

Spectral distances on RCD spaces

Shouhei Honda *

March 27, 2023

Abstract

We provide relationships between the spectral convergences in Bérard-Besson-Gallot sense, in Kasue-Kumura sense and the measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence, for compact finite dimensional RCD spaces. As an independent interest, a canonical approximation map between such spaces with respect to spectral datas is obtained.

1 Introduction

The paper establishes *reconstructions* of compact spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below via embeddings by eigenfunctions/heat kernels. Moreover related convergence notions are discussed. The precise descriptions are explained below.

1.1 Spectral convergence

Roughly speaking, *spectral convergence* means that spectral informations, including eigenvalues/eigenfunctions, behave continuously with respect to a convergence of spaces in some topology. Since we have a couple of choices on the topologies, the purpose of this subsection is to clarify them.

1.1.1 Bérard-Besson-Gallot sense

Let (M^n, g) be an n -dimensional closed Riemannian manifold. Then the spectrum of the minus Laplacian $-\Delta^g = -\text{tr}(\text{Hess})$, counted with the multiplicities, can be written as follows;

$$0 = \lambda_0^g < \lambda_1^g \leq \lambda_2^g \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.1)$$

We say that a sequence of smooth functions on M^n , $\mathbf{a} = (\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}}, \varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots)$, is a *spectral data* of (M^n, g) if $\Delta^g \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}} + \lambda_i^{\mathbf{a}} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}} = 0$ and $\|\varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}\|_{L^2} = 1$ are satisfied. Thus $\{\varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}\}_i$ gives an orthonormal basis of $L^2(M^n, \text{vol}^g)$, where vol^g denotes the Riemannian volume measure on M^n with respect to the Riemannian metric g .

Bérard-Besson-Gallot discussed in [BBG94] a family of smooth maps $I_t^{\mathbf{a}} : M^n \rightarrow \ell^2$ for all spectral data \mathbf{a} and $t \in (0, \infty)$ defined by

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) := \left(\sqrt{\text{vol}^g M^n} e^{-\lambda_i^g t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x) \right)_{i \geq 1}, \quad (1.2)$$

*Mathematical Institute, Tohoku University, shouhei.honda.e4@tohoku.ac.jp

which gives indeed an embedding of M^n into ℓ^2 . More precisely they defined a pseudo distance by using these embeddings, denoted by $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t((M^n, g), (N^k, h))$, between closed Riemannian manifolds (M^n, g) and (N^k, h) as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t((M^n, g), (N^k, h)) \\ & := \max \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{a}} \inf_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(M^n), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(N^k)), \sup_{\mathbf{b}} \inf_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(M^n), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(N^k)) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.3)$$

where $\mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}$ denotes the Hausdorff distance in ℓ^2 . A main result in [BBG94] states that $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ is actually a distance in the smooth framework, namely it is trivially symmetric, it satisfies the triangle inequality and it is nondegenerate. The nontrivial part is the nondegeneracy, namely if $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t((M^n, g), (N^k, h)) = 0$ holds, then (M^n, g) is isometric to (N^k, h) . Let us recall the proof of this nondegeneracy as follows.

Firstly we check $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(M^n) = I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(N^k)$ for some spectral datas \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} , which allows us to find a homeomorphism $f : M^n \rightarrow N^k$ preserving the embeddings $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}, I_t^{\mathbf{b}}$ (in particular $n = k$). Secondly we observe that any point has a chart around the point by the restriction of an eigenmap. Combining this with beautiful arguments proves that f gives a diffeomorphism and that f preserves the Laplacians, namely

$$\Delta^g(\psi \circ f) = (\Delta^h \psi) \circ f, \quad \forall \psi \in C^\infty(N^k). \quad (1.4)$$

Since (1.4) implies by looking at the principal symbols that f also preserves the Riemannian metrics, we conclude that f is an isometry.

Roughly speaking, this nondegeneracy says that any spectral data reconstructs the metric structure of a closed Riemannian manifold.

It is emphasized that a precompactness result with respect to $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ is given in the same paper and that a Lipschitz convergence with flat curvature is *not* enough to get the convergence with respect to $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$. In fact under a Lipschitz convergence;

$$\left(\mathbb{S}^1(1) \times \mathbb{S}^1(1 + \epsilon), g_{\mathbb{S}^1(1)} \oplus g_{\mathbb{S}^1(1+\epsilon)} \right) \rightarrow \left(\mathbb{S}^1(1) \times \mathbb{S}^1(1), g_{\mathbb{S}^1(1)} \oplus g_{\mathbb{S}^1(1)} \right) \quad (1.5)$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the corresponding spectral distances $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ between the LHS and the RHS in (1.5) do not converge to 0 for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, where $g_{\mathbb{S}^1(r)}$ denotes the canonical Riemannian metric on $\mathbb{S}^1(r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; |x|_{\mathbb{R}^2} = r\}$. See [BBG94, Example 28]. This tells us that $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ -convergence might be completely different from the previously known convergence notions in metric geometry.

Here let us give the following natural questions.

- (Q1) Is it possible to generalize the spectral distance $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ above to a nonsmooth setting?
- (Q2) Can we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ -convergence in terms of the measured Gromov-Hausdorff (mGH) convergence?

As mentioned above, only considering mGH convergence is not enough in order to give a positive answer to (Q2) because the Lipschitz convergence is strictly stronger than the mGH-convergence. To give a positive answer to (Q1), in the paper, we adopt *metric measure spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below*, so called RCD spaces, as a nonsmooth context. The first main results, Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, giving positive answers to both (Q1) and (Q2), will be explained later.

1.1.2 Kasue-Kumura sense

In [KK94, KK96], Kasue-Kumura defined a distance between possibly weighted closed Riemannian manifolds by using their heat kernels. The idea is close to that of [BBG94], but they are different. The precise definition is as follows; for all weighted closed Riemannian manifolds $(M^n, g, e^{-\psi} \text{dvol}^g)$, $(N^k, h, e^{-\varphi} \text{dvol}^h)$, denoting by p, q their heat kernels, respectively, the *spectral distance* in the sense of Kasue-Kumura between them is defined by the infimum of $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying that there exist maps $f_1 : M^n \rightarrow N^k, f_2 : N^k \rightarrow M^n$ such that

$$e^{-(t+1/t)} |q(f_1(x), f_1(\tilde{x}), t) - p(x, \tilde{x}, t)| < \epsilon, \quad \forall x, \forall \tilde{x} \in M^n, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (1.6)$$

and

$$e^{-(t+1/t)} |p(f_2(y), f_2(\tilde{y}), t) - q(y, \tilde{y}, t)| < \epsilon, \quad \forall y, \forall \tilde{y} \in N^k, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (1.7)$$

are satisfied. Then they also established a precompactness result with respect to this distance. Here let us give the following natural question as in the case of Bérard-Besson-Gallot.

- (Q3) After generalizing the spectral distance in the sense of Kasue-Kumura, denoted by \tilde{d}_{Spec} in the paper, to a nonsmooth setting, can we give a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of \tilde{d}_{Spec} -convergence in terms of the mGH convergence?

The second main result, Theorem 1.4, provides a positive answer to (Q3) as explained in the next subsection.

1.2 Main results

We say that a metric measure space $\mathbb{X} = (X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is said to be an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$, or RCD space for short, if Ricci curvature is bounded below by K and dimension is bounded above by N in a synthetic sense, and the $H^{1,2}$ -Sobolev space is a Hilbert space. See subsection 2.1 for a brief introduction on the definition. In the sequel all spaces we will discuss are assumed to be not single points.

Let us fix a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space $\mathbb{X} = (X, \mathbf{d}_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$. Then the spectrum of the minus Laplacian $-\Delta_X$ on X can be also written by

$$0 = \lambda_0(\mathbb{X}) < \lambda_1(\mathbb{X}) \leq \lambda_2(\mathbb{X}) \leq \cdots \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.8)$$

counted with the multiplicities, because the canonical inclusion of the $H^{1,2}$ -Sobolev space into $L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is a compact operator. Thus by similar ways as in the case of closed Riemannian manifolds, we can also define a spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} , a family of topological embeddings $I_t^{\mathbf{a}} : X \rightarrow \ell^2$ by

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) := \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_X(X)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x) \right)_{i \geq 1} \quad (1.9)$$

and the spectral pseudo distance $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})$ between compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} .

It is trivial that $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ is still symmetric and that the triangle inequality for $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ also holds. However the nondegeneracy of $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ for compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces is *not* satisfied as the following observation shows; for all $c, t \in (0, \infty)$ and spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} , letting $\mathbb{Y} := (X, \mathbf{d}_X, c^{-2}\mathbf{m}_X)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (c\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}}, c\varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots)$, we have

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) = I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(x), \quad \forall x \in X = Y. \quad (1.10)$$

In particular although $d_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = 0$ holds, but \mathbb{X} is not isomorphic to \mathbb{Y} as metric measure spaces whenever $c \neq 1$.

We are now in a position to introduce a main result about the nondegeneracy. Roughly speaking the above is only the case when $d_{\text{Spec}}^t = 0$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathbb{Y} = (Y, d_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y)$ be a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space. If*

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X) \subset I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \quad (1.11)$$

holds for some $t \in (0, \infty)$ and some spectral datas \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} of \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} , respectively, then \mathbb{X} is isometric to \mathbb{Y} as metric measure spaces, up to a multiplication of a positive constant to \mathbf{m}_Y .

We will also give a quantitative result of the above, see Theorem 3.12 with Proposition 3.11. Since it is easy to see that if $d_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = 0$, then $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X) = I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y)$ for some \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} , we obtain the following as a corollary of the theorem above.

Corollary 1.2 (Nondegeneracy). *If a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space $\mathbb{Y} = (Y, d_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y)$ satisfies $d_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = 0$ and $\mathbf{m}_X(X) = \mathbf{m}_Y(Y)$, then \mathbb{X} is isomorphic to \mathbb{Y} .*

Let us emphasize here that the results above seem to be new even in the weighted smooth framework. Moreover they show that the framework of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces gives a positive answer to (Q1).

In order to introduce another main result, Theorem 1.3, we denote the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_X$, without counting the multiplicities, by

$$0 = \mu_0(\mathbb{X}) < \mu_1(\mathbb{X}) < \mu_2(\mathbb{X}) < \cdots \rightarrow \infty \quad (1.12)$$

and then we define $\nu_i(\mathbb{X})$ by the multiplicity of $\mu_i(\mathbb{X})$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let \mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X} be compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces ($i = 1, 2, \dots$). Assume that the diameters $\text{diam}(X_i, d_i)$ are uniformly bounded. Then the following four conditions are equivalent.*

1. *We have*

$$d_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{m}_{X_i}(X_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{m}_X(X) \quad (1.13)$$

for some $t \in (0, \infty)$.

2. *(1) is satisfied for any $t \in (0, \infty)$.*

3. *We have*

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad \mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X}) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \nu_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j, \quad (1.14)$$

where the notation, $\xrightarrow{\text{mGH}}$, denotes the mGH convergence.

4. *We have*

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad \mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j. \quad (1.15)$$

This theorem gives a positive answer to (Q2). Namely, the spectral convergence with respect to d_{Spec}^t holds with the convergence of the total measures if and only if the mGH convergence holds with the convergence of eigenvalues, without counting the multiplicities. This provides us a well-understanding of d_{Spec}^t -convergence. In fact, the example (1.5) is a mGH convergent sequence with the Riemannian volume measures, but $\nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i)$ does not

converge $\nu_1(\mathbb{X})$, and $\mu_2(\mathbb{X}_i)$ converge to $\mu_1(\mathbb{X})$ ($\neq \mu_2(\mathbb{X})$ by definition). Note that Theorem 1.3 can be improved in the case when the sequence is noncollapsed, see Corollary 4.3.

Finally let us give a positive answer to (Q3). Note that the spectral distance \tilde{d}_{Spec} in the sense of Kasue-Kumura is also well-defined for compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces (see Proposition 5.2).

Theorem 1.4. *Under the same setting as in Theorem 1.3, we see that \mathbb{X}_i \tilde{d}_{Spec} -converge to \mathbb{X} if and only if \mathbb{X}_i mGH-converge to \mathbb{X} .*

1.3 Strategy of proof

Firstly let us introduce an outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Under assuming (1.11), we can find a continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ preserving the embeddings I_t^a, I_t^b . The first ingredient of the proof is to show that the pushforward measure $f_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X$ is equal to $c\mathfrak{m}_Y$ for some positive constant $c \in (0, \infty)$.

In the case of closed Riemannian manifolds, this is done in [BBG94] after proving the smoothness of f . Note that we can follow the same arguments as in [BBG94] if

$$f_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X \ll \mathfrak{m}_Y \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{df_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X}{d\mathfrak{m}_Y} \in L^2(Y, \mathfrak{m}_Y) \quad (1.16)$$

hold. However it may be hard to check (1.16) directly in this setting (for instance the Lipschitz continuity of f is not enough to get (1.16) in general). In order to overcome this difficulty by a simple trick, we use the dual heat flow \tilde{h}_s acting on the space of all Borel probability measures on Y to prove that $\tilde{h}_s(f_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X/\mathfrak{m}_X(X))$ is equal to \mathfrak{m}_Y up to a multiplication of a positive constant to \mathfrak{m}_Y . Then letting $s \rightarrow 0^+$ yields the desired equality $f_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X = c\mathfrak{m}_Y$. In particular since the support of $f_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X$ is Y , we easily see that f is surjective. Following [BBG94] with $f_{\#}\mathfrak{m}_X = c\mathfrak{m}_Y$, it holds that f also preserves the eigenvalues and the eigenfunctions. In particular f preserves I_s^a and I_s^b for any $s \in (0, \infty)$. Therefore letting $s \rightarrow 0^+$ with the Varadhan type asymptotics established in [JLZ16] (see (2.8)) allows us to conclude that f preserves the distances. Note that this argument is also different from the one in [BBG94] as explained just after (1.4). Thus we have Theorem 1.1.

Secondly we provide a sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.3. As a first step, we recall that under a mGH-convergence of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces;

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad (1.17)$$

the eigenvalues behave continuously as follows;

$$\lambda_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \lambda_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j. \quad (1.18)$$

Moreover the eigenfunctions also behave continuously with respect to the uniform and the $H^{1,2}$ -strong convergences. This is proved in [GMS13] for RCD spaces (see also [ChC00, Fuk87]), and this behavior is also called a spectral convergence in the previous literatures.

Then it is not hard to check by (1.18) that the last two conditions in Theorem 1.3 are equivalent to each other. Furthermore the remaining implications are done by applying the previous convergence results for I_t^a proved in [AHPT21] with Corollary 1.2 (or Theorem 1.1).

Finally let us add a comment on the proof of Theorem 1.4. After proving that \tilde{d}_{Spec} determines actually a distance even for compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces (see Proposition 5.2), the desired conclusion comes from the uniform convergence of heat kernels with respect

to the mGH-convergence proved in [AHT18, ZZ19] and an elementary fact in topology that any bijective continuous map from a compact space to a Hausdorff space is indeed a homeomorphism.

1.4 Organization of the paper

In the next section, Section 2, we give a brief introduction on RCD spaces, mainly focusing on eigenfunctions/heat kernels for our purposes. Section 3 is devoted to the proofs of results about the spectral convergence in the sense of Bérard-Besson-Gallot. As a related observation, we establish a *canonical* mGH-approximation between compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces via spectral datas, which has an independent interest. See Proposition 3.11 and Theorem 3.12. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.4. The final section, Section 6, discusses the case when the limit space is a single point, as the remaining case.

Acknowledgement. A part of the work is done during the stay at the Fields Institute for the Thematic Program on Nonsmooth Riemannian and Lorentzian Geometry. The author wishes to thank the institute and all of the organizers for their warm hospitalities. He acknowledges supports of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) of 20H01799, the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) of 21H00977 and Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) of 22H05105.

2 RCD space

In order to keep our short presentations in the paper, we assume that the readers are familiar to the theory of RCD spaces. The main purpose of this section is to provide a brief introduction on the theory. See [A19] for a nice survey on this topic.

2.1 Definition and terminology

A triple (X, d_X, \mathbf{m}_X) , denoted by \mathbb{X} for short, is said to be a *metric measure space* if (X, d_X) is a complete separable metric space and \mathbf{m}_X is a Borel measure on X with full support and $\mathbf{m}_X(A) < \infty$ for any bounded Borel subset A of X . A map between metric measure spaces, $f : X \rightarrow Y$, is said to be an *isomorphism* as metric measure spaces if it is an isomorphism as metric spaces and the pushforward measure $f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X$ of \mathbf{m}_X by f coincides with \mathbf{m}_Y .

Fix a metric measure space $\mathbb{X} = (X, d_X, \mathbf{m}_X)$. Then the $H^{1,2}$ -Sobolev space, denoted by $H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X})$, is defined by the finiteness domain of the Cheeger energy $\text{Ch} : L^2(X, \mathbf{m}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ (see also [C99, Sh00]). Note that the Cheeger energy $\text{Ch}(f)$ of $f \in H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X})$ can be written in terms of the canonical object $|\nabla f| \in L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$, called the *minimal relaxed slope* of f . We say that \mathbb{X} is *infinitesimally Hilbertian*, written by IH for short below, if the $H^{1,2}$ -Sobolev space is a Hilbert space. Note that if \mathbb{X} is IH, then for all $f, g \in H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X})$, the pointwise inner product $\langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle(x)$ makes sense for \mathbf{m}_X -a.e. $x \in X$. The domain of the Laplacian Δ_X of \mathbb{X} , denoted by $D(\Delta_X)$, is defined by the set of all $f \in H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X})$ satisfying that there exists (a unique) $\varphi \in L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$, denoted by $\Delta_X f$, such that

$$\int_X \langle \nabla f, \nabla g \rangle d\mathbf{m}_X = - \int_X \varphi g d\mathbf{m}_X, \quad \forall g \in H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X}). \quad (2.1)$$

We are now in a position to introduce the definition of RCD spaces. We say that (X, d, \mathbf{m}) is an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space, or RCD space for short, for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty]$ if the following four conditions are satisfied;

1. (Riemannian assumption) it is IH;
2. (Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property) if a $H^{1,2}$ -function $f \in H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X})$ satisfies $|\nabla f|(x) \leq 1$ for \mathbf{m}_X -a.e. $x \in X$, then f has a 1-Lipschitz representative;
3. (volume growth condition) there exist $x \in X$ and $C \in [1, \infty)$ such that $\mathbf{m}_X(B_r(x)) \leq Ce^{Cr^2}$ holds for any $r \in [1, \infty)$, where $B_r(x)$ denotes the open ball of radius r centered at x ;
4. (weak Bochner inequality) the Bochner inequality;

$$\frac{\Delta_X |\nabla f|^2}{2} \geq \frac{(\Delta_X f)^2}{N} + \langle \nabla \Delta_X f, \nabla f \rangle + K |\nabla f|^2 \quad (2.2)$$

is satisfied in a weak sense.

See [AGS14, AGMR15, G15] for the precise definition and see [AMS19, CM21, EKS15] for equivalent definitions we are adopting. See also for instance [BNS22, BPS21, BS19, G18, KM21, MN19] for the structure theory and recent developments.

Unless otherwise stated in the sequel (in particular except for the final section, Section 6), whenever we discuss $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces, we assume that they are not single points.

Finally in order to simplify our notations below, let us introduce the following.

Definition 2.1 ($\mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$). For all $K \in \mathbb{R}, N \in [1, \infty), d \in [1, \infty)$ and $v \in [1, \infty)$, let us denote by $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ the set of all compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces \mathbb{X} , up to isomorphisms, such that $\text{diam}(X, \mathbf{d}_X) \in [d^{-1}, d]$ and $\mathbf{m}_X(X) \in [v^{-1}, v]$ are satisfied.

It is known from, for instance, [EKS15, Theorem 3.22] that $\mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ with the measured Gromov-Hausdorff topology is compact, which will be discussed in subsection 3.2.

2.2 Heat flow and its kernel

This subsection is devoted to introducing the main topics of the paper; heat kernels and eigenfunctions. Let us fix an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space \mathbb{X} for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$ in the sequel. Note that we will immediately use standard notations in this topic, for example, $C(a_1, a_3, \dots, a_k)$ denotes a positive constant depending only on a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k .

2.2.1 General case

The *heat flow* of \mathbb{X} starting at $f \in L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is defined by the absolutely continuous (or equivalently, smooth, in this setting, see [GP20]) curve;

$$h_t f : (0, \infty) \rightarrow L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X) \quad (2.3)$$

satisfying that $h_t f \in D(\Delta)$ holds for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, that $h_t f \rightarrow f$ in $L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ and that

$$\frac{d}{dt} h_t f = \Delta_X h_t f, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty). \quad (2.4)$$

Then the *heat kernel* $p_X(x, y, t)$ of \mathbb{X} is determined by the continuous function $p_X : X \times X \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying that for any $f \in L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$, we have

$$h_t f(x) = \int_X f(y) p_X(x, y, t) d\mathbf{m}_X(y), \quad \text{for } \mathbf{m}_X\text{-a.e. } x \in X. \quad (2.5)$$

See also [S95, S96]. The sharp Gaussian (gradient) estimates on p_X proved in [JLZ16, Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.2] (see also [GM14, J15]) are stated as follows.

Theorem 2.2 (Gaussian estimate). *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $C = C(K, N, \epsilon) \in (1, \infty)$ such that*

$$\frac{C^{-1}}{\mathbf{m}_X(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))} \exp\left(-\frac{d_X(x, y)^2}{(4 - \epsilon)t} - Ct\right) \leq p_X(x, y, t) \leq \frac{C}{\mathbf{m}_X(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))} \exp\left(-\frac{d_X(x, y)^2}{(4 + \epsilon)t} + Ct\right) \quad (2.6)$$

holds for all $x, y \in X$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$ and that

$$|\nabla_x p_X(x, y, t)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{t} \mathbf{m}_X(B_{\sqrt{t}}(x))} \exp\left(-\frac{d_X(x, y)^2}{(4 + \epsilon)t} + Ct\right) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{m}_X\text{-a.e. } x \in X \quad (2.7)$$

holds for all $t > 0$ and $y \in X$. In particular the Varadhan type asymptotics is also satisfied in this setting;

$$-4t \log p_X(x, y, t) \rightarrow d_X(x, y)^2, \quad \forall x, y \in X, \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0^+. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that the heat flow can be extended to a map $h_t : L^p(X, \mathbf{m}_X) \rightarrow L^p(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ by satisfying (2.5), and then we have $h_t f \in L^p(X, \mathbf{m}_X) \cap C(X)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$ and $f \in L^p(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ because of (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7). Moreover the heat flow \tilde{h}_t also acts on the set of all Borel probability measures on X , denoted by $\mathcal{P}(X)$, as the dual of h_t , namely $\tilde{h}_t : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ is defined by satisfying

$$\int_X f d\tilde{h}_t \mathbf{n} = \int_X h_t f d\mathbf{n} \quad (2.9)$$

for any continuous functions f on X with bounded supports. Then it is proved in [AGS15, Theorem 4.8] that $\tilde{h}_t \mathbf{n} = n_t \mathbf{m}_X$ holds for some $n_t \in L^1(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ with a log-Harnack inequality (see also [AH17, Proposition 4.4]). Since $\tilde{h}_t \mathbf{n} = n_t \mathbf{m}_X = (h_{t/2} n_{t/2}) \mathbf{m}_X$ holds, we know $n_t \in L^1(X, \mathbf{m}_X) \cap C(X)$. This observation will play a role in the proof of Lemma 2.3 below.

2.2.2 Compact case

From now on we assume that (X, d_X) is compact. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, denoting by $E_\lambda(\mathbb{X}) = \{f \in D(\Delta_X); \Delta_X f + \lambda f = 0\}$, the *multiplicity* of λ , denoted by $\nu_{\mathbb{X}}(\lambda)$, is defined by the dimension of the linear space $E_\lambda(\mathbb{X})$. Then we say that a real number λ is an *eigenvalue* of $-\Delta_X$ if $\nu_{\mathbb{X}}(\lambda) \geq 1$ holds (then $\lambda \geq 0$ holds). Any nonzero element of $E_\lambda(\mathbb{X})$ for an eigenvalue λ is called an *eigenfunction*.

On the other hand, the Bishop-Gromov inequality (see [LV09, Theorem 5.31] and [S06b, Theorem 2.3]) and a Poincaré inequality (see [R12, Theorem 1]) show that the canonical inclusion $H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X}) \hookrightarrow L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X)$ is a compact operator (see [HK00, Theorem.8.1]). This observation with a standard technique in functional analysis allows us to denote by

$$0 = \lambda_0(\mathbb{X}) < \lambda_1(\mathbb{X}) \leq \lambda_2(\mathbb{X}) \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty \quad (2.10)$$

the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_X$ counted with the multiplicities. On the other hand, without counting the multiplicities, we denote the eigenvalues by

$$0 = \mu_0(\mathbb{X}) < \mu_1(\mathbb{X}) < \mu_2(\mathbb{X}) < \dots \rightarrow \infty \quad (2.11)$$

and then we define $\nu_i(\mathbb{X})$ by the multiplicity of $\mu_i(\mathbb{X})$, namely $\nu_i(\mathbb{X}) := \nu_{\mathbb{X}}(\mu_i(\mathbb{X}))$. Thus by definition, (2.10) can be written by

$$0 = \mu_0(\mathbb{X}) < \underbrace{\mu_1(\mathbb{X}) = \dots = \mu_1(\mathbb{X})}_{\nu_1(\mathbb{X})} < \underbrace{\mu_2(\mathbb{X}) = \dots = \mu_2(\mathbb{X})}_{\nu_2(\mathbb{X})} < \mu_3(\mathbb{X}) = \dots \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.12)$$

Let us recall that for a sequence φ_i^X of corresponding eigenfunctions of eigenvalues $\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})$ with $\|\varphi_i^X\|_{L^2} = 1$, $\{\varphi_i^X\}_i$ is an L^2 -orthonormal basis of $L^2(X, \mathfrak{m}_X)$. Moreover it is known that

$$p_X(x, y, t) = \sum_{i \geq 0} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t} \varphi_i^X(x) \varphi_i^X(y), \quad \forall x, \forall y \in X, \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (2.13)$$

holds and that

$$p_X(\cdot, y, t) = \sum_{i \geq 0} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t} \varphi_i^X(y) \varphi_i^X \quad \text{in } H^{1,2}(\mathbb{X}) \quad (2.14)$$

holds for all $y \in X$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. Combining (2.13) and (2.14) with (2.7), we know the following quantitative estimates on eigenvalues/eigenfunctions;

$$\|\varphi_i^X\|_{L^\infty} \leq \tilde{C} \lambda_i(\mathbb{X})^{N/4}, \quad \|\nabla \varphi_i^X\|_{L^\infty} \leq \tilde{C} \lambda_i(\mathbb{X})^{(N+2)/4}, \quad \lambda_i(\mathbb{X}) \geq \tilde{C}^{-1} i^{2/N} \quad (2.15)$$

if $\text{diam}(X, \mathfrak{d}_X) \in (0, d]$ holds for some positive number d , where $\tilde{C} := \tilde{C}(K, N, d) \in (1, \infty)$ (see the appendix of [AHPT21] and see also [J14]). In particular (2.15) implies that (2.13) is also satisfied in $C(X \times X)$.

Finally let us end this subsection by giving the following technical lemma which will play a role in the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Lemma 2.3. *If a Borel measure \mathfrak{n} on X satisfies $\mathfrak{n}(X) \in (0, \infty)$ and*

$$\int_X \varphi_i^X \, \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{n} = 0, \quad \forall i \geq 1, \quad (2.16)$$

then $\mathfrak{n} = a\mathfrak{m}$ for some positive constant $a \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume $\mathfrak{n}(X) = 1$. For any $t > 0$, denoting by $\tilde{h}_t \mathfrak{n} = n_t \mathfrak{m}$ for some $n_t \in L^1(X, \mathfrak{m}_X) \cap C(X)$ (thus $n_t \in L^2(X, \mathfrak{m}_X)$ because of the compactness of X), we have for any $i \geq 1$

$$\int_X \varphi_i^X n_t \, \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} = \int_X \varphi_i^X \, \mathrm{d}(\tilde{h}_t \mathfrak{n}) = \int_X h_t \varphi_i^X \, \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{n} = e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t} \int_X \varphi_i^X \, \mathrm{d}\mathfrak{n} = 0. \quad (2.17)$$

Thus n_t is a constant. Then letting $t \rightarrow 0^+$ completes the proof. \square

3 Spectral distance in the sense of Bérard-Besson-Gallot

In this section we discuss embeddings $I_t^{\mathfrak{a}}$ of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces into ℓ^2 as explained in the introduction.

3.1 Embedding via eigenfunctions

Let us fix a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space \mathbb{X} for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$, and fix $t \in (0, \infty)$. Then it is proved in [AHPT21, subsection 4.2] that for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, the map $\Phi_t^X : X \hookrightarrow L^2(X, \mathfrak{m}_X)$ defined by $\Phi_t^X(x) := (y \mapsto p_X(x, y, t))$ is a topological embedding. Thanks to (2.7), we know that Φ_t^X is $C(K, N, d, v, t_0, t_1)$ -Lipschitz if $\mathbb{X} \in \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ and $t \in [t_0^{-1}, t_0]$ are satisfied for some positive constants $d, v, t_0 \in [1, \infty)$. In order to replace the target space $L^2(X, \mathfrak{m}_X)$ of Φ_t^X by ℓ^2 , we introduce the following.

Definition 3.1 (Spectral data). A sequence of functions on X

$$\mathfrak{a} = (\varphi_0^{\mathfrak{a}}, \varphi_1^{\mathfrak{a}}, \varphi_2^{\mathfrak{a}}, \dots) \quad (3.1)$$

is said to be a *spectral data* of \mathbb{X} if $\Delta_X \varphi_i^{\mathfrak{a}} + \lambda_i(\mathbb{X}) \varphi_i^{\mathfrak{a}} = 0$ holds with $\|\varphi_i^{\mathfrak{a}}\|_{L^2} = 1$ for any i (thus $\{\varphi_i^{\mathfrak{a}}\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(X, \mathfrak{m}_X)$).

Fix a spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} . Denoting by $\iota^{\mathbf{a}} : L^2(X, \mathbf{m}_X) \simeq \ell^2$ the canonical isomorphism via \mathbf{a} , an embedding $\Phi_t^{\mathbf{a}} : X \hookrightarrow \ell^2$ defined by $\Phi_t^{\mathbf{a}} := \iota^{\mathbf{a}} \circ \Phi_t^X$ is explicitly written by

$$\Phi_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) = \left(e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x) \right)_{i \geq 0} \quad (3.2)$$

because of (2.13). Following [BBG94], let us discuss a normalized embedding;

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}} : X \hookrightarrow \ell^2 \quad (3.3)$$

defined by

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) := \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_X(X)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x) \right)_{i \geq 1}. \quad (3.4)$$

Remark 3.2. As a generalizaion of (1.10), for all $c, s \in (0, \infty)$, letting $\mathbb{Z} := (X, \sqrt{t}/\text{sd}_X, c^{-2}\mathbf{m}_X)$ and $\mathbf{c} := (c\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}}, c\varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots)$, we have

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) = I_s^{\mathbf{c}}(x), \quad \forall x \in X = Z. \quad (3.5)$$

This observation tells us that when we wish to compare $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}$ with $I_s^{\mathbf{b}}$ for different s, t , after rescaling metrics, the situation is reduced to the case when $s = t$.

Let us prove that any embedding $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}$ reconstructs the metric measure structure of \mathbb{X} in the following sense.

Theorem 3.3. *Let \mathbb{Y} be a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space and let \mathbf{b} be a spectral data of \mathbb{Y} . If a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies*

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) = I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)), \quad \forall x \in X, \quad (3.6)$$

namely

$$\sqrt{\mathbf{m}_X(X)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x) = \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)), \quad \forall i \geq 1, \quad (3.7)$$

then f gives an isomorphism as metric measure spaces, up to a multiplication of a positive constant to \mathbf{m}_Y .

Proof. Firstly let us prove that f is continuous (then in particular f is Borel measurable). Take a convergent sequence $x_j \rightarrow x$ in X . After passing to a subsequence, with no loss of generality, we can assume that $f(x_j) \rightarrow y$ in Y for some $y \in Y$. Then since for any $i \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(y) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x_j)) \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_X(X)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x_j) \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_X(X)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x) = \sqrt{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)} e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t/2} \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

we have $\varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(y) = \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x))$. In particular, thanks to (2.13), it holds that

$$p_Y(y, w, s) = p_Y(f(x), w, s), \quad \forall w \in Y, \quad \forall s \in (0, \infty). \quad (3.9)$$

Thus letting $s \rightarrow 0^+$ in (3.9) with (2.8) shows $d_Y(y, w) = d_Y(f(x), w)$ for any $w \in Y$, thus $y = f(x)$, which proves $f(x_j) \rightarrow f(x)$. Thus f is continuous.

Next we consider a Borel measure $f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X$ on Y . Since $f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X(Y) = \mathbf{m}_X(X) \in (0, \infty)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}} d(f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X) &= \int_X \varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)) d\mathbf{m}_X(x) \\ &= \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_X(X)}{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)} \right)^{1/2} \cdot e^{-(\lambda_i(\mathbb{X}) - \lambda_i(\mathbb{Y}))t/2} \cdot \int_X \varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}} d\mathbf{m}_X \\ &= 0, \quad \forall i \geq 1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Lemma 2.3 allows us to conclude that $f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X = c\mathbf{m}_Y$ holds for some positive constant $c \in (0, \infty)$ (thus $c = \mathbf{m}_X(X)/\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)$).

In particular the support of $f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X$ coincides with Y . Therefore f is surjective because if $Y \setminus f(X) \neq \emptyset$, then since $f(X)$ is compact, we can find a ball B included in $Y \setminus f(X)$, thus $f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X(B) = \mathbf{m}_X(\emptyset) = 0$, which contradicts a fact that $\text{supp } f_{\#}\mathbf{m}_X = Y$.

Note that (3.7) yields

$$\mathbf{m}_X(X) e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t} (\varphi_i^{\mathbf{a}}(x))^2 = \mathbf{m}_Y(Y) e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t} (\varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)))^2, \quad \forall i \geq 1. \tag{3.11}$$

Integrating this over X shows

$$\mathbf{m}_X(X) e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{X})t} = \mathbf{m}_Y(Y) e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t} c \int_Y (\varphi_i^{\mathbf{b}})^2 d\mathbf{m}_Y = \mathbf{m}_X(X) e^{-\lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})t}. \tag{3.12}$$

Thus $\lambda_i(\mathbb{X}) = \lambda_i(\mathbb{Y})$ for any i . In particular combining this with (3.7) yields

$$\mathbf{m}_X(X) p_X(x, w, s) = \mathbf{m}_Y(Y) p_Y(f(x), f(w), s), \quad \forall x, w \in X, \quad \forall s \in (0, \infty). \tag{3.13}$$

Thus (2.8) under letting $s \rightarrow 0^+$ in (3.13) shows that f preserves the distance, namely f gives an isomorphism. Therefore we conclude. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us define a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ by $f(x) := (I_t^{\mathbf{b}})^{-1} \circ I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x)$, where this is well-defined because of (1.11). Then since it is trivial that (3.6) is satisfied, Theorem 3.3 completes the proof. \square

3.2 mGH and convergence of spectral datas

Let us fix a measured Gromov-Hausdorff (mGH) convergent sequence of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$;

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow[f_i]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad (\text{or } \mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X} \text{ for short}), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v), \tag{3.14}$$

where $\{f_i\}_i$ denote fixed ϵ_i -mGH approximations from X_i to X realizing the mGH convergence from \mathbb{X}_i to \mathbb{X} as explained below (see Definition 2.1 for the definition of $\mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$).

The following is a definition of a mGH approximation which will be compared with the spectral one later. Let us emphasize that in the sequel except for the final subsection, subsection 6.2, any sequence of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces we will mainly discuss is always assumed that their diameters and total measures are away from 0 and ∞ , namely they are in $\mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ for some $d \in [1, \infty)$ and some $v \in [1, \infty)$.

Definition 3.4 (GH/mGH approximation). For two compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces \mathbb{Y}, \mathbb{Z} , a Borel map $f : Y \rightarrow Z$ is said to be an ϵ -Gromov-Hausdorff (GH) approximation (as metric spaces) if $|\mathbf{d}_Z(f(x), f(y)) - \mathbf{d}_Y(x, y)| \leq \epsilon$ holds for all $x, y \in Y$ with $Z = B_\epsilon(f(Y))$. Furthermore we say that it is an ϵ -measured Gromov-Hausdorff (mGH) approximation (as metric measure spaces) if it is an ϵ -GH approximation with

$$\mathbf{W}_Z^2 \left(\frac{f_\# \mathbf{m}_Y}{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)}, \frac{\mathbf{m}_Z}{\mathbf{m}_Z(Z)} \right) + |\mathbf{m}_Y(Y) - \mathbf{m}_Z(Z)| \leq \epsilon, \quad (3.15)$$

where \mathbf{W}_Z^2 denotes the L^2 -Wasserstein distance on $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ ($= \mathcal{P}_2(Z)$ because of the compactness of Z).

Note that GH/mGH convergences are metrizable by distances $\mathbf{d}_{\text{GH}}/\mathbf{d}_{\text{mGH}}$, respectively and that their convergences can be also expressed by existences of approximations, as expressed in (3.14) (see for instance [S06a]).

In the setting (3.14), we say that a sequence of points $x_i \in X_i$ converges to a point $x \in X$ if $f_i(x_i) \rightarrow x$ in X . Note that this convergence notion depends on the choice of approximations $\{f_i\}_i$.

Remark 3.5. This is an intrinsic approach for the mGH convergence. See [GMS13] for an extrinsic one and the equivalence to our setting. See also [AH17, AH18] for related convergence notions for functions, which will be used immmediately in the sequel.

Let us define the convergence of spectral datas with respect to the mGH convergence.

Definition 3.6 (Convergence of spectral datas). We say that a sequence of spectral datas \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbb{X}_i converge to a spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} with respect to (3.14) if $\varphi_j^{\mathbf{a}_i}$ pointwisely converge to $\varphi_j^{\mathbf{a}}$ for any j , namely

$$\varphi_j^{\mathbf{a}_i}(x_i) \rightarrow \varphi_j^{\mathbf{a}}(x), \quad \text{whenever } x_i \rightarrow x. \quad (3.16)$$

Then we denote by $\mathbf{a}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{a}$ the convergence.

Note that the pointwise convergence of $\varphi_j^{\mathbf{a}_i}$ implies the uniform and the $H^{1,2}$ -strong convergences of $\varphi_j^{\mathbf{a}_i}$ because of (2.15). The following is a direct consequence of [GMS13, Theorem 7.8].

Theorem 3.7 (Compactness of spectral datas). *Any sequence of spectral datas \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbb{X}_i has a convergent subsequence to a spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} with respect to (3.14). In particular we have*

$$\lambda_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \lambda_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j. \quad (3.17)$$

Corollary 3.8. *The following two conditions are equivalent.*

1. We have

$$\mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$\nu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \nu_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j. \quad (3.19)$$

2. We have

$$\mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. Let us give a proof of the nontrivial implication, from (2) to (1). Assume that (2) is satisfied. It is trivial that (3.19) holds for $j = 0$ because of the (2,2)-Poincaré inequality. The validity of (3.20) for $j = 2$ implies that there exists $\tau \in (0, 1)$ such that $\mu_2(\mathbb{X}_i) \geq \mu_1(\mathbb{X}_i) + \tau$ holds for any i . Combining this with the validity of (3.20) for $j = 1$ yields that (3.19) holds for $j = 1$. Similarly by induction for j we have (3.19) for any j , namely (1) holds. \square

Finally we end this subsection by introducing convergence results on $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}$ with respect to the mGH convergence, proved in [AHPT21, Theorem 5.19].

Theorem 3.9 (Convergence of $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}$). *We have*

$$I_{t_i}^{\mathbf{a}_i}(X_i) \rightarrow I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X) \quad (3.21)$$

with respect to the Hausdorff distance $d_{\ell^2}^H$ in ℓ^2 , and

$$I_{t_i}^{\mathbf{a}_i} \rightarrow I_t^{\mathbf{a}} \quad (3.22)$$

with respect to the uniform convergence, for all convergent sequences of positive numbers $t_i \rightarrow t$ in $(0, \infty)$ and of spectral datas $\mathbf{a}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{a}$.

3.3 Spectral approximation

The purpose of this subsection is to construct mGH approximations via spectral embeddings $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}$.

Let us fix two compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} . Fix $\epsilon, t \in (0, \infty)$ and spectral datas \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} of \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} , respectively. Firstly we define a spectral approximation which is a spectral analogue of Definition 3.4.

Definition 3.10 (Spectral approximation). We say that a Borel measurable map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral weak approximation if

$$d_{\ell^2} \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)) \right) < \epsilon, \quad \forall x \in X \quad (3.23)$$

holds. Moreover f is an $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral approximation if it is an $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral weak approximation and it holds that for any $y \in Y$, there exists $x \in X$ such that

$$d_{\ell^2} \left(I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(f(x)), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(y) \right) < \epsilon. \quad (3.24)$$

holds.

Let us give fundamental properties on spectral (weak) approximations. In order to simplify our notations, we use a standard notation in this topic; $\Psi = \Psi(\cdot; K, N, d, v, t_0)$ denotes a positive function on $(0, \infty)$ depending only on K, N, d, v and t_0 such that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Psi(\epsilon; K, N, d, v, t_0) = 0 \quad (3.25)$$

holds.

Proposition 3.11. *We have the following.*

1. Let \mathbb{Z} be a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space. If $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral (or weak, respectively) approximation and $g : Y \rightarrow Z$ is a $(\delta; \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ -spectral (or weak, respectively) approximation for some spectral data \mathbf{c} of \mathbb{Z} , then $g \circ f$ is also an $(\epsilon + \delta; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c})$ -spectral (or weak, respectively) approximation.

2. If there exists an $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral (or weak, respectively) approximation from X to Y , then

$$d_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right) < 5\epsilon \quad \left(\text{or } I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X) \subset B_{5\epsilon} \left(I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right), \text{ respectively} \right) \quad (3.26)$$

is satisfied, where B_ϵ denotes the ϵ -open neighborhood.

3. If

$$d_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right) < \epsilon \quad \left(\text{or } I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X) \subset B_\epsilon \left(I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right), \text{ respectively} \right) \quad (3.27)$$

holds, then there exists a $(5\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral (weak, respectively) approximation from X to Y .

4. (From mGH to spectral approximation) If a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an ϵ -mGH approximation, then f is also a $(\Psi; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral approximation, whenever $\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} \in \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ and $t \in [t_0^{-1}, t_0]$ are satisfied for some positive constants $d, v, t_0 \in [1, \infty)$, where $\Psi = \Psi(\epsilon; K, N, d, v, t_0)$.

Proof. Since (1), (2) and (3) are direct consequences of their definitions, let us give only a proof of (4) by contradiction. Assume that the assertion is not satisfied. Then there exist a positive number $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and sequences of;

1. compact RCD(K, N) spaces \mathbb{X}_i and \mathbb{Y}_i whose diameters and total measures are away from 0 and ∞ ;
2. positive numbers $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0^+$;
3. positive numbers $t_i \in (0, \infty)$ which are away from 0 and ∞ ;
4. spectral datas $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i$ of $\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{Y}_i$, respectively, and
5. ϵ_i -mGH approximations $f_i : \mathbb{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_i$

such that f_i is not a $(\tau; \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i, t_i)$ -spectral approximation. With no loss of generality we can assume that $t_i \rightarrow t$ for some $t \in (0, \infty)$. Theorem 3.7 shows that after passing to a subsequence, we can assume that

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow[g_i]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad \mathbb{Y}_i \xrightarrow[h_i]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{Y} \quad (3.28)$$

hold for some compact RCD(K, N) spaces \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} and that $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ for some spectral datas \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} of \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} , respectively, with respect to (3.28). By the very definition of the mGH approximation, Definition 3.4, with no loss of generality we can also assume that f_i converges uniformly to an isomorphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ as metric measure spaces with respect to (3.28). Since f satisfies (3.6), Theorem 3.9 allows us to conclude that f_i is a $(\delta_i; \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i, t_i)$ -spectral approximation for some $\delta_i \rightarrow 0^+$ because of the uniform convergence of f_i to f . This is a contradiction. \square

The next theorem gives a quantitative version of Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.12. *Assume that $\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} \in \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ and $t \in [t_0^{-1}, t_0]$ are satisfied for some positive constants $d, v, t_0 \in [1, \infty)$. Then we have the following.*

1. (From spectral weak approximation to mGH) Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral weak approximation. If $|\mathbf{m}_X(X) - \mathbf{m}_Y(Y)| \leq \epsilon$ holds, then f is a $\Psi(\epsilon; K, N, d, v, t_0)$ -mGH approximation.

2. (Uniqueness) Let $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ be $(\epsilon; \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, t)$ -spectral weak approximations. Then

$$\sup_{x \in X} \mathbf{d}_Y(f(x), g(x)) \leq \Psi(\epsilon; K, N, d, v, t_0). \quad (3.29)$$

Proof. Firstly let us prove (1) by contradiction. If the assertion is not satisfied, then as done in the first part of the proof of (4) of Proposition 3.11, there exist a positive number $\tau \in (0, 1]$ and sequences of;

1. compact RCD(K, N) spaces

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow[g_i]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad \mathbb{Y}_i \xrightarrow[h_i]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{Y} \quad (3.30)$$

with $|\mathbf{m}_{X_i}(X_i) - \mathbf{m}_{Y_i}(Y_i)| \rightarrow 0$;

2. positive numbers $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0^+$;

3. positive numbers $t_i \rightarrow t$ in $(0, \infty)$;

4. spectral datas $\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$, respectively with respect to (3.30), and

5. $(\epsilon_i; \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{b}_i, t_i)$ -spectral weak approximations $f_i : X_i \rightarrow Y_i$

such that each f_i is not a τ -mGH-approximation.

Let us define a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ as follows; for any $x \in X$, take a sequence $x_i \in X_i$ converging to x with respect to (3.30), and find a sequence $y_i \in Y_i$ with

$$\mathbf{d}_{\ell^2} \left(I_{t_i}^{\mathbf{a}_i}(x_i), I_{t_i}^{\mathbf{b}_i}(y_i) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.31)$$

where such y_i can be found by, for instance, $y_i := f_i(x_i)$. Moreover find a sequence $y(i) \in Y$ with $\mathbf{d}_Y(h_i(y_i), y(i)) \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$f(x) := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} y(i). \quad (3.32)$$

In order to check that this is well-defined, let us take $\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{y}_i, \tilde{y}(i)$ as above instead of $x_i, y_i, y(i)$, respectively. With no loss of generality, after passing to a subsequence, we can assume that $y(i), \tilde{y}(i) \rightarrow y, \tilde{y}$ hold for some $y, \tilde{y} \in Y$, respectively. Then it is enough to check $y = \tilde{y}$.

By the construction with Theorem 3.9, we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{\ell^2} \left(I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(y), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(\tilde{y}) \right) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2} \left(I_{t_i}^{\mathbf{a}_i}(x_i), I_{t_i}^{\mathbf{a}_i}(\tilde{x}_i) \right) \leq C \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{d}_{X_i}(x_i, \tilde{x}_i) = 0, \quad (3.33)$$

where we used a C -Lipschitz continuity of $\Phi_{t_i}^{X_i}$, where C is independent of i . Thus $y = \tilde{y}$, namely f is well-defined. Moreover by the construction we see that (3.6) holds, thus f gives an isomorphism because of Theorem 3.3 with $\mathbf{m}_X(X) = \mathbf{m}_Y(Y)$.

Let us prove by contradiction that f_i uniformly converge to f . If f_i does not converge uniformly to f , then there exist a positive constant $\tilde{\tau} \in (0, 1)$ and sequences of $x_i, \tilde{x}_i \in X_i$ such that $\mathbf{d}_{X_i}(x_i, \tilde{x}_i) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbf{d}_{Y_i}(f_i(x_i), f_i(\tilde{x}_i)) \geq \tilde{\tau}$ are satisfied. With no loss of generality we can assume that $x_i, \tilde{x}_i \rightarrow x$ for some $x \in X$. Then recalling the definition of f , we have

$$\tilde{\tau} \leq \mathbf{d}_{Y_i}(f_i(x_i), f_i(\tilde{x}_i)) \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_Y(f(x), f(x)) = 0 \quad (3.34)$$

which is a contradiction.

In particular f_i gives an δ_i -GH approximation for some $\delta_i \rightarrow 0^+$. Since the uniform convergence of f_i implies that $(f_i)_\# \mathbf{m}_{X_i}(B_r(w_i)) \rightarrow f_i \# \mathbf{m}_X(B_r(w)) = \mathbf{m}_Y(B_r(w))$ for any convergent sequence $w_i \in Y_i \rightarrow w \in Y$ with respect to (3.30), we can easily get the weak convergence of $(f_i)_\# \mathbf{m}_{X_i}$ to \mathbf{m}_Y with respect to (3.30). Thus it holds from [LV09, Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.3] that

$$\mathbb{W}_{Y_i}^2 \left(\frac{(f_i)_\# \mathbf{m}_{X_i}}{\mathbf{m}_{X_i}(X_i)}, \frac{\mathbf{m}_{Y_i}}{\mathbf{m}_{Y_i}(Y_i)} \right) \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_Y^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_Y}{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)}, \frac{\mathbf{m}_Y}{\mathbf{m}_Y(Y)} \right) = 0, \quad (3.35)$$

which proves that f_i gives a $\tilde{\delta}_i$ -mGH-approximation for some $\tilde{\delta}_i \rightarrow 0^+$. This is a contradiction. Thus we have (1).

For (2), we adopt contradiction as the proof again. Recalling that the definition of the limit map f above does not depend on f_i , since the proof is similar to the above, we omit the proof. \square

3.4 Spectral distance

Let us fix two compact RCD(K, N) spaces \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$, and fix $t \in (0, \infty)$. We introduce a spectral distance, based on the same ideas in [BBG94], as follows.

Definition 3.13 (Spectral pseudo distance and its variants). Let us put

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) := \inf_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}} \left\{ \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right) \right\}, \quad (3.36)$$

$$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) := \sup_{\mathbf{a}} \inf_{\mathbf{b}} \left\{ \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right) \right\}, \quad (3.37)$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) := \max \left\{ \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}), \overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) \right\}, \quad (3.38)$$

where \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} above run over all spectral datas of \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} , respectively, and

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) := \sup_{\mathbf{b}} \inf_{\mathbf{a}} \left\{ \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right) \right\} = \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{Y}, \mathbb{X}). \quad (3.39)$$

It is trivial by definition that

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t \geq \max \left\{ \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t \right\} \geq \min \left\{ \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t, \overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t \right\} \geq \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t \quad (3.40)$$

holds and that the infimum in (3.36) can be replaced by the minimum, namely

$$\underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y) \right) \quad (3.41)$$

for some spectral datas \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} of \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} , respectively because of applying Theorem 3.7 to a fixed space. As a corollary of this observation with Theorem 1.1, we have the following.

Corollary 3.14. \mathbb{X} is isomorphic to \mathbb{Y} , up to a multiplication of a positive constant to \mathbf{m}_Y , if and only if $\underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = 0$ holds. In particular we have Corollary 1.2.

Proposition 3.15. *For a compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space \mathbb{Z} , we have*

$$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) \leq \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z}) + \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Y}) \quad (3.42)$$

and

$$\overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) \leq \overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z}) + \overleftarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Y}). \quad (3.43)$$

In particular, combining the above with Corollary 3.14, we see that $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ defines a distance on the set of all isomorphism classes of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces with the total measures 1.

Proof. Since (3.43) is a corollary of (3.42), let us prove (3.42) only. The triangle inequality for the Hausdorff distance yields

$$\mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y)) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(Z)) + \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(Z), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y)) \quad (3.44)$$

for all spectral datas $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$.

Thus taking the infimum with respect to \mathbf{b} shows

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y)) &\leq \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(Z)) + \inf_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(Z), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(Y)) \\ &\leq \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X), I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(Z)) + \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Y}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Moreover taking the infimum with respect to \mathbf{c} and then taking the supremum with respect to \mathbf{a} completes the proof of (3.42). \square

4 \mathbf{d}_{mGH} vs $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$

The main purpose of this section is to provide a proof of Theorem 1.3. The following is a generalization of [BBG94, (ii) of Theorem 17] to the RCD setting.

Theorem 4.1. *Let*

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v) \quad (4.1)$$

for some K, N, d, v . Then for any $t \in (0, \infty)$, after passing to a subsequence, we have

$$\overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.2)$$

In particular $\underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Take a sequence of spectral datas \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbb{X}_i with

$$\left| \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) - \inf_{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}_i}(X_i), I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(X)) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Thanks to Theorem 3.7, after passing to a subsequence, we have $\mathbf{a}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{a}$ for some spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} . Then since

$$\mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}_i}(X_i), I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X)) + \left| \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) - \inf_{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}_i}(X_i), I_t^{\mathbf{c}}(X)) \right| \geq \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \quad (4.4)$$

and the LHS converge to 0 because of Theorem 3.9, we conclude. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathbb{X}_i be a sequence of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces in $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ for some K, N, d, v and let $\mathbb{X} \in \mathcal{M}$. If*

$$\mathbf{m}_{X_i}(X_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{m}_X(X) \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.6)$$

hold for some $t \in (0, \infty)$, then we have

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}. \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. The proof is done by contradiction. If not, then after passing to a subsequence, there exists $\tilde{\mathbb{X}} \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathbf{m}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{X}) = \mathbf{m}_X(X)$ holds, that

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \quad (4.8)$$

holds and that \mathbb{X} is not isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$. Thus Theorem 4.1 with (3.40) and (3.42) shows

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) &\leq \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \leq \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}_i) + \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \\ &\leq \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{X}_i) + \overrightarrow{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Therefore Corollary 3.14 allows us to conclude that \mathbb{X} is isomorphic to $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$, which is a contradiction. \square

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Firstly we omit a result, Corollary 6.2, which will be proved in subsection 6.2, to get

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(X_i, \mathbf{d}_{X_i}) > 0 \quad (4.10)$$

under any of conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4). Namely it is enough to focus only on sequences in $\mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ for some d, v .

Recall that in Corollary 3.8 we already proved the equivalence between (3) and (4), thus firstly let us prove the implication from (1) to (3). Assume that (1) holds. Then the desired mGH convergence;

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow[f_i]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X} \quad (4.11)$$

is already established by Theorem 4.2. Thus we focus on the remaining convergence results $\mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X})$ and $\nu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \nu_j(\mathbb{X})$ for any j .

As discussed in the proof of Corollary 3.8, we have $\mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X})$ for any $j \leq 1$. Assume that $\nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i)$ does not converge to $\nu_1(\mathbb{X})$. After passing to a subsequence, with no loss of generality we can assume that $\nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i)$ is a constant k which is independent of i . Then Theorem 3.7 easily allows us to conclude that $k = \nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i) < \nu_1(\mathbb{X})$ and $\mu_2(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_1(\mathbb{X})$ are satisfied, namely a finite sequence of eigenvalues of $-\Delta_{X_i}$;

$$0 = \mu_0(\mathbb{X}_i) < \underbrace{\mu_1(\mathbb{X}_i) = \cdots = \mu_1(\mathbb{X}_i)}_{k = \nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i)} < \mu_2(\mathbb{X}_i) \quad (4.12)$$

“converge” to a finite sequence of eigenvalues of $-\Delta_X$;

$$0 = \mu_0(\mathbb{X}) < \underbrace{\mu_1(\mathbb{X}) = \cdots = \mu_1(\mathbb{X})}_k = \mu_1(\mathbb{X}), \quad (4.13)$$

respectively. Finding a sequence of spectral datas \mathbf{a}_i of \mathbb{X}_i converging to a spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} , define a spectral data \mathbf{b} of \mathbb{X} by

$$\mathbf{b} := \left(\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots, \varphi_{k-1}^{\mathbf{a}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\varphi_k^{\mathbf{a}} + \varphi_{k+1}^{\mathbf{a}}), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\varphi_k^{\mathbf{a}} - \varphi_{k+1}^{\mathbf{a}}), \varphi_{k+2}^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots \right). \quad (4.14)$$

Then our assumption (1.13) yields that there exists a sequence of spectral datas \mathbf{b}_i of \mathbb{X}_i such that

$$d_{\ell^2}^H \left(I_t^{\mathbf{b}_i}(X_i), I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(X) \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.15)$$

holds.

On the other hand, by the very definition of $\nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i)$ there exists $A_i \in O(k)$ such that

$$\mathbf{b}_i = \left(\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}_i}, (\varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}_i}, \dots, \varphi_k^{\mathbf{a}_i}) A_i, \varphi_{k+1}^{\mathbf{a}_i}, \dots \right) \quad (4.16)$$

holds. Thanks to the compactness of $O(k)$, with no loss of generality we can assume that $A_i \rightarrow A$ holds for some $A \in O(k)$. In particular \mathbf{b} can be written by

$$\mathbf{b} = \left(\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}}, (\varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots, \varphi_k^{\mathbf{a}}) A, \varphi_{k+1}^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots \right), \quad (4.17)$$

which shows that $\varphi_{k+1}^{\mathbf{a}}$ can be obtained by a linear combination of $\varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots, \varphi_k^{\mathbf{a}}$. This is a contradiction. Thus we have $\nu_1(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \nu_1(\mathbb{X})$. Moreover this observation also proves $\mu_2(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_2(\mathbb{X})$.

Since other cases, $j \geq 2$, is similarly done by induction on j , we omit the proof. Thus we have (3).

Next let us give a proof of the remaining nontrivial implication, from (3) to (2). Assume that (3) holds (under the same notation as in (4.11)). Let us fix a convergent sequence of spectral datas $\mathbf{a}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{a}$. Take a spectral data \mathbf{b} of \mathbb{X} . For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define a new sequence of spectral datas $\mathbf{b}(m)$ of \mathbb{X} by

$$\mathbf{b}(m) := \left(\varphi_0^{\mathbf{b}}, \dots, \varphi_{b_m}^{\mathbf{b}}, \varphi_{b_m+1}^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots \right), \quad \text{where } b_m := \sum_{i=1}^m \nu_i(\mathbb{X}). \quad (4.18)$$

Note that $\mathbf{b}(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{b}$ holds (with respect to the trivial convergence $\mathbb{X} \xrightarrow[\text{id}_X]{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}$) because of (2.15). Therefore it is enough to prove that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence of spectral datas $\mathbf{b}_n(m)$ of \mathbb{X}_n such that $\mathbf{b}_n(m) \rightarrow \mathbf{b}(m)$ with respect to (4.11). Actually this is done by putting

$$\mathbf{b}_n(m) := \left(\varphi_0^{\mathbf{a}_i}, \left(\varphi_1^{\mathbf{a}_n}, \dots, \varphi_{\nu_1(\mathbb{X})}^{\mathbf{a}_n} \right) B_1, \dots, \left(\varphi_{b_{m-1}+1}^{\mathbf{a}_n}, \dots, \varphi_{b_m}^{\mathbf{a}_n} \right) B_m, \varphi_{b_m+1}^{\mathbf{a}_n}, \dots \right), \quad (4.19)$$

where this is well-defined for any sufficiently large n , and $B_i \in O(\nu_i(\mathbb{X}))$ is defined by satisfying

$$\left(\underbrace{\varphi_{b_{i-1}+1}^{\mathbf{b}}, \dots, \varphi_{b_i}^{\mathbf{b}}}_{\nu_i(\mathbb{X})} \right) = \left(\underbrace{\varphi_{b_{i-1}+1}^{\mathbf{a}}, \dots, \varphi_{b_i}^{\mathbf{a}}}_{\nu_i(\mathbb{X})} \right) B_i. \quad (4.20)$$

Thus we have (3). \square

Recall that [BBG94, (i) of Theorem 17] proves the d_{Spec}^t -convergence for a Lipschitz convergent sequence of closed Riemannian manifolds with Ricci curvature bounded below under assuming that the limit space has simple spectrum. Note that if the limit space of

a mGH-convergent sequence has simple spectrum, then we can easily check (1.15) because of (1.18). Therefore Theorem 1.3 also recovers this result.

Finally let us give an improvement of Theorem 1.3 for a special class of RCD spaces, so-called noncollapsed RCD spaces, where an $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space is said to be *noncollapsed* if the reference measure coincides with the N -dimensional Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}^N . See [DePhG18] for the details.

Corollary 4.3. *Let \mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X} be compact noncollapsed $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces ($i = 1, 2, \dots$). Assume $\sup_i \text{diam}(X_i, \mathbf{d}_{X_i}) < \infty$. If*

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.21)$$

holds for some $t \in (0, \infty)$, then $\mathcal{H}^N(X_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^N(X)$. In particular we have

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}, \quad \mu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \mu_j(\mathbb{X}) \text{ and } \nu_j(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \nu_j(\mathbb{X}), \quad \forall j. \quad (4.22)$$

Proof. Let

$$\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_i := \left(X_i, \mathbf{d}_{X_i}, \frac{\mathcal{H}^N}{\mathcal{H}^N(X_i)} \right), \quad \tilde{\mathbb{X}} := \left(X, \mathbf{d}_X, \frac{\mathcal{H}^N}{\mathcal{H}^N(X)} \right). \quad (4.23)$$

Then since $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_i, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) \rightarrow 0$ because of Remark 3.2, Theorem 1.3 yields

$$\tilde{\mathbb{X}}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}. \quad (4.24)$$

Thus it follows from [DePhG18, Theorem 1.2] that $\mathcal{H}^N(X_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^N(X)$ holds. The remaining statements also come from Theorem 1.3. \square

5 Spectral distance in the sense of Kasue-Kumura

Before giving the proof of Theorem 1.4, let us provide the definition of the spectral distance in the sense of [KK94, KK96] for compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces.

Definition 5.1 (Spectral distance in the sense of Kasue-Kumura). Let \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} be compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$. Then the *spectral distance* in the sense of Kasue-Kumura between them, denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})$, is defined by the infimum of $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying that there exist maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that

$$e^{-(t+1/t)} |p_Y(f(x), f(\tilde{x}), t) - p_X(x, \tilde{x}, t)| < \epsilon, \quad \forall x, \forall \tilde{x} \in X, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$e^{-(t+1/t)} |p_X(g(y), g(\tilde{y}), t) - p_Y(y, \tilde{y}, t)| < \epsilon, \quad \forall y, \forall \tilde{y} \in Y, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (5.2)$$

are satisfied.

The proof of the next proposition is given by the same ideas as discussed in [KK94] (see also [KK96]) in the smooth framework. For reader's convenience, let us provide the proof in this setting.

Proposition 5.2. *The spectral distance $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}}$ in the sense above is indeed a distance on $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, v)$ for all K, N, d, v .*

Proof. It is easily checked by definition that \tilde{d}_{Spec} is symmetric with the triangle inequality. Thus let us prove the nondegeneracy. Assume that $\tilde{d}_{\text{Spec}}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = 0$ holds for some $\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y} \in \mathcal{M}$. Then there exist sequences of maps $f_i : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g_i : Y \rightarrow X$ such that

$$e^{-(t+1/t)} |p_Y(f_i(x), f_i(\tilde{x}), t) - p_X(x, \tilde{x}, t)| < \frac{1}{i}, \quad \forall x, \forall \tilde{x} \in X, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$e^{-(t+1/t)} |p_X(g_i(y), g_i(\tilde{y}), t) - p_Y(y, \tilde{y}, t)| < \frac{1}{i}, \quad \forall y, \forall \tilde{y} \in Y, \quad \forall t \in (0, \infty) \quad (5.4)$$

are satisfied. Let A be a countable dense subset of X . After passing to a subsequence with a diagonal argument, we can assume that $\{f_i(x)\}_i$ is a convergent sequence in Y for any $x \in A$. Then defining a map $f : A \rightarrow Y$ by $f(x) := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_i(x)$, we have $p_Y(f(x), f(\tilde{x}), t) = p_X(x, \tilde{x}, t)$ for all $x, \tilde{x} \in A$ and $t \in (0, \infty)$. In particular (2.8) allows us to conclude that f preserves the distances. Thus there exists a unique continuous extension of f to a map from X to Y , still denoted by $f : X \rightarrow Y$. It is trivial that f also preserves the distance and the heat kernel. In particular f is injective. Similarly we can construct a map $g : Y \rightarrow X$ which preserves the distance (and the heat kernel).

On the other hand, since $f \circ g : Y \rightarrow Y$ preserves the distance, it must be an isomorphism as metric spaces because Y is compact (see for instance [BBI01]). In particular f is surjective. Thus f is an isomorphism as metric spaces.

In order to check that f preserves the measures, taking $\psi \in C(Y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y \psi d(f_{\#} \mathbf{m}_X) &= \int_X \psi \circ f(x) d\mathbf{m}_X(x) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_X \int_Y \psi(y) p_Y(y, f(x), t) d\mathbf{m}_Y(y) d\mathbf{m}_X(x) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_Y \int_X \psi(y) p_X(f^{-1}(y), x, t) d\mathbf{m}_X(x) d\mathbf{m}_Y(y) = \int_Y \psi d\mathbf{m}_Y. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Thus $f_{\#} \mathbf{m}_X = \mathbf{m}_Y$, namely \mathbb{X} is isomorphic to \mathbb{Y} . \square

Let us end this section by finishing the proof of the remaining main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. As in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we also omit a result, Proposition 6.4. The proposition allows us to show that the following argument is enough to conclude.

Recalling that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(K, N, d, \nu)$ is compact with respect to \mathbf{d}_{mGH} , thanks to Proposition 5.2, it is enough to check that the canonical map, $\text{id} : (\mathcal{M}, \mathbf{d}_{\text{mGH}}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}, \tilde{\mathbf{d}}_{\text{Spec}})$, is continuous. Actually this continuity is achieved by applying the pointwise convergence of the heat kernels with respect to mGH-convergence proved in [AHT18, Theorem 3.3] (see also [ZZ19, Corollary 3.10]) with Theorem 2.2. Thus we conclude. \square

6 Collapsing to a single point

In this final section we discuss the remaining case; a sequence of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces converge to a single point. Firstly let us clarify the meanings of $I_t^{\mathbf{a}}$ and of the heat kernel on a single point.

6.1 Convention

Let \mathbb{X} be a metric measure space and assume that this is a single point, namely $X = \{x\}$ and $\mathbf{m}_X = c\delta_x$ for some $c \in (0, \infty)$, where δ_x denotes the Dirac measure at x . Then the heat kernel p_X of \mathbb{X} is defined by

$$p_X(x, x, t) := \frac{1}{\mathbf{m}_X(X)} = \frac{1}{c}. \quad (6.1)$$

Furthermore the spectral data \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X} is uniquely determined by

$$\mathbf{a} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{c}}, 0, 0, \dots \right) \quad (6.2)$$

and the embedding $I_t^{\mathbf{a}} : X \rightarrow \ell^2$ is defined by

$$I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(x) := (0, 0, \dots) \in \ell^2. \quad (6.3)$$

Then we can consider the previous notions even in this setting, namely, for example, the spectral distances in the sense of [BBG94] or of [KK94] between compact RCD(K, N) spaces which are possibly single points, are well-defined by the same ways.

6.2 Results

Let us emphasize that Theorems 6.1 and 6.3 below show that $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t$ and \mathbf{d}_{mGH} are equivalent *without any assumption* on eigenvalues if the limit space is a single point.

Theorem 6.1. *Let*

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \mathbb{X}. \quad (6.4)$$

be a mGH convergent sequence of compact RCD(K, N) spaces for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$. Assume that \mathbb{X} is a single point. Then for any $t \in (0, \infty)$ we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.5)$$

Proof. Thanks to (2.15), we have for any sufficiently large i ,

$$|e^{-\lambda_j(\mathbb{X}_i)t/2} \varphi_j^{X_i}| \leq C(K, N) e^{-\lambda_j(\mathbb{X}_i)t/2} \lambda_j(\mathbb{X}_i)^{N/4}, \quad \forall j. \quad (6.6)$$

Combining this with a fact that $\lambda_1(\mathbb{X}_i) \rightarrow \infty$ implies

$$\mathbf{d}_{\ell^2}^{\text{H}}(I_t^{\mathbf{a}_i}(X_i), I_t^{\mathbf{a}}(X)) \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.7)$$

for all spectral datas \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a} of \mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X} , respectively. In particular (6.7) shows (6.5). \square

Corollary 6.2. *Let \mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X} be compact RCD(K, N) spaces ($i = 1, 2, \dots$). If \mathbb{X} is not a single point and (6.5) holds for some $t \in (0, \infty)$, then*

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(X_i, \mathbf{d}_i) > 0. \quad (6.8)$$

Proof. The proof is done by contradiction. If the assertion is not satisfied, then after passing to a subsequence with normalizations of the measures, we can assume that \mathbb{X}_i mGH converge to a single point $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$. Thus since Theorem 6.1 yields $\mathbf{d}_{\text{Spec}}^t(\mathbb{X}, \tilde{\mathbb{X}}) = 0$, we see that \mathbb{X} must be also a single point. This is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 6.3. *Let \mathbb{X}_i be a sequence of compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and some $N \in [1, \infty)$. Assume that $\sup_i \text{diam}(X_i, d_{X_i}) < \infty$ holds, that $\mathbf{m}_{X_i}(X_i) \rightarrow c$ holds for some $c \in (0, \infty)$ and that (6.5) holds for a single point \mathbb{X} and some $t \in (0, \infty)$. Then (6.4) holds with $\mathbf{m}_X(X) = c$.*

Proof. The proof is also done by a contradiction. If the assertion is not satisfied, then after passing to a subsequence, we have

$$\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{mGH}} \tilde{\mathbb{X}} \tag{6.9}$$

for some compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ space $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$ with $\mathbf{m}_{\tilde{X}}(\tilde{X}) = c$, which is not a single point. On the other hand (6.5) easily yields that $I_t^{\mathbf{b}}(\tilde{X})$ is a single point for any spectral data \mathbf{b} of $\tilde{\mathbb{X}}$. This is a contradiction. \square

Finally by similar ways as above, we have the following, where we omit the proof.

Proposition 6.4. *Let \mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X} be compact $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces ($i = 1, 2, \dots$). Assume that $\sup_i \text{diam}(X_i, d_{X_i}) < \infty$ holds, that \mathbb{X} is not a single point and that $\mathbb{X}_i \xrightarrow{\text{d}_{\text{Spec}}} \mathbb{X}$. Then*

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam}(X_i, d_i) > 0. \tag{6.10}$$

Theorem 6.5. *Theorem 1.4 is still satisfied if \mathbb{X} is a single point.*

References

- [A19] L. AMBROSIO: *Calculus, heat flow and curvature-dimension bounds in metric measure spaces*, Proceedings of the ICM 2018, Vol. 1, World Scientific, Singapore, (2019), 301–340.
- [AGS14] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, G. SAVARÉ: *Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below*. Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), 1405–1490.
- [AGS15] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, G. SAVARÉ: *Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds*. Ann. of Prob. **43** (2015), 339–404.
- [AGMR15] L. AMBROSIO, N. GIGLI, A. MONDINO, T. RAJALA: *Riemannian Ricci curvature lower bounds in metric measure spaces with σ -finite measure*. Trans. of the AMS. **367** (2015), 4661–4701.
- [AH17] L. AMBROSIO, S. HONDA: *New stability results for sequences of metric measure spaces with uniform Ricci bounds from below*. Measure theory in non-smooth spaces, 1–51, Partial Differ. Equ. Meas. Theory, De Gruyter Open, Warsaw, 2017.
- [AH18] L. AMBROSIO, S. HONDA: *Local spectral convergence in $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ spaces*, Nonlinear Anal. **177** Part A (2018), 1–23.
- [AHT18] L. AMBROSIO, S. HONDA, D. TEWODROSE: *Short-time behavior of the heat kernel and Weyl’s law on $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ -spaces*, Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. **53**(1) (2018), 97–119.
- [AHPT21] L. AMBROSIO, S. HONDA, J. W. PORTEGIES, D. TEWODROSE: *Embedding of $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ -spaces in L^2 via eigenfunctions*, J. Funct. Anal. **280** (2021), no. 10, Paper No. 108968, 72 pp.

- [AMS19] L. AMBROSIO, A. MONDINO, G. SAVARÉ: *Nonlinear diffusion equations and curvature conditions in metric measure spaces*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **262** (2019), no. 1270, v+121 pp.
- [BBG94] P. BÉRARD, G. BESSON, S. GALLOT: *Embedding Riemannian manifolds by their heat kernel*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **4**(4) (1994), 373–398.
- [BNS22] E. BRUÈ, A. NABER, D. SEMOLA: *Boundary regularity and stability for spaces with Ricci bounded below*. Invent. Math. (2022), Doi: 10.1007/s00222-021-01092-8
- [BPS21] E. BRUÈ, E. PASQUALETTO, D. SEMOLA: *Rectifiability of $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces via δ -splitting maps*. Ann. Fenn. Math. **46** (2021), no. 1, 465–482.
- [BS19] E. BRUÈ, D. SEMOLA: *Constancy of dimension for $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ spaces via regularity of Lagrangian flows*. Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. **73** (2019), 1141–1204
- [BBI01] D. BURAGO, Y. BURAGO, S. IVANOV: *A course in metric geometry*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **33**, (2001).
- [CM21] F. CAVALLETTI, E. MILMAN: *The Globalization Theorem for the Curvature Dimension Condition*. Invent. Math. **226** (2021), no. 1, 1–137.
- [C99] J. CHEEGER: *Differentiability of Lipschitz functions on metric measure spaces*. Geom. Funct. Anal. **9** (1999), 428–517.
- [ChC00] J. CHEEGER, T. H. COLDING: *On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below III*, J. Differential Geom. **54** (2000), 37–74.
- [DePhG18] G. DE PHILIPPIS, N. GIGLI: *Non-collapsed spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below*, Journal de l'École polytechnique, **5** (2018), 613–650.
- [EKS15] 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), 993–1071.
- [Fuk87] K. FUKAYA: *Collapsing of Riemannian manifolds and eigenvalues of Laplace operator*, Invent. Math. **87** (1987), 517–547.
- [GM14] N. GAROFALO, A. MONDINO: *Li-Yau and Harnack type inequalities in $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ metric measure spaces*, Nonlinear Analysis **95** (2014), 721–734.
- [G15] N. GIGLI: *On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **236** (2015), no. 1113.
- [G18] N. GIGLI: *Nonsmooth differential geometry – An approach tailored for spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **251** (2018), no. 1196.
- [GMS13] N. GIGLI, A. MONDINO, G. SAVARÉ: *Convergence of pointed non-compact metric measure spaces and stability of Ricci curvature bounds and heat flows*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **111** (2015), 1071–1129.
- [GP20] N. GIGLI, E. PASQUALETTO: *Lectures on Nonsmooth Differential Geometry*, Springer International Publishing, 2020.

- [HK00] P. HAJŁASZ, P. KOSKELA, *Sobolev met Poincaré*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **145** (2000), no. 688.
- [J14] R. JIANG: *Cheeger-harmonic functions in metric measure spaces revisited*. J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 1373–1394.
- [J15] R. JIANG: *The Li-Yau Inequality and Heat Kernels on Metric Measure Spaces*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **104** (2015), 29–57.
- [JLZ16] R. JIANG, H. LI, AND H.-C. ZHANG: *Heat Kernel Bounds on Metric Measure Spaces and Some Applications*, Potent. Anal. **44** (2016), 601–627.
- [KM21] V. KAPOVITCH, A. MONDINO: *On the topology and the boundary of N -dimensional $\text{RCD}(K, N)$ spaces*, Geom. Topol. **25** (2021), no. 1, 445–495.
- [KK94] A. KASUE, H. KUMURA: *Spectral convergence of Riemannian manifolds*, Tohoku Math. J. **46** (1994), 147–179.
- [KK96] A. KASUE, H. KUMURA: *Spectral convergence of Riemannian manifolds II*, Tohoku Math. J. **48** (1996), 71–120.
- [LV09] J. LOTT, C. VILLANI: *Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport*. Ann. of Math. **169** (2009), 903–991.
- [MN19] A. MONDINO, A. NABER: *Structure theory of metric measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **21** (2019), 1809—1854.
- [R12] T. RAJALA: *Local Poincaré inequalities from stable curvature conditions on metric spaces*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **44**(3) (2012), 477–494.
- [Sh00] N. SHANMUGALINGAM: *Newtonian spaces: an extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana **16** (2000), 243–279.
- [S95] K.-T. STURM: *Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. II. Upper Gaussian estimates for the fundamental solutions of parabolic equations*, Osaka J. Math. **32**(2) (1995), 275–312.
- [S96] K.-T. STURM: *Analysis on local Dirichlet spaces. III. The parabolic Harnack inequality*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **75**(9) (1996), 273–297.
- [S06a] K.-T. STURM: *On the geometry of metric measure spaces, I*. Acta Math. **196** (2006), 65–131.
- [S06b] K.-T. STURM: *On the geometry of metric measure spaces, II*. Acta Math. **196** (2006), 133–177.
- [ZZ19] H.-C. ZHANG, X.-P. ZHU: *Weyl’s law on $\text{RCD}^*(K, N)$ metric measure spaces*. Comm. Anal. Geom. **27** (2019), no. 8, 1869–1914.