

OBSERVABLE CONCENTRATION OF m -SPACES INTO
NEGATIVELY PINCHED MANIFOLDS

KEI FUNANO

Abstract. The measure concentration property of an m -space X is roughly described as that any 1-Lipschitz map on X to a metric space Y is almost close to a constant map. The target space Y is called the screen. The case of $Y = \mathbb{R}$ is widely studied in many literature. (see [8], [11], [17], [18], [22], [25], [26] and their references). M. Gromov developed the theory of measure concentration in the case where the screen Y is not necessarily $\mathbb{R}$ (cf. [6], [7], [8]). In this paper, we consider the case where the screen Y is a simply connected negatively pinched manifold. We also show that if the screen Y is so big, then the m -space X does not concentrate.

1. Introduction

Let μ_n be the volume measure on the n -dimensional unit sphere S^n in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ normalized as $\mu_n(S^n) = 1$. In 1919, P. Levy proved that for any 1-Lipschitz function $f : S^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, the inequality

$$(1.1) \quad \mu_n \left(\{x \in S^n \mid |f(x) - m_f| \geq \epsilon\} \right) \leq 2e^{-(n-1)\epsilon^2/2}$$

holds, where m_f is some constant determined by f . For any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This means that any 1-Lipschitz function on S^n is almost close to a constant function for sufficiently large $n \geq N$. This high dimensional concentration phenomenon of functions was first extensively used and emphasized by V. D. Milman in his investigation of asymptotic geometric analysis. He used Levy's inequality (1.1) for a short proof of Dvoretzky's theorem on Euclidean section of convex bodies (cf. [15]). The same year later he extended Levy's result to some nonspherical spaces and then pushed forward the idea of concentration of functions as a general unifying principle (cf. [14], [16]). Nowadays, the concentration theory of functions is widely studied in many literature and blend with various areas of mathematics (see [8], [11], [17], [18], [22], [25], [26] and references therein for further information).

In 1999, M. Gromov promoted a theory of concentration of maps into general metric spaces by introducing the notion of the observable diameter in [8]. He settled the following definition.

Date: October 17, 2019.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C21, 53C23, 31C15.

Key words and phrases. CAT(0)-space, measure concentration, m -space, observable diameter.

Definition 1.1. Let Y be a metric space and μ_Y a Borel measure on Y such that $\mu_Y(Y) < +\infty$. We define for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$\text{diam}(\mu_Y; \varepsilon) := \inf \{ \text{diam}(Y_0 \cup Y_1) : Y_0, Y_1 \text{ are Borel subsets such that } \mu_Y(Y_0) \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } \mu_Y(Y_1) \leq \varepsilon \}$ and call it the partial diameter of μ_Y .

An m -space is a triple $(X; d; \mu)$, where d is a complete separable metric on a set X and μ a finite Borel measure on $(X; d)$.

Definition 1.2 (Observable diameter). Let $(X; d; \mu)$ be an m -space and Y a metric space. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we define the observable diameter of X by

$$\text{diam}(X \overset{L^1}{\rightarrow} Y; \mu) := \sup \{ \text{diam}(f(\mu); \nu) : f : X \rightarrow Y \text{ is a 1-Lipschitz map} \}$$

where $f(\mu)$ stands for the push-forward measure of μ by f .

The target metric space Y is called the screen. The idea of the observable diameter came from the quantum and statistical mechanics, that is, we think of μ as a state on a configuration space X and f is interpreted as an observable. We define a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of m -spaces is a Levy family if $\text{diam}(X_n \overset{L^1}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{R}; \mu_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, where μ_n is the total measure of the m -space X_n . This is equivalent to that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any sequence $\{f_n : X_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of 1-Lipschitz functions, we have

$$\mu_n(f_n \in [c, c+\varepsilon]) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty;$$

where c is a some constant determined by f_n . The Levy families are first introduced and analysed from a geometric point of view by Gromov and Milman in [9]. The inequality (1.1) shows that the sequence $\{S^n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Levy family. Gromov proved in [8] that $\text{diam}(X_n \overset{L^1}{\rightarrow} Y; \mu_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for a Levy family $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ if the screen Y is a compact metric space or a Euclidean space. He also discussed the case where the screens are Euclidean spaces whose dimensions go to infinity by considering the barycenters of the push-forward measures (see Theorem 4.13). His barycenter method also goes well if the screens are negatively curved metric spaces, that is to say, CAT(0)-spaces (see Section 4). In [7], he considers and analyzes the questions of isoperimetry of waists and concentration forms from a unit sphere to a Euclidean space. In the recent work [12], M. Ledoux and K. Oleszkiewicz estimated the observable diameter $\text{diam}(X \overset{L^1}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{R}^k; \mu)$ provided that the m -space X has a Gaussian concentration. In our previous paper [5], the author studied the case where the screen Y is a metric space with a doubling measure. In [6], Gromov introduced the notion of L^p -concentration of maps from m -spaces into metric spaces. The property of L^p -concentration is closely related to that of the concentration (see Lemma 4.18 and 4.20), and in [6], he got several L^2 -concentration inequalities of maps (see for example, Theorem 4.25 and Proposition 4.28).

In this paper, motivated by Gromov's study, we study concentration phenomenon of maps into CAT(0)-spaces. In particular, we consider the case where dimensions of screens

go to infinity. Given $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 < 0$ and $n \geq N$, we denote by $NM(n; \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ the set of all n -dimensional complete simply connected Riemannian manifolds with sectional curvature bounded from below by ϵ_1 and from above by ϵ_2 . One of our main theorems in this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.3. Let $(X_n; d_n; g_{n=1}^1)$ be a sequence of mm-spaces of finite diameter and $p \geq 1$. We assume that a sequence $(a(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of natural numbers and sequences $(f_{1n})_{n=1}^\infty, (f_{2n})_{n=1}^\infty$ of negative numbers satisfy that $f_{1n} \leq f_{2n}, \sup_{n \geq N} f_{2n} < 0$, and

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{p}{2n} \text{diam } X_n \stackrel{Lip_1}{\rightarrow} R^{a(n)}; m_n \xrightarrow{(\epsilon_{1n})^{1/4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p} 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Then we have

$$\sup_n \text{diam } X_n \stackrel{Lip_1}{\rightarrow} N; m_n \xrightarrow{(\epsilon_{1n})^{1/4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p} NM(a(n); \epsilon_{1n}; \epsilon_{2n}) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Note that the assumption of the theorem directly implies that $(X_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Levy family.

In the proof of Theorem 1.3, we find a point in a screen N which is a kind of barycenter of the push-forward measure on N , and prove that the measure concentrates to the point by the delicate discussions comparing N with a real hyperbolic space.

For $\epsilon_0 < 0$ and $n \geq N$, we indicate by $NM(n; \epsilon_0)$ the set of all n -dimensional complete simply connected Riemannian manifolds with negative sectional curvature bounded from below by ϵ_0 . A similar argument in the proof of Theorem 1.3 implies the following theorem.

Theorem 1.4. Let $(X_n; d_n; g_{n=1}^1)$ be a sequence of mm-spaces of finite diameter and $p \geq 1$. We assume that a sequence $(a(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ of natural numbers satisfies that

$$(1.3) \quad \text{diam } X_n \stackrel{Lip_1}{\rightarrow} R^{a(n)}; m_n \xrightarrow{(\text{diam } X_n)^p} 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 < 0$, we have

$$\sup_n \text{diam } X_n \stackrel{Lip_1}{\rightarrow} N; m_n \xrightarrow{(\text{diam } X_n)^p} NM(a(n); \epsilon_0) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

As corollaries of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4, we obtain L^p -concentration results of maps into N for $p \geq 1$ (see Corollary 4.22 and 4.23).

The next theorem says that if the screen Y is so big that the mm-space X which satisfies some homogeneity condition, can isometrically be embedded into Y , then its observable diameter $\text{diam}(X \stackrel{Lip_1}{\rightarrow} Y; m)$ is not close to zero.

Theorem 1.5. Let $(X_n; d_n; g_{n=1}^1)$ be a Levy family with $\inf_{n \geq N} m_n > 0$ and $(fY_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ a sequence of metric spaces satisfying the following conditions (1)–(3).

- (1) $X_n = \text{Supp } m_n$ is connected.

(2) For any $r > 0$ and $n \geq N$, all measures of closed balls in X_n with radius r are mutually equal.

(3) For each $n \geq N$, there exists an isometric embedding from X_n to Y_n .

Then, for any α with $0 < \alpha < \inf_{n \geq N} m_n$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha} \text{diam}(X_n \overset{\text{Lip}_1}{\hookrightarrow} Y_n; m_n) = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha} \text{diam} X_n:$$

From Theorem 1.5, we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 1.6. For any α with $0 < \alpha < 1$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\alpha} \text{diam}(S^n \overset{\text{Lip}_1}{\hookrightarrow} R^{n+1}; 1) > 0:$$

Note that the dimension $n + 1$ of the screen can be replaced by any natural number greater than n .

As an appendix, we discuss the case where the screen Y is a (combinatorial) tree and give some answer to Exercise of Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:32 in [8]. Precisely, we prove the following proposition:

Proposition 1.7. Assume that a sequence $f(X_n; d_n; \mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces is a Levy family. Then, we have

$$\sup \text{diam}(X_n \overset{\text{Lip}_1}{\hookrightarrow} T; \mu_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $\alpha > 0$.

2. Preliminaries

Let $(X; d)$ be a metric space. For $x \in X$, $r > 0$, and $A, B \subset X$, we put

$$B_X(x; r) := \{y \in X \mid d(x; y) \leq r\}; d(A; B) := \inf_{a \in A, b \in B} d(a; b);$$

$$d(x; A) := d(x; \{a \in A\}); A_r := \{y \in X \mid d(y; A) \leq r\}; A_{+r} := \{y \in X \mid d(y; A) < r\};$$

We denote by m and m_n the total measure of mm-spaces X and X_n respectively, and by Supp the support of a Borel measure.

2.1. Observable diameter and Levy radius. In this subsection, we prove several results in [8] because we find no proof anywhere. Let $(X; d)$ be an mm-space and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a Borel measurable function. A number $a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is called a pre-Levy mean of f iff $f(\cdot) \in [1; a_0]$ $m=2$ and $f(\cdot) \in [a_0; +1]$ $m=2$. We remark that a_0 does exist, but it is not unique for f in general. Let $A_f \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the set of all pre-Levy means of f . The proof of the following lemma is easy and we omit the proof.

Lemma 2.1 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:19]). A_f is a closed bounded interval.

The Levy mean m_f of f is defined by $m_f := (a_f + b_f)/2$, where $a_f := \min A_f$ and $b_f := \max A_f$. For $\alpha > 0$, we define the Levy radius, $\text{LeRad}(X; \alpha)$, as the infimum of $\alpha > 0$ such that every 1-Lipschitz function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $(f(x) \in [m_f - \alpha; m_f + \alpha])$ $m_f = 2$.

Lemma 2.2 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:32]). For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\text{diam}(X \stackrel{\text{Lip}_1}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{R}; m) \leq 2 \text{LeRad}(X; \epsilon):$$

Proof. Put $a := \text{LeRad}(X; \epsilon)$. It follows from the definition of the Levy radius that $(\int_X |f(x) - m_f| dx) \leq \epsilon$ for any 1-Lipschitz function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. So we obtain $f([m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]) \geq m$, which implies $\text{diam}(f([m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]); m) \leq \text{diam}([m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]) = 2\epsilon$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 2.3 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:32]). For any ϵ with $0 < \epsilon < m/2$ we have

$$\text{LeRad}(X; \epsilon) \leq \text{diam}(X \stackrel{\text{Lip}_1}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{R}; m):$$

Proof. Put $a := \text{diam}(X \stackrel{\text{Lip}_1}{\rightarrow} \mathbb{R}; m)$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a closed interval $X_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $f([m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]) \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\text{diam} X_0 \leq a + \epsilon$. We shall show that $m_f \in X_0$. If $X_0 \subset [m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]$, we have

$$\frac{m}{2} < m_f - \epsilon \leq f([m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]) \cap X_0 \leq f([m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]) \leq m_f + \epsilon,$$

which is a contradiction. In the same way, we have $X_0 \not\subset [m_f - \epsilon; m_f + \epsilon]$. Hence, we get $m_f \in X_0$, which yields $X_0 \subset [m_f - (a + \epsilon); m_f + (a + \epsilon)]$ since $\text{diam} X_0 \leq a + \epsilon$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\int_X |f(x) - m_f| dx) &\leq \int_{[m_f - (a + \epsilon); m_f + (a + \epsilon)]} |f(x) - m_f| dx \\ &\leq \int_{X_0} |f(x) - m_f| dx \leq m \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have $\text{LeRad}(X; \epsilon) \leq a + \epsilon$, which completes the proof of the lemma.

Combining Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.4 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:32]). A sequence $(X_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces is a Levy family if and only if $\text{LeRad}(X_n; \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

2.2. Levy radius and concentration function. Given an mm-space $(X; d; \mu)$, we define the function $\chi_X: (0; +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\chi_X(r) := \sup \{ \mu(A) : A \text{ is a Borel subset of } X \text{ such that } \text{diam}(A) \leq r \}$$

and call it the concentration function of X . Although the following lemmas and corollary are somewhat standard, we prove them for the completeness of this paper.

Lemma 2.5 (cf. [11, Section 1.3]). For any $r > 0$ we have

$$\text{LeRad}(X; 2\chi_X(r)) \leq r:$$

Proof. Let $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a 1-Lipschitz function. We put $A := \{x \in X : f(x) \leq m_f + r\}$ and $A^0 := \{x \in X : f(x) \leq m_f\}$. Then,

$$\int_X |f(x) - m_f| dx = \int_X (f(x) - m_f)_+ dx \leq \int_A (f(x) - m_f) dx \leq r \mu(A) \leq r \chi_X(r):$$

In the same way,

$$f(x) \leq \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy + \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy = 2 \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy.$$

Since $(A)^m = 2$ and $(A^0)^m = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy &= \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy + \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \\ &= \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy + \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \\ &= 2 \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

Lemma 2.6 (cf. [11, Section 1.3]). For any α with $0 < \alpha < m$, we have

$$\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy.$$

Proof. Let A be a Borel subset of X such that $(A)^m = 2$. We define a function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f(x) = d(x, A)$. Putting $\alpha = \text{LeRad}(X; \alpha)$, by the definition of the Levy radius, we have $\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \alpha^m$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy &\leq \alpha^m \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \\ &= \alpha^m \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy = \alpha^m \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists a point $x_0 \in \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \alpha^m \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy$ and we have $m_f = \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy = \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \alpha^m \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy;$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.

Corollary 2.7. A sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of m -spaces is a Levy family if and only if $\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $r > 0$.

Proof. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a Levy family. Fix $r > 0$ and take any $\epsilon > 0$. For an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m_n = 2 - \epsilon$, we have $\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \epsilon$. Hence, we only consider the case of $m_n = 2 > \epsilon$. From the assumption, we have $2 \text{LeRad}(X_n; \epsilon) \leq r$ for any sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by virtue of Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq 2 \text{LeRad}(X_n; \epsilon)^m \leq \epsilon^m;$$

which shows $\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Conversely, assume that $\int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $r > 0$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and take any $\epsilon > 0$. From the assumption, we have $2 \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy \leq \epsilon$ for any sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, applying Lemma 2.5 to X_n , we obtain

$$\text{LeRad}(X_n; \epsilon) \leq \text{LeRad}(X_n; 2 \int_X |f(x) - f(y)|^m dy) \leq \epsilon;$$

This completes the proof.

2.3. Concentration function and separation distance. Let $(X; d; \mu)$ be an mm-space. For any $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1$ and $N \geq 2$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sep}(X; \epsilon; N) &= \text{Sep}(\epsilon; 0; N) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{I \subseteq J \\ |I| \leq N}} \inf_{i \in I} d(X_i; X_j) \end{aligned}$$

X_i, X_j are Borel subsets of X which satisfy $\mu(X_i) \geq \epsilon$ for any $i \in I$;

and call it the separation distance of X . In this subsection, we investigate the relationships between the concentration function and the separation distance. The proof of the following lemma is easy, and we omit the proof.

Lemma 2.8 (cf. [8, Section 3.1.33]). Let $(X; d_X; \mu_X)$ and $(Y; d_Y; \mu_Y)$ be two mm-spaces. Assume that a 1-Lipschitz map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies $f(\mu_X) = \mu_Y$. Then we have

$$\text{Sep}(Y; \epsilon; N) \leq \text{Sep}(X; \epsilon; N):$$

Let us recall that the Hausdorff distance between two bounded closed subsets A and B in a metric space X is defined by

$$d_H(A; B) = \inf \{ r > 0 \mid A \subset B_r; B \subset A_r \}:$$

It is easy to check that d_H is the metric on the set C_X of all bounded closed subsets of X .

Lemma 2.9 (Blaschke, cf. [1, Theorem 4.4.15]). If X is a compact metric space, then $(C_X; d_H)$ is also compact.

Lemma 2.10. Let $(X; d; \mu)$ be an mm-space and assume that $\text{Supp } \mu$ is connected. Then, for any $r > 0$ with $\mu_X(r) > 0$ we have

$$\text{Sep}(X; \frac{r}{2}; \mu_X(r)) \leq r:$$

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. We may assume that $X = \text{Supp } \mu$. Suppose that $\text{Sep}(X; \frac{r}{2}; \mu_X(r)) > r$, there exist $r_0 > 0$ with $r_0 > r$ and Borel subsets $X_1, X_2 \subset X$ such that $\mu(X_1) \geq \frac{r}{2}$, $\mu(X_2) \geq \mu_X(r)$, and $d(X_1; X_2) > r_0$. Let us show that $(X_1)_r + (X_1)_{+r_0} = X$. If $(X_1)_r = (X_1)_{+r_0}$, we have $X = (X_1)_r \cup X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0}$. Since X is connected, we get either $X_1 = \emptyset$ or $X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0} = \emptyset$. It follows from $\mu(X_1) \geq \frac{r}{2} > 0$ that $(X_1)_r \neq \emptyset$. By $d(X_1; X_2) > r_0$, we obtain $X_2 \subset X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0}$, which implies that $X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0} \subset (X_2)$ and $\mu_X(r) > 0$. Therefore, we have $X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0} \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. Thus, there exists a point $x_0 \in X \setminus (X_1)_r \cap X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0}$. Taking a sufficient small ball B centered at x_0 such that $B \subset X \setminus (X_1)_r$ and $B \setminus X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0} = \emptyset$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(X_2) &\geq \mu_X(r) \geq \mu(X \setminus (X_1)_r) \\ &\geq \mu(B \cap (X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0})) = \mu(B) + \mu(X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0} \cap B) \\ &> \mu(X \setminus (X_1)_{+r_0}) \geq \mu(X_2); \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have finished the proof.

Remark 2.11. If $\text{Supp } \mu$ is disconnected, the above lemma does not hold in general. For example, consider the space $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ with a metric d given by $d(x_1, x_2) = 1$ and with a Borel probability measure μ given by $\mu(\{x_1\}) = \mu(\{x_2\}) = 1/2$. In this case, we have $\chi_X(1/2) = 1/2$ and $\text{Sep}(X; 1/2; 1/2) = 1$.

Lemma 2.12. For any $r > 0$ there exists a Borel subset $X_0 \subset X$ such that

$$\chi_n(X_0)_{+r} = \chi_n(r) \text{ and } (X_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r):$$

Proof. From the definition of the concentration function, for any $n \geq N$, there exist a closed subset $A_n \subset X$ such that

$$(A_n)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r) \text{ and } \chi_n(X_0)_{+r} + \frac{1}{n} = \chi_n(r):$$

Take an increasing sequence $K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \dots$ of compact subsets of X such that $\chi_n(K_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By using Lemma 2.9 and the diagonal argument, we have that $fA_n \setminus K_i$ Hausdorff converges to a closed subset $B_i \subset K_i$ and $fX_n(A_n)_{+r} \setminus K_i$ Hausdorff converges to a closed subset $C_i \subset K_i$ for each $i \geq 1$. Put $K = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$, $\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} C_i$, $X_0 = \overline{K}$, and $Y_0 = \mathbb{R}$. It is easy to check that $B_1 \subset B_2 \subset \dots$ and $C_1 \subset C_2 \subset \dots$. We will show that $d(K; \mathbb{R}) = r$ by contradiction. If $d(K; \mathbb{R}) < r$, there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that $d(K; \mathbb{R}) < r_0 < r$. Hence there exist $x \in K$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d(x; y) < r_0$. There exists $i \geq 1$ such that $x \in B_i$ and $y \in C_i$, because both fB_n and fC_n are increasing sequences. Since both $fA_n \setminus K_i$ and $fX_n(A_n)_{+r} \setminus K_i$ Hausdorff converge to B_i and C_i respectively, there exist two sequences $f x_n$ and $f y_n$ such that $d(x_n; x) \rightarrow 0$ and $d(y_n; y) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and $x_n \in A_n$ and $d(y_n; A_n) \geq r$ for any $n \geq N$. Therefore, for any sufficiently large $n \geq N$ we have

$$d(x_n; y_n) \leq d(x_n; x) + d(x; y) + d(y; y_n) < r_0 + d(x; y) + d(y; y_n) < r;$$

which is a contradiction, because $x_n \in A_n$ and $d(y_n; A_n) \geq r$. Thus, we obtain $d(K; \mathbb{R}) = r$ which yields that $d(X_0; Y_0) = r$ and therefore $Y_0 \subset X_n(X_0)_{+r}$. Let us show that $(X_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r)$ and $(Y_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r)$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \geq N$ such that $\chi_n(K_{n_0}) < \epsilon$. Take any $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for any sufficiently large n we have $A_n \setminus K_{n_0} \subset (B_{n_0})_{\epsilon}$. Therefore,

$$(X_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} \subset (B_{n_0})_{\epsilon} \cup (A_n \setminus K_{n_0})_{\frac{m}{2}} \subset (A_n)_{\frac{m}{2}} + (K_{n_0})_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r) + \epsilon:$$

By taking $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we obtain $(X_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r)$, which shows $(X_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r)$. In the same way, we have $(Y_0)_{\frac{m}{2}} = \chi_n(r)$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 2.12 directly implies

Lemma 2.13. For an m -space X and $r > 0$, we have

$$\text{Sep}(X; \frac{m}{2}; \chi_n(r)) = r:$$

Corollary 2.14. If a sequence fX_n of m -spaces satisfies that $\text{Sep}(X_n; \epsilon; \chi_n(r)) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, we then have $\chi_n(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $r > 0$.

Proof. Suppose that there exists $c > 0$ such that $\chi_n(r) \geq c$ for infinitely many $n \geq N$. Applying Lemma 2.13 to X_n , we have

$$r \leq \text{Sep}(X_n; \frac{m_n}{2}; \chi_n(r)) \leq \text{Sep}(X_n; \chi_n(r); \chi_n(r)) \leq \text{Sep}(X_n; c; c):$$

This is a contradiction, since the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 2.15 (cf. [11, Lemma 1.1]). Let $(X; d; \chi)$ be an mm-space. Assume that a Borel subset $A \subset X$ and $r_0 > 0$ satisfy $\chi(A) > 0$ and $\chi(X \setminus A_{r_0}) < \epsilon$. Then, for any $r > 0$ we have

$$\chi(X \setminus A_{r_0+r}) \leq \chi(r):$$

Corollary 2.16. Assume that a sequence $\{X_n; d_n; \chi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces satisfy $\chi_n(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $r > 0$. Then, we have $\text{Sep}(X_n; \chi_n; \chi_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\chi_n > 0$.

Proof. Since $\text{Sep}(X_n; \chi_n; \chi_n) = 0$ for $n \geq N$ with $m_n < \epsilon$, we assume that $m_n \geq \epsilon$ for any $n \geq N$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $\chi_n(\epsilon) < \epsilon/2$ for any sufficiently large $n \geq N$ from the assumption. Thus, it follows from Lemma 2.15 that $\chi_n(X_n \setminus (A_n)_{+2\epsilon}) \leq \chi_n(\epsilon) < \epsilon/2$ for any Borel sets $A_n, B_n \subset X_n$ with $\chi_n(A_n) \geq \epsilon$ and $\chi_n(B_n) \geq \epsilon$. In the same way, we get $\chi_n(X_n \setminus (B_n)_{+2\epsilon}) < \epsilon/2$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_n(X_n \setminus ((A_n)_{+2\epsilon} \setminus (B_n)_{+2\epsilon})) &= \chi_n(X_n \setminus (A_n)_{+2\epsilon}) + \chi_n(X_n \setminus (B_n)_{+2\epsilon}) \\ &< \epsilon; \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\chi_n((A_n)_{+2\epsilon} \setminus (B_n)_{+2\epsilon}) > 0$, and thereby $(A_n)_{+2\epsilon} \setminus (B_n)_{+2\epsilon} \notin \mathcal{F}_n$. As a consequence, we have $\text{diam}(A_n; B_n) \geq 4\epsilon$, which shows $\text{Sep}(X_n; \chi_n; \chi_n) \geq 4\epsilon$. This completes the proof.

Combining Corollaries 2.14 and 2.16, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.17 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:33]). A sequence $\{X_n; d_n; \chi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of mm-spaces is a Levy family if and only if $\text{Sep}(X_n; \chi_n; \chi_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any $\chi_n > 0$.

3. Proof of the Main theorem

Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold and μ a Borel measure on M such that $\text{Supp } \mu$ is compact and $\mu(M) < +\infty$. We consider the function $d : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$d(x) := \int_M \frac{\mu(dy)}{d_M(x; y)} d(y);$$

where d_M is the Riemannian distance on M . The proof of the following lemma is easy and we omit the proof.

Lemma 3.1. There exists a point $x \in M$ such that d attains its minimum and

$$d_M(x; \text{Supp } \mu) \leq 2 \text{diam}(\text{Supp } \mu):$$

Remark 3.2. The above x is not unique in general. For example, consider a $M = \mathbb{R}$ and a Borel probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ given by $\mu\{0\} = \mu\{1\} = 1/2$. In this case, the points 0 and 1 imply the infimum of the function d .

From now on, we consider the m -dimensional hyperbolic space H^m as a Poincaré disk model $D_m := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid |x| < 1\}$. For $\kappa < 0$, we denote by $H^m(\kappa)$ a complete simply connected Riemannian manifold of constant curvature κ . We consider $(H^m(\kappa); d_{H^m(\kappa)})$ as $(D_m; (1 - \frac{\kappa}{4}) d_{H^m})$.

Lemma 3.3 (cf. [20, Theorem 4.6.1]). For any $x, y \in H^m$ we have

$$d_{H^m}(x; y) = 2 \log \frac{1 - \frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{|x||y|}}{1 - \frac{|x|^2}{4}} + \frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{(1 - \frac{|x|^2}{4})(1 - \frac{|y|^2}{4})} + 1 :$$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The claim obviously holds in the case of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{diam } X_n = 0$, so we assume that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{diam } X_n > 0$. Under this assumption, since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n = 0$ implies the claim, we also assume that $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} m_n > 0$. Note that there is a sequence $\{c_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of positive numbers such that $c_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\frac{1}{2n} \text{diam } X_n \leq \frac{L_{\text{Lip}_1} R^{a(n)}; m_n}{(c_n)^{1/4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Hence we only consider the case that $c_n = 2n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\{N_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be any sequence such that $N_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{a(n); c_n; 2n\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{f_n : X_n \rightarrow N_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be any sequence of 1-Lipschitz maps. Let $p_n \in N_n$ be the infimum of the function $d_{(f_n)^{-1}(c_n)} : N_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We shall show that

$$(f_n)^{-1}(c_n) \cap N_n \cap B_{N_n}(p_n; r) \subset \frac{1}{(c_n)^{1/4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p}$$

for any $r > 0$ with $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (c_n)^{1/4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p = (2 \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} c_n)$ and sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Since N_n is simply connected and has nonpositive sectional curvature, N_n has no cut locus at any point. Let ℓ_n be a linear isometry from the tangent space of N_n at p_n to the tangent space of $H^{a(n)}(c_n)$ at 0 and put $\ell'_n := \exp_0 \circ \ell_n \circ \exp_{p_n}^{-1} : N_n \rightarrow H^{a(n)}(c_n)$. By virtue of the hinge theorem (cf. [21, Chapter IV, Remark 2.6]), we have

$$\frac{1}{2n} d_{H^{a(n)}}(\ell'_n(x); \ell'_n(x^0)) \leq d_{N_n}(x; x^0)$$

for any $x, x^0 \in N_n$. Since ℓ'_n is the $\frac{1}{2n}$ -Lipschitz map from X_n to the Euclidean space $(D_{a(n)}; d_{\mathbb{R}^{a(n)}})$, from the assumption there exists a Borel subset $A_n \subset D_{a(n)}$ such that $A_n \subset \text{Supp}(\ell'_n \circ f_n)^{-1}(c_n)$, $(\ell'_n \circ f_n)^{-1}(c_n)(A_n) > m_n = (c_n)^{1/4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p$, and $\text{diam}(A_n; d_{\mathbb{R}^{a(n)}}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us show that $d_{H^{a(n)}}(A_n; 0) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that $d_{H^{a(n)}}(A_n; 0) \geq \varepsilon$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\varepsilon > 0$. For any $x \in D_{a(n)}$, we take $y \in D_{a(n)}$ such that $y = -x$ as a vector

in $R^{a(n)}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n} d_{H^{a(n)}}(0; y) = \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{2n} d_{H^{a(n)}}(0; x):$$

We define $\pi_n : D_{a(n)} \rightarrow D_{a(n)}$ by $\pi_n(x) = y$. Since $1n = 2n + 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $d_{H^{a(n)}}(A_n; 0) \rightarrow 0$ for any $n \geq N$, we get $\text{diam}(\pi_n(A_n); d_{R^{a(n)}}), d_{R^{a(n)}}(\pi_n(A_n); S^{a(n)-1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\text{diam}(A_n; d_{R^{a(n)}}), d_{R^{a(n)}}(A_n; S^{a(n)-1}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, there are points $q_n \in D_{a(n)}$ having the following properties (1), (2):

- (1) $\pi_n(q_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (2) $\pi_n(x) \rightarrow \pi_n(y)$ and $\pi_n(x) \rightarrow \pi_n(y)$ for any $x \in \pi_n(A_n)$.

Claim 3.4. For any $n \geq N$ and $x \in \pi_n^{-1}(A_n) \setminus f_n(X_n)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \leq \mathbb{Q} \frac{1}{d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)} + \mathbb{P} \frac{c_n}{\text{diam } X_n};$$

where c_n are positive numbers satisfying $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = d_{N_n}(p_n; \pi_n^{-1}(q_n)) = 1 = 2^{\frac{p}{2}}$.

Proof. According to the hinge theorem (cf. [21, Chapter IV, Theorem 4.2 (2)]), we have $d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x) = (1 - \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n} d_{H^{a(n)}}(q_n; \pi_n^{-1}(x)))$. Note that also $d_{N_n}(p_n; x) = (1 - \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n} d_{H^{a(n)}}(0; \pi_n^{-1}(x)))$. Therefore, from Lemma 3.3 and (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \leq \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)} \\ & d_{H^{a(n)}}(0; \pi_n^{-1}(x)) \leq d_{H^{a(n)}}(q_n; \pi_n^{-1}(x)) \\ & = \log \frac{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}}{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}} \\ & \leq \log \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}}{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}} \\ & = \log \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}}{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}} \\ & \leq \log \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}}{\mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n d_{N_n}(\pi_n^{-1}(q_n); x)}} =: \mathbb{P} \frac{1}{1n} b_n: \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{p}{d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \quad \frac{q}{d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x} \\
 & \frac{q}{d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x + b_h} \quad \frac{q}{d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x} \\
 & \frac{q}{d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x + b_h + d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x} \\
 & \frac{p}{d_{N_n}(p_n; x) + d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x} \quad \frac{q}{d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x} \\
 & \frac{p}{2} \frac{b_h}{d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} :
 \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.1, we have $d_{N_n}(p_n; x) \leq 2 \operatorname{diam} X_n$. Therefore we obtain

$$\frac{p}{d_{N_n}(p_n; x)} \quad \frac{q}{d_{N_n}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n); x} \leq \frac{p}{2} \frac{b_h}{2 \operatorname{diam} X_n} :$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_h = d_{N_n}(p_n; (n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n) = 1$, putting $c_n := b_h = (2 \frac{p}{2})$, this completes the proof of the claim.

Assume first that $(f_n - f_n)(n)(H^{a(n)} n A_n) = 0$ for infinitely many $n \geq N$. Then, by using Claim 3.4, we get

$$d_{(f_n)(n)}((n) \quad 'n)^{-1}(q_n) = d_{(f_n)(n)}(p_n) \leq \frac{m_n C_n}{\operatorname{diam} X_n} < d_{(f_n)(n)}(p_n) :$$

This is a contradiction since $p_n \geq N_n$ is the minimum of the function $d_{(f_n)(n)}$.

$\inf_{1 \leq n \leq N} (f_n)^{1=4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p = (2 \inf_{1 \leq n \leq N} f_n)^p$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_n = d_{N_n} p_n; (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n) = 1 = (2^{p/2})$,
we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c_n}{\text{diam } X_n} \inf_{1 \leq n \leq N} \frac{(f_n)^{1=4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p}{2} \\
& + \frac{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n)}{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n) + d_{N_n} p_n; f_n(x_n)} d_n(x_n) \\
& \frac{c_n \inf_{1 \leq n \leq N}}{2 \text{diam } X_n} + \frac{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n)}{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n) + d_{N_n} p_n; f_n(x_n)} d_n(x_n) \\
& \frac{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n)}{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n) + d_{N_n} p_n; f_n(x_n)} \\
& \frac{c_n (f_n)^{1=4} \inf_{1 \leq n \leq N} (\text{diam } X_n)^p}{2} \inf_{1 \leq n \leq N} d_n(x_n) \\
& \frac{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n)}{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n) + d_{N_n} p_n; f_n(x_n)} \frac{d_{N_n} p_n; f_n(x_n)}{2 d_{N_n} p_n; (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n)} d_n(x_n) \\
& \frac{d_{N_n} p_n; (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n)}{d_{N_n} (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n); f_n(x_n) + d_{N_n} p_n; f_n(x_n)} d_n(x_n) < 0
\end{aligned}$$

for any sufficiently large $n \geq N$. Therefore we obtain $d_{(f_n)}(q_n) (f_n)^{1=4} (q_n) < d_{(f_n)}(p_n)$ for any sufficiently large $n \geq N$. Consequently we have a contradiction since $p_n \geq M_n$ is the minimum of the function $d_{(f_n)}(q_n)$.

Since $d_{H^a(n)}(A_n; 0) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$A_n \leq B_{H^a(n)}(0; r \inf_{1 \leq n \leq N} \frac{p}{2n}) \leq B_{H^a(n)}(0; r \frac{p}{2n}) = f_n B_{N_n}(p_n; r)$$

for any $r > 0$ and sufficiently large $n \geq N$. Therefore we obtain

$$(f_n)(q_n) N_n \leq B_{N_n}(p_n; r) \leq (f_n)(q_n) N_n f_n^{-1}(A_n) \frac{(f_n)^{1=4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p}{2}$$

for any sufficiently large $n \geq N$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. As in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we assume that $\inf_{n \geq N} f_n > 0$ and $\inf_{n \geq N} \text{diam } X_n > 0$. Let $f_n g_{n=1}^1$ be any sequence such that $N_n \geq N M_n(a(n); 0)$ for each $n \geq N$ and $f_n : X_n \rightarrow N_n g_{n=1}^1$ be any sequence of 1-Lipschitz maps. We shall show that

$$(f_n)(q_n) N_n \leq B_{N_n}(p_n; r) \leq \frac{(f_n)^{1=4} (\text{diam } X_n)^p}{2}$$

for any $r_n > 0$ such that $\inf_{1 \leq n} (\text{diam } X_n)^p = (2 \inf_{1 \leq n} r_n)$ and $r < 1$. Let $p_n \in \mathbb{N}_n$ be the minimum of the function $d_{(f_n)}(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{N}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Take $r_n > 0$ with $\overline{f_n(X_n)} \subset B_{N_n}(p_n; r_n)$ and let ϵ_n be negative numbers such that the sectional curvature on $B_{N_n}(p_n; r_n)$ is bounded from above by ϵ_n and $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let ℓ_n be a linear isometry from the tangent space of N_n at p_n to the tangent space of $H^{a(n)}(\cdot)$ at 0 and put $\ell'_n := \exp_0 \circ \ell_n \circ \exp_{p_n}^{-1} : B_{N_n}(p_n; r_n) \rightarrow B_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(0; r_n)$. By virtue of the hinge theorem, we have

$$\frac{1}{p_n} d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(\ell'_n(x); \ell'_n(x^0)) \leq d_{N_n}(x; x^0)$$

for any $x, x^0 \in B_{N_n}(p_n; r_n)$. Since $\ell'_n \circ f_n$ is the $\frac{1}{p_n}$ -Lipschitz map from X_n to the Euclidean space $(D_{a(n)}; d_{R^{a(n)}})$, from the assumption there exists a Borel subset $A_n \subset D_{a(n)}$ and $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $A_n \subset \text{Supp}(\ell'_n \circ f_n)(\cdot) \cap B_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(0; r_n)$, $(\ell'_n \circ f_n)(\cdot)(A_n) > m_n = (\text{diam } X_n)^p$, and $\text{diam}(A_n; d_{R^{a(n)}}) \leq \frac{\epsilon_n}{p_n}$.

Let us show that $d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(A_n; 0) = \frac{1}{p_n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(A_n; 0) \geq C \frac{1}{p_n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $x \in D_{a(n)}$, we take $y \in D_{a(n)}$ such that $y = x$ as a vector in $R^{a(n)}$ for some $e \geq 0$ and

$$\frac{1}{p_n} d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(0; y) = \frac{1}{p_n} d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(0; x):$$

We define $\eta_n : D_{a(n)} \rightarrow D_{a(n)}$ by $\eta_n(x) = y$. Since $\text{diam}(A_n; d_{R^{a(n)}}) \leq \frac{\epsilon_n}{p_n}$, $d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(A_n; 0) \geq C \frac{1}{p_n}$, and $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\text{diam}(\eta_n(A_n); d_{R^{a(n)}(\cdot)}; d_{R^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(\eta_n(A_n); S^{a(n)-1})) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty:$$

Thus, as in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we have a contradiction.

From $d_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(A_n; 0) = \frac{1}{p_n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\text{diam}(A_n; d_{R^{a(n)}(\cdot)}) \leq \frac{\epsilon_n}{p_n}$, we get

$$A_n \subset B_{H^{a(n)}(\cdot)}(0; r_n) = \ell'_n(B_{N_n}(p_n; r_n))$$

for any $r > 0$ with $r < 1$ and sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore we obtain

$$(f_n)(\cdot) \cap N_n \cap B_{N_n}(p_n; r) \subset (f_n)(\cdot) \cap N_n \cap \ell_n^{-1}(A_n) \subset \frac{1}{p_n} \overline{(\text{diam } X_n)^p}$$

for any sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. By (2) and $m_n < +1$, X_n is compact. Hence, there exist $x_n, y_n \in X_n$ such that $\text{diam } X_n = d_n(x_n; y_n)$. We define a function $f_n : X_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_n(x_n) = d_n(x_n; x)$. Let a_n be a pre-Levy mean of f_n . Then we have

Claim 3.5. $\text{diam } X_n = 2a_n$.

Proof. If $a_n < \text{diam } X_n = 2$, we get $B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) \setminus B_{X_n}(y_n; a_n) \neq \emptyset$. Since $B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) = \{x \in X_n \mid f_n(x) \leq a_n\}$ and by (2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_n - 2 \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) &= \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) + \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(y_n; a_n) \\ &= \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) [B_{X_n}(y_n; a_n)]; \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $X_n = \text{Supp } \mu_n \cap B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) \cup B_{X_n}(y_n; a_n)$. This is a contradiction because X_n is connected. This completes the proof of the claim.

Given $y \in X_n$, we define a function $f_y : X_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_y(x) := d_n(x; y)$. Then we have

Claim 3.6. μ_n is a pre-Levy mean of f_y .

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_n} (f_y \circ \mu_n)(x) d\mu_n(x) &= \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(y; a_n) \\ &= \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) = \int_{X_n} (f_y \circ \mu_n)(x) d\mu_n(x); \end{aligned}$$

we obtain $\int_{X_n} (f_y \circ \mu_n)(x) d\mu_n(x) = \mu_n(B_{X_n}(y; a_n))$. On the other hand, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_n} (f_y \circ \mu_n)(x) d\mu_n(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(y; a_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{X_n} B_{X_n}(x_n; a_n) \\ &= \int_{X_n} (f_y \circ \mu_n)(x) d\mu_n(x) = \frac{\mu_n(B_{X_n}(y; a_n))}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

Take any $\epsilon > 0$ and put $B_{n,\epsilon} := \{x \in X_n : d_n(x; y) < \epsilon\}$. Then, it follows from Fubini's theorem together with Claim 3.5 and 3.6 that

$$\int_{X_n} \mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon}) = \int_{X_n} \int_{X_n} (f_y \circ \mu_n)(x) d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) = \mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon})^2.$$

Let $\mu_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ be an isometric embedding and $A_n \subset Y_n$ any Borel subset with $\mu_n(A_n) = \mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon})$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(A_n) &= \mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon}) \\ \mu_n(A_n) &= \mu_n(A_n) + \mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon}) = \mu_n(A_n) + \mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon})^2 = 2\mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon}) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the right-hand side of the above inequality is positive for any sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So, we get $\mu_n(B_{n,\epsilon}) \setminus \mu_n(A_n) \neq \emptyset$; which leads to that there exist $x_n^0, y_n^0 \in \mu_n^{-1}(A_n)$ with $d_n(x_n^0, y_n^0) < \epsilon$. Hence, we obtain

$$\text{diam}(X_n, d_n) \leq \text{diam}(Y_n, d_n) + \epsilon \leq \frac{\text{diam } X_n}{2} + \epsilon;$$

and this completes the proof of the theorem.

4. Applications and some related topics about the main theorems

In this section, we investigate concentration phenomenon of maps into CAT(0)-spaces.

4.1. Barycenter of a measure and observable central radius.

4.1.1. Basics of the barycenter of a measure. First, we shall review some standard terminology in metric geometry. A metric space $(X; d_X)$ is said to be geodesic if every two points $x, y \in X$ can be joined by a rectifiable curve whose length coincides with $d_X(x; y)$. A rectifiable curve $\gamma: [0; 1] \rightarrow X$ is called a minimal geodesic if it is globally minimizing and has a constant speed, i.e., parameterized proportionally to the arclength. A geodesic metric space X is called a CAT(0)-space if we have

$$d_X(x; (1=2)^{-1}(y+z))^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} d_X(x; y)^2 + \frac{1}{2} d_X(x; z)^2 - \frac{1}{4} d_X(y; z)^2$$

for any $x, y, z \in X$ and any minimizing geodesic $\gamma: [0; 1] \rightarrow X$ from y to z . If the reverse inequality

$$d_X(x; (1=2)^{-1}(y+z))^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} d_X(x; y)^2 + \frac{1}{2} d_X(x; z)^2 - \frac{1}{4} d_X(y; z)^2$$

holds for any x, y, z and γ , then we say that $(X; d_X)$ is an Alexandrov space of nonnegative curvature.

Example 4.1. (1) A complete simply connected Riemannian manifold is a CAT(0)-space if and only if its sectional curvature is nonpositive everywhere. Similarly, a complete Riemannian manifold is an Alexandrov space of nonnegative curvature if and only if its sectional curvature is nonnegative.

(2) A Hilbert space is both CAT(0)-space and Alexandrov space of nonnegative curvature.

(3) For a compact convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let d_Ω equip the length metric d_Ω induced from the standard metric of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then $(\Omega; d_\Omega)$ is an Alexandrov space of nonnegative curvature.

(4) A tree is a CAT(0)-space.

Let $(X; d_X)$ be a metric space. We denote by $B(X)$ the set of all finite Borel measures on X with separable supports. Given $1 \leq p < +\infty$, we indicate by $B^p(X)$ the set of all Borel measures $\mu \in B(X)$ such that $\int_X d_X(x; y)^p d\mu(y) < +\infty$ for some (hence all) $x \in X$. Obviously, $B^p(X) \subset B^q(X) \subset B(X)$ for any $p > q$.

The following two characterizations of CAT(0)-spaces and Alexandrov spaces of nonnegative curvatures are due to K.-T. Sturm.

Theorem 4.2 (cf. [24, Theorem 4.9]). A complete metric space X is a CAT(0)-space if and only if, for any $\mu \in B(X)$ with $m = \mu(X) > 0$, we have

$$\inf_{x \in X} \int_X d_X(x; y)^2 d\mu(y) \leq \frac{1}{2m} \int_X \int_X d_X(x; y)^2 d\mu(x) d\mu(y);$$

Theorem 4.3 (cf. [23, Theorem 1.4]). A geodesic metric space X is an Alexandrov space of nonnegative curvature if and only if, for $\mu \in B(X)$ with $m = \mu(X) > 0$, we have

$$\inf_{x \in X} \int_X d_X(x; y)^2 d\mu(y) \geq \frac{1}{2m} \int_X \int_X d_X(x; y)^2 d\mu(x) d\mu(y);$$

See [2], [3], [4], [8], [10] and references therein for further information about CAT (0) spaces and Alexandrov spaces.

For any $\mu \in B^1(X)$ and $z \in X$, we consider the function $h_{z,\mu} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$h_{z,\mu}(x) := \int_X d_X(x;y)^2 d\mu(y) - d_X(z;y)^2 \int_X d\mu(y).$$

Note that

$$\int_X d_X(x;y)^2 d\mu(y) - d_X(z;y)^2 \int_X d\mu(y) = \int_X d_X(x;z) \left(\int_X d_X(x;y) + d_X(z;y) \right) d\mu(y) < +\infty;$$

that is, the function $h_{z,\mu}$ is well-defined.

Definition 4.4. The point $z_0 \in X$ is called the barycenter of $\mu \in B^1(X)$ if for any $z \in X$, z_0 is the unique minimizing point of the function $h_{z,\mu}$. We denote the point z_0 by $b(\mu)$. A metric space X is said to be barycentric if every $\mu \in B^1(X)$ has the barycenter.

Proposition 4.5 (cf. [24, Proposition 4.3]). A CAT (0)-space N is barycentric. Moreover, for any $\mu \in B^2(N)$, we have

$$\int_N d_N(b(\mu);y)^2 d\mu(y) = \inf_{x \in N} \int_N d_N(x;y)^2 d\mu(y):$$

S. Ohta pointed out in [19, Lemma 5.5] that Proposition 4.5 holds for more general metric spaces, such as 2-uniformly convex metric spaces.

A simple variational argument yields the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.6 (cf. [24, Proposition 5.4]). Let H be a Hilbert space. Then for each $\mu \in B^1(H)$ with $m = \int_H \|x\|^2 d\mu(x) < \infty$, we have

$$b(\mu) = \frac{1}{m} \int_H \langle x, b(\mu) \rangle d\mu(x):$$

For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by NM^n the set of all n -dimensional complete simply connected Riemannian manifolds with nonpositive sectional curvatures.

Lemma 4.7 (cf. [24, Proposition 5.10]). Let $N \in NM^n$ and $\mu \in B^1(N)$. Then $x = b(\mu)$ if and only if

$$\int_N \exp_x^{-1}(y) d\mu(y) = 0:$$

In particular, $b(\exp_{b(\mu)}^{-1}(\mu)) = 0$:

Let $(\Omega; \mathcal{A}; P)$ be a probability space and X a barycentric metric space. For X -valued random variable $W : \Omega \rightarrow X$ satisfying $W \in B^1(X)$, we define its expectation by the barycenter of $W \in B^1(X)$.

4.1.2. **Observable central radius.** Let Y be a metric space and assume that $2 \in B^1(Y)$ has the barycenter. For any $\epsilon > 0$, putting $m := m(\epsilon, Y)$, we define the central radius $\text{CRad}(\epsilon; m)$ of Y as the infimum of $\rho > 0$ such that $B_Y(b(\epsilon); \rho) \supseteq m$.

Let $(X; d_X; \mu_X)$ be an mm-space with $\mu_X \in B^1(X)$ and Y a barycentric metric space. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we define

$$\text{ObsCRad}_Y(X; \epsilon) := \sup \{ \text{CRad}(f(\mu_X); m) \mid f: X \rightarrow Y \text{ is a 1-Lipschitz map} \};$$

and call it the observable central radius of X .

The proof of the following lemma is easy, so we omit the proof.

Lemma 4.8 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:31]). For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} Y; m) \leq 2 \text{ObsCRad}_Y(X; \epsilon);$$

We prove the following lemma by Gromov, since we find no proof anywhere in [8].

Lemma 4.9 (cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:31]). Let X be an mm-space with a finite diameter and $(Y; \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ a Hilbert space. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$(4.1) \quad \text{ObsCRad}_Y(X; \epsilon) \leq \text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} Y; m) + \frac{1}{m} \text{diam } X;$$

Proof. Given a 1-Lipschitz map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, let $Y_0 \subseteq Y$ be a Borel subset such that $f(\mu_X)(Y_0) = m$. From Lemma 4.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Y \|f(x) - z\|^2 d\mu_X(x) &= \frac{1}{m} \int_{Z^Y} \int_Y \|y - z\|^2 d\mu_X(x)(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \int_{Z^Y} \int_Y \|y - z\|^2 d\mu_X(x)(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \int_{Y_0} \int_Y \|y - z\|^2 d\mu_X(x)(y) + \frac{1}{m} \int_{Y \setminus Y_0} \int_Y \|y - z\|^2 d\mu_X(x)(y) \\ &\leq \text{diam } Y_0 + \frac{1}{m} \text{diam } X; \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\int_Y \|f(x) - b(f(\mu_X); \text{diam } Y_0 + \frac{1}{m} \text{diam } X)\|^2 d\mu_X(x) \leq \int_Y \|f(x) - b(f(\mu_X); \text{diam } Y_0 + \frac{1}{m} \text{diam } X)\|^2 d\mu_X(x);$$

which implies that $\text{CRad}(f(\mu_X); m) \leq \text{diam } Y_0 + \frac{1}{m} \text{diam } X$. This completes the proof.

Remark 4.10. In [8], Lemma 4.9 is stated as

$$(4.2) \quad \text{ObsCRad}_Y(X; \epsilon) \leq \text{diam}(X \xrightarrow{\text{Lip}_1} Y; m) + \frac{1}{m} \text{diam } X;$$

The inequality (4.1) gives slightly better estimate than that (4.2) gives.

Lemma 4.11. For any $N \geq N M^{-n}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\text{ObsCRad}_N(X; \epsilon) \leq \text{ObsCRad}_{R^n}(X; \epsilon);$$

In particular, if a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of m -spaces and a sequence $\{a(n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of natural numbers satisfy that

$$\text{ObsCRad}_{R^{a(n)}}(X_n; \epsilon) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\sup_n \text{ObsCRad}_N(X_n; \epsilon) \leq N \cdot 2 N M^{-a(n)} \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty;$$

Proof. Let $f : X \rightarrow N$ be an arbitrary 1-Lipschitz map. We identify the tangent space of N at $z = b f(x)$ with R^n and consider a map $f_0 := \exp_z^{-1} \circ f : X \rightarrow R^n$. According to the hinge theorem, f_0 is a 1-Lipschitz map. By using Lemma 4.7, we have $f_0^{-1} B_{R^n}(b f_0(x); \epsilon) = f_0^{-1} B_{R^n}(0; \epsilon) = f^{-1} B_N(z; \epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Hence, we obtain

$$\text{CRad}(f(x); m) = \text{CRad}(f_0(x); m) \leq \text{ObsCRad}_{R^n}(X; \epsilon)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$ and this completes the proof.

Proposition 4.12. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of m -spaces of finite diameters and $p \geq 1$. We assume that a sequence of natural numbers $\{a(n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfies that

$$(4.3) \quad \text{diam } X_n \cdot \frac{\text{Lip}_1^{a(n)}(R^{a(n)}; m_n)}{(\text{diam } X_n)^p} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\sup_n \text{ObsCRad}_N(X_n; \epsilon) \leq N \cdot 2 N M^{-a(n)} \epsilon \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty;$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 4.11.

Note that in Proposition 4.12, we need not pinch the sectional curvature of the screen N . The assumption (4.3) is stronger than both (1.2) and (1.3) for $p < 1$ in general.

Let M be a compact connected Riemannian manifold and μ_M the normalized volume measure on M . We denote by $\lambda_1(M)$ the first non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplacian on M . We shall consider M as an m -space $(M; d_M; \mu_M)$.

Theorem 4.13 (Gromov, cf. [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:41]). Let M be a compact connected Riemannian manifold and $N \geq N M^{-n}$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\text{ObsCRad}_N(M; \epsilon) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1(M)} \frac{r^n}{\epsilon}:$$

Proof. In [8, Section 3 $\frac{1}{2}$:41], Gromov proved the case of $N = R^n$. This and Lemma 4.11 gives the proof of the proposition.

We indicate by $S^n(r)$ the n -dimensional sphere in R^{n+1} with radius $r > 0$.

Corollary 4.14. Let s be a number with $0 < s < 1/2$ and $(a(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ a sequence of natural numbers such that $a(n)/n^{1-2s} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{f \in \text{ObsCRad}_N(S^n(n^s); \epsilon)} \int_N |f|^{2N} M^{-a(n)} g \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty:$$

Proof. Combining $\int_1 S^n(n^s) = n^{1-2s}$ and Theorem 4.13, we have the corollary.

Remark 4.15. Let us consider the case of $s = 1/2$. Denote by f_n the projection from $S^n(\bar{n})$ into $\mathbb{R}$. It is known by H. Poincaré that the sequence $(f_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ converges weakly to the canonical Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}$ (cf. [13, Section 1.1]). Therefore, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S^n(\bar{n})} |f_n|^{Lip_1} d\mu_n > 0:$$

Corollary 4.16. Assume that a sequence $(a(n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of natural numbers satisfies that $a(n)/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{f \in \text{ObsCRad}_N(SO(n); \epsilon)} \int_N |f|^{2N} M^{-a(n)} g \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty:$$

Proof. Since

$$\text{Ric}_{SO(n)} \geq \frac{n-1}{4} \geq \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2n};$$

we have $\int_1(SO(n)) \geq (n-1)/4$ by Lichnerowicz's theorem. Therefore, by combining this and Theorem 4.13, the proof is completed.

4.2. L^p -concentration of maps. Let $(X; d_X; \mu_X)$ be an mm-space and $(Y; d_Y)$ a metric space. Given a Borel measurable map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $p \geq 0$, we put

$$V_p(f) := \int_X \int_X d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d\mu_X(x) d\mu_X(x^0)^{1-p};$$

$$V_1(f) := \inf_{r > 0} \int_X \int_X (d_Y(f(x); f(x^0)) \wedge r)^2 d\mu_X(x) d\mu_X(x^0) = 0$$

Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of mm-spaces and $(Y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ a sequence of metric spaces. For any $p \geq 0$, we say that a sequence $f_n: X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ of Borel measurable maps L^p -concentrates if $V_p(f_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Given an mm-space X and a metric space Y we define

$$\text{Obs}L^p\text{-Var}_Y(X) := \sup\{V_p(f) \mid f: X \rightarrow Y \text{ is a 1-Lipschitz map}\};$$

and call it the observable L^p -variation of X .

The standard argument yields the following basic fact.

Lemma 4.17. For $0 < p < q$, L^q -concentration of maps implies L^p -concentration of maps under the assumption $\sup_{n \geq 2N} \mu_n < 1$.

We shall investigate relationships between concentration and L^p -concentration.

Lemma 4.18. Let X be an m -space and Y a metric space. For any $\epsilon > 0$, $p \in (0, +1]$, and a Borel measurable map $f : X \rightarrow Y$, we have

$$\text{diam}(f(x); m) \leq \frac{2}{(m)^{1-p}} V_p(f).$$

Proof. The case of $p = 1$ is easy, so we consider the case of $p < +1$ only. Assume that $\int_X d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) > \epsilon_0$ for any $x^0 \in X$ and $\epsilon_0 := V_p(f) = (m)^{1-p}$. By the Chebyshev's inequality, we get

$$V_p(f)^p = \int_X \int_X d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) > \int_X \epsilon_0^p d_X(x^0) = \epsilon_0^p m = V_p(f)^p.$$

Hence, there is a point $x^0 \in X$ such that $\int_X d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) > \epsilon_0$. This completes the proof.

Corollary 4.19. For any $p \in (0, +1]$, L^p -concentration of maps implies concentration of maps.

Lemma 4.20. Let X be an m -space with a finite diameter and Y a metric space. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, $p \in (0, +1]$, and 1-Lipschitz map $f : X \rightarrow Y$, we have

$$V_p(f)^p \leq m^2 \text{diam}(f(x); m) \frac{1}{(\text{diam } X)^p} + 2m \frac{1}{(\text{diam } X)^p} :$$

Proof. For any $\epsilon > 0$ with $\text{diam}(f(x); m) = (\text{diam } X)^p < \epsilon$, there exists a Borel subset $A \subset Y$ such that $\text{diam } A < \epsilon$ and $f^{-1}(A) \subset X$ with $m(f^{-1}(A)) = (\text{diam } X)^p$. By $\text{diam } A < \epsilon$, we get

$$(4.4) \quad \int_{f^{-1}(A)} \int_{f^{-1}(A)} d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) \leq m^2 \epsilon^p.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \int_X d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) &= \int_{f^{-1}(A)} \int_{f^{-1}(A)} d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) \\ &\quad + \int_{f^{-1}(A)^c} \int_{f^{-1}(A)^c} d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) \\ &\leq m^2 \epsilon^p + 2m \frac{1}{(\text{diam } X)^p} \int_{f^{-1}(A)^c} d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x); \end{aligned}$$

we also have

$$(4.5) \quad \int_{X \setminus f^{-1}(A)} \int_{f^{-1}(A)} d_Y(f(x); f(x^0))^p d_X(x) d_X(x^0) \leq 2m \frac{1}{(\text{diam } X)^p} :$$

Combining (4.4) and (4.5), we obtain

$$V_p(f)^p \leq m^2 \epsilon^p + 2m \frac{1}{(\text{diam } X)^p} :$$

This completes the proof.

Corollary 4.21. Let $(X_n, g_{n=1}^1)$ be a sequence of mm-spaces with finite diameters and $(Y_n, g_{n=1}^1)$ a sequence of metric spaces. Assume that $\sup_{n \geq 1} m_n < +\infty$ and

$$\text{diam } X_n \xrightarrow{Lip_1} Y_n; m_n \xrightarrow{(\text{diam } X_n)^p} 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $p > 0$ and some $p \in (0, +\infty)$. Then we have $\text{ObsL}^p\text{-Var}_{X_n}(X_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Combining Theorem 1.3, 1.4, and Corollary 4.21, we get the following L^p -concentration results.

Corollary 4.22. Let $(X_n, g_{n=1}^1)$, p , $(a(n), g_{n=1}^1)$, $(f_{1n}, g_{n=1}^1)$, and $(f_{2n}, g_{n=1}^1)$ be as in Theorem 1.3 and assume that $\sup_{n \geq 1} m_n < +\infty$. Then we have

$$\sup \text{ObsL}^p\text{-Var}_{X_n}(X_n) \leq C M(a(n); f_{1n}; f_{2n}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Corollary 4.23. Let $(X_n, g_{n=1}^1)$, p , and $(a(n), g_{n=1}^1)$ be as in Theorem 1.4 and assume that $\sup_{n \geq 1} m_n < +\infty$. Then for any $\epsilon_0 < 0$, we have

$$\sup \text{ObsL}^p\text{-Var}_{X_n}(X_n) \leq C M(a(n); \epsilon_0) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

As in the above corollaries, combining Lemma 4.8, Proposition 4.12, and Corollary 4.21, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.24. Let $(X_n, g_{n=1}^1)$, p , and $(a(n), g_{n=1}^1)$ be as in Proposition 4.12 and assume that $\sup_{n \geq 1} m_n < +\infty$. Then we have

$$\sup \text{ObsL}^p\text{-Var}_{X_n}(X_n) \leq C M(a(n)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Theorem 4.25 (Gromov, cf. [6, Section 8]). Let M be an m -dimensional compact symmetric metric space of rank 1 and N be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Then, for any 1-Lipschitz map $f : M \rightarrow N$, we have

$$V_2(f)^2 \leq \frac{n}{m} \int_M \int_M d_M(x; x^0)^2 d_M(x) d_M(x^0) :$$

We indicate by M^n the set of all n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds.

Corollary 4.26. Assume that $0 < s < 1/2$ and a sequence $(a(n), g_{n=1}^1)$ of natural numbers satisfies $a(n) = n^{1-2s} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then we have

$$\sup \text{ObsL}^{2s}\text{-Var}_M(S^n(a(n))) \leq C M(a(n)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

In particular, for any $s > 0$ we have

$$\sup \text{diam}(S^n(a(n))) \xrightarrow{Lip_1} M; m_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Remark 4.27. Since compact symmetric spaces $SO(n)$ are not rank 1 for $n \geq 4$, we cannot apply Theorem 4.25 for $SO(n)$.

Let X be an m -space and $N \geq NM^n$. For any Borel measurable map $f : X \rightarrow N$ with $f(x) \in B^1(N)$, we put $f_0 := \exp_{b(f(x))}^{-1} f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proposition 4.28 (cf. [8, Section 13]). The map $f_0 : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies that $\|f_0(x) - f_0(x^0)\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq d_N(f(x), f(x^0))$ for any $x, x^0 \in X$ and $V_2(f) \leq \sqrt{2}V_2(f_0)$.

Corollary 4.29. Let X be an m -space and $N \geq NM^n$. Then we have

$$\text{ObsL}^2\text{-Var}_N(X) \leq \sqrt{2} \text{ObsL}^2\text{-Var}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(X).$$

In particular, if a sequence $f_{X_{n_{g_n=1}}}$ of m -spaces and a sequence of natural numbers satisfy that

$$\text{ObsL}^2\text{-Var}_{\mathbb{R}^{a(n)}}(X_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty;$$

then we have

$$\sup_n \text{ObsL}^2\text{-Var}_N(X_n) \leq NM^{a(n)}g \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Assume that there exists a 1-Lipschitz map $f : X \rightarrow N$ satisfies that $f(x) \notin B^1(X)$. From Theorem 4.2, we have $V_2(f) = +\infty$. Take a point $x_0 \in X$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we put $f_k := f|_{B_X(x_0; k)}$. Since $f_k \in B^1(B_X(x_0; k))$, from Proposition 4.28, there exists a 1-Lipschitz map $\tilde{f}_k : B_X(x_0; k) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $V_2(f_k) \leq \sqrt{2}V_2(\tilde{f}_k)$. From [1, Theorem 3.1.2], there exists a $\frac{1}{n}$ -Lipschitz extension of $\tilde{f}_k$, say $g_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $(1 - \frac{1}{n})g_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a 1-Lipschitz map and

$$V_2\left(\frac{1}{n}g_k\right) \leq \frac{1}{n}V_2(\tilde{f}_k) \leq \frac{1}{2n}V_2(f_k) \rightarrow V_2(f) = +\infty \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty;$$

we obtain $\text{ObsL}^2\text{-Var}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(X) = +\infty$. From this and Proposition 4.28, we have completed the proof.

Lemma 4.30. Let N be a CAT(0)-space and X an m -space. Then for any Borel measurable map $f : X \rightarrow N$ with $f(x) \in B^1(N)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\text{CRad}(f(x); m) \leq \frac{V_2(f)}{2m}.$$

Proof. Assume that $f(x) \notin B_N(b(f(x)); \epsilon)$ holds for $\epsilon := V_2(f) = \frac{1}{2m}$. Combining Theorem 4.2 and the Chebyshev's inequality, we get

$$\frac{V_2(f)^2}{2m} = \int_0^\infty \int_N d_N(b(f(x)); q)^2 df(x)(q) \leq \frac{V_2(f)^2}{2m};$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, we obtain $f(x) \in B_N(b(f(x)); \epsilon)$ m -a.e. This completes the proof.

Corollary 4.31. L^2 -concentration of maps into CAT(0)-space implies concentration of maps to their expectations.

Combining Theorem 4.25 and Lemma 4.30, we also get the same result obtained in Corollary 4.14.

From Theorem 4.3, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.32. Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of mm-spaces with $\sup_{n \geq 1} m_n < +\infty$ and $(Y_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ a sequence of Alexandrov spaces of nonnegative curvatures. Assume that a sequence $(f_n) : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ of Borel measurable maps satisfies that

$$\inf_{y \in Y_n} \int_{X_n} d_{Y_n}(y, f_n(x))^2 d\mu_n(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Then we have $V_2(f_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of the following lemma is easy.

Lemma 4.33 (cf. [8, Section 3.1.32]). For an mm-space (X, d_X) , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\text{diam}(X^{Lip_1}(\mathbb{R}^n; m_n)) \leq \frac{1}{n} \text{diam}(X^{Lip_1}(\mathbb{R}; m)) :$$

Lemma 4.34. Let M be an n -dimensional compact connected Riemannian manifold such that $\text{Ric}_M \geq \epsilon_1 > 0$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\text{diam}(M^{Lip_1}(\mathbb{R}^n; 1)) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon_1} \sqrt{2n \log \frac{2n}{\epsilon_1}} :$$

Proof. From the Levy-Gromov isoperimetric inequality, we have $\mu_M(r) \geq e^{-1} r^{n-2}$ (cf. [9, Section 1.2, Remark 2]). Thus, combining Lemmas 2.2, 2.5, and 4.33 leads to the lemma.

Remark 4.35. For fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the inequality in Lemma 4.34 is weaker than that in Theorem 4.13 for a Riemannian manifold M with a positive lower Ricci curvature bound for the same space $\mathbb{R}^n$. However, in the case where $\epsilon = 0$, the inequality in Lemma 4.34 gives a better estimate for the observable diameter of M than that in Theorem 4.13.

Corollary 4.36. Let M be an n -dimensional compact connected Riemannian manifold such that $\text{Ric}_M \geq \epsilon_1 > 0$. Then, for any $p > 0$ we have

$$\text{diam}(M^{Lip_1}(\mathbb{R}^n; 1)) \leq \frac{1}{(\text{diam } M)^p} \sqrt[n]{2n \log \frac{2n^p}{\epsilon_1}} :$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.34 together with the Myers's diameter theorem.

Corollary 4.37. Let s be a number with $0 < s < 1/2$ and $(a(n))_{n=1}^\infty$ a sequence of natural numbers such that $(a(n) \log n)^{1-2s} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any $p > 0$, we have

$$\sup_{f \in \text{Obs}(L^p\text{-Var}_N(S^n(n^s)))} \int_N |f|^{a(n)} d\mu \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Proof. Since $\text{Ric}_{S^n(n^s)} = (n-1)n^{2s}$, combining this and Corollary 4.36, we obtain

$$\text{diam } S^n(n^s) \stackrel{\text{Lip}_1}{\leq} R^{a(n)}; 1 \leq \frac{\sqrt[n]{2a(n) \log \frac{2a(n)n^{sp-p}}{(n-1)n^{2s}}}}{(\text{diam } S^n(n^s))^p}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, combining Corollary 4.17 and 4.24, this completes the proof.

Note that the assumption of $f a(n) g_{n=1}^1$ in Corollary 4.37 is stronger than that in Corollary 4.26. Hence, Corollary 4.26 implies better result than Corollary 4.37 for $p \geq 2$.

Corollary 4.38. Assume that a sequence $f a(n) g_{n=1}^1$ of natural numbers satisfies that $(a(n) \log n) = n! \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any $p > 0$ we have

$$\sup \text{ObsL}^p\text{-Var}_N \text{SO}(n) \leq N^{2N} M^{a(n)} g \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty :$$

Proof. Since $\text{Ric}_{\text{SO}(n)} = (n-1)/4$ and by using Corollary 4.36, we have

$$\text{diam } \text{SO}(n) \stackrel{\text{Lip}_1}{\leq} R^{a(n)}; 1 \leq \frac{\sqrt[n]{8a(n) \log \frac{2a(n)(2n)^{p-2-p}}{n-1}}}{(\text{diam } \text{SO}(n))^p}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, applying Corollary 4.17 and 4.24, this completes the proof.

5. Tree screens

We define a tree T as a (possibly infinite) connected combinatorial graph having no loops. We identify the individual edges of a tree as bounded closed intervals of the real lines, and then define the distance between two points of the tree to be the minimum of the lengths of paths joining them.

Definition 5.1. Let $(X; d_X; \mu_X)$ be an m -space and $f: X \rightarrow T$ be a Borel measurable map. A pre-Levy mean of f is a point $p \in T$ such that there exist two trees $T^0, T^{\infty} \subset T$ such that

$$T = T^0 \cup T^{\infty}; T^0 \setminus T^{\infty} = \text{fpg}; f(\mu_X)(T^0) = \frac{m}{3}; \text{ and } f(\mu_X)(T^{\infty}) = \frac{m}{3}:$$

Proposition 5.2. There exists a pre-Levy mean.

Proof. Take an edge e of T and x an inner point $q \in e$. There exist two trees $T^0, T^{\infty} \subset T$ such that $T^0 \setminus T^{\infty} = \text{fpg}$ and $T = T^0 \cup T^{\infty}$. If $f(\mu_X)(T^0); f(\mu_X)(T^{\infty}) = m/3$, we have finished the proof. Hence we consider the case of $f(\mu_X)(T^0) < m/3$.

Let V^0 be the vertex set of T^0 . For any $v \in V^0$, we indicate by C_v the set of all connected components of $T \setminus \text{fvg}$ and put $C_v^0 := \{ \mathbb{P} \in [\text{fvg}] \cap C_v \}$. Suppose that a point $v \in V^0$ satisfies $f(\mu_X)(\mathbb{P}) < m/3$ for any $\mathbb{P} \in C_v^0$, then it is easy to check that v is a pre-Levy mean of f . So, we assume that for any $v \in V^0$ there exists $T_v \subset C_v^0$ such that $f(\mu_X)(T_v) = m/3$. If for some $v \in V^0$ there exists $T_v^0 \subset C_v^0 \cap T_v$ such that $f(\mu_X)(T_v^0) = m/3$, then this v is a pre-Levy mean of f . Therefore, we also assume that $f(\mu_X)(T_v^0) < m/3$ for any $v \in V^0$ and $T_v^0 \subset C_v^0 \cap T_v$.




Figure 1. Tree

We denote by $\mathcal{T}$ the set of all unit speed geodesics $\gamma: [0; L(\gamma)] \rightarrow T^0$ from q such that $L(\gamma) \geq 2V^0$ and $[\gamma; L(\gamma)] \subset T_{(t)}$ for each $(t) \in V^0$ and $L(\gamma) \in \mathcal{L} \setminus [0; L(\gamma)]$. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{T}^0$ for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}$ with $L(\gamma) \in \mathcal{L}^0$. Put $\gamma = \sup\{L(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Let us show that there exists $e \in \mathcal{T}$ with $L(e) = \gamma$. If $L(\gamma) < \gamma$ for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists a sequence $f_n \in \mathcal{T}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $L(f_1) < L(f_2) < \dots$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then we have

$$f(x)(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_{n=1}^\infty} f(x)(\gamma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_{n=1}^\infty} \frac{2m}{3};$$

which is a contradiction. Suppose that there exists a sequence $f_n \in \mathcal{T}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $t_1 < t_2 < \dots$ and $L(f_n) \rightarrow \gamma$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $f_n \in V^0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $T^0 = T_{(L(\gamma))}$ and

$$f(x)(T) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_{n=1}^\infty} f(x)(\gamma) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{T}_{n=1}^\infty} \frac{m}{3};$$

$e \in \mathcal{T}$ is a pre-Levy mean of f . We will consider the other case, that is, there exist $t_0 \in [0; L(e)]$ and edge e_0 of T^0 such that $e(t_0) \in V^0$ and e_0 connects $e(t_0)$ and $e \in \mathcal{T}$. If $f(x)(\mathcal{S}(C_{(t_0)} \cap T_{(t_0)})) \cap f(e(t_0)) = m=3$, then $e(t_0)$ is a pre-Levy mean of f . If $f(x)(\mathcal{S}(C_{(t_0)} \cap T_{(t_0)})) \cap f(e(t_0)) < m=3$, there exists a pre-Levy mean of f on e_0 since $e_0 \subset T_{(L(\gamma))}$. This completes the proof.

Lemma 5.3. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\text{diam}(X \stackrel{\text{Lip}_1}{\rightarrow} T; m) \leq 2 \text{Sep}(X; \frac{m}{3}; \frac{1}{2})$$

Proof. Let $f : X \rightarrow T$ be an arbitrary 1-Lipschitz map. Take a pre-Levy mean $p \in T$ of f and let $T^0; T^0 \rightarrow T$ be its associated trees. Let $\epsilon > 0$ satisfies $\epsilon > \text{Sep}(X; m=3; \epsilon=2)$. Suppose that $f(x) \in T^0 \cap B_T(p; \epsilon)$. Then, applying Lemma 2.8, we have

$$\epsilon \leq d_T(T^0; T^0 \cap B_T(p; \epsilon)) \leq \text{Sep}(f(x); \frac{m}{3}; \frac{1}{2}) \leq \text{Sep}(x; \frac{m}{3}; \frac{1}{2};$$

which is a contradiction. In the same way, we have $f(x) \in T^0 \cap B_T(p; \epsilon) \leq \epsilon=2$. As a consequence, we obtain $f(x) \in T \cap B_T(p; \epsilon) \leq \epsilon$. This completes the proof.

Proof of Proposition 1.7. The claim obviously follows from Lemma 5.3.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Professor Takashi Shioya for his valuable suggestions related to Theorem 1.3 and many fruitful discussions. He also thanks to Professor Vitali Milman for useful comments. Without them, this work would have never been completed.

References

- [1] L. Ambrosio and P. Tilli, Topics on analysis in metric spaces, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, 25. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- [2] M. R. Bridson, A. Haefliger, Metric spaces of non-positive curvature, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 319. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [3] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, A course in metric geometry, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 33. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [4] Y. Burago, M. Gromov, G. Perelman, A. D. Aleksandrov spaces with curvatures bounded below, (Russian) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 47, no. 2 (284), 3(51, 222, 1992; translation in Russian Math. Surveys 47, no. 2, 1(58, 1992.
- [5] K. Funano, Observable concentration of m -spaces into spaces with doubling measures, Geom. Dedicata 127, 49(56, 2007.
- [6] M. Gromov, CAT(κ)-spaces: construction and concentration, (Russian summary) Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) 280, Geom. i Topol. 7, 100(140, 299(300, 2001; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.) 119, no. 2, 178(200, 2004.
- [7] M. Gromov, Isoperimetry of waists and concentration of maps, Geom. Funct. Anal., 13, no. 1, pp178(215, 2003.
- [8] M. Gromov, Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces, Based on the 1981 French original, With appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes. Translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates. Progress in Mathematics, 152. Birkhauser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999.
- [9] M. Gromov, V. D. Milman, A topological application of the isoperimetric inequality, Amer. J. Math. 105, no. 4, 843(854, 1983.
- [10] J. Jost, Nonpositive curvature: geometric and analytic aspects, Lectures in Mathematics ETH Zurich. Birkhauser Verlag, Basel, 1997.
- [11] M. Ledoux, The concentration of measure phenomenon, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 89. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [12] M. Ledoux and K. Oleszkiewicz, On measure concentration of vector valued maps, preprint, 2007.

- [13] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand Probability in Banach spaces. Isoperimetry and processes, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), 23. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [14] V. D. Milman, A certain property of functions defined on finite-dimensional manifolds, (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 200, 781{784, 1971.
- [15] V. D. Milman, A new proof of A. Dvoretzky's theorem on cross-sections of convex bodies, (Russian) Funkcional. Anal. i Prilozhen. 5, no. 4, 28{37, 1971.
- [16] V. D. Milman, Asymptotic properties of functions of several variables that are defined on homogeneous spaces, Soviet Math. Dokl. 12, 1277{1281, 1971; translated from Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 199, 1247{1250, 1971 (Russian).
- [17] V. D. Milman, The heritage of P. Levy in geometrical functional analysis, Colloque Paul Levy sur les Processus Stochastiques (Palaiseau, 1987). Astérisque No. 157-158, 273{301, 1988.
- [18] V. D. Milman, G. Schechtman, Asymptotic theory of finite-dimensional normed spaces. With an appendix by M. Gromov, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1200. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.
- [19] S. Ohta, Extending Lipschitz and Holder maps between metric spaces, preprint, available at <http://www.math.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~sohta/>, 2007.
- [20] J. Ratcliffe, Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds, Second edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 149. Springer, New York, 2006.
- [21] T. Sakai, Riemannian geometry, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 149. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [22] G. Schechtman, Concentration results and applications, Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. 2, 1603{1634, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [23] K.-T. Sturm, Metric spaces of lower bounded curvatures, Exposition. Math. 17, 35{47, 1999.
- [24] K.-T. Sturm, Probability measures on metric spaces of nonpositive curvature, Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002), 357{390, Contemp. Math., 338, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.
- [25] M. Talagrand, Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces, Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math. No. 81, 73{205, 1995.
- [26] M. Talagrand, New concentration inequalities in product spaces, Invent. Math. 126, no. 3, 505{563, 1996.

Mathematical Institute, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, JAPAN
 E-mail address: sa4m23@math.tohoku.ac.jp