

# GOOD GEODESICS SATISFYING THE TIMELIKE CURVATURE-DIMENSION CONDITION

MATHIAS BRAUN

ABSTRACT. Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a locally causally closed,  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular measured Lorentzian geodesic space obeying the weak timelike curvature-dimension condition  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  in the sense of Cavalletti and Mondino. We prove the existence of geodesics of probability measures on  $M$  which satisfy the entropic semiconvexity inequality defining  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  and whose densities with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$  are additionally uniformly  $L^\infty$  in time. This holds apart from any nonbranching assumption. We also discuss similar results under the timelike measure-contraction property.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Optimal transport on Lorentzian spaces	5
2.1. Lorentzian geodesic spaces	5
2.2. Lorentz–Wasserstein distance	8
2.3. Entropic timelike curvature-dimension condition	10
3. Existence of good geodesics	12
3.1. Strong timelike $p$ -dualizability along $\ell_p$ -geodesics	12
3.2. Construction of a candidate	13
3.3. $(K, N, p)$ -convexity inequality	15
3.4. Uniform density bounds	17
4. Variations of the main result	23
4.1. The infinite-dimensional case	24
4.2. General timelike convex functionals	27
4.3. Timelike measure-contraction property	28
References	29

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**Lott–Sturm–Villani theory.** In the noughties, descriptions of synthetic Ricci curvature bounds by  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  for metric measure spaces  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m})$  via optimal transport were set up by Sturm [40, 41], and independently Lott and Villani [28]. This leads to the so-called  $\text{CD}(K, \infty)$  spaces. Combined with the works of Ambrosio,

---

*Date:* May 17, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49J52, 53C50, 58E10, 58Z05, 83C99.

*Key words and phrases.* Timelike geodesics; Timelike curvature-dimension condition; Strong energy condition; Lorentzian pre-length spaces.

The author is sincerely grateful to Robert McCann for help- and fruitful discussions and for communicating the content of Remark 2.15, and to Fabio Cavalletti and Andrea Mondino for their help with the proof of Lemma 3.1. This research is supported in part by Canada Research Chairs Program funds and a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Grant (2020-04162) held by Robert McCann.

Gigli, and Savaré [3, 4, 5], these have become a research area which is highly active today. The strongest results in this framework have been obtained for  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  spaces, i.e.  $\text{CD}(K, \infty)$  spaces admitting a synthetic upper bound  $N \in [1, \infty)$  on their “dimension” [6, 12, 15, 21, 28, 41]. The literature is too large to be cited exhaustively; let us only mention the splitting theorem [20] for  $\text{RCD}(0, N)$  spaces, i.e. infinitesimally Hilbertian  $\text{CD}(0, N)$  spaces, which in turn has led to a good structure theory for  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces [8, 22, 32].

In [36, 37] Rajala has proven the existence of  $W_2$ -geodesics of measures whose densities are uniformly  $L^\infty$  in time under  $\text{CD}(K, \infty)$  and  $\text{CD}(K, N)$ , respectively, once their endpoints have bounded support and  $L^\infty$ -densities with respect to  $\mathfrak{m}$ . In addition, by [2, 37] such a geodesic can be constructed to satisfy the defining entropic semiconvexity inequality. This generalizes results from the smooth case [13, 29, 38], and remarkably does not rely on any nonbranching assumption.

Rajala’s work has led to cornerstone results for the theory of CD spaces. We only quote a few: a metric Brenier theorem [3], existence of “many” test plans which in turn are used to axiomatize Sobolev calculus [3, 21], the Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property (without using heat flow [4]) which links this Eulerian calculus to the Lagrangian side [20], the proof of constancy of the dimension for  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  spaces [8], the weak Poincaré inequality [37], stability of super-Ricci flows [42], etc.

**Nonsmooth Lorentzian geometry.** Recently, ideas especially similar to [15] have led to synthetic *timelike* lower Ricci bounds in nonsmooth general relativity by Cavalletti and Mondino [11] in terms of the (*weak*) *timelike curvature-dimension conditions*  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$  and  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$ ,  $p \in (0, 1)$ , in the “entropic” sense.

Here, the relevant structures are *Lorentzian pre-length spaces*  $(M, \mathfrak{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  [27], see also [39] for a related approach. In the same way metric measure spaces generalize smooth Riemannian manifolds, these provide singular counterparts to smooth Lorentzian spacetimes. They come with a chronological relation  $\ll$  and a notion of causality  $\leq$  between points in  $M$ . The *time separation function*  $\tau$  takes over the role of a metric, in the sense that parallel to the smooth case [25, 30, 34] it allows for notions of length, geodesics, strong causality, etc.<sup>1</sup> Developing such a singular theory within general relativity aims to include spacetimes with low regularity metrics. In turn, this would allow one to address the Cauchy initial value problem for the Einstein equation, the cosmic censorship conjectures, and physically relevant models in wider generality than currently possible. See e.g. the introductions of [11, 27] for related literature.

The TCD and wTCD conditions are defined by asking for the convexity, see Definition 2.17 and Definition 2.20, of the exponentiated relative entropy

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu) := e^{-\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu)/N}, \quad (1.1)$$

on the space of probability measures on  $M$ , along some chronological optimal mass transport from past to future located distributions. Here, optimality — and the notion of *geodesics* with respect to which convexity of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  is formulated — are quantified by the *p-Lorentz–Wasserstein distance*

$$\ell_p(\mu, \nu) := \sup \|\tau\|_{L^p(M^2, \pi)},$$

$p \in (0, 1]$ , first introduced in [14] and further studied in [11, 26, 30, 33, 43]. The supremum is taken over all causal couplings  $\pi$  of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ ; see Section 2.2 for details.

Notably,  $\text{TCD}_p^e(0, N)$  and  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(0, N)$  are nonsmooth analogues of the *strong energy condition* of Hawking and Penrose [23, 24, 35]. The latter is a nonnegative definiteness condition on the stress-energy tensor. For a vanishing cosmological

<sup>1</sup>Though  $\tau(x, y)$  should never be interpreted as a distance, cf. Remark 2.2, but rather as the maximal proper time a spacetime point  $x \in M$  needs to travel to  $y \in M$ .

constant, this boils down to nonnegativity of the Ricci tensor in every timelike direction by the Einstein equation. In turn, the latter property can be characterized by convexity of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  along suitable  $\ell_p$ -geodesics. This was discovered in [30, 33] and in fact motivated the authors of [11] to introduce the TCD and wTCD conditions for singular *measured Lorentzian pre-length spaces*  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$ , i.e. Lorentzian pre-length spaces endowed with a reference measure  $\mathbf{m}$ .

**Objective.** In this article, we provide a nonsmooth Lorentzian version of Rajala's results [36, 37], namely the rich existence of *good*  $\ell_p$ -geodesics. We hope our results to be an equally useful contribution to the young theory of TCD and wTCD spaces as [36, 37] was for CD spaces; possible applications of Theorem 1.2 and related future work we attack soon are described below.

Before stating our major Theorem 1.2, we specify what we mean by “good”. A detailed account of our notation is postponed to Chapter 2.

All over this paper, given  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(M^2)$  we use the abbreviation

$$T_\pi := \|\tau\|_{L^2(M, \pi)}.$$

**Definition 1.1.** *Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a measured Lorentzian pre-length space, and let  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . An  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  is called *good* if the following conditions hold.*

- a. *There exists some  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  with  $\tau \in L^2(M^2, \pi)$ , and for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and*

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K, N}^{(t)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1). \quad (1.2)$$

- b. *We have the uniform  $L^\infty$ -bound*

$$\sup\{\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} : t \in [0, 1]\} < \infty.$$

**Theorem 1.2.** *Assume that  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is a locally causally closed,  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular Lorentzian geodesic space satisfying  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, and suppose that the density  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Then there exists a good  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$ .*

*More precisely, some  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  satisfies, for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and*

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq e^{D\sqrt{K-N}/2} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\},$$

where  $D := \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$ .

We also establish the subsequent variations of Theorem 1.2.

- Assuming the stronger  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$  condition in place of  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$ , one may relax the hypotheses on  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , cf. Remark 3.18.
- A version of it holds for a dimension-independent  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  condition, newly introduced in Definition 4.1 below following [40], cf. Theorem 4.7 and Remark 4.8. A key message here is that the upper dimension bound, apart from which timelike Ricci bounds have not been studied thus far, is not strictly required, but of course gives quantitatively better results.
- Our proof can be adapted to the situation of more general timelike convex functionals on  $\mathcal{P}(M)$ , cf. Theorem 4.9.
- Lastly, we present a version for the *timelike measure-contraction property*  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  from [11], following the work [10] for metric measure spaces, cf. Theorem 4.13. Here, by nature of the TMCP condition (the terminal

measure is a Dirac measure) the r.h.s. of the obtained inequality

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq \frac{1}{(1-t)^N} e^{Dt\sqrt{K-N}} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}$$

is not bounded in  $t \in [0, 1]$ , but blows up as  $t$  approaches 1.

In the wTCD context, Theorem 1.2 seems optimal with respect to which endpoints  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are allowed, i.e. strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable ones according to Definition 2.8. Having covered this framework, Theorem 1.2 is expected to be relevant for stability questions, since the limit of a sequence of TCD spaces is only known to be wTCD in general [11, Thm. 3.14]. We point out that local causal closedness and  $\mathcal{K}$ -global hyperbolicity, two main assumptions of Theorem 1.2, are precisely the regularity conditions used to set up the corresponding notion of weak convergence of measured Lorentzian geodesic spaces in [11]. On the other hand, the assumption of regularity is rather technical, but seems essential for a crucial lemma in this work, namely Lemma 2.13, cf. Remark 2.15. The author is indebted to Robert McCann for pointing out this detail.

As in [36, 37] we avoid any assumption on (timelike) nonbranching [11, Def. 1.10], which makes Theorem 1.2 convenient for spacetimes with low regularity. Indeed, while spacetimes with  $C^{1,1}$ -metrics are timelike nonbranching [11], this property is expected to fail e.g. for lower regularity of the metric and for closed cone structures [31]. Nevertheless, already in the timelike nonbranching case, an interesting byproduct of Theorem 1.2 and the uniqueness of  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings and  $\ell_p$ -geodesics [11, Thm. 3.19, Thm. 3.20] is the following.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Assume that  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is a timelike nonbranching, locally causally closed,  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular Lorentzian geodesic space obeying  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  be timelike  $p$ -dualizable, and suppose that  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Then the unique  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  is good.*

**Proof strategy for Theorem 1.2.** The proof of Theorem 1.2 is fully carried out in Chapter 3. We were mostly inspired by the clever strategy [37] whose arguments we adapt to the Lorentzian setting at various instances.

The proof is based on a bisection argument. Given  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  as hypothesized, we choose an  $\ell_p$ -midpoint  $\mu_{1/2}$  of them at which  $\mathcal{U}_N$  is maximal, see Lemma 3.5. By  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$ , it obeys (1.2) for time 1/2. Then we choose  $\ell_p$ -midpoints  $\mu_{1/4}$  of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_{1/2}$ , and  $\mu_{3/4}$  of  $\mu_{1/2}$  and  $\mu_1$ , in the same manner. Iteratively, we thus construct a collection of measures  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  for every dyadic  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Based on a crucial property of the distortion coefficients  $\sigma_{K, N}^{(r)}$ , stated in Lemma 3.8, the inequality (1.2) — which is a priori only true for  $\mu_t$  at time 1/2 with  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  replaced by its ancestors — extends to every dyadic  $t \in [0, 1]$  with  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  on the r.h.s. This inequality is stable under weak completion to an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  defined on all of  $[0, 1]$  from Corollary 3.7.

As afterwards discussed in Section 3.4, maximality of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  already suffices to guarantee the desired density bounds for  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ . The reason is that by the curvature-dimension condition, for appropriate endpoints mass has to be spread along some  $\ell_p$ -geodesic in a certain way, see Lemma 3.11. If the density of some midpoint in our construction was too large, we could use the latter geodesic to shuffle mass around and to build a midpoint with strictly smaller entropy, contradicting the maximality of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  at our chosen midpoint. The proofs of the key Proposition 3.14 and Proposition 3.16 are based on this principle.

Contrary to [36, 37], however, we do not really work with bare  $\ell_p$ -intermediate points, but with intermediate slices of  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plans, cf. Subsection 2.2.4. An  $\ell_p$ -intermediate point does not need to admit a *chronological* coupling to any

of its endpoints, which is however required to invoke the wTCD condition. On the other hand, this is clear if the chosen intermediate point already lies on an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan. In fact, the notion of *strong* timelike  $p$ -dualizability is preserved along such plans, see Lemma 3.1. (For timelike  $p$ -dualizability arising in the definition of  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$ , however, this is unclear, cf. Remark 3.2 and Remark 3.18.)

**Applications and future work.** A long-term goal we wish to contribute to with our Theorem 1.2 is to obtain a nonsmooth Lorentzian analogue of the splitting theorem for  $\text{RCD}(0, N)$  spaces [20]. (Recall that in the smooth Lorentzian case, splitting theorems are well-known to hold under the strong energy condition [7, 16, 17].) In turn, as for  $\text{RCD}$  spaces [22, 32] this could lead to a structure theory for TCD or wTCD spaces in which  $\mathfrak{m}$ -a.e. “tangent cone” is isometric to Minkowski space. Relying on Theorem 1.2, one could then try to follow [8] to prove that the dimension of that space is  $\mathfrak{m}$ -a.e. constant throughout  $M$ . Of course, a notion to be established beforehand is a Lorentzian counterpart to infinitesimal Hilbertianity.

Also, for essentially nonbranching metric measure spaces  $(M, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{m})$  the entropic curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}^e(K, N)$  is equivalent, under similar assumptions on  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  as in Theorem 1.2, to the improved inequality

$$\rho_t^{-1/N}(\gamma_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t)}(\mathfrak{d}(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)) \rho_0^{-1/N}(\gamma_0) + \sigma_{K, N}^{(t)}(\mathfrak{d}(\gamma_0, \gamma_1)) \rho_1^{-1/N}(\gamma_1) \quad (1.3)$$

being satisfied along  $\pi$ -a.e. geodesic  $\gamma$  on  $M$  with respect to a  $W_2$ -optimal geodesic plan  $\pi$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  [15, Thm. 3.12]. This is close to what Theorem 1.2 asserts, and it links  $\text{CD}^e(K, N)$  to the reduced curvature-dimension condition  $\text{CD}^*(K, N)$  [6]. Motivated by this, in a forthcoming work we will introduce nonsmooth Lorentzian counterparts of  $\text{CD}(K, N)$  [41] and  $\text{CD}^*(K, N)$ . More precisely, we will provide timelike curvature-dimension conditions  $\text{TCD}_p(K, N)$  and  $\text{TCD}_p^*(K, N)$ ,  $p \in (0, 1)$ , for measured Lorentzian pre-length spaces, which are formulated in terms of the *Rényi* entropy instead of the relative entropy. Among other properties such as e.g. Bishop–Gromov’s inequality in sharp form, we will get a Lorentzian analogue of (1.3) and prove the equivalence of  $\text{TCD}_p^*(K, N)$  to  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$  in the timelike nonbranching case, in particular for smooth Lorentzian spacetimes.

**Organization.** In Chapter 2, we shortly review the theories of Lorentzian pre-length spaces, Lorentzian optimal transport, and timelike curvature-dimension conditions. Chapter 3 contains the proof of Theorem 1.2, while Chapter 4 outlines, and partially proves, the above mentioned extensions of Theorem 1.2.

## 2. OPTIMAL TRANSPORT ON LORENTZIAN SPACES

This chapter recapitulates recent progress in nonsmooth Lorentzian geometry and optimal transport theory on such spaces. The reader is invited to consult the main references [11, 27] for more details, proofs, and especially examples.

### 2.1. Lorentzian geodesic spaces.

**2.1.1. Basic assumptions and notation.** Everywhere in this paper, let  $(M, \mathfrak{d})$  be a proper — hence separable — metric space. All topological and measure-theoretic properties are understood with respect to the topology induced by  $\mathfrak{d}$  and its induced Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, respectively. We do *not* assume  $\mathfrak{d}$  to be complete; all results used below which require completeness are applied for compact subsets of  $M$ .

Moreover, we always fix a nontrivial Radon measure  $\mathfrak{m}$  on  $M$ . For simplicity, we assume that  $\mathfrak{m}$  is fully supported, in symbols  $\text{spt } \mathfrak{m} = M$ .

Let  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  be the set of all probability measures on  $M$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}_c(M)$  and  $\mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(M)$  be its subsets of all elements with compact support and  $\mathfrak{m}$ -absolutely continuous

measures, respectively, and set  $\mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M) := \mathcal{P}_c \cap \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(M)$ . Whenever we say that a specified property is satisfied “subject to the decomposition  $\mu = \rho \mathfrak{m} + \mu_{\perp}$ ”, we mean that  $\mu_{\perp}$  is the  $\mathfrak{m}$ -singular part in the Lebesgue decomposition of  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{m}$ , and that  $\mu - \mu_{\perp} = \rho \mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{P}^{\text{ac}}(M)$ .

For a Borel map  $F: M \rightarrow M'$  into a metric space  $(M', \mathfrak{d}')$  as well as  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ ,  $F_{\#}\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M')$  designates the usual *push-forward* of  $\mu$  under  $F$  given by  $F_{\#}\mu[B] := \mu[F^{-1}(B)]$  for every Borel set  $B \subset M'$ .

Given  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ , let  $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$  be the set of all *couplings* of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , i.e. all  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(M^2)$  with  $\pi[\cdot \times M] = \mu$  and  $\pi[M \times \cdot] = \nu$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}([0, 1]; M)$  denote the set of all continuous curves  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ , endowed with the uniform topology. For  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the *evaluation map*  $\mathbf{e}_t: \mathcal{C}([0, 1]; M) \rightarrow M$  is defined by  $\mathbf{e}_t(\gamma) := \gamma_t$ .

**2.1.2. Chronology and causality.** Throughout, we fix a preorder  $\leq$  and a transitive relation  $\ll$ , contained in  $\leq$ , on  $M$ . We say that  $x, y \in M$  are in *timelike* or *causal* relation if  $x \ll y$  or  $x \leq y$ , respectively. The triple  $(M, \ll, \leq)$  is called *causal space* [27, Def. 2.1]. We write  $x < y$  provided  $x \leq y$  yet  $x \neq y$ . Let us set

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\ll}^2 &:= \{(x, y) \in M^2 : x \ll y\}, \\ M_{\leq}^2 &:= \{(x, y) \in M^2 : x \leq y\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.1.** We term a causal space  $(M, \ll, \leq)$  *causally closed* if  $\leq$  is closed, i.e.  $M_{\leq}^2$  is closed in  $M^2$ . Analogously,  $(M, \ll, \leq)$  is *locally causally closed* if every point in  $M$  has an open neighborhood  $U \subset M$  such that  $\{(x, y) \in \bar{U}^2 : x \leq y\}$  is relatively closed in  $\bar{U}^2$ .

Given a (not necessarily Borel) set  $A \subset M$ , we define [27, Def. 2.3] the *chronological future*  $I^+(A) \subset M$  and the *causal future*  $J^+(A) \subset M$  of  $A$  by

$$\begin{aligned} I^+(A) &:= \{y \in M : x \ll y \text{ for some } x \in A\}, \\ J^+(A) &:= \{y \in M : x \leq y \text{ for some } x \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, the *chronological past*  $I^-(A)$  and the *causal past*  $J^-(A)$  of  $A$  are defined. By a slight abuse of notation, given  $x \in M$  we write  $I^{\pm}(x) := I^{\pm}(\{x\})$  and  $J^{\pm}(x) := J^{\pm}(\{x\})$ . For  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ , we write  $I^{\pm}(\mu) := I^{\pm}(\text{spt } \mu)$  and  $J^{\pm}(\mu) := J^{\pm}(\text{spt } \mu)$ . For all these objects, we set  $I(A, B) := I^+(A) \cap I^-(B)$ , and we define  $I(x, y)$ ,  $I(\mu, \nu)$ ,  $J(A, B)$ ,  $J(x, y)$ , and  $J(\mu, \nu)$  analogously.

**2.1.3. Lorentzian pre-length spaces.** A function  $\tau: M^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is a *time separation function* [27, Def. 2.8] if it is lower semicontinuous, and for every  $x, y, z \in M$ ,

- a.  $\tau(x, y) = 0$  if  $x \not\ll y$ ,
- b.  $\tau(x, y) > 0$  if and only if  $x \ll y$  — in other words,  $M_{\ll}^2 = \{\tau > 0\}$  — and
- c. if  $x \leq y \leq z$  we have the *reverse triangle inequality*

$$\tau(x, z) \geq \tau(x, y) + \tau(y, z). \quad (2.1)$$

The existence of such a  $\tau$  implies that  $\ll$  is an *open relation* [27, Prop. 2.13], whence  $I^{\pm}(A)$  is open for every  $A \subset M$  [27, Lem. 2.12].

**Remark 2.2.** Besides (2.1), unlike the metric in metric geometry  $\tau$  is only symmetric in pathological cases: for every  $x \in M$ , either  $\tau(x, x) = 0$  or  $\tau(x, x) = \infty$ , and if  $\tau(x, y) \in (0, \infty)$ , then  $\tau(y, x) = 0$  [27, Prop. 2.14].

**Definition 2.3.** A Lorentzian pre-length space is a quintuple  $(M, \mathfrak{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  consisting of a causal space  $(M, \ll, \leq)$  equipped with a proper metric  $\mathfrak{d}$  and a time separation function  $\tau$  as above.

2.1.4. *Length of curves.* Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a Lorentzian pre-length space. A *curve* is a continuous map  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow M$ ,  $a, b \in \mathbf{R}$  with  $a < b$ . Such a curve  $\gamma$  is called (*future-directed*) *timelike* or (*future-directed*) *causal* if it is locally Lipschitz continuous with respect to  $\mathbf{d}$ , and  $\gamma_s \ll \gamma_t$  or  $\gamma_s \leq \gamma_t$  for every  $s, t \in [a, b]$  with  $s < t$ , respectively. It is *null* if it is causal and  $\gamma_a \not\ll \gamma_b$ . Analogous notions make sense for *past-directed* curves and their *causal character* (i.e. their property of being chronological, causal, or null). Unless stated otherwise, every curve of a specified causal character is assumed future-directed.

The *length* of a curve  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow M$  is defined through

$$\text{Len}_\tau(\gamma) := \inf \{ \tau(\gamma_{t_0}, \gamma_{t_1}) + \cdots + \tau(\gamma_{t_{n-1}}, \gamma_{t_n}) \},$$

where the infimum is taken over all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and all  $t_0, \dots, t_n \in [a, b]$  with  $t_0 = 0$ ,  $t_n = 1$ , and  $t_i < t_{i+1}$  for every  $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  [27, Def. 2.24]. It is additive with respect to restriction to disjoint partitions [27, Lem. 2.25]. Reparametrizations do neither change causal characters [27, Lem. 2.27] nor the  $\tau$ -length [27, Lem. 2.28].

2.1.5. *Geodesics.* A future-directed causal curve  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow M$  is a *geodesic* (or *maximal*) provided  $\text{Len}_\tau(\gamma) = \tau(\gamma_a, \gamma_b)$  [27, Def. 2.33]. The spaces of all such curves  $\text{Geo}(M)$ , and its subset of timelike curves is called  $\text{TGeo}(M)$ . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TGeo}^*(M) := \{ \gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M : \tau(\gamma_s, \gamma_t) = (t-s)\tau(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) > 0 \\ \text{for every } s, t \in [0, 1] \text{ with } s < t \}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that every timelike geodesic has a weak parametrization [27, Def. 3.31] by  $\tau$ -arclength if  $\tau$  is continuous and  $\tau(x, x) = 0$  for every  $x \in M$  [27, Cor. 3.35]. In different terms, we have  $\text{TGeo}^*(M) \subset \text{TGeo}(M)$ , and every element of  $\text{TGeo}(M)$  has a reparametrization belonging to  $\text{TGeo}^*(M)$ .

*Remark 2.4 (Caveat).* In general, the sets  $\text{TGeo}^*(M)$  and  $\text{TGeo}(M)$  do *not* coincide. The subtle point is that, under the above mentioned weak reparametrization, the resulting curve may not be  $\mathbf{d}$ -Lipschitz any more. It is not even clear in general why elements in  $\text{TGeo}^*(M)$  are continuous. This will be the main point about our assumption of regularity later; see Lemma 2.13 and Remark 2.15 below.

We call  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  *geodesic* if for every  $x, y \in M$  with  $x < y$  there exists a future-directed causal geodesic  $\gamma \in \text{Geo}(M)$  with initial point  $x$  and final point  $y$ .

2.1.6. *Global hyperbolicity.* Next, we introduce a useful condition which ensures both that the time separation function  $\tau$  behaves nicely, and that geodesics exist.

Following [11, Sec. 1.1], we call  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  *non-totally imprisoning* if for every compact  $C \subset M$  there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that the arclength of every causal curve in  $C$  with respect to  $\mathbf{d}$  is bounded from above by  $c$ .

**Definition 2.5.** A Lorentzian pre-length space  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is globally hyperbolic if it is non-totally imprisoning and  $J(x, y)$  is compact for every  $x, y \in M$ . It is  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic if  $J(K_0, K_1)$  is compact for all compact  $K_0, K_1 \subset M$ .

*Remark 2.6.*  $\mathcal{K}$ -global hyperbolicity is not much more restrictive than global hyperbolicity: if in addition to the latter,  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is locally causally closed and  $I^\pm(x) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $x \in M$ ,  $\mathcal{K}$ -global hyperbolicity holds [11, Lem. 1.5].

Thanks to [27, Def. 3.25, Thm. 3.26], global hyperbolicity implies the nonsmooth analogue of the well-known *strong causality condition* for smooth Lorentzian spacetimes [34, Def. 14.11]. On every globally hyperbolic Lorentzian length space (see [27, Def. 3.22] for the precise definition),  $\tau$  is finite and continuous [27, Thm. 3.28]; in particular,  $\tau(x, x) = 0$  for every  $x \in M$ . Also, every such space is geodesic by the nonsmooth Avez–Seifert theorem [27, Thm. 3.30].

In the recent work [9], a nonsmooth analogue of Geroch's characterization [19] of global hyperbolicity in terms of Cauchy time functions has been achieved.

$\mathcal{K}$ -global hyperbolicity is convenient for optimal transport purposes later.

**2.2. Lorentz–Wasserstein distance.** Smooth Lorentzian theories of optimal transport have been studied in [14, 26, 30, 33, 43]. We review the cornerstones of the accompanying nonsmooth theory recently developed in [11] now.

**2.2.1. Chronological and causal couplings.** Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a Lorentzian pre-length space, and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ . We define the set  $\Pi_{\ll}(\mu, \nu)$  of all *chronological couplings* of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  to consist of all  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$  with  $\pi[M_{\ll}^2] = 1$ . Similarly, the set  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu, \nu)$  of all *causal couplings* of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is defined. If  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is causally closed, clearly  $\pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu, \nu)$  if and only if  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$  and  $\text{spt } \pi \subset M_{\leq}^2$ ; an analogous statement holds in the locally causally closed case provided  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$ .

Intuitively, a chronological or causal coupling of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  describes an option of transporting an infinitesimal mass portion  $d\mu(x)$  to an infinitesimal mass portion  $d\nu(y)$  in such a way that  $x \ll y$  or  $x \leq y$ , respectively.

**2.2.2. The  $\ell_p$ -optimal transport problem.** In the following, given any  $p \in (0, 1)$  and following [11, 30] we adopt the conventions

$$\begin{aligned} \sup \emptyset &:= -\infty, \\ (-\infty)^p &:= (-\infty)^{1/p} := -\infty, \\ \infty - \infty &:= -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The total transport cost function  $\ell_p: \mathcal{P}(M)^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty] \cup \{-\infty\}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_p(\mu, \nu) &:= \sup \{ \|\tau\|_{L^p(M^2, \pi)} : \pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu, \nu) \} \\ &= \sup \{ \|l\|_{L^p(M^2, \pi)} : \pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the function  $l: M^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty] \cup \{-\infty\}$  is defined by

$$l^p(x, y) := \begin{cases} \tau^p(x, y) & \text{if } x \leq y, \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Remark 2.7.* The sets of maximizers for both suprema defining  $\ell_p(\mu, \nu)$  coincide. One advantage of the second formulation is that under (local) causal closedness and global hyperbolicity assumptions,  $l^p$  is upper semicontinuous on  $M^2$ . In this case, standard optimal transport techniques [1, 44] can be applied to study the second problem, which in turn yields results for the first [11, Rem. 2.2]. Moreover, the preimages  $l^{-1}([0, \infty))$  and  $l^{-1}((0, \infty))$  conveniently encode causality and chronology of points in  $M^2$ , respectively.

A coupling  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$  of  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  is  *$\ell_p$ -optimal* if  $\pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu, \nu)$  and

$$\ell_p(\mu, \nu) = \|\tau\|_{L^p(M^2, \pi)} = \|l\|_{L^p(M^2, \pi)}.$$

If  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is locally causally closed and globally hyperbolic, and if  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  with  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu, \nu) \neq \emptyset$ , then there exists an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi$  of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , and its total transport cost  $\|\tau\|_{L^p(M^2, \pi)}$  is finite [11, Prop. 2.3].<sup>2</sup>

Lastly, an important property of  $\ell_p$  is the *reverse triangle inequality* [11, Prop. 2.5] strongly reminiscent of (2.1): for every  $\mu, \nu, \sigma \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ ,

$$\ell_p(\mu, \sigma) \geq \ell_p(\mu, \nu) + \ell_p(\nu, \sigma). \quad (2.2)$$

<sup>2</sup>This holds in more generality, but the named case will be the only relevant in our work.



**2.2.3. Timelike  $p$ -dualizability.** Next, we review the concept of (strong) timelike  $p$ -dualizability,  $p \in (0, 1]$ , of pairs  $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ . It originates in [11] and generalizes the notion of  $p$ -separation from [30, Def. 4.1]. Pairs satisfying this condition allow for a good duality theory [11, Prop. 2.19, Prop. 2.21, Thm. 2.26], which has been used to characterize  $\ell_p$ -geodesics (see Subsection 2.2.4 below) in the smooth case [30, Thm. 4.3, Thm. 5.8]. In our case, it is needed to set up the timelike curvature-dimension condition from Definition 2.20 below.

In view of the subsequent Definition 2.8 taken from [11, Def. 2.18, Def. 2.27], we refer to [11, Def. 2.6] for the inherent definition of cyclical monotonicity of a subset of  $M_{\leq}^2$  with respect to  $\ell^p$ , which generalizes the standard concept of cyclical monotonicity with respect to any given cost function [44, Def. 5.1]. It will only be relevant in Lemma 3.1 below.

As usual, given any  $a, b: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  we define the function  $a \oplus b: M^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by  $(a \oplus b)(x, y) := a(x) + b(y)$ .

**Definition 2.8.** Given  $p \in (0, 1]$ , a pair  $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  is termed

- a. timelike  $p$ -dualizable by  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu, \nu)$  if  $\pi$  is an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling, and there exist Borel functions  $a, b: M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  with  $a \oplus b \in L^1(M^2, \mu \otimes \nu)$  and  $\ell^p \leq a \oplus b$  on  $\text{spt } \mu \times \text{spt } \nu$ ,
- b. strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable by  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu, \nu)$  provided  $(\mu, \nu)$  is timelike  $p$ -dualizable by  $\pi$ , and there exists some  $\ell^p$ -cyclically monotone Borel set  $\Gamma \subset M_{\leq}^2 \cap (\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$  such that any given coupling  $\sigma \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is  $\ell_p$ -optimal if and only if  $\sigma[\Gamma] = 1$ , and
- c. timelike  $p$ -dualizable if  $(\mu, \nu)$  is timelike  $p$ -dualizable by some  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu, \nu)$ ; analogously for strong timelike  $p$ -dualizability.

Moreover, any  $\pi$  as above is called timelike  $p$ -dualizing.

In this framework, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TD}_p(M) &:= \{(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(M)^2 : (\mu, \nu) \text{ timelike } p\text{-dualizable}\}, \\ \text{STD}_p(M) &:= \{(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}(M)^2 : (\mu, \nu) \text{ strongly timelike } p\text{-dualizable}\} \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 2.9.* It will be useful to keep in mind that by definition, every  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of a strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable pair is concentrated on  $M_{\leq}^2$ .

*Example 2.10.* Evidently, if  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$ , then  $(\mu, \nu)$  is timelike  $p$ -dualizable if and only if there exists an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu, \nu)$  concentrated on  $M_{\leq}^2$ .

A relevant example (already in the smooth case, cf. [30, Lem. 4.4, Thm. 7.1]) for the strong version is the following. If  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  on a locally causally closed, globally hyperbolic Lorentzian geodesic space  $(M, d, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  with  $\text{spt } \mu \times \text{spt } \nu \subset M_{\leq}^2$ , then the pair  $(\mu, \nu)$  is strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable,  $p \in (0, 1]$  [11, Cor. 2.29].

**2.2.4. Geodesics revisited.** Given any  $p \in (0, 1]$ , following [11, Def. 2.31] and [30, Def. 1.1] we recall the subsequent notion.

**Definition 2.11.** A collection  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  of elements of  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  is termed  $\ell_p$ -geodesic provided  $\ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) \in (0, \infty)$  and, for every  $s, t \in [0, 1]$  with  $s < t$ ,

$$\ell_p(\mu_s, \mu_t) = (t - s) \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1).$$

*Remark 2.12.* In Definition 2.11, the condition  $\ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) > 0$  does not imply the existence of a chronological coupling of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ .

An important principle for us is how  $\ell_p$ -geodesics relate to geodesics on  $M$  (recall Subsection 2.1.5). This is summarized in Lemma 2.13, see [1, Thm. 2.10], [11, Prop. 2.32], and [44, Thm. 7.21, Thm. 7.30] for related results; the results from [44] yield those of Lemma 2.13 below by considering the space  $\mathcal{X} := J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , which is

Polish under  $\mathcal{K}$ -global hyperbolicity. Note that the condition of *regularity* enters our assumptions here quite crucially, for it ensures that the result from [44] (which assumes continuity of maximizing paths) can in fact be applied; cf. Remark 2.15.

Assume that all  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings of two given  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  are chronological. Following [44, Def. 7.20], we then define the set of  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plans from  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  to  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  by

$$\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu, \nu) := \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\text{TGeo}^*(M)) : (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# \pi \text{ is } \ell_p\text{-optimal}\}.$$

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $p \in (0, 1]$  and suppose that  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is a locally causally closed,  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular Lorentzian geodesic space. Suppose that  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  satisfy  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_0, \mu_1) \neq \emptyset$ , and that all  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  (which exist according to the previous condition) are chronological. Then the following properties hold.*

- (i) *For every  $\ell_p$ -optimal  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , there exists  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  such that  $\pi = (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# \pi$ .*
- (ii) *There exists at least one  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$ .*
- (iii) *For every  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  interpolating between  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , there is  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  such that  $(\mathbf{e}_t)_\# \pi = \mu_t$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ .*
- (iv) *For every  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ ,  $(\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_\# \pi \in \mathcal{P}(M^2)$  is an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of  $(\mathbf{e}_s)_\# \pi$  and  $(\mathbf{e}_t)_\# \pi$  for every  $s, t \in [0, 1]$  with  $s < t$ .*
- (v)  *$\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is weakly compact.*
- (vi) *If  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and if  $\sigma$  is any nontrivial measure on  $C([0, 1]; M)$  with  $\sigma \leq \pi$ , then  $\sigma[C([0, 1]; M)]^{-1} \sigma$  is an element of  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$ , where  $\sigma_i := \sigma[C([0, 1]; M)]^{-1} (\mathbf{e}_i)_\# \sigma \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ .*

In the setting of item (iii), we say that  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  is represented by  $\pi$ .

*Remark 2.14.* Unlike (v), the set of  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  with  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# \pi[M_{\ll}^2] = 1$  is in general *not* compact (not even closed), unless every  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  is chronological. Compare with Remark 2.9 and Remark 3.2 below.

*Remark 2.15 (About regularity).* Recall that a Lorentzian length space is called *regular* if it is regularly localizable in the sense of [27, Def. 3.16]. Then on any globally hyperbolic, regular Lorentzian length space, any element in  $\text{TGeo}^*(M)$  is in fact continuous. This result is due to private communication of the author with Robert McCann and will be shown in one of his forthcoming works. As mentioned, this property is what makes [44, Thm. 7.21, Thm. 7.30] applicable to our setting, yielding Lemma 2.13.

Given this discussion, the results in this paper hold in fact true under the weaker hypothesis  $\text{TGeo}^*(M) \subset C([0, 1]; M)$ . This might be useful e.g. in the framework of limit theorems. For simplicity, we stick to the regular case, though.

### 2.3. Entropic timelike curvature-dimension condition.

**Definition 2.16.** *A sextuple  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  consisting of a Lorentzian pre-length space  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  endowed with a Radon measure  $\mathbf{m}$  as hypothesized in Subsection 2.1.1 will be called measured Lorentzian pre-length space.*

For measured Lorentzian pre-length spaces, all notions from Section 2.1 are understood with respect to the inherent Lorentzian pre-length structure.

2.3.1. *Timelike  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity.* For later convenience, we introduce the following Definition 2.17 leaned on [30, Def. 6.5]. With a slight abuse of notation compared to (1.1), given a functional  $E: \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  with sufficiently large finiteness domain  $\mathcal{D}(E) \subset \mathcal{P}(M)$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ , define  $\mathcal{U}_N: \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by

$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu) := e^{-E(\mu)/N}$ . In our work, the most relevant functional  $E$  is the relative entropy  $\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$  introduced in Subsection 2.3.2 below, but see also Section 4.2.

For  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ ,  $r \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\vartheta \in [0, \infty]$ , we consider the distortion coefficients

$$\sigma_{K,N}^{(r)}(\vartheta) := \begin{cases} \frac{\sin(r\vartheta\sqrt{K/N})}{\sin(\vartheta\sqrt{K/N})} & \text{if } 0 < K\vartheta^2 < N\pi^2, \\ r & \text{if } K\vartheta^2 = 0, \\ \frac{\sinh(r\vartheta\sqrt{-K/N})}{\sinh(\vartheta\sqrt{-K/N})} & \text{if } K\vartheta^2 < 0, \\ \infty & \text{if } K\vartheta^2 \geq \pi^2. \end{cases}$$

Here we employ the convention  $0 \cdot \infty := 0$ .

**Definition 2.17.** Let  $p \in (0, 1]$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . We say that a functional  $E: \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  on a Lorentzian pre-length space  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is  $(K, N, p)$ -convex relative to  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{P}(M)^2$  if the following holds. For every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{D}(E)^2$  with  $\ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) < \infty$  there exist an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  such that for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K,N}^{(1-t)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K,N}^{(t)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1).$$

*Remark 2.18.* Unlike the metric definition of  $(K, N)$ -convex functions [15, Def. 2.7], in Definition 2.17 the pathological situation  $T_\pi = \infty$  might occur. This either reduces to a trivial condition ( $K < 0$ ), does not involve any  $L^2$ -norm of  $\tau$  at all ( $K = 0$ ) or — for  $K > 0$  and in the relevant case  $E = \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$  — cannot hold by the timelike Bonnet–Myers theorem [11, Prop. 3.6].

*Remark 2.19.* In the framework of Definition 2.17, define  $e: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  by  $e(t) := E(\mu_t)$ . Then  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity of  $E$  is equivalent to the following. For every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{Q} \cap \mathcal{D}(E)^2$  with  $\ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) < \infty$  there exist an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  such that if  $e^{-1}(\{-\infty\})$  is empty and  $\|\tau\|_{L^2(M^2, \pi)} < \infty$ , then  $e$  is semiconvex on  $(0, 1)$  and satisfies

$$\ddot{e} - \frac{1}{N} \dot{e}^2 \geq K \|\tau\|_{L^2(M^2, \pi)}^2$$

in the distributional sense on  $(0, 1)$ .

2.3.2. *Relative entropy.* We define  $\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}: \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  by

$$\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu) = \begin{cases} \int_M \rho \log \rho \, \mathbf{d}\mathfrak{m} & \text{if } \mu = \rho \mathfrak{m} \ll \mathfrak{m}, (\rho \log \rho)^+ \in L^1(M, \mathfrak{m}), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This functional possesses the following properties, details of which can be found in [11, 30, 40]. By Jensen's inequality,  $\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu) \geq -\log \mathfrak{m}[\text{spt } \mu] > -\infty$  for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$ . Moreover,  $\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is weakly lower semicontinuous in the following form: if a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  in  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  converges weakly to  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  and there is a Borel set  $C \subset M$  with  $\mathfrak{m}[C] < \infty$  and  $\text{spt } \mu_n \subset C$  for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , then

$$\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_n).$$

2.3.3. *The curvature-dimension condition.* Now we finally come to the main definition from [11], namely [11, Def. 3.2], based on the groundbreaking results [30, Cor. 6.6, Cor. 7.5] and [33, Cor. 4.4].

Recall the definition (1.1) of the exponentiated relative entropy  $\mathcal{U}_N$ .

**Definition 2.20.** Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathfrak{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a measured Lorentzian pre-length space, and let  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . We say that the former satisfies

- a. *the (entropic) timelike curvature-dimension condition  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$  if  $\mathcal{U}_N$  is  $(K, N, p)$ -convex relative to  $\text{TD}_p(M)$ , and*
- b. *the weak (entropic) timelike curvature-dimension condition  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  if  $\mathcal{U}_N$  is  $(K, N, p)$ -convex relative to  $\text{STD}_p(M) \cap \mathcal{P}_c(M)^2$ .*

*Remark 2.21.* If the space  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic and satisfies the  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, N)$  condition (in fact,  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  according to Definition 4.11 suffices), then it is timelike geodesic. If in addition, it is causally path connected [27, Def. 3.4] — in particular, if  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is a Lorentzian length space — then it is geodesic [11, Rem. 3.9]. Hence, we may and will always assume the geodesic property with no restriction.

In Section 4.1, we introduce an “infinite-dimensional” analogue of the  $\text{wTCD}$  condition in the spirit of [40].

Among the many properties of these  $\text{TCD}$  and  $\text{wTCD}$  conditions proven in [11], let us quote: the timelike Brunn–Minkowski inequality [11, Prop. 3.4], the timelike Bishop–Gromov inequality [11, Prop. 3.5], the timelike Bonnet–Myers inequality [11, Prop. 3.6], consistency and scaling properties [11, Lem. 3.10], or nonsmooth Hawking–Penrose singularity theorems [11, Thm. 5.6, Cor. 5.13]. The limit of a sequence of measured Lorentzian geodesic  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$  spaces converging weakly, in a certain sense, is (only)  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  [11, Thm. 3.12]. Lastly, given  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and  $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  admitting an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling in  $\Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , we have uniqueness of  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings of  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  [11, Thm. 3.19]; similarly, they are connected by a unique  $\ell_p$ -geodesic [11, Thm. 3.20].

*Remark 2.22.* Except for the Bonnet–Myers inequality, all preceding results are in fact valid under the weaker [11, Prop. 3.11] timelike measure contraction property from Definition 4.11 below.

### 3. EXISTENCE OF GOOD GEODESICS

In this chapter, we prove Theorem 1.2. We show every intermediate result under the most general assumptions, possibly beyond those of Theorem 1.2. Together, however, these reduce precisely to the hypotheses of our main result.

**3.1. Strong timelike  $p$ -dualizability along  $\ell_p$ -geodesics.** The main argument for the construction of the  $\ell_p$ -geodesic for Theorem 1.2 is based on bisection by iteratively selecting appropriate midpoints of  $\ell_p$ -geodesics. To this aim, we have to ensure that strong timelike  $p$ -dualizability behaves well along these.

The proof of the corresponding nontrivial Lemma 3.1 is grounded on a private communication of the author with Fabio Cavalletti and Andrea Mondino.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a Lorentzian geodesic space,  $p \in (0, 1]$ , and  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) \in \mathcal{P}(M)^2$ . Moreover, let  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and define  $\mu_t := (\mathbf{e}_t)_{\#} \pi \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ . If the pair  $(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, so is  $(\mu_s, \mu_t)$  for every  $s, t \in [0, 1]$  with  $s < t$ .*

*Proof.* We assume that  $s, t \in (0, 1)$ , the case  $\{s, t\} \cap \{0, 1\} \neq \emptyset$  is analogous. Note that  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_{\#} \pi$  is concentrated on  $M_{\ll}^2$ , and so is  $(\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_{\#} \pi \in \Pi(\mu_s, \mu_t)$ . Since the latter is  $\ell_p$ -optimal and the total cost

$$\ell_p(\mu_s, \mu_t) = (t - s) \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1)$$

is positive and finite, the pair  $(\mu_s, \mu_t)$  is timelike  $p$ -dualizable.

To show strong timelike  $p$ -dualizability of  $(\mu_s, \mu_t)$ , we have to construct an  $\ell^p$ -cyclically monotone Borel set  $\Gamma_{s,t} \subset M_{\ll}^2 \cap (\text{spt } \mu_s \times \text{spt } \mu_t)$  such that  $\pi[\Gamma_{s,t}] = 1$  for every  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_s, \mu_t)$ . Let  $\Gamma \subset M_{\ll}^2 \cap (\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$  be

an  $\ell_p$ -cyclically monotone Borel set on which every  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling belonging to  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is concentrated, and define

$$\Gamma_{s,t} := (\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)[(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)^{-1}(\Gamma)].$$

To show that  $\Gamma_{s,t}$  is  $\ell_p$ -cyclically monotone, we follow the proof of [18, Lem. 4.4]. Let  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^n, y^n) \in \Gamma_{s,t}$ , and select  $\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^n \in \text{TGeo}^*(M)$  with  $(x^i, y^i) = (\gamma_s^i, \gamma_t^i)$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is  $\ell_p$ -cyclically monotone and since  $\gamma^i \in \text{TGeo}^*(M)$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the empirical measure  $\sigma$  of  $\gamma^1, \dots, \gamma^n$  is an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan interpolating its endpoints [11, Prop. 2.8]. Therefore,  $(\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\sigma$  is an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of its marginals, and applying [11, Prop. 2.8] again yields the  $\ell_p$ -cyclical monotonicity of

$$\text{spt}(\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\sigma = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{(\gamma_s^i, \gamma_t^i)\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{(x^i, y^i)\}.$$

Given any  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_s, \mu_t)$ , by gluing and a measurable selection argument as in the proof of [1, Thm. 2.10], using that  $\mu_s$  and  $\mu_t$  lie on an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic, we find  $\alpha \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  with  $(\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\alpha = \pi$ . Noting that

$$\pi[\Gamma_{s,t}] = (\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\alpha[\Gamma_{s,t}] = (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_{\#}\alpha[\Gamma] = 1$$

then terminates the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* An analogue to Lemma 3.1 for timelike  $p$ -dualizability is unclear to us, at least if timelike branching occurs (by uniqueness of  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings in the nonbranching situation, see [11, Thm. 3.19, Thm. 3.20] and Corollary 1.3). The problem is that for  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  interpolating a timelike  $p$ -dualizable pair  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ , despite the existence of a chronological  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  it might happen that  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_{\#}\pi$  gives mass to  $\{\tau = 0\}$ . Thus,  $(\mathbf{e}_s, \mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\pi$  is not any more a candidate for a chronological coupling of  $(\mathbf{e}_s)_{\#}\pi$  and  $(\mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\pi$  in Step 1 of the above proof of Lemma 3.1.

Assuming that  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_{\#}\pi[\{\tau = 0\}] = 0$  would not be enough for our purposes either: some of our arguments (see e.g. Lemma 3.5 or Lemma 3.13) rely on weak compactness of  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , but the previous condition does generally not pass over to weak limits. This is the main reason why we were unable to prove the TCD counterpart of Theorem 1.2 beyond strictly timelike  $p$ -ordered pairs of measures, as described in Remark 3.18 below. On the other hand, by Remark 2.9 this stability is no issue in the strong timelike  $p$ -dualizable case.

**3.2. Construction of a candidate.** In this section, we construct an appropriate  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  for which we verify in Section 3.3 and Section 3.4 that it satisfies the goodness properties from Definition 1.1.

**Assumption 3.3.** *From now on, until the end of this article, and unless explicitly stated otherwise we assume  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  to be a locally causally closed,  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular Lorentzian geodesic space.*

Given  $N \in (0, \infty)$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_N$  be as in (1.1), and for  $t \in (0, 1)$  define the functional  $\mathcal{V}_N^t : \mathcal{P}(C([0, 1]; M)) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  through

$$\mathcal{V}_N^t(\pi) := \mathcal{U}_N((\mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\pi).$$

Except for Section 4.3, we mostly work with the functional

$$\mathcal{V}_N := \mathcal{V}_N^{1/2}. \tag{3.1}$$

*Remark 3.4.*  $\mathcal{V}_N$  only depends on a single slice of its argument, and one is tempted to follow the CD-treatise [36] more closely instead and consider the functional  $\mathcal{U}_N$  on the set of  $\ell_p$ -midpoints of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  similar to [36, Ch. 3] or [37, Sec. 3.2]. However,

in our case it is more convenient to work with  $\ell_p$ -geodesic plans. For instance, for  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ ,  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ , the pairs  $(\mu_0, (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_{\#}\pi)$  and  $((\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_{\#}\pi, \mu_1)$  inherit the dualizability and chronology properties of  $(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  — needed e.g. for Corollary 3.7 or Proposition 3.14 below (and recall Lemma 3.1) — while this seems unclear for general  $\ell_p$ -midpoints, see Remark 2.12.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $p, t \in (0, 1)$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Assume that  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  admit an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling in  $\Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ . Then  $\mathcal{V}_N^t$  has a maximizer in  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  with finite value. Moreover, if  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  holds for some  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ , and if  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  are strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, for every maximizer  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  of  $\mathcal{V}_N^t$  the measure  $(\mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\pi \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  has finite entropy; in particular  $(\mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\pi \ll \mathfrak{m}$ .*

*Proof.* First, recall from Section 2.2 that  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1) \neq \emptyset$ . As  $\text{spt}(\mathbf{e}_t)_{\#}\pi = \{\gamma_t : \gamma \in \text{spt}\pi\} \subset J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  for every  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{V}_N^t(\pi) \leq \mathfrak{m}[J(\mu_0, \mu_1)]^{1/N}$$

by Jensen's inequality. Thus,  $\mathcal{V}_N^t$  is bounded on  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ .

Moreover,  $\mathcal{V}_N^t$  is weakly upper semicontinuous on  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ . Since the latter is weakly compact by Lemma 2.13, the existence of a maximizer for  $\mathcal{V}_N^t$  follows from the direct method.

The last claim follows by taking the  $t$ -slice of an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan representing an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  witnessing the  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity inequality of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  as a competitor. Hence, the maximum of  $\mathcal{V}_N$  is strictly positive.  $\square$

We construct  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  as follows. Let the pair  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable. Initially, set  $\mu_{1/2} := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_{\#}\pi \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$ , where  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is a maximizer of  $\mathcal{V}_N$  according to Lemma 3.5.

By induction, suppose that for a given  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  we have defined  $\mu_{k2^{-n}} \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  for every  $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^n\}$ . For every odd  $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^{n+1} - 1\}$ , by construction the pair  $(\mu_{(k-1)2^{-n-1}}, \mu_{(k+1)2^{-n-1}}) \in (\mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}))^2$  is strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable thanks to Lemma 3.1, and we define  $\mu_{k2^{-n-1}} \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  as the midpoint of an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan interpolating the probability measures  $\mu_{(k-1)2^{-n-1}}$  and  $\mu_{(k+1)2^{-n-1}}$  according to Lemma 3.5. Let  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1] \cap \mathbf{D}}$  denote the resulting collection, where  $\mathbf{D} \subset \mathbf{Q}$  designates the set of dyadic numbers.

To complete this collection to an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic, we need the following result [11, Thm. 2.14]. Its key is the stability of (causal relations of point pairs in the support of)  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings under weak convergence of their marginals under the assumption of local causal closedness.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $p \in (0, 1]$ , and let  $(\mu_n^i)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be sequences in  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  which converge weakly to  $\mu^i \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ , respectively, such that for some compact set  $C \subset M$ ,  $\text{spt}\mu_n^0 \cup \text{spt}\mu_n^1 \subset C$  for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Suppose that  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_n^0, \mu^0) \neq \emptyset \neq \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_n^1, \mu^1)$  for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \ell_p(\mu_n^0, \mu_n^1) = \ell_p(\mu^0, \mu^1).$$

*Moreover, every weak limit point of any sequence  $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  of  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings  $\pi_n \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_n^0, \mu_n^1)$ ,  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , belongs to  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and is  $\ell_p$ -optimal.*

**Corollary 3.7.** *Under all assumptions of Lemma 3.5 and the foregoing hypotheses on  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , some  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  coincides with the previously constructed collection at all times in  $[0, 1] \cap \mathbf{D}$ .*

*Proof. Step 1. Geodesic property for dyadic points.* As in the case of geodesics in metric spaces, it is straightforward to verify by induction, using the reverse triangle

inequality (2.2) for  $\ell_p$ , that for every  $s, t \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbf{D}$  with  $s < t$ ,

$$\ell_p(\mu_s, \mu_t) \geq (t - s) \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1). \quad (3.2)$$

But this inequality is in fact an equality since

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) &\geq \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_s) + \ell_p(\mu_s, \mu_t) + \ell_p(\mu_t, \mu_1) \\ &\geq [s + (t - s) + (1 - t)] \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) = \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1). \end{aligned}$$

**Step 2. Completion.** Let  $t \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathbf{D}$  and  $t_n := \lfloor t 2^n \rfloor 2^{-n} \in (0, t) \cap \mathbf{D}$ ,  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Clearly,  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  converges to  $t$  from below. Since  $\mu_{t_n}$  is supported in the compact set  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , a nonrelabeled subsequence of  $(\mu_{t_n})_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  converges weakly to some  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  with support in  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  by Prokhorov's theorem.

Note that  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_t) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Indeed,  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_{t_m}) \neq \emptyset$  for every  $m \in \mathbf{N}$  with  $m > n$  by (3.2). Fixing  $\pi_m \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_{t_m})$ ,  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ , by tightness of usual couplings [44, Lem. 4.4] a nonrelabeled subsequence of  $(\pi_m)_{m \in \mathbf{N}_{>n}}$  converges weakly to some  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_t)$ . By local causal closedness of  $M$  and Portmanteau's theorem,  $\pi$  is concentrated on a closed subset of  $M_{\leq}^2$ , whence  $\pi \in \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_t)$ .

We now claim that the resulting curve  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  is an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$ . Let  $s, t \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathbf{D}$  with  $s < t$ , and let  $(s_k)_{k \in \mathbf{N}}$  and  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  be their approximating sequences in  $[0, 1] \cap \mathbf{D}$  as above. Let  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  be large enough so that  $s_k < s < t_n < t$  for every  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ . By the reverse triangle inequality (2.2) and (3.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_p(\mu_s, \mu_t) &\geq \ell_p(\mu_s, \mu_{t_n}) + \ell_p(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_t) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ell_p(\mu_{s_k}, \mu_{t_n}) + \ell_p(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_t) \\ &= (t_n - s) \ell_p(\mu_0, \mu_1) + \ell_p(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_t). \end{aligned}$$

Here, in the second line we have applied Lemma 3.6, using that  $\Pi_{\leq}(\mu_{s_k}, \mu_s) \neq \emptyset \neq \Pi_{\leq}(\mu_{t_n}, \mu_{t_n})$  for every  $k$  and  $n$  as above. Finally, letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the previous inequality while using Lemma 3.6 again, the claim follows as for (3.2).  $\square$

In the rest of this chapter, we fix some  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  as provided by Corollary 3.7 and refer to it as the *candidate* (but we may use the notation  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  at other occasions as well, whenever convenient).

**3.3.  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity inequality.** Now we start proving that the candidate  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  is good according to Definition 1.1: it has to obey the  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity inequality for  $\mathcal{U}_N$  defining  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ , and  $\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}$  has to be uniformly bounded in  $t \in [0, 1]$  subject to the decomposition  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathfrak{m}$ . (Recall that  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$  by Lemma 3.5, weak lower semicontinuity of  $\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ , and Jensen's inequality.) We start with the former.

The subsequent identities taken from [36, Lem. 3.2] are crucial in the proof of the main Proposition 3.10.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ , and let  $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in [0, 1]$  with  $t_1 < t_2$  as well as  $\vartheta \geq 0$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{K, N}^{((1-t_3)t_1+t_3t_2)}(\vartheta) &= \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t_3)}((t_2 - t_1)\vartheta) \sigma_{K, N}^{(t_1)}(\vartheta) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K, N}^{(t_3)}((t_2 - t_1)\vartheta) \sigma_{K, N}^{(t_2)}(\vartheta), \\ \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-(1-t_3)t_1-t_3t_2)}(\vartheta) &= \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t_3)}((t_2 - t_1)\vartheta) \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t_1)}(\vartheta) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K, N}^{(t_3)}((t_2 - t_1)\vartheta) \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t_2)}(\vartheta). \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 3.9.* Recall that analogous formulas are not valid for the distortion coefficients used to set up the finite-dimensional CD condition for metric measure spaces [41, Def. 1.3]. Related to this, Lemma 3.8 is the main reason for the local-to-global property of its reduced counterpart [6, Thm. 5.1].

**Proposition 3.10.** *Assume  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for some  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_m)$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable. Then there exists some timelike  $p$ -dualizing coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  such that the candidate  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  associated to  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  from Section 3.2 obeys, for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,*

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K, N}^{(t)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1).$$

*Proof.* We loosely follow [36, Sec. 3.1], but have to perform a subtle modification. The curvature-dimension condition in [36, Def. 1.1] might be different from its entropic counterpart for metric measure spaces which are not essentially nonbranching [15, Def. 3.1, Thm. 3.12], and the  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$  condition from Definition 2.20 is formulated in the spirit of [15]. In particular, the  $\ell_p$ -geodesic and the  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  therein have a priori nothing to do with each other, unlike [36, Def. 1.1]. We thus have to keep track of all couplings appearing in the TCD condition at every step of the dyadic construction from Section 3.2.

This is done by a monotonicity argument by gradually selecting the plan with respect to which the  $L^2$ -norm of  $\tau$  is maximal if  $K < 0$  or minimal if  $K \geq 0$ , and a tightness argument justifying the final passage to the limit. For simplicity, let us assume that  $K < 0$ , the other case is treated analogously.

**Step 1.** *Approximate  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity inequality for dyadic times.* By maximality of  $\mathcal{V}_N$ , the  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  condition, and Lemma 2.13 there is an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi_1 \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  such that

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{1/2}) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\pi_1}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\pi_1}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1).$$

Now suppose that for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  there exists  $\pi_n \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  such that for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{k2^{-n}}) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-k2^{-n})}(T_{\pi_n}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K, N}^{(k2^{-n})}(T_{\pi_n}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1). \quad (3.3)$$

Let  $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^{n+1} - 1\}$  be an odd number. Arguing as above and noting that the ancestors  $\mu_{(k-1)2^{-n-1}}$  and  $\mu_{(k+1)2^{-n-1}}$  of  $\mu_{k2^{-n-1}}$  are strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, there is an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\omega_{n+1}^k \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_{(k-1)2^{-n-1}}, \mu_{(k+1)2^{-n-1}})$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{k2^{-n-1}}) &\geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\omega_{n+1}^k}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{(k-1)2^{-n-1}}) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\omega_{n+1}^k}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{(k+1)2^{-n-1}}) \\ &\geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\omega_{n+1}^k}) \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-(k-1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_n}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\omega_{n+1}^k}) \sigma_{K, N}^{((k-1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_n}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\omega_{n+1}^k}) \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-(k+1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_n}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_{\omega_{n+1}^k}) \sigma_{K, N}^{((k+1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_n}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1). \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality, we have used our induction hypothesis. By Corollary 3.7, Lemma 2.13 and an argument as in the proof of [1, Thm. 2.11] we now construct a plan  $\alpha_{n+1}^k \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , which is henceforth fixed, with the property that  $(\mathbf{e}_{(k-1)2^{-n-1}}, \mathbf{e}_{(k+1)2^{-n-1}})_{\#} \alpha_{n+1}^k = \omega_{n+1}^k$ . We observe that  $\alpha_{n+1}^k$  is concentrated on timelike geodesics by Remark 2.9.

Having at our disposal these  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plans  $\alpha_{n+1}^k$  for every odd index  $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^{n+1} - 1\}$ , employing that

$$T_{\omega_{n+1}^k} = 2^{-n} T_{\pi_{n+1}^k}$$

for  $\pi_{n+1}^k := (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_{\#} \alpha_{n+1}^k$ , considering the  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling

$$\pi_{n+1} := \text{argmax}\{T_\pi : \pi \in \{\pi_n, \pi_{n+1}^1, \dots, \pi_{n+1}^{2^{n+1}-1}\}\}$$



of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ , and using the nonincreasingness of the function  $\sigma_{K,N}^{(r)}(\vartheta)$  in  $\vartheta \geq 0$  for every  $r \in [0, 1]$ , from the above inequalities we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{k2^{-n-1}}) &\geq \sigma_{K,N}^{(1/2)}(2^{-n} T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \sigma_{K,N}^{(1-(k-1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K,N}^{(1/2)}(2^{-n} T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \sigma_{K,N}^{((k-1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K,N}^{(1/2)}(2^{-n} T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \sigma_{K,N}^{(1-(k+1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) \\ &\quad + \sigma_{K,N}^{(1/2)}(2^{-n} T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \sigma_{K,N}^{((k+1)2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1) \\ &= \sigma_{K,N}^{(1-k2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K,N}^{(k2^{-n-1})}(T_{\pi_{n+1}}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we have used Lemma 3.8.

**Step 2. Construction of  $\pi$  and conclusion.** By induction, we have thus obtained a sequence  $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  of  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  such that  $\pi_n$  satisfies (3.3) for every  $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ ,  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Since  $\text{spt } \pi_n \subset \text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1$  is compact for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , Prokhorov's theorem, Lemma 3.6 and strong timelike  $p$ -dualizability of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  imply weak convergence of a nonrelabeled subsequence of  $(\pi_n)_{n \in \mathbf{N}}$  to an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ . Since  $\tau$  is continuous and bounded on  $\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1$ , we have  $T_{\pi_n} \rightarrow T_\pi$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the inequality for  $\mathcal{U}_N$  from Step 1 and employing weak upper semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  in the case  $t \in [0, 1] \setminus \mathbf{D}$  thus gives the desired inequality.

**Step 3. Properties of  $\pi$ .** By Lemma 3.6,  $\pi$  constitutes an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ . As such, it is concentrated on  $M_{\ll}^2$  thanks to Remark 2.9, whence it is timelike  $p$ -dualizing.  $\square$

**3.4. Uniform density bounds.** Now we show that the candidate  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from Section 3.2 satisfies the desired  $L^\infty$ -bounds for its densities with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$ . This requires some preliminary work culminating in Proposition 3.16 below, where it turns out that maximizers of  $\mathcal{V}_N$  directly admit the correct density bounds.

**3.4.1. Spread of mass.** First, we examine how the wTCD condition spreads mass along appropriate  $\ell_p$ -geodesics. In view of Proposition 3.14, Corollary 3.15, and Proposition 3.16 this is the key result which provides us with the critical threshold for the  $L^\infty$ -norm of  $\rho_t$  subject to the decomposition  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m}$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular measured Lorentzian geodesic space satisfying  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for some  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Suppose that  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  is strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, and that  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then there exists an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  connecting  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  such that  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , and we have*

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_{1/2} > 0\}] \geq e^{-D\sqrt{K^-N}/2} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\}^{-1},$$

where  $D := \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$ .

*Proof.* First, note that  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$ . Moreover,  $\sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1) < \infty$  by  $\mathcal{K}$ -global hyperbolicity. Lastly, as  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, \infty)$  implies  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(-K^-, \infty)$ , we may and will assume without restriction that  $K \leq 0$ .

Let  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  be a timelike  $p$ -dualizing coupling for  $(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  along which  $\mathcal{U}_N$  obeys the  $(K, N, p)$ -convexity property from Definition 2.20. By Lemma 2.13,  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  is represented by some plan  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ . Since  $\text{spt } \mu_t = \{\gamma_t : \gamma \in \text{spt } \boldsymbol{\pi}\} \subset J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is compact, the TCD-property implies that  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  for every given  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover,

$$E := \{\rho_{1/2} > 0\}$$

is contained in a compact set, whence  $\mathfrak{m}[E] \in (0, \infty)$ . Set

$$R := \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}\}$$

and note that for every  $\vartheta \in [0, \infty)$  and every given  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\sigma_{K, N}^{(t)}(\vartheta) \geq t e^{-(1-t)\vartheta} \sqrt{-K/N},$$

see e.g. [10, Rem. 2.3]. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{1/2}) &\geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K, N}^{(1/2)}(T_\pi) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} e^{-D\sqrt{-K/N}/2} \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-D\sqrt{-K/N}/2} \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_1) \\ &\geq e^{-D\sqrt{-K/N}/2} R^{-1/N}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that  $\pi\text{-esssup } \tau(M^2) \leq D$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_{1/2}) \leq \mathfrak{m}[E]^{1/N}$  as in the proof of Lemma 3.5. The claim follows.  $\square$

*Remark 3.12.* Of course, the same reasoning yields

$$\mathfrak{m}\{\{\rho_t > 0\}\} \geq e^{-D\sqrt{K^-/N}} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}\}^{-1}$$

for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  in the situation of Lemma 3.11. Note that for  $t = 1/2$ , which is the relevant case in the sequel, Lemma 3.11 provides a better constant, though.

**3.4.2. Mass excess functional.** Now we introduce the mass excess functional we deal with later especially in Proposition 3.14, Corollary 3.15, and Proposition 3.16. It measures how much its input deviates from satisfying our density requirements for a good geodesic. Given  $c \geq 0$  as well as  $t \in (0, 1)$ , define  $\mathcal{F}_c: \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_c(\mu) := \|(\rho - c)^+\|_{L^1(M, \mathfrak{m})} + \mu_\perp[M] \quad (3.4)$$

subject to the decomposition  $\mu = \rho \mathfrak{m} + \mu_\perp$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_c^t: \mathcal{P}(C([0, 1]; M)) \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\mathcal{E}_c^t(\pi) := \mathcal{F}_c((\mathbf{e}_t)_\# \pi).$$

Except for Section 4.3 below, we mostly work with the functional

$$\mathcal{E}_c := \mathcal{E}_c^{1/2}. \quad (3.5)$$

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let  $(M, d, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular Lorentzian geodesic space, and let  $p \in (0, 1]$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$ , as well as  $c \geq 0$ . Suppose that  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  admit an  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling in  $\Pi_\leq(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , and that all  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings are chronological. Then  $\mathcal{E}_c^t$  has a minimizer in  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is compact, the functional  $\mathcal{F}_c$  is weakly lower semicontinuous on  $\mathcal{P}(J(\mu_0, \mu_1))$ , cf. e.g. [44, Thm. 30.6] or [37, Lem. 3.6]. Hence,  $\mathcal{E}_c^t$  is weakly lower semicontinuous on  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ . The claim follows as for Lemma 3.5.  $\square$

**3.4.3.  $L^\infty$ -bounds for minimizers of  $\mathcal{E}_c$ .** In this section, we study the minimal values of  $\mathcal{E}_c$  for all real  $c$  no smaller than the critical threshold

$$\text{thr} := e^{D\sqrt{K^-/N}/2} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}\}, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $D := \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$  for every  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  as hypothesized in Theorem 1.2 (recall Lemma 3.11). In fact, in this case it turns out that the minimal value of  $\mathcal{E}_c$  is always 0. To prove this, we first go strictly above the threshold in Proposition 3.14, which is where most of the work has to be done. Corollary 3.15 establishes the analogous result for the precise threshold  $\text{thr}$ .

**Proposition 3.14.** *Suppose  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for some  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, and assume that  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Finally, let  $c > \text{thr}$ . Then*

$$\min \mathcal{E}_c(\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* We roughly follow the strategy of the proof of [37, Prop. 3.11], up to several modifications required since we work entirely with  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plans and not with  $\ell_p$ -intermediate points. We argue by contradiction. Suppose that

$$\min \mathcal{E}_c(\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)) > 0.$$

Let  $\text{Min}_c \subset \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  be the set of minimizers of  $\mathcal{E}_c$  on  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , which is nonempty by Lemma 3.13. Since all midpoints of elements of  $\text{Min}_c$  have support in the compact set  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , there exists  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \text{Min}_c$  such that

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > c\}] \geq \frac{\text{thr}^{1/4}}{c^{1/4}} \sup\{\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\omega > c\}] : \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \text{Min}_c\} \quad (3.7)$$

subject to the decompositions  $\nu = \rho_\nu \mathbf{m} + \nu_\perp$  and  $\omega = \rho_\omega \mathbf{m} + \omega_\perp$ , employing the abbreviations  $\nu := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_\# \boldsymbol{\pi}$  and  $\omega := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_\# \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ .

In the sequel, our strategy is to shuffle around mass from  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  which contributes towards the positivity of  $\mathcal{E}_c(\boldsymbol{\pi})$  to build an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  with less energy. That way, we will arrive at a contradiction.

**Step 1.** *Detection of the set of midpoints with large density.* We will first assume that  $\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > c\}] > 0$ , in which case the supremum on the r.h.s. of (3.7) is strictly positive. Fix  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > c + \delta\}] \geq \frac{\text{thr}^{1/2}}{c^{1/2}} \mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > c\}]. \quad (3.8)$$

Henceforth using the abbreviations

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \{\rho_\nu > c\}, \\ A_\delta &:= \{\rho_\nu > c + \delta\}, \\ G_\delta &:= (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})^{-1}(A_\delta), \end{aligned}$$

we define  $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_0 &:= \nu[A_\delta]^{-1} (\mathbf{e}_0)_\# [\boldsymbol{\pi} \llcorner G_\delta], \\ \kappa_1 &:= \nu[A_\delta]^{-1} (\mathbf{e}_1)_\# [\boldsymbol{\pi} \llcorner G_\delta]. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we take the portion of curves in  $\text{spt } \boldsymbol{\pi}$  which hits  $A_\delta$  at time  $1/2$  and both trace it back to  $\text{spt } \mu_0$  and follow it forward to  $\text{spt } \mu_1$ , up to normalization. It is straightforward to verify that  $\kappa_i \ll \mathbf{m}$ , and that the density of  $\kappa_i$  with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$  is  $\mathbf{m}$ -essentially bounded,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Lastly,  $(\kappa_0, \kappa_1)$  is (strongly, by restriction) timelike  $p$ -dualizable by  $\pi := \nu[A_\delta]^{-1} (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# [\boldsymbol{\pi} \llcorner G_\delta] \in \mathcal{P}(M^2)$ . Indeed,  $\pi$  constitutes a coupling of  $\kappa_0$  and  $\kappa_1$  which is supported on  $M_{\ll}^2$  by Remark 2.9. As  $\kappa_0$  and  $\kappa_1$  are compactly supported, the claim thus follows from [11, Rem. 2.20].

**Step 2.** *Construction of a new geodesic.* By Step 1, Lemma 3.11 and Lemma 2.13, and as  $\sup \tau(\text{spt } \kappa_0 \times \text{spt } \kappa_1) \leq D$ , there exists  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\kappa_0, \kappa_1)$  representing an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\kappa_0$  to  $\kappa_1$  such that

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho > 0\}] \geq \frac{1}{\text{thr}} \quad (3.9)$$

subject to the decomposition  $(\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_\# \boldsymbol{\beta} = \rho \mathbf{m}$ . Set

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} := \boldsymbol{\pi} \llcorner (\text{TGeo}^*(M) \setminus G_\delta) + \frac{c}{c + \delta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \llcorner G_\delta + \frac{\delta}{c + \delta} \nu[A_\delta] \boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

We verify that  $\alpha \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ . Clearly,  $\alpha$  is supported on  $\text{TGeo}^*(M)$ , and  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# \alpha$  is a coupling of  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$ . We claim that the latter is in fact  $\ell_p$ -optimal. To demonstrate this, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{M^2} \tau^p d(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# \alpha &= \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M)} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\alpha \\
&= \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M) \setminus G_\delta} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\pi + \frac{c}{c+\delta} \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M) \cap G_\delta} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\pi \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M)} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\beta \\
&= \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M)} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\pi - \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M) \cap G_\delta} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\pi \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \int_{\text{TGeo}^*(M)} \tau^p \circ (\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1) d\beta \\
&= \ell_p^p(\mu_0, \mu_1) - \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \int_{M^2} \tau^p d(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# [\pi \llcorner G_\delta] \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \ell_p^p(\kappa_0, \kappa_1).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we have used that  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and  $\beta \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\kappa_0, \kappa_1)$ . Now note that  $\pi \llcorner G_\delta \leq \pi$ , and given that  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , by Lemma 2.13  $\nu[A_\delta]^{-1} \pi \llcorner G_\delta$  constitutes an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan interpolating its marginals. The latter are precisely  $\kappa_0$  and  $\kappa_1$ , whence

$$\int_{M^2} \tau^p d(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# [\pi \llcorner G_\delta] = \nu[A_\delta] \ell_p^p(\kappa_0, \kappa_1),$$

which proves the  $\ell_p$ -optimality of  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1)_\# \alpha$ .

Showing that  $((\mathbf{e}_t)_\# \alpha)_{t \in [0,1]}$  is an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic is now done by using the reverse triangle inequality (2.2) and arguing as for Corollary 3.7.

**Step 3. Energy excess of  $\alpha$ .** We decompose  $\theta = \rho_\theta \mathbf{m} + \theta_\perp$ , where  $\theta := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_\# \alpha$ , and compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_c(\pi) - \mathcal{E}_c(\alpha) &= \int_M (\rho_\nu - c)^+ d\mathbf{m} + \nu_\perp[M] - \int_M (\rho_\theta - c)^+ d\mathbf{m} - \theta_\perp[M] \\
&= \int_{M \setminus A_\delta} \left[ (\rho_\nu - c)^+ - \left[ \rho_\nu + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho - c \right]^+ \right] d\mathbf{m} \\
&\quad + \int_{A_\delta} \left[ (\rho_\nu - c)^+ - \left[ \frac{c}{c+\delta} \rho_\nu + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho - c \right]^+ \right] d\mathbf{m} \\
&= \int_{M \setminus A_\delta} \left[ (\rho_\nu - c)^+ - \left[ \rho_\nu + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho - c \right]^+ \right] d\mathbf{m} \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \int_{A_\delta} [\rho_\nu - \nu[A_\delta] \rho] d\mathbf{m} \\
&= \int_{M \setminus A_\delta} \left[ (\rho_\nu - c)^+ - \left[ \rho_\nu + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho - c \right]^+ \right] d\mathbf{m} \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \int_{M \setminus A_\delta} \rho d\mathbf{m} \\
&= \int_{B_1} (c - \rho) d\mathbf{m} + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \int_{B_2} \rho d\mathbf{m} \\
&= \int_{\{\rho < c\}} \min \left\{ c - \rho, \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho \right\} d\mathbf{m},
\end{aligned}$$

where we abbreviate

$$B_1 := \left\{ \rho_\nu < c \leq \rho_\nu + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho \right\},$$

$$B_2 := \left\{ \rho_\nu + \frac{\delta}{c+\delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho < c \right\}.$$

Now we consider the event

$$E := \{\rho > 0\}.$$

Since  $\pi$  minimizes  $\mathcal{E}_c$ , the last integral must vanish identically, whence

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho < c\} \cap E] = 0 \tag{3.10}$$

and  $\alpha \in \text{Min}_c$ . On the other hand,  $\rho_\theta > c$  on  $\{\rho \geq c\} \cap E$ . Combining (3.10), (3.9), (3.8) and (3.7) therefore gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\theta > c\}] &\geq \mathbf{m}[\{\rho \geq c\} \cap E] = \mathbf{m}[E] \geq \frac{\nu[A_\delta]}{\text{thr}} \geq \frac{c}{\text{thr}} \mathbf{m}[A_\delta] \\ &\geq \frac{c^{1/2}}{\text{thr}^{1/2}} \mathbf{m}[A] \geq \frac{c^{1/4}}{\text{thr}^{1/4}} \sup\{\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\omega > c\}] : \sigma \in \text{Min}_c\}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired contradiction.

**Step 4.** *Treatise of the singular part.* In the remaining case  $\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > c\}] = 0$ , the measure  $\nu$  has a nontrivial singular part with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$  since  $\mathcal{E}_c(\pi) > 0$ . Analogously to above, we can shuffle this singular portion to the  $\beta$ -part of the  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $\alpha$  constructed in Step 2 using (3.9) and giving  $\mathcal{E}_c(\alpha) < \mathcal{E}_c(\pi)$ , which leads to a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.15.** *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 3.14,*

$$\min \mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}}(\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)) = 0.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.14, we get that for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\min \mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}}(\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)) \\ &\leq \min \mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}+2^{-n}}(\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)) + 2^{-n} \mathbf{m}[J(\mu_0, \mu_1)] \\ &= 2^{-n} \mathbf{m}[J(\mu_0, \mu_1)]. \end{aligned}$$

The r.h.s. converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by compactness of  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ .  $\square$

3.4.4. *Maximizers of  $\mathcal{V}_N$  have zero excess.* For the subsequent main result of this section, recall the definitions (3.1) of  $\mathcal{V}_N$  and (3.6) of  $\text{thr}$ , respectively.

**Proposition 3.16.** *Suppose  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  for some  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, and assume that  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}}(\pi) = 0$$

for every maximizer  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  of  $\mathcal{V}_N$ .

*Proof.* As for Proposition 3.14, our ansatz is a contradiction argument, i.e. we assume the existence of a maximizer  $\pi \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  with

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}}(\pi) > 0.$$

Our proof follows the one of [36, Prop. 3.5] and for Proposition 3.14.

**Step 1.** *Detection of the set of midpoints with large density.* We recall from Lemma 3.5 that by the hypothesized wTCD condition and since all  $\ell_p$ -geodesics

from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  have support in the compact set  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ , we must have  $\mathcal{V}_N(\boldsymbol{\pi}) > 0$ . In particular,  $\nu := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})\sharp\boldsymbol{\pi} \ll \mathbf{m}$ . Now let  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > \text{thr} + \eta\}] \geq \mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > \text{thr} + 2\eta\}] > 0$$

subject to the decomposition  $\nu = \rho_\nu \mathbf{m}$ , and define

$$c_1 := \frac{4}{\eta} \mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > \text{thr} + \eta\}] - \frac{4}{\eta} \mathbf{m}[\{\rho_\nu > \text{thr} + 2\eta\}].$$

Given any  $\phi \in (0, \eta/3)$  there exists  $\delta \in (\eta, 2\eta)$  such that

$$\mathbf{m}[A_\delta] < \mathbf{m}[A'_\delta] + c_1\phi,$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} A_\delta &:= \{\rho_\nu > \text{thr} + \delta\}, \\ A'_\delta &:= \{\rho_\nu > \text{thr} + \delta - 3\phi\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Step 2.** *Construction of a new geodesic.* Let  $\kappa_0, \kappa_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  be defined as in Step 1 of the proof of Proposition 3.14. Using Corollary 3.15, there exists  $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  such that

$$\|\rho\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq \frac{\text{thr}}{\nu[A_\delta]}$$

subject to the decomposition  $(\mathbf{e}_{1/2})\sharp\boldsymbol{\beta} = \rho \mathbf{m}$ . Setting  $G_\delta := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})^{-1}(A_\delta)$ , define  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  through

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} := \boldsymbol{\pi} \mathbf{L}(\text{TGeo}^*(M) \setminus G_\delta) + \frac{\text{thr} + \delta - \phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \mathbf{L} G_\delta + \frac{\phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \nu[A_\delta] \boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

**Step 3.** *Energy excess of  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ .* We decompose  $\theta = \rho_\theta \mathbf{m} + \theta_\perp$ , where  $\theta := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})\sharp\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , and let  $\rho$  denote the density of  $(\mathbf{e}_{1/2})\sharp\boldsymbol{\beta}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$ . Then the subsequent estimates are readily verified.

- On  $A_\delta$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\theta &\leq \frac{\text{thr} + \delta - \phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \rho_\nu + \frac{\phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho_\theta \leq \frac{(\text{thr} + \delta - \phi)\rho_\nu + \text{thr} \phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \\ &\leq \rho_\nu + \frac{(\text{thr} - \rho_\nu)\phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} < \rho - \frac{\delta\phi}{\text{thr} + \delta}, \\ \rho_\theta &\geq \frac{\text{thr} + \delta - \phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \rho_\nu > \text{thr} + \delta - \phi. \end{aligned}$$

- On  $A'_\delta \setminus A_\delta$ , we have

$$\rho_\theta \leq \rho_\nu + \frac{\phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho \leq \rho_\nu + \frac{\text{thr} \phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} < \text{thr} + \delta + \phi.$$

- On  $M \setminus A'_\delta$ , we have

$$\rho_\theta \leq \rho_\nu + \frac{\phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \nu[A_\delta] \rho \leq \text{thr} + \delta - 3\phi + \frac{\text{thr} \phi}{\text{thr} + \delta} \leq \text{thr} + \delta - 2\phi.$$

Moreover, we define and estimate the mass differences

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{A_\delta} &:= \int_{A_\delta} (\rho_\nu - \rho_\theta) \, \text{d}\mathbf{m} \geq c_2 \phi, \\ \kappa_{A'_\delta \setminus A_\delta} &:= \int_{A'_\delta \setminus A_\delta} (\rho_\theta - \rho_\nu) \, \text{d}\mathbf{m} < c_1 \phi^2, \\ \kappa_{M \setminus A'_\delta} &:= \int_{M \setminus A'_\delta} (\rho_\theta - \rho_\nu) \, \text{d}\mathbf{m}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_2 := \delta \mathbf{m}[A_\delta]/(\text{thr} + \delta)$ . Approximating  $\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}$  by a Rényi-type entropy [40, Lem. 4.1] and with analogous computations as for [36, Prop. 3.5], for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $N_\varepsilon \geq N$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}(\theta) - \text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}(\nu) &\leq \varepsilon - N_\varepsilon \int_M \rho_\theta^{1-1/N_\varepsilon} \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} + N_\varepsilon \int_M \rho_\nu^{1-1/N_\varepsilon} \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \\
&\leq \varepsilon + N_\varepsilon \int_{A_\delta} \rho_\theta^{-1/N_\varepsilon} (\rho_\nu - \rho_\theta) \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} + N_\varepsilon \int_{M \setminus A'_\delta} \rho_\theta^{-1/N_\varepsilon} (\rho_\nu - \rho_\theta) \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \\
&\quad + N_\varepsilon \int_{A'_\delta \setminus A_\delta} \rho_\theta^{-1/N_\varepsilon} (\rho_\nu - \rho_\theta) \, \mathbf{d}\mathbf{m} \\
&\leq \varepsilon + N_\varepsilon \kappa_{A_\delta} (\text{thr} + \delta - \phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon} - N_\varepsilon \kappa_{M \setminus A'_\delta} (\text{thr} + \delta - 2\phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon} \\
&\quad - N_\varepsilon \kappa_{A'_\delta \setminus A_\delta} (\text{thr} + \delta + \phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon} \\
&= N_\varepsilon \kappa_{A_\delta} [(\text{thr} + \delta - \phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon} - (\text{thr} + \delta - 2\phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon}] \\
&\quad + N_\varepsilon \kappa_{A'_\delta \setminus A_\delta} [(\text{thr} + \delta - 2\phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon} - (\text{thr} + \delta + \phi)^{-1/N_\varepsilon}] \\
&\leq \varepsilon - \frac{c_2 - c_1\phi}{(\text{thr} + \delta - 2\phi)} \phi^2 + c_2 c_3 \phi^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Here  $c_3 > 0$  is some constant independent of  $\varepsilon$ , and the last inequality is computed as in the proof of [36, Prop. 3.5]. Choosing  $\varepsilon$  and  $\phi$  small enough, the r.h.s. becomes strictly negative. Therefore  $\mathcal{V}_N(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) > \mathcal{V}_N(\boldsymbol{\pi})$ , which is the desired contradiction.  $\square$

The following consequence thus terminates the *proof* of Theorem 1.2.

**Corollary 3.17.** *Retain the assumptions and the notation from Proposition 3.16. Then the candidate  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  constructed in Section 3.2 satisfies, for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  as well as*

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq e^{D\sqrt{K-N}/2} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\}.$$

*Remark 3.18.* Minor modifications of the above arguments lead to a TCD version of Theorem 1.2. Namely, let us first define  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  to be in *strict  $p$ -timelike order*,  $p \in (0, 1)$ , if all  $\ell_p$ -optimal couplings of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are concentrated on  $M_{\ll}^2$ . By Remark 2.9, this property is weaker than strong timelike  $p$ -dualizability and thus includes the important case when  $\text{spt } \mu \times \text{spt } \nu \subset M_{\ll}^2$ . As for Lemma 3.1, we see that this property is preserved along  $\ell_p$ -geodesics from  $\mu$  to  $\nu$ .

Therefore, an analogue of Theorem 1.2 holds when assuming that  $\text{TCD}_p^\varepsilon(K, N)$  instead of  $\text{wTCD}_p^\varepsilon(K, N)$  therein, and that — instead of being strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable —  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are in strict  $p$ -timelike order.

*Remark 3.19.* Similar arguments as ours above give the existence of good geodesics for arbitrary metric measure spaces obeying  $\text{CD}^\varepsilon(K, N)$ . While in the essentially nonbranching case, this partly follows from [37, Thm. 1.2] by [15, Thm. 3.12], we are not aware of such a general result for the *entropic* CD condition.

#### 4. VARIATIONS OF THE MAIN RESULT

Finally, we discuss various extensions of Theorem 1.2. In all cases, the proof of Theorem 1.2 can then mostly be adopted to the respective situation up to some details which we highlight below.

**4.1. The infinite-dimensional case.** The following is a Lorentzian analogue of Sturm's  $\text{CD}(K, \infty)$  condition for metric measure spaces [40, Def. 4.5] (see also [28]); the counterpart of Theorem 4.7 for metric measure spaces is due to [36, Thm. 1.3] whose strategy we loosely follow.

**Definition 4.1.** *A measured Lorentzian pre-length space  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is termed to obey the weak timelike curvature-dimension condition  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$  and  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  if for every strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable pair  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) \in (\mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}))^2$ , there exists a timelike  $p$ -dualizing coupling  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  such that, for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,*

$$\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mu_t) \leq (1-t) \text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mu_0) + t \text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mu_1) - \frac{K}{2} t(1-t) T_{\pi}^2.$$

*Remark 4.2.* In an evident way, one may define the  $\text{TCD}_p(K, \infty)$  condition as an infinite-dimensional analogue of  $\text{TCD}_p^e(K, N)$ . Taking Remark 3.18 into account, similar results as those presented below for  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  hold for this curvature-dimension condition as well, up to minor modifications.

Before turning to the main Theorem 4.7 of this section, independently of it we examine elementary properties of the  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  condition just introduced. The reader may directly go over to Subsection 4.1.2 at first reading.

**4.1.1. Properties of  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$ .** It is clear that  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  has analogous consistency and scaling properties as its finite-dimensional Lorentzian counterpart [11, Lem. 3.10]. Moreover, as already indicated in Remark 4.2 it can be regarded as an “infinite-dimensional” analogue of the  $\text{wTCD}$  condition from Definition 2.20 by the following result.

**Proposition 4.3.** *The condition  $\text{wTCD}_p^e(K, N)$  implies  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  for every  $p \in (0, 1)$  and every  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ .*

*Proof.* We follow the argument for [15, Lem. 2.12]. By nestedness of the weak timelike curvature-dimension condition [11, Lem. 3.10], given any strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable pair  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) \in (\mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}))^2$ , there is exists timelike  $p$ -dualizing  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  and a  $\mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$ -valued  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  such that, for every  $N' \geq N$ , we have

$$\mathcal{U}_{N'}(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N'}^{(1-t)}(T_{\pi}) \mathcal{U}_{N'}(\mu_0) + \sigma_{K, N'}^{(t)}(T_{\pi}) \mathcal{U}_{N'}(\mu_1). \quad (4.1)$$

Note that  $\pi$  and  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  can be chosen independently of  $N'$ . Using that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{K, N'}^{(t)}(\vartheta) &= t - \frac{K}{6N'} (t^3 - t) \vartheta^2 + o((N')^{-1}), \\ \mathcal{U}_{N'}(\mu) &= 1 - \frac{1}{N'} \text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mu) + o((N')^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $\mu \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  as  $N' \rightarrow \infty$ , the claim follows by subtracting 1 at both sides of (4.1), multiplying the resulting inequality by  $N'$ , and letting  $N' \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

Lastly, we derive volume growth estimates for  $\tau$ -shells following [40, Thm. 4.26]. As in [11, Sec. 3.1], define the open  $\tau$ -ball of radius  $R > 0$  centered at  $o \in M$  by

$$\mathbf{B}^{\tau}(o, R) := \{x \in I^+(o) \cup \{o\} : \tau(o, x) < R\}.$$

Since  $\mathbf{B}^{\tau}(o, R)$  has typically infinite volume, only localizations with respect to  $\tau$ -star-shaped sets lead to meaningful estimates. Here, we term a set  $E \subset I^+(o) \cup \{o\}$   $\tau$ -star-shaped with respect to  $o$  if for every  $x \in E$ , every geodesic  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma_0 = o$  and  $\gamma_1 = x$ , and every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we have  $\gamma_t \in E$ .



Now let  $o \in M$ , and let  $E \subset I^+(o) \cup \{o\}$  be compact and  $\tau$ -star-shaped with respect to  $o$ . Given  $R > 0$  and  $\varepsilon \in (0, R]$ , define

$$S^\tau(o, R, \varepsilon) := \bar{B}^\tau(o, R) \setminus B^\tau(o, R - \varepsilon)$$

as well as the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} v_R &:= \mathfrak{m}[\bar{B}^\tau(o, R) \cap E], \\ v_{R, \varepsilon} &:= \mathfrak{m}[S^\tau(o, R, \varepsilon) \cap E]. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Assume  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  for some  $p \in (0, 1)$  and  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and let  $o$  and  $E$  as hypothesized above. Let  $\varepsilon, r, R > 0$  such that  $r \leq R - 3\varepsilon$ , and let  $\delta \in (0, r]$ . Then for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , if  $K > 0$  we have*

$$v_{R, \varepsilon} \leq v_{r, \delta} \left[ \frac{v_{r+2\varepsilon+t(R-r-2\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon+\delta}}{v_{r, \delta}} \right]^{1/t} e^{-K(1-t)(R-r-2\varepsilon)^2/2},$$

while in the case  $K \leq 0$ ,

$$v_{R, \varepsilon} \leq v_{r, \delta} \left[ \frac{v_{r+2\varepsilon+t(R-r-2\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon+\delta}}{v_{r, \delta}} \right]^{1/t} e^{-K(1-t)(R-r+\delta)^2/2}.$$

*Proof. Step 1. Preliminary inequalities.* We first establish upper and lower bounds for the quantity  $\tau(x, y)$ , where  $x \in S^\tau(o, r, \delta)$  and  $y \in S^\tau(o, R, \varepsilon)$ . By the reverse triangle inequality (2.1), we obtain

$$\tau(x, y) \leq \tau(o, y) - \tau(o, x) \leq R - r + \delta. \quad (4.2)$$

To obtain a lower bound for  $\tau(x, y)$ , let  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  be a timelike geodesic which satisfies  $\gamma_0 = o$  and  $\gamma_1 \in \partial \bar{B}^\tau(o, R - 3\varepsilon/2)$ . Then we have  $\gamma_t \in \partial \bar{B}^\tau(o, r + \varepsilon/2)$  for  $t := (r + \varepsilon/2)(R - 3\varepsilon/2)^{-1}$  which, again thanks to (2.1), implies

$$\tau(x, y) \geq \tau(x, \gamma_t) + \tau(\gamma_t, \gamma_1) + \tau(\gamma_1, y) \geq \tau(\gamma_t, \gamma_1) = R - r - 2\varepsilon. \quad (4.3)$$

**Step 2. Invoking the wTCD condition.** We consider the distributions

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0 &:= v_{r, \delta}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{S^\tau(o, r, \delta) \cap E} \mathfrak{m}, \\ \mu_1 &:= v_{R, \varepsilon}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{S^\tau(o, R, \varepsilon) \cap E} \mathfrak{m}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_0) &= -\log v_{r, \delta}, \\ \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_1) &= -\log v_{R, \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since  $\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1 \subset M_{\ll}^2$  the pair  $(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  is strongly  $p$ -dualizable by Example 2.10. Let  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  be an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic and  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  be a timelike  $p$ -dualizing coupling, respectively, witnessing the semiconvexity inequality for  $\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$  defining  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$ . By Lemma 2.13, some  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  represents  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$ . Similarly as in Step 1, we obtain, for  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ -a.e.  $\gamma \in \text{TGeo}^*(M)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(o, \gamma_t) &\geq \tau(o, \gamma_0) + \tau(\gamma_0, \gamma_t) \geq r - \delta + t(R - r - 2\varepsilon), \\ \tau(o, \gamma_t) &\leq \tau(o, \gamma_1) - \tau(\gamma_t, \gamma_1) \leq r + 2\varepsilon + t(R - r - 2\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

This gives  $\text{spt } \mu_t \subset S^\tau(o, r + 2\varepsilon + t(R - r - 2\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon + \delta) \cap E$ . Set

$$\nu_t := v_{r+2\varepsilon+t(R-r-2\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon+\delta}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{S^\tau(o, r+2\varepsilon+t(R-r-2\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon+\delta) \cap E} \mathfrak{m}$$

and observe that

$$-\log v_{r+2\varepsilon+t(R-r-2\varepsilon), 2\varepsilon+\delta} = \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nu_t) \leq \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_t)$$

by Jensen's inequality. Therefore, since in the case  $K > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nu_t) &\leq (1-t) \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_0) + t \text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_1) - \frac{K}{2} t(1-t) T_{\pi}^2 \\ &\leq -(1-t) \log v_{r,\delta} - t \log v_{R,\varepsilon} - \frac{K}{2} t(1-t) (R-r-2\varepsilon)^2 \end{aligned}$$

by (4.3), while in the case  $K \leq 0$ ,

$$\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\nu_t) \leq -(1-t) \log v_{r,\delta} - t \log v_{R,\varepsilon} - \frac{K}{2} t(1-t) (R-r+\delta)^2$$

by (4.2), the claim follows by elementary algebraic manipulations.  $\square$

Finally, applying Lemma 4.4 subject to the choice  $t := \varepsilon(R-r-2\varepsilon)^{-1} \in (0,1)$  easily leads to the following.

**Corollary 4.5.** *Assume  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  for some  $p \in (0,1)$  and  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and let  $o$  and  $E$  as hypothesized above. Let  $\varepsilon, r, R > 0$  with  $r \leq R - 4\varepsilon$ , and let  $\delta \in (0, r]$ . Then if  $K > 0$ , we have*

$$v_{R,\varepsilon} \leq v_{r,\delta} \left[ \frac{v_{r+3\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon+\delta}}{v_{r,\delta}} \right]^{(R-r)/\varepsilon-2} e^{-K(R-r-3\varepsilon)^2/2},$$

while in the case  $K \leq 0$ ,

$$v_{R,\varepsilon} \leq v_{r,\delta} \left[ \frac{v_{r+3\varepsilon, 2\varepsilon+\delta}}{v_{r,\delta}} \right]^{(R-r)/\varepsilon-2} e^{-K(R-r+\delta)^2/2}.$$

4.1.2. *Geodesics with uniformly bounded densities.* Now we turn to our actual goal, namely Theorem 4.7. Its statement holds in a stronger form, cf. Remark 4.8, but we prefer to present a slightly different proof for the sole existence of  $\ell_p$ -geodesics with bounded densities. This underlines the role that  $\ell_p$ -geodesics play also in the  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  case and is exemplary for a similar result in the next Section 4.2 where, however, the relevant exponential term does not appear.

Reproducing the proof of Lemma 3.11 gives the following.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $(M, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular measured Lorentzian geodesic space obeying  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  for some  $p \in (0,1)$  and  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ . Assume that  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathfrak{m}, \rho_1 \mathfrak{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  is strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable with  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})$ . Then there exists an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  such that  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  for every  $t \in (0,1)$ , and*

$$\mathfrak{m}[\{\rho_{1/2} > 0\}] \geq e^{-K^{-D^2/8}} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}\}^{-1},$$

where  $D \geq \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$ .

**Theorem 4.7.** *Suppose  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  for  $p \in (0,1)$  and  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ . Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathfrak{m}, \rho_1 \mathfrak{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable, and assume that  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})$ . Then there is an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  connecting  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  such that for every  $t \in [0,1]$ ,  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}})$  and*

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})} \leq e^{K^{-D^2/12}} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}\}, \quad (4.4)$$

where  $D := \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$ .

*Proof.* We only outline the proof and highlight the necessary changes compared to our arguments in Chapter 3. Let us redefine

$$\text{thr} := e^{K^{-D^2/8}} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathfrak{m})}\}.$$

Unlike Section 3.2, this time we directly construct a candidate by selecting our midpoints as minimizers of the functional  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}}$  from (3.5). Let  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  be a minimizer of  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{thr}}$  according to Lemma 3.13. Observe that Corollary 3.15 still

holds in this case, where the modified threshold  $\text{thr}$  comes from Lemma 4.6. Define  $\mu_{1/2} := (\mathbf{e}_{1/2})_{\sharp} \boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$ . By Corollary 3.15, we have  $\mu_{1/2} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and

$$\|\rho_{1/2}\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq e^{K^- D^2/8} \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\}$$

subject to the decomposition  $\mu_{1/2} = \rho_{1/2} \mathbf{m}$ . By Lemma 3.1, the pairs  $(\mu_0, \mu_{1/2})$  and  $(\mu_{1/2}, \mu_1)$  are strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable. The construction of  $\mu_{1/2}$  yields that  $\sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \text{spt } \mu_{1/2})$  and  $\sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_{1/2} \times \text{spt } \mu_1)$  are no larger than  $D/2$ . Moreover,  $\mu_{1/2}$  is an  $1/2$ -midpoint with respect to  $\ell_p$ . Next, we construct  $\mu_{1/4} \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  and  $\mu_{3/4} \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  as above as midpoints of some element of  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_0, \mu_{1/2})$  and  $\text{OptGeo}_{\ell_p}(\mu_{1/2}, \mu_1)$  according to Lemma 3.13, Corollary 3.15, and Lemma 3.1, respectively. Proceeding iteratively in this way, we get a family  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbf{D}}$  with the following properties. For every  $t \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbf{D}$  written as  $t = k 2^{-n}$ ,  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and odd  $k \in \{1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ , we have  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  with

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq e^{4^{-n+1} K^- D/8} \max\{\|\rho_{(k-1)2^{-n}}\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_{(k+1)2^{-n}}\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\} \quad (4.5)$$

subject to the decomposition  $\mu_s = \rho_s \mathbf{m}$  for all  $s \in [0, 1]$  under consideration. Here we have used that by our midpoint construction along  $\ell_p$ -geodesic plans, for every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and every odd  $k \in \{0, \dots, 2^n\}$  the function  $\tau$  is no larger than  $2^{-n+1} D$  on  $\text{spt } \mu_{(k-1)2^{-n}} \times \text{spt } \mu_{(k+1)2^{-n}}$ . Inductively, (4.4) holds for every  $t \in [0, 1] \cap \mathbf{D}$ .

As in the proof of Corollary 3.7, this collection is completed to an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic. By weak lower semicontinuity of the functional  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{thr}}$  from (3.4) on  $\mathcal{P}(J(\mu_0, \mu_1))$ , see the proof of Lemma 3.13, and (4.5) we get  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{thr}}(\mu_t) = 0$  for every  $t \in [0, 1]$ . This implies  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and (4.5) for its density with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 4.8.* Combining the arguments of [2, Ch. 4] with our strategy in Chapter 3, one can construct  $\ell_p$ -geodesics satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 4.7 along which, in addition, the semiconvexity inequality for  $\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}$  defining  $\text{wTCD}_p(K, \infty)$  holds.

**4.2. General timelike convex functionals.** Similar conclusions as in Theorem 4.7 can also be drawn for any kind of functional obeying a certain timelike convexity property as follows. Let  $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  be convex with  $f(0) = 0$ , and define the functional  $E: \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$  by

$$E(\mu) := \begin{cases} \int_M f(\rho) \, d\mathbf{m} & \text{if } \mu = \rho \mathbf{m} \ll \mathbf{m}, f^+(\rho) \in L^1(M, \mathbf{m}), \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $E$  be weakly  $(0, N, p)$ -convex relative to  $\mathcal{P}_c(M)^2 \cap \text{STD}_p(M)$  according to Definition 2.17,  $p \in (0, 1)$  and  $N \in (0, \infty]$ , and assume that  $r \mapsto f(r)/r$  is increasing on  $(0, \infty)$ . Then for every strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable pair  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)$  with  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ , there exists an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  such that for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(E)$  and*

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\}.$$

Again, the *proof* of Theorem 4.9 is mainly based on the following result. The rest is treated analogously to Chapter 3 and Section 4.1.

**Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular measured Lorentzian geodesic space, and let  $E$  be as hypothesized in Theorem 4.9. Let  $(\mu_0, \mu_1) = (\rho_0 \mathbf{m}, \rho_1 \mathbf{m}) \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)^2$  be strongly timelike  $p$ -dualizable with  $\rho_0, \rho_1 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Then there is an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, 1]}$  connecting  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  such that for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(E)$  and*

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_t > 0\}] \geq \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\}^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* By our assumptions on  $\rho_0$ ,  $\rho_1$ , and  $f$  it is clear that  $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathcal{D}(E)$ .

Let  $\pi \in \Pi_{\ll}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  be a timelike  $p$ -dualizing coupling and  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic with respect to which  $E$  satisfies its defining convexity inequality. As in the proof of Lemma 3.11, we infer that  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(E)$  for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ , and that

$$E := \{\rho_t > 0\},$$

subject to the decomposition  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m}$ , obeys  $\mathbf{m}[E] \in (0, \infty)$ . Setting

$$R := \max\{\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}, \|\rho_1\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}\}$$

then yields, on the one hand,

$$E(\mu_t) \leq (1-t) \int_{\{\rho_0 > 0\}} \frac{f(\rho_0)}{\rho_0} \rho_0 \, d\mathbf{m} + t \int_{\{\rho_1 > 0\}} \frac{f(\rho_1)}{\rho_1} \rho_1 \, d\mathbf{m} \leq \frac{f(R)}{R}.$$

On the other hand,  $E(\mu_t) \geq \mathbf{m}[E] f(\mathbf{m}[E]^{-1})$  by Jensen's inequality. Employing the strict increasingness of  $r \mapsto f(r)/r$  on  $(0, \infty)$  yields the claim.  $\square$

**4.3. Timelike measure-contraction property.** Lastly, following [10] for metric measure spaces, we establish a version of Theorem 1.2 for the subsequent *timelike measure contraction property*  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, \infty)$  [11, Def. 3.7] as follows.

**Definition 4.11.** *A measured Lorentzian pre-length space  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  satisfies  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$  and  $N \in (0, \infty)$  if for every  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_c(M) \cap \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and every  $x_1 \in I^+(\mu_0)$  there exists an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1 := \delta_{x_1}$  such that for every  $t \in [0, 1)$ ,*

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t)}(T_{\mu_0 \otimes \mu_1}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0).$$

**Lemma 4.12.** *Let  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  be a  $\mathcal{K}$ -globally hyperbolic, regular measured Lorentzian geodesic space satisfying  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  for  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Suppose that  $\mu_0 = \rho_0 \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_c^{\text{ac}}(M)$  with  $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Lastly, let  $x_1 \in I^+(\mu_0)$ . Then there is an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1 := \delta_{x_1}$  such that for every  $t \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  and*

$$\mathbf{m}[\{\rho_t > 0\}] \geq (1-t)^N e^{-tD\sqrt{K-N}} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}^{-1},$$

where  $D \geq \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \{x_1\})$ .

*Proof.* We may and will confine ourselves to the case  $K \leq 0$ . Given an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$  obeying the inequality defining  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  and arguing similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.11, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}[\{\rho_t > 0\}]^{1/N} &\geq \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t)}(T_{\mu_0 \otimes \mu_1}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0) \\ &\geq (1-t) e^{-tD\sqrt{-K/N}} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}^{-1/N}. \end{aligned}$$

This terminates the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.13.** *Assume  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  for some  $p \in (0, 1)$ ,  $K \in \mathbf{R}$ , and  $N \in (0, \infty)$ . Let  $\mu_0 = \rho_0 \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{P}_c(M)$  with  $\rho_0 \in L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})$ . Lastly, let  $x_1 \in I^+(\mu_0)$ . Then there exists an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1 := \delta_{x_1}$  satisfying the following two properties for every  $t \in [0, 1)$ .*

(i) *We have  $\mu_t = \rho_t \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  with*

$$\mathcal{U}_N(\mu_t) \geq \sigma_{K, N}^{(1-t)}(T_{\mu_0 \otimes \mu_1}) \mathcal{U}_N(\mu_0). \quad (4.6)$$

(ii) *Setting  $D := \sup \tau(\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \{x_1\})$ , we have*

$$\|\rho_t\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq \frac{1}{(1-t)^N} e^{Dt\sqrt{K-N}} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}.$$

*Proof.* The bisection argument from Chapter 3 does not work under  $\text{TMCP}_p^e(K, N)$  since  $\mu_1 \not\ll \mathbf{m}$ , while every intermediate measure should be absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathbf{m}$ . We rather follow the proof of [10, Thm. 3.1].

**Step 1.** *Construction of a “backward” geodesic.* Given any  $n, k \in \mathbf{N}$ , we set  $s_n^k := (1 - 2^{-n})^k$ . For fixed  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , we define  $\nu_1 := \mu_0$  and inductively, for  $k \in \mathbf{N}$ , let  $\nu_{s_n^k} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$  arise from the  $2^{-n}$ -slice of an  $\ell_p$ -optimal geodesic plan which interpolates  $\nu_{s_n^{k-1}}$  and  $\mu_1$ , and which maximizes the functional  $\mathcal{U}_N$  by Lemma 3.5. Using Lemma 4.12 and following the lines of Proposition 3.14, Corollary 3.15 and Proposition 3.16, for every  $n, k \in \mathbf{N}$  we obtain

$$\|\rho_{s_n^k}\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{-n})^N} e^{2^{-n} s_n^{k-1} D \sqrt{K-N}} \|\rho_{s_n^{k-1}}\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})},$$

subject to the decomposition  $\mu_s := \rho_s \mathbf{m}$  for every  $s \in (0, 1]$  under consideration. Here, as in the proof of Theorem 4.7, we have used that  $\tau$  is no larger than  $s_n^{k-1} D$  on  $\text{spt } \nu_{s_n^{k-1}} \times \{x_1\}$ . Inductively, by geometric summation this yields

$$\|\rho_{s_n^k}\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})} \leq \frac{1}{(s_n^k)^N} e^{(1-s_n^k) D \sqrt{K-N}} \|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty(M, \mathbf{m})}. \quad (4.7)$$

**Step 2.** *Construction of the geodesic and verification of its properties.* Define  $t_n^k := 1 - s_n^k$  and  $\mu_{t_n^k} := \nu_{s_n^k} \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$ , where  $k, n \in \mathbf{N}$ . As for Proposition 3.10 and using the uniqueness of the  $\ell_p$ -optimal coupling between  $\mu_{t_n^k}$  and  $\mu_1$ , we obtain (4.6) for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  of the form  $t := t_n^k$  for some  $n, k \in \mathbf{N}$ . As in Corollary 3.7, by taking diagonal sequences the collection  $(\mu_{t_n^k})_{n, k \in \mathbf{N}}$  is completed to an  $\ell_p$ -geodesic from  $\mu_0$  to  $\mu_1$ . The inequality (4.6) immediately extends to arbitrary  $t \in (0, 1)$  by upper semicontinuity of  $\mathcal{U}_N$  plus continuity and boundedness of  $\tau$  on  $\text{spt } \mu_0 \times \{x_1\}$ ; similarly, the lower semicontinuity of  $\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}}$  and the compactness of  $J(\mu_0, \mu_1)$  imply  $\mu_t \in \mathcal{D}(\text{Ent}_{\mathbf{m}})$ . Lastly, as in the last step of the proof of Theorem 4.7 we obtain the weak stability of (4.7). The proof is terminated.  $\square$

*Remark 4.14.* If in addition  $(M, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{m}, \ll, \leq, \tau)$  is timelike nonbranching in the above Theorem 4.13, as for Corollary 1.3  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are connected by a unique  $\ell_p$ -geodesic, which thus automatically satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 4.13.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI. *A user’s guide to optimal transport*. Modelling and optimisation of flows on networks, 1–155, Lecture Notes in Math., 2062, Fond. CIME/CIME Found. Subser., Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [2] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, A. MONDINO, T. RAJALA. *Riemannian Ricci curvature lower bounds in metric measure spaces with  $\sigma$ -finite measure*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 7, 4661–4701.
- [3] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, G. SAVARÉ. *Calculus and heat flow in metric measure spaces and applications to spaces with Ricci bounds from below*. Invent. Math. **195** (2014), no. 2, 289–391.
- [4] ———. *Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below*. Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), no. 7, 1405–1490.
- [5] ———. *Bakry–Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds*. Ann. Probab. **43** (2015), no. 1, 339–404.
- [6] K. BACHER, K.-T. STURM. *Localization and tensorization properties of the curvature-dimension condition for metric measure spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. **259** (2010), no. 1, 28–56.
- [7] J. K. BEEM, P. E. EHRLICH, S. MARKVORSEN, G. J. GALLOWAY. *Decomposition theorems for Lorentzian manifolds with nonpositive curvature*. J. Differential Geom. **22** (1985), no. 1, 29–42.
- [8] E. BRUÉ, D. SEMOLA. *Constancy of the dimension for  $\text{RCD}(K, N)$  spaces via regularity of Lagrangian flows*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **73** (2020), no. 6, 1141–1204.
- [9] A. BURTSCHER, L. GARCÍA-HEVELING. *Time functions on Lorentzian length spaces*. Preprint, arXiv:2108.02693, 2021.
- [10] F. CAVALLETTI, A. MONDINO. *Optimal maps in essentially non-branching spaces*. Commun. Contemp. Math. **19** (2017), no. 6, 1750007, 27 pp.

- [11] ———. *Optimal transport in Lorentzian synthetic spaces, synthetic timelike Ricci curvature lower bounds and applications*. Preprint, [arXiv:2004.08934](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.08934), 2020.
- [12] F. CAVALLETTI, E. MILMAN. *The globalization theorem for the curvature-dimension condition*. *Invent. Math.* **226** (2021), no. 1, 1–137.
- [13] D. CORDERO-ERAUSQUIN, R. J. MCCANN, M. SCHMUCKENSLÄGER. *A Riemannian interpolation inequality à la Borell, Brascamp and Lieb*. *Invent. Math.* **146** (2001), no. 2, 219–257.
- [14] M. ECKSTEIN, T. MILLER. *Causality for nonlocal phenomena*. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **18** (2017), no. 9, 3049–3096.
- [15] M. ERBAR, K. KUWADA, K.-T. STURM. *On the equivalence of the entropic curvature-dimension condition and Bochner’s inequality on metric measure spaces*. *Invent. Math.* **201** (2015), no. 3, 993–1071.
- [16] J.-H. ESCHENBURG. *The splitting theorem for space-times with strong energy condition*. *J. Differential Geom.* **27** (1988), no. 3, 477–491.
- [17] G. J. GALLOWAY. *The Lorentzian splitting theorem without the completeness assumption*. *J. Differential Geom.* **29** (1989), no. 2, 373–387.
- [18] F. GALAZ-GARCÍA, M. KELL, A. MONDINO, G. SOSA. *On quotients of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below*. *J. Funct. Anal.* **275** (2018), no. 6, 1368–1446.
- [19] R. GEROCH. *Domain of dependence*. *J. Mathematical Phys.* **11** (1970), 437–449.
- [20] N. GIGLI. *The splitting theorem in non-smooth context*. Preprint, [arXiv:1302.5555](https://arxiv.org/abs/1302.5555), 2013.
- [21] ———. *On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications*. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **236** (2015), no. 1113, vi+91 pp.
- [22] N. GIGLI, A. MONDINO, T. RAJALA. *Euclidean spaces as weak tangents of infinitesimally Hilbertian metric measure spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below*. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **705** (2015), 233–244.
- [23] S. W. HAWKING. *The occurrence of singularities in cosmology. I*. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **294** (1966), 511–521.
- [24] S. W. HAWKING, R. PENROSE. *The singularities of gravitational collapse and cosmology*. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **314** (1970), 529–548.
- [25] S. W. HAWKING, G. F. R. ELLIS. *The large scale structure of space-time*. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, No. 1. Cambridge University Press, London-New York, 1973. xi+391 pp.
- [26] M. KELL, S. SUHR. *On the existence of dual solutions for Lorentzian cost functions*. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire* **37** (2020), no. 2, 343–372.
- [27] M. KUNZINGER, C. SÄMANN. *Lorentzian length spaces*. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **54** (2018), no. 3, 399–447.
- [28] J. LOTT, C. VILLANI. *Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport*. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **169** (2009), no. 3, 903–991.
- [29] R. J. MCCANN. *Polar factorization of maps on Riemannian manifolds*. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **11** (2001), no. 3, 589–608.
- [30] ———. *Displacement convexity of Boltzmann’s entropy characterizes the strong energy condition from general relativity*. *Camb. J. Math.* **8** (2020), no. 3, 609–681.
- [31] E. MINGUZZI. *Causality theory for closed cone structures with applications*. *Rev. Math. Phys.* **31** (2019), no. 5, 1930001, 139 pp.
- [32] A. MONDINO, A. NABER. *Structure theory of metric measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds*. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **21** (2019), no. 6, 1809–1854.
- [33] A. MONDINO, S. SUHR. *An optimal transport formulation of the Einstein equations of general relativity*. Preprint, [arXiv:1810.13309](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.13309), 2018.
- [34] B. O’NEILL. *Semi-Riemannian geometry. With applications to relativity*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, 103. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York, 1983. xiii+468 pp.
- [35] R. PENROSE. *Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **14** (1965), 57–59.
- [36] T. RAJALA. *Improved geodesics for the reduced curvature-dimension condition in branching metric spaces*. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **33** (2013), no. 7, 3043–3056.
- [37] ———. *Interpolated measures with bounded density in metric spaces satisfying the curvature-dimension conditions of Sturm*. *J. Funct. Anal.* **263** (2012), no. 4, 896–924.
- [38] M.-K. VON RENESSE, K.-T. STURM. *Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy, and Ricci curvature*. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **58** (2005), no. 7, 923–940.
- [39] C. SORMANI, C. VEGA. *Null distance on a spacetime*. *Classical Quantum Gravity* **33** (2016), no. 8, 085001, 29 pp.
- [40] K.-T. STURM. *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I*. *Acta Math.* **196** (2006), no. 1, 65–131.

- [41] ———. *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II.* Acta Math. **196** (2006), no. 1, 133–177.
- [42] ———. *Super-Ricci flows for metric measure spaces.* J. Funct. Anal. **275** (2018), no. 12, 3504–3569.
- [43] S. SUHR. *Theory of optimal transport for Lorentzian cost functions.* Münster J. Math. **11** (2018), no. 1, 13–47.
- [44] C. VILLANI. *Optimal transport. Old and new.* Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 338. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. xxii+973 pp.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO BAHEN CENTRE, 40 ST. GEORGE STREET ROOM 6290, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 2E4, CANADA

*Email address:* `braun@math.toronto.edu`