d}_{i, \sigma(1)} + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \widehat{d}_{\sigma(k), \sigma(k+1)} + \widehat{d}_{\sigma(N), j} \right)$$

over all chain of  $N$  indices  $\sigma(k) \in \{1, \dots, I\}$  with  $N \leq 1 + \Lambda/\rho$ , and with

$$(8.2) \quad \|\widehat{r}_{\sigma(k)} - \widehat{r}_{\sigma(k+1)}\|_{\ell^\infty(Y)} \leq \rho + C_0 \varepsilon_1^{1/2} + 2\varepsilon_1 < \rho_0, \quad \text{for } k = 0, \dots, N,$$

where we denote  $\sigma(0) := i$  and  $\sigma(N+1) := j$ . In this minimization problem, the numbers  $\widehat{d}_{\sigma(k), \sigma(k+1)}$  are determined by the data  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y \cap \mathcal{B}_\infty(\widehat{r}_{\sigma(k)}, \varepsilon_1^{1/4})$  in Corollary 2.5 since the condition (8.2) is valid for all  $k$ . Thus the solution of the minimization problem can be found using the given data  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  only. Note that the numbers  $\widehat{d}_{j,j'}^Y$  assumed in Corollary 2.5 can be determined by  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  due to (3.7).

Now let us analyze the property of the solution of the minimization problem (8.1). Given any pair of points in  $X$ , consider a shortest path  $\gamma$  connecting these two points. On this shortest path  $\gamma$ , one can choose a chain of points with at most  $N \leq 1 + \Lambda/\rho$  points such that each pair of adjacent points has distance at most  $\rho$ . Since the set  $X$  is an  $\varepsilon_2$ -net of  $M$ , we can replace this chain of points on  $\gamma$  by points in  $X$ , and thus each pair of adjacent points has distance at most  $\rho + \varepsilon_2 = \rho + C_0 \varepsilon_1^{1/2}$ . We require  $\rho + C_0 \varepsilon_1^{1/2} < \rho_0/2$  such that the condition (2.9) is satisfied by the elements in  $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_Y$  corresponding to this chain of points in  $X$ , by virtue of (5.22). Let us relabel this chain of points by  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  with endpoints  $x_1, x_N$  for convenience. Then the estimate (2.12) shows that for this particular chain of points, we

have

$$\begin{aligned} E &:= \left| d(x_1, x_N) - \sum_{i=k}^{N-1} \widehat{d}_{k,k+1} \right| \leq NC_5(\varepsilon_1^{1/2} + (\rho + \varepsilon_1^{1/2})^{4/3}) \\ &< 8\Lambda C_5(\varepsilon_1^{1/2}\rho^{-1} + \rho^{1/3}). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain a good estimate when we choose  $\rho = \varepsilon_1^{3/8}$ , namely

$$(8.3) \quad E < 16\Lambda C_5 \varepsilon_1^{1/8}.$$

This particular chain of points above satisfies the conditions of the minimization problem (8.1), and thus the solution of the minimization problem also satisfies (8.3) when we choose  $\rho = \varepsilon_1^{3/8}$ . Therefore, the solution of the minimization problem (8.1) gives us an approximate distance  $\widehat{d}(x_i, x_j) := \widehat{d}_{i,j}$  that satisfies

$$(8.4) \quad |\widehat{d}(x_i, x_j) - d(x_i, x_j)| < 16\Lambda C_5 \varepsilon_1^{1/8}, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, I\}.$$

This proves part (1) of Theorem 1.2.

Part (2) is a direct consequence of the estimate (8.4) and [29, Corollary 1.10].  $\square$

## 9. MANIFOLD RECONSTRUCTION FROM NOISY HEAT KERNEL

In this section, we consider the reconstruction of a manifold from noisy heat kernel measurements (2.1) satisfying (2.2).

**Theorem 9.1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold of dimension  $n$  satisfying the bounds (1.1) with parameter  $\Lambda$ , and let  $U = B(y_0, R)$  be a ball of radius  $R > \Lambda^{-1}$ . Suppose the Ricci curvature of  $M$  is non-negative. Then there exist constants  $\widehat{\sigma}, C_{22} > 0$  explicitly depending only on  $n, \Lambda$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \sigma < \widehat{\sigma}$  and  $0 < h \leq \sigma^{1/2}$ .*

*Let  $Y = \{y_j : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$  be an  $h$ -net in the ball  $U$ . Assume that either*

*(i)  $\{z_i : i = 1, \dots, I\}$  is an  $h$ -net in  $M \setminus \overline{U}$ , and we are given  $\widehat{d}_{j,j'}^Y$ ,  $j, j' = 0, 1, \dots, J$  such that  $|\widehat{d}_{j,j'}^Y - d(y_j, y_{j'})| < h$ ,*

*or*

*(ii)  $\{z_i : i = 1, \dots, I\}$  is an  $h$ -net in  $M$ .*

*Moreover, assume that we are given the data*

$$(9.1) \quad \{\widetilde{G}(y_j, z_i, t) : i = 1, \dots, I, j = 0, 1, \dots, J, 0 < t < 1\}$$

*which satisfy*

$$(9.2) \quad e^{-\frac{\sigma}{t}} \leq \frac{\widetilde{G}(y_j, z_i, t)}{G(y_j, z_i, t)} \leq e^{\frac{\sigma}{t}}, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, I, j = 0, \dots, J, 0 < t < 1.$$

*Then the given data (9.1) determine a smooth Riemannian manifold  $(\widehat{M}, \widehat{g})$  that is diffeomorphic to  $M$ . Moreover, there is a diffeomorphism  $F : \widehat{M} \rightarrow M$  such that*

$$(9.3) \quad \frac{1}{L} \leq \frac{d_M(F(x), F(x'))}{d_{\widehat{M}}(x, x')} \leq L, \quad \text{for } x, x' \in \widehat{M},$$

*where  $L = 1 + C_{22}\sigma^{1/24}$ .*

**Proof.** By Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 4.1 in [65] (see also [73]), for every  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,  $t > 0$ ,

$$(9.4) \quad G(y, z, t) \leq C_\epsilon v_{z,t} \exp\left(-\frac{d^2(y, z)}{(4 + \epsilon)t}\right),$$

and

$$(9.5) \quad G(y, z, t) \geq C_\epsilon^{-1} v_{z,t} \exp\left(-\frac{d^2(y, z)}{(4-\epsilon)t}\right),$$

where  $v_{z,t} = \text{vol}^{-1}(B(z, \sqrt{t}))$ , and  $C_\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Taking log on both sides of (9.4), we have

$$\frac{d^2}{4} + t \log G \leq t \log(C_\epsilon v_{z,t}) + \frac{d^2}{4} - \frac{d^2}{4+\epsilon} \leq t \log(C_\epsilon v_{z,t}) + C(\Lambda)\epsilon.$$

Similarly, from (9.5),

$$\frac{d^2}{4} + t \log G \geq t \log(C_\epsilon^{-1} v_{z,t}) + \frac{d^2}{4} - \frac{d^2}{4-\epsilon} \geq t \log(C_\epsilon^{-1} v_{z,t}) - C(\Lambda)\epsilon.$$

Combining the two inequalities above, we obtain

$$(9.6) \quad |d^2(y, z) + 4t \log G(y, z, t)| \leq 4t |\log C_\epsilon| + 4t |\log v_{z,t}| + C(\Lambda)\epsilon.$$

From the noisy measurements  $\tilde{G}(y, z, t) = \eta(y, z, t)G(y, z, t)$ , (9.6) and (2.2) yield that

$$(9.7) \quad \begin{aligned} |d^2(y, z) + 4t \log \tilde{G}(y, z, t)| &\leq |d^2(y, z) + 4t \log G(y, z, t)| + 4t |\log \eta| \\ &\leq 4\sigma + 4t |\log C_\epsilon| + 4t |\log v_{z,t}| + C(\Lambda)\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now we pick sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $C(\Lambda)\epsilon < \sigma$ . For small  $t > 0$ , we know

$$t |\log v_{z,t}| = t |\log \text{vol}(B(z, \sqrt{t}))| \leq C(n)t |\log t|.$$

Thus one can pick sufficiently small  $t > 0$  such that  $4t |\log C_\epsilon| + 4t |\log v_{z,t}| < \sigma$ . Hence,

$$|d^2(y, z) + 4t \log \tilde{G}(y, z, t)| < 6\sigma,$$

which yields that

$$(9.8) \quad \left|d(y, z) - \sqrt{4t |\log \tilde{G}(y, z, t)|}\right| < 6\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

First, consider the case when the condition (i) is valid. Since  $\{z_i\}$  is an  $h$ -net in  $M \setminus \bar{U}$  for  $h \leq \sigma^{1/2}$ , (9.8) shows that the data  $\tilde{G}(y_j, z_i, t)$  for some suitable choice of  $t$  (depending on  $\sigma$ ) give a  $7\sigma^{1/2}$ -approximation of the distances of the pairs  $(y_j, z_i)$ . Moreover, we are already given an  $h$ -approximation  $\hat{d}_{j,j'}^Y$  of the distances of the pairs  $(y_j, y_{j'})$  in  $Y$ . Since the set  $X = \{z_i : i = 1, \dots, I\} \cup Y$  is a  $(2h)$ -net in  $M$ , thus the sets  $X, Y$  and the given data satisfy the conditions (a1) and (a2) with parameter  $\varepsilon_1 = 7\sigma^{1/2}$ .

Second, consider the case when the condition (ii) is valid. Since  $\{z_i\}$  is an  $h$ -net in  $M$  for  $h \leq \sigma^{1/2}$ , (9.8) shows that the data  $\tilde{G}(y_j, z_i, t)$  for some suitable choice of  $t$  (depending on  $\sigma$ ) give a  $7\sigma^{1/2}$ -approximation of the interior distance functions on  $Y$ . Thus the sets  $\{z_i\}, Y$  and the given data satisfy the conditions (a1) and (a2) with parameter  $\varepsilon_1 = 7\sigma^{1/2}$ .

These considerations imply that in both cases (i) and (ii) the claim follows by applying Theorem 1.2(2).  $\square$

Finally, we obtain the uniqueness and the stability for the inverse problem for heat kernel.

**Proof of Theorem 2.1.** Let  $X_1 = \{z_1^1, \dots, z_I^1\} \cup \{y_0^1, \dots, y_J^1\} \subset M_1$ ,  $Y_1 = \{y_0^1, \dots, y_J^1\} \subset M_1$  and  $X_2 = \{z_1^2, \dots, z_I^2\} \cup \{y_0^2, \dots, y_J^2\} \subset M_2$ ,  $Y_2 = \{y_0^2, \dots, y_J^2\} \subset M_2$ .

Due to the condition (2.3), the heat kernel data  $G_2(y_j^2, z_i^2, t)$  of  $M_2$  can be used as the noisy observations of the heat kernel of  $M_1$  at  $(y_j^1, z_i^1, t)$ . Then by the proof of Theorem 9.1, the heat kernel data  $G_2(y_j^2, z_i^2, t)$  of  $M_2$  and  $d_{M_2}(y_j^2, y_{j'}^2)$  determine the distances  $d_{M_1}(x, y)$  of  $M_1$  for  $(x, y) \in X_1 \times Y_1$  up to an error  $7\sigma^{1/2}$ . Similarly, the heat kernel data  $G_2(y_j^2, z_i^2, t)$  of  $M_2$  and  $d_{M_2}(y_j^2, y_{j'}^2)$  also determine the distances  $d_{M_2}(x, y)$  of  $M_2$  for  $(x, y) \in X_2 \times Y_2$  up

to an error  $7\sigma^{1/2}$ . Thus, by enumerating the points in  $X_l$  as  $\{x_i^l : i = 0, 1, \dots, I'\}$  and the points in  $Y_l$  as  $\{y_j^l : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$ , we see that

$$|d_{M_1}(x_i^1, y_j^1) - d_{M_2}(x_i^2, y_j^2)| < 14\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, I', \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, J.$$

Thus, the numbers  $d_{i,j} = d_{M_1}(x_i^1, y_j^1)$  can be used as the noisy distance data both for the manifold  $M_1$  and for the manifold  $M_2$  with an error  $14\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Hence, by Theorem 1.2 we have

$$|d_{M_1}(x_i^1, x_{i'}^1) - d_{M_2}(x_i^2, x_{i'}^2)| \leq C_1(14\sigma^{\frac{1}{2}})^{\frac{1}{8}} < 2C_1\sigma^{\frac{1}{16}}, \quad i, i' = 0, 1, \dots, I',$$

and there is a manifold  $\widehat{M}$  such that there are  $L_1$ -bi-Lipschitz diffeomorphisms  $F_1 : M_1 \rightarrow \widehat{M}$  and  $F_2 : M_2 \rightarrow \widehat{M}$  with  $L_1$  given in Theorem 1.2. Hence there is an  $(L_1^2)$ -bi-Lipschitz diffeomorphism  $F = F_2^{-1} \circ F_1 : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ , which proves the claim.  $\square$

**Proof of Corollary 2.2.** Let  $\Lambda > R^{-1}$  be such that both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  satisfy the geometric bounds (1.1). Consider an arbitrary  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $h = \sigma^{1/2}$ . Let  $\{y_j^1 : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$  be an  $h$ -net in  $U_1$  and  $\{y_j^2 = \Phi(y_j^1) : j = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$  be an  $h$ -net in  $U_2$ .

We recall that the map  $\Psi : M_1 \setminus U_1 \rightarrow M_2 \setminus U_2$  is assumed only to be a bijection, and thus we need to do some additional considerations to obtain suitable  $h$ -nets on sets  $M_1 \setminus U_1$  and  $M_2 \setminus U_2$ . To that end, let  $\{\tilde{z}_i^1, i = 1, 2, \dots, I_1\}$  be an  $h$ -net in  $M_1 \setminus U_1$  and  $\{\tilde{z}_i^2, i = 1, 2, \dots, I_2\}$  be an  $h$ -net in  $M_2 \setminus U_2$ . Then we define

$$z_i^1 = \begin{cases} \tilde{z}_i^1, & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, I_1, \\ \Psi^{-1}(\tilde{z}_{i-I_1}^2), & \text{for } i = I_1 + 1, I_1 + 2, \dots, I_1 + I_2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$z_i^2 = \begin{cases} \Psi(\tilde{z}_i^1), & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, I_1, \\ \tilde{z}_{i-I_1}^2, & \text{for } i = I_1 + 1, I_1 + 2, \dots, I_1 + I_2. \end{cases}$$

Then  $\{z_i^1 : i = 1, \dots, I_1 + I_2\}$  is an  $h$ -net in  $M_1 \setminus U_1$  and  $\{z_i^2 : i = 1, \dots, I_1 + I_2\}$  is an  $h$ -net in  $M_2 \setminus U_2$ , and we have

$$G_1(y_j^1, z_i^1, t) = G_2(y_j^2, z_i^2, t), \quad i = 1, \dots, I_1 + I_2, \quad j = 0, \dots, J, \quad 0 < t < 1.$$

By applying Theorem 2.1, it follows that the Gromov-Hausdorff distance of the metric spaces  $(M_1, d_{g_1})$  and  $(M_2, d_{g_2})$  is smaller than  $C_{23}\sigma^{1/24}$ , where  $C_{23} > 0$  depends only on  $n$  and  $\Lambda$ , see e.g. Corollary 7.3.28 in [12]. Letting  $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ , we see that Gromov-Hausdorff distance of  $(M_1, d_{g_1})$  and  $(M_2, d_{g_2})$  is zero, which implies that  $(M_1, d_{g_1})$  and  $(M_2, d_{g_2})$  are isometric as (compact) metric spaces, see e.g. [12, 69]. By the Myers-Steenrod theorem, there is a diffeomorphism  $F : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  between Riemannian manifolds such that  $g_2 = F_*g_1$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

## APPENDIX A. AUXILIARY LEMMAS

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\text{Sec}_M \geq -\Lambda^2$ . Suppose  $\gamma_{x,v_1}(t)$ ,  $\gamma_{x,v_2}(t)$  are two distance-minimizing geodesics emanating from  $x \in M$  with unit initial vectors  $v_1, v_2 \in S_x M$ . Denote by  $\alpha$  the angle between  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ . Then there is a uniform constant  $C_A > 1$ , explicitly depending only on  $\Lambda$ , such that*

$$(A.1) \quad d(\gamma_{x,v_1}(t_1), \gamma_{x,v_2}(t_2)) \leq |t_1 - t_2| + C_A \alpha, \quad \forall t_1, t_2 \in [0, \Lambda].$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $t_1 \leq t_2$ . Let us denote  $a = \gamma_{x,v_1}(t_1)$  and  $b = \gamma_{x,v_2}(t_1)$ . We can compare the triangle  $axb$  with a triangle  $\overline{a}\overline{x}\overline{b}$  in the rescaled hyperbolic plane  $H$  with constant sectional curvature  $-\Lambda^2$ , satisfying that  $d(x, a) = \overline{d}(\overline{x}, \overline{a}) = t_1$ ,  $d(x, b) = \overline{d}(\overline{x}, \overline{b}) = t_1$ ,  $\alpha = \angle \overline{a}\overline{x}\overline{b}$ . Then Toponogov's theorem yields  $d(a, b) \leq \overline{d}(\overline{a}, \overline{b})$ .

On the hyperbolic plane  $H$ , the exponential map is smooth everywhere, and its differential is uniformly bounded. Hence,

$$(A.2) \quad \bar{d}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq C(\Lambda)|t_1 v_1 - t_1 v_2| \leq C(\Lambda)t_1 \alpha.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} d(\gamma_{x,v_1}(t_1), \gamma_{x,v_2}(t_2)) &\leq d(a, b) + d(\gamma_{x,v_2}(t_1), \gamma_{x,v_2}(t_2)) \\ &\leq \bar{d}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) + |t_2 - t_1| \leq |t_2 - t_1| + C(\Lambda)\Lambda\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma A.2.** *There exists a uniform constant  $C_6 > 1$  such that the following holds. Let  $N$  be a compact Riemannian manifold with boundary  $\partial N$  with sectional curvature bounded below by  $\text{Sec}_N \geq -\Lambda^2$ . Let  $a, b, c \in N$  and  $\beta$  be the angle of the length minimizing curves  $[ab]$  and  $[bc]$  at  $b$ . Then we have*

$$(A.3) \quad |ac| \leq |ab| - |bc| \cos \beta + C_6 |bc|^2 / \min\{\Lambda^{-1}, |ab|, d(b, \partial N)\}.$$

**Proof.** To prove the statement, we apply Toponogov's Theorem to the triangle  $abc$ . Below, let  $H$  be the rescaled hyperbolic plane of constant sectional curvature  $-\Lambda^2$ , and  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c} \in H$  be such that  $|\bar{a}\bar{b}| = |ab|$ ,  $|\bar{b}\bar{c}| = |bc|$  and  $\angle \bar{a}\bar{b}\bar{c} = \angle abc = \beta$ . Here by  $|xy|$ , we denote the distance between points  $x$  and  $y$  in whatever space they belong.

(i) Let us first consider the case when

$$(A.4) \quad |ab| = \frac{1}{4}, \quad |bc| < \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad d(b, \partial N) \geq 1.$$

Then  $|ac| \leq |ab| + |bc| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . Applying Toponogov's theorem to triangle  $abc$  implies that  $|ac| \leq |\bar{a}\bar{c}|$ .

By [69, Prop. 48], the law of cosines on  $H$  gives

$$(A.5) \quad \cosh(\Lambda|\bar{a}\bar{c}|) = \cosh(\Lambda|\bar{a}\bar{b}|) \cosh(\Lambda|\bar{b}\bar{c}|) - \sinh(\Lambda|\bar{a}\bar{b}|) \sinh(\Lambda|\bar{b}\bar{c}|) \cos \beta$$

and thus

$$\cosh(\Lambda|ac|) \leq \cosh(\Lambda|ab|) \cosh(\Lambda|bc|) - \sinh(\Lambda|ab|) \sinh(\Lambda|bc|) \cos \beta.$$

Using Taylor series, the above yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\cosh(\Lambda|ac|) - \cosh(\Lambda|ab|) \\ &\leq \cosh(\Lambda|ab|) (\cosh(\Lambda|bc|) - 1) - \sinh(\Lambda|ab|) \sinh(\Lambda|bc|) \cos \beta \\ &= -V|bc| \cos \beta + E_1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $V = \Lambda \sinh(\Lambda|ab|) > 0$  and  $E_1$  satisfies  $|E_1| \leq C|bc|^2$ , where  $C$  is a uniform constant.

By triangle inequality,  $-|bc| \leq |ac| - |ab| \leq |bc|$ . Then one can show that

$$\cosh(\Lambda|ac|) - \cosh(\Lambda|ab|) \geq V(|ac| - |ab|) + E_2,$$

where  $E_2$  satisfies  $|E_2| \leq C(|ac| - |ab|)^2 \leq C|bc|^2$ , where  $C$  is a uniform constant. Combining these we see that

$$V(|ac| - |ab|) + E_2 \leq -V|bc| \cos \beta + E_1,$$

or

$$|ac| - |ab| \leq -|bc| \cos \beta + V^{-1}(E_1 - E_2),$$

which yields the inequality

$$(A.6) \quad |ac| \leq |ab| - |bc| \cos \beta + C_6 |bc|^2,$$

where  $C_6$  is a uniform constant. We can assume that  $C_6 > 8$ .

Consider next the case when

$$(A.7) \quad |ab| = \frac{1}{4}, \quad \text{and} \quad d(b, \partial N) \geq 1.$$

If it holds that  $|bc| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ , then  $C_6 > 8$  yields that  $C_6|bc|^2 > 2|bc|$ . Considering  $|ac| \leq |ab| + |bc|$ , we see that (A.6) automatically holds. Since we have already proven (A.6) when  $|bc| < \frac{1}{4}$ , we can conclude that (A.6) holds under assumptions (A.7).

Next, consider the case when

$$(A.8) \quad |ab| \geq \frac{1}{4}, \quad d(b, \partial N) \geq 1.$$

Let  $a'$  be the point on  $[ab]$  with  $|a'b| = \frac{1}{4}$ . By the triangle inequality we have  $|ac| \leq |aa'| + |a'c|$ . Moreover, we have  $|aa'| = |ab| - |a'b|$  and thus (A.6) for the triangle  $a'bc$  implies

$$|ac| - |ab| \leq |aa'| + |a'c| - |ab| \leq |a'c| - |a'b| \leq -|bc| \cos \beta + C_6|bc|^2.$$

Hence, (A.6) holds under assumption (A.8).

The inequality (A.6) yields that the inequality (A.3) holds.  $\square$

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $M$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature bounded by  $|\text{Sec}_M| \leq \Lambda^2$ . Let  $B(x_0, R)$  be an open ball for  $R \leq \min\{\text{inj}(M)/2, \pi/(4\Lambda)\}$ . Then there exist uniform constants  $\widehat{\varepsilon}, c_3, C_{16} > 0$  explicitly depending on  $\Lambda, R$ , such that the following holds for  $0 < \varepsilon < \widehat{\varepsilon}$ .*

*Given a point  $x \in B(x_0, R/2)$ , take  $z_0$  to be the nearest point in  $B(x_0, R)$  from  $x$ . Let  $z_1, z_2 \in N_\varepsilon(R)$  such that*

$$(A.9) \quad |z_1 z_2| \geq C_{17}\varepsilon, \quad |z_0 z_1| < c_3, \quad |z_0 z_2| < c_3,$$

*for some  $C_{17} \geq 32(\Lambda R)^{-1}$ . Then  $\angle z_1 x z_2 > C_{16} C_{17} \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to Lemma 6.1(1): we use the upper bound for the angle  $\angle x z_1 z_2$  to derive an lower bound for  $\angle z_1 x z_2$ . First, we show that the incident angle of  $[x z_1]$ , i.e. the angle of  $[x z_1]$  with the tangent space  $T_{z_1} \Sigma_{|x_0 z_1|}$  is bounded from below. Suppose  $|x_0 z_1| \leq |x_0 z_2|$ .

We take the point  $z'_1 \in \Sigma_{3R/2}$  such that  $|x_0 z'_1| - |x_0 z_1| = |z_1 z'_1|$ . Let  $z'_0$  be the nearest point in  $\Sigma_{3R/2}$  from  $x$ . Then for sufficiently small  $c_3, \varepsilon$ , we have

$$|x z'_1| \geq |x z'_0| - |z'_0 z'_1| \geq |x z_0| + \frac{R}{2} - 2c_3 \geq |x z_1| + |z_1 z'_1| - 3c_3.$$

Hence the same argument as (6.3) gives  $(\pi - \angle x z_1 z'_1)^2 \leq C_7^{-1} 3c_3$ , which is

$$(A.10) \quad \angle x z_1 x_0 \leq C(\Lambda) c_3^{1/2}.$$

For the upper bound for the angle  $\angle x_0 z_1 z_2$ , one can apply Rauch comparison theorem to compare with the sphere of constant sectional curvature  $\Lambda^2$ . Namely, we take the triangle  $\overline{x_0 z_1 z_2}$  on the sphere such that  $|x_0 z_1| = |\overline{x_0 z_1}|$ ,  $|z_1 z_2| = |\overline{z_1 z_2}|$ ,  $\angle x_0 z_1 z_2 = \angle \overline{x_0 z_1 z_2}$ . Due to Rauch comparison theorem,  $|x_0 z_2| \geq |\overline{x_0 z_2}|$ . Hence,

$$\cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_2|) \leq \cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_1|) \cos(\Lambda |z_1 z_2|) + \sin(\Lambda |x_0 z_1|) \sin(\Lambda |z_1 z_2|) \cos(\angle x_0 z_1 z_2).$$

Assume  $\angle x_0 z_1 z_2 > \pi/2$ . Since  $|x_0 z_1| \leq R + \varepsilon < \pi/(2\Lambda)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_2|) - \cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_1|) &\leq \cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_1|) (\cos(\Lambda |z_1 z_2|) - 1) \\ &\quad + \sin(\Lambda |x_0 z_1|) \sin(\Lambda |z_1 z_2|) \cos(\angle x_0 z_1 z_2) \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda^2 R}{8} |z_1 z_2| \angle x_0 z_1 z_2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_2|) - \cos(\Lambda |x_0 z_1|) \geq \Lambda (|x_0 z_1| - |x_0 z_2|).$$

Hence,

$$2\varepsilon \geq |x_0 z_2| - |x_0 z_1| \geq -\frac{\Lambda R}{8} |z_1 z_2| \angle x_0 z_1 z_2,$$

which yields  $\angle x_0 z_1 z_2 \leq 2\pi/3$  due to the condition (A.9). Thus combining with (A.10), we can choose sufficiently small  $c_3$  such that

$$(A.11) \quad \angle x z_1 z_2 \leq \angle x z_1 x_0 + \angle x_0 z_1 z_2 \leq \frac{5}{6}\pi.$$

Then the lemma follows from the exact same argument in the last part of Lemma (6.1)(1).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Alessandrini, *Stable determination of conductivity by boundary measurements*, Appl. Anal. **27** (1988), 153–172.
- [2] G. Alessandrini, J. Sylvester, *Stability for a multidimensional inverse spectral theorem*, Comm. PDE. **15** (1990), 711–736.
- [3] R. Alexander, S. Alexander, *Geodesics in Riemannian manifolds-with-boundary*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **30** (1981), 481–488.
- [4] S. Alexander, V. Kapovitch, A. Petrunin, *Alexandrov geometry: preliminary version no. 1*, arXiv:1903.08539.
- [5] M. Anderson, A. Katsuda, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, M. Taylor, *Geometric Convergence, and Gel’fand’s Inverse Boundary Problem*, Invent. Math. **158** (2004), 261–321.
- [6] M. Belishev, *An approach to multidimensional inverse problems for the wave equation*, (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **297** (1987), 524–527.
- [7] M. Belishev, Y. Kurylev, *To the reconstruction of a Riemannian manifold via its spectral data (BC-method)*, Comm. PDE **17** (1992), 767–804.
- [8] P. Bérard, G. Besson, S. Gallot, *Embedding Riemannian manifolds by their heat kernel*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **4** (1994), 373–398.
- [9] R. Bosi, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, *Reconstruction and stability in Gel’fand’s inverse interior spectral problem*, To appear in Analysis and PDE.
- [10] Y. Brudnyi, P. Shvartsman, *A linear extension operator for a space of smooth functions defined on closed subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$* , Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **280** (1985), 268–270. English transl. in Soviet Math. Dokl. **31**, No. 1 (1985), 48–51.
- [11] Y. Brudnyi, P. Shvartsman, *Generalizations of Whitney’s extension theorem*, Int. Math. Research Notices **3** (1994), 129–139.
- [12] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, *A course in metric geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **33**, AMS, 2001. xiv+415 pp.
- [13] D. Burago, S. Ivanov, Y. Kurylev, *A graph discretization of the Laplace-Beltrami operator*, J. Spectr. Theory **4** (2014), no. 4, 675–714.
- [14] D. Burago, S. Ivanov, M. Lassas, J. Lu, *Stability of the Gel’fand inverse boundary problem via the unique continuation*, arXiv:2012.04435.
- [15] I. Chavel, *Riemannian geometry—a modern introduction*. Cambridge U. Press, 1993.
- [16] J. Cheeger, *Finiteness theorems for Riemannian manifolds*, Amer. J. Math. **92** (1970), 61–75.
- [17] J. Cheeger, S. T. Yau, *A lower bound for the heat kernel*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **34** (1981), 465–480.
- [18] X. Chen, M. Lassas, L. Oksanen, G. Paternain, *Detection of Hermitian connections in wave equations with cubic non-linearity*, To appear in JEMS. arXiv:1902.05711.
- [19] S. Cheng, T. Dey, E. Ramos, *Manifold reconstruction from point samples*, SODA (2005), 1018–1027.
- [20] R. Coifman, S. Lafon, *Diffusion maps*, Appl. Comp. Harm. Anal. **21** (2006), 5–30.
- [21] R. Coifman, S. Lafon, A. Lee, M. Maggioni, B. Nadler, F. Warner, S. Zucker, *Geometric diffusions as a tool for harmonic analysis and structure definition of data: Multiscale methods*, Proc. of Nat. Acad. Sci. **102** (2005), 7432–7438.
- [22] M. de Hoop, G. Uhlmann, Y. Wang, *Nonlinear responses from the interaction of two progressing waves at an interface*, Ann. de l’Inst. Henri Poincaré C, Anal. non lin. **36** (2019), 347–363.
- [23] M. de Hoop, G. Uhlmann, Y. Wang, *Nonlinear interaction of waves in elastodynamics and an inverse problem*, Math. Ann. **376** (2020), 765–795.
- [24] M. Di Cristo, L. Rondi, S. Vessella, *Stability properties of an inverse parabolic problem with unknown boundaries*. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **185** (2006), 223–255.



- [25] D. Dos Santos Ferreira, C. Kenig; J. Sjöstrand, G. Uhlmann, *Determining a magnetic Schrödinger operator from partial Cauchy data*. Comm. Math. Phys. **271** (2007), 467–488.
- [26] C. Fefferman, *A sharp form of Whitney’s extension theorem*, Ann. of Math. **161** (2005), 509–577.
- [27] C. Fefferman, *Whitney’s extension problem for  $C^m$* , Ann. of Math. **164** (2006), 313–359.
- [28] C. Fefferman,  *$C^m$ -extension by linear operators*, Ann. of Math. **166** (2007), 779–835.
- [29] C. Fefferman, S. Ivanov, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, H. Narayanan, *Reconstruction and interpolation of manifolds I: The geometric Whitney problem*, Found. Comp. Math. **20** (2020), 1035–1133.
- [30] C. Fefferman, S. Ivanov, M. Lassas, H. Narayanan: *Reconstruction of a Riemannian manifold from noisy intrinsic distances*, SIAM J. Math. Data Science **2** (2020), No. 3, 770–808.
- [31] C. Fefferman, B. Klartag, *Fitting  $C^m$ -smooth function to data I*, Ann. of Math. **169** (2009), 315–346.
- [32] C. Fefferman, B. Klartag, *Fitting  $C^m$ -smooth function to data II*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **25** (2009), 49–273.
- [33] C. Fefferman, S. Mitter, H. Narayanan, *Testing the manifold hypothesis*, JAMS **29** (2016), 983–1049.
- [34] I. Gel’fand, *Some aspects of functional analysis and algebra*, Proc. Intern. Cong. Math. **1** (1954), 253–277.
- [35] M. Gromov, *Filling Riemannian manifolds*, J. Diff. Geom. **18** (1983), 1–147.
- [36] C. Guillarmou, L. Tzou, *Calderon inverse problem with partial data on Riemann surfaces*. Duke Math. J. **158** (2011), 83–120.
- [37] T. Helin, M. Lassas, L. Oksanen, T. Saksala, *Correlation based passive imaging with a white noise source*, J. Math. Pures et Appl. **116** (2018), 132–160.
- [38] T. Helin, M. Lassas, L. Ylinen, Z. Zhang, *Inverse problems for heat equation and space-time fractional diffusion equation with one measurement*. J. Diff. Eq. **269** (2020), no. 9, 7498–7528.
- [39] P. Hintz, G. Uhlmann, J. Zhai, *An inverse boundary value problem for a semilinear wave equation on Lorentzian manifolds*, Int. Math. Res. Not., rnab088, 2021.
- [40] P. Hintz, G. Uhlmann, J. Zhai, *The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for a semilinear wave equation on Lorentzian manifolds*, arXiv:2103.08110.
- [41] S. Ivanov, *Distance difference representations of Riemannian manifolds*, Geom. Dedicata **207** (2020), 167–192.
- [42] H. Karcher, *Riemannian Comparison Constructions*. In Global differential geometry (Ed. S. S. Chern), Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 27 (1989) MAA., pp. 170–222.
- [43] A. Kasue, *Convergence of Riemannian manifolds and Laplace operators. I*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **52** (2002), 1219–1257.
- [44] A. Katchalov, Y. Kurylev, *Multidimensional inverse problem with incomplete boundary spectral data*, Comm. Part. Diff. Eq. **23** (1998), 55–95.
- [45] A. Katchalov, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, *Inverse Boundary Spectral Problems*. Chapman Hall/CRC, Pure and Applied Mathematics **123**. (2001), 290pp.
- [46] A. Katsuda, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, *Stability of boundary distance representation and reconstruction of Riemannian manifolds*, Inverse Probl. Imag. **1** (2007), 135–157.
- [47] C. Kenig; J. Sjöstrand, G. Uhlmann, *The Calderón problem with partial data*. Ann. of Math. **165** (2007), 567–591.
- [48] R. Kohn, M. Vogelius, *Determining conductivity by boundary measurements*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **37** (1984), 289–298.
- [49] R. Kohn, M. Vogelius, *Determining conductivity by boundary measurements. II. Interior results*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **38** (1985), 643–667.
- [50] K. Krupchyk, Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, *Inverse spectral problems on a closed manifold*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **90** (2008), 42–59.
- [51] K. Krupchyk, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse problems for advection diffusion equations in admissible geometries*. Comm. Part. Diff. Eq. **43** (2018), 585–615.
- [52] Y. Kurylev, *Inverse boundary problems on Riemannian manifolds*, Contemp. Math. **173** (1994), 181–192.
- [53] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, *Inverse problem for a Dirac-type equation on a vector bundle*, Adv. Math. **221** (2009), 170–216.
- [54] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, L. Oksanen, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse problem for Einstein-scalar field equations*. To appear in Duke Math. J.
- [55] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, E. Somersalo, *Maxwell’s equations with a polarization independent wave velocity: direct and inverse problems*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **86** (2006), 237–270.
- [56] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann, *Rigidity of broken geodesic flow and inverse problems*, Amer. J. Math. **132** (2010), 529–562.
- [57] Y. Kurylev, M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann, *Inverse problems for Lorentzian manifolds and non-linear hyperbolic equations*, Invent. Math. **212** (2018), 781–857.
- [58] Y. Kurylev, L. Oksanen, G. Paternain, *Inverse problems for the connection Laplacian*, J. Diff. Geom. **110** (2018), 457–494.
- [59] M. Lassas, *Inverse problems for linear and non-linear hyperbolic equations*. Proc. Int. Congress of Math. ICM 2018, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, Vol III, 3739–3760, 2018.

- [60] M. Lassas, L. Oksanen, *Inverse problem for the Riemannian wave equation with Dirichlet data and Neumann data on disjoint sets*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), 1071–1103.
- [61] M. Lassas, T. Saksala, *Determination of a Riemannian manifold from the distance difference functions*, Asian J. Math. **23** (2019), 173–200.
- [62] M. Lassas, M. Taylor, G. Uhlmann, *The Dirichlet-to-Neumann map for complete Riemannian manifolds with boundary*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **11** (2003), 207–221.
- [63] M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann, *On determining a Riemannian manifold from the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **34** (2001), 771–787.
- [64] M. Lassas, G. Uhlmann, Y. Wang, *Inverse Problems for Semilinear Wave Equations on Lorentzian Manifolds*, Comm. in Math. Phys. **360** (2018), 555–609.
- [65] P. Li, S. T. Yau, *On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator*, Acta Math. **156** (1986), 153–201.
- [66] F. Memoli, *Spectral Gromov-Wasserstein distances for shape matching*, In Proc. NORDIA, 2009.
- [67] M. Ovsjanikov et al., *One Point Isometric Matching with the Heat Kernel*, Computer Graphics Forum **29** (2010):1555-1564.
- [68] L. Pestov, G. Uhlmann, *Two dimensional compact simple Riemannian manifolds are boundary distance rigid*, Ann. of Math. **161** (2005), 1093–1110.
- [69] P. Petersen, *Riemannian geometry*, 1st Ed. Springer, 1998. xvi+432pp.
- [70] C. Plaut, *Metric spaces of curvature  $\geq k$* , Handbook of geometric topology, 819–898, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
- [71] J. Portegies, *Embeddings of Riemannian manifolds with heat kernels and eigenfunctions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **69** (2016), 478–518.
- [72] S. Roweis, L. Saul, *Nonlinear dimensionality reduction by locally linear embedding*, Science **290** (2000), 2323–2326.
- [73] R. Schoen, S. T. Yau, *Lectures on differential geometry*, International Press, 1994.
- [74] K. Shiohama, *An introduction to the geometry of Alexandrov spaces*, Lecture Notes Series, 8. Seoul National University, Seoul, 1993. ii+78 pp.
- [75] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, *Stability estimates for the hyperbolic Dirichlet to Neumann map in anisotropic media*, J. Funct. Anal. **154** (1998), 330–358.
- [76] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, *Boundary rigidity and stability for generic simple metrics*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (2005), 975–1003.
- [77] C. Stolk, M. de Hoop, *Microlocal analysis of seismic inverse scattering in anisotropic elastic media*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **55** (2002), 261–301.
- [78] J. Tenenbaum, V. de Silva, J. Langford, *A global geometric framework for nonlinear dimensionality reduction*, Science **290** (2000), 2319–2323.
- [79] G. Uhlmann, *Inverse boundary value problems for partial differential equations*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III (Berlin, 1998). Doc. Math., 77–86.
- [80] G. Uhlmann, Y. Wang, *Determination of space-time structures from gravitational perturbations*, To appear in Comm. Pure App. Math.
- [81] S. Varadhan, *On the behaviour of the fundamental solution of the heat equation with variable coefficients*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **20** (1967), 431–455.
- [82] N. Varopoulos, *The Poisson kernel on positively curved manifolds*, J. Funct. Anal. **44** (1981), 359–380.
- [83] Y. Wang, T. Zhou, *Inverse problems for quadratic derivative nonlinear wave equations*, Comm. PDE **44** (2019), 1140–1158.
- [84] X. Wang, K. Zhu, *Isometric embeddings via heat kernel*, J. Diff. Geom. **99** (2015), 497–538.
- [85] H. Whitney, *Functions differentiable on the boundaries of regions*, Ann. of Math. **35** (1934), 482–485.
- [86] H. Zha, Z. Zhang, *Continuum Isomap for manifold learnings*, Comp. Stat. Data Anal. **52** (2007), 184–200.

CHARLES FEFFERMAN: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, FINE HALL, WASHINGTON ROAD, PRINCETON NJ, 08544-1000, USA.

SERGEI IVANOV: ST. PETERSBURG DEPARTMENT OF STEKLOV MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 27 FONTANKA, ST. PETERSBURG 191023, RUSSIA.

MATTI LASSAS: UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. Box 68, 00014, HELSINKI, FINLAND.

JINPENG LU: UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, P.O. Box 68, 00014, HELSINKI, FINLAND.

HARIHARAN NARAYANAN: SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, TATA INSTITUTE FOR FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, MUMBAI 400005, INDIA.