

RICCI CURVATURE IN DIMENSION 2

ALEXANDER LYTCHAK AND STEPHAN STADLER

ABSTRACT. We prove that in two dimensions the synthetic notions of lower bounds on sectional and on Ricci curvature coincide.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The result. In this note we provide an affirmative answer to a question raised by Cédric Villani, [Vil16, Open Problem 9].

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, d) be a metric space and let \mathcal{H}^2 be the 2-dimensional Hausdorff measure on X . If (X, d, \mathcal{H}^2) is an $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ space then X is an Alexandrov space of curvature at least κ .*

The converse of our theorem is due to Anton Petrunin, [Pet11].

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, all $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ spaces (X, d, \mathcal{H}^2) are topological surfaces, possibly with boundary.

1.2. Theory of RCD spaces. The synthetic theory of spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds, initiated in [Stu06] and [LV09], has experienced a tremendous growth over the last 15 years. We refer the reader to the surveys [Vil16] and [Amb18] for an overview of the current state of the theory and the huge bibliography.

The analytic aspects of the theory are highly developed. Most results, previously known on Riemannian manifolds with lower bounds on Ricci curvature, now possess natural generalizations to the synthetic framework, see for instance [AGS14], [Gig15], [CM15]. Moreover, there is a sophisticated understanding of measure theoretic, or rather “almost everywhere” properties of such spaces, [MN17], [BS18].

On the other hand, gaining information on the “everywhere” metric structure, or even less ambitious, on the topological structure of RCD spaces, seems to be very difficult. Only a few results in this direction are known, all of which require either a rigid setting, [Gig13], [DPG16], or strong a priori assumptions on the geometry, [KK17], [KL16].

1.3. Central steps in the proof. The proof is a combination of analytic RCD-techniques, some basic results about Alexandrov spaces, the canonical uniformization of singular surfaces introduced in [LW17b]

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C23, 30L10, 49Q05, 49J52.

Key words and phrases. RCD spaces, Alexandrov spaces, synthetic Ricci curvature, conformal parametrization.

and Reshetnyak’s analytic theory of surfaces with integral curvature bounds, [Res93].

In the first step, we use the Bishop–Gromov comparison and the cone-rigidity theorem, [DPG16], to study the infinitesimal structure of a space X as in Theorem 1.1. More precisely, it is shown that unique tangent spaces exist at all points and are Euclidean cones over either intervals or circles. In analogy with the theory of Alexandrov spaces, we call the set of points, at which the tangent space is homeomorphic to a half-plane, the *boundary* of X and denote it by ∂X . Another application of the Bishop–Gromov comparison implies that ∂X is a closed subset of X . This is the content of Section 2.

In Section 3, we consider, for any $\delta > 0$, the set of points X^δ at which the density of X is δ -close to the density of the Euclidean plane. The set X^δ is open, dense, disjoint from ∂X and, by the theorem of Cheeger–Colding–Reifenberg, [CC97], X^δ is a topological surface without boundary, once δ is small enough. Due to [CM18], X^δ satisfies an isoperimetric inequality of Euclidean type.

The next two sections are the central pieces of the proof. In Section 4, we use [LW17b], to find for any point $x \in X^\delta$ a small closed neighborhood $\bar{\Omega}$ and a canonical parametrization $\phi : \bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ obtained by solving a Plateau problem. This parametrization is a *quasisymmetric map*, which in addition is *infinitesimally conformal*. This implies, in particular, that there exists a function $f \in L^2(D)$, the *conformal factor*, such that the lengths of *almost all curves* in $\bar{\Omega}$ are obtained by integrating f along the corresponding curve in \bar{D} . In other words, the metric in $\bar{\Omega}$ appears to be obtained from the flat metric in \bar{D} by a “singular conformal change with factor f ”.

In Section 5, we identify the Laplace operator of Ω in terms of D and f and use the Bakry–Émery property of RCD spaces to derive an analytic condition on f . This condition implies log-subharmonicity in the case $\kappa = 0$ and a related property for general κ .

Using [Res93], we deduce in Section 6 that the metric on Ω is *everywhere* controlled by f , and has curvature bounded below by κ in the sense of Alexandrov.

In order to finish the proof of the main theorem we show that X^δ is a convex subset of X , a statement which is expected to be true in much greater generality, [CN12]. Once the convexity is verified, Toponogov’s globalization theorem, in the form of [Pet16], provides that last step. The proof of this convexity in Section 7, relies on the non-branching property of RCD spaces, [RS14]. Assuming that a geodesic between two non-boundary points passes through a point x on the boundary ∂X , we easily obtain many branching geodesics, once we know that X is a topological surface with boundary near x . While in general, topological control in RCD spaces is very difficult to achieve, here we

obtain the required statement by a twofold application of the Cheeger–Colding–Reifenberg theorem.

1.4. Acknowledgment. The paper arose as a follow-up project to a series of joint papers of the first author and Stefan Wenger. For this and inspiring discussions the authors express their gratitude to Stefan Wenger. We are grateful to Vitali Kapovitch and Anton Petrunin for helpful conversations. For helpful comment on previous versions we would like to thank Nicola Gigli, Martin Kell, Christian Ketterer and Andrea Mondino. Both authors were partially supported by DFG grant SPP 2026.

2. BASIC STRUCTURE

2.1. Notation. By D we denote the open unit disc in \mathbb{R}^2 and by \bar{D} its closure. By \mathcal{H}^k or \mathcal{H}_X^k we denote the k -dimensional Hausdorff measure on a metric space X .

In a metric space X we denote by d the distance and by $B_r(x)$ the open ball of radius r around the point x . By $\ell(\gamma) = \ell_X(\gamma)$ we will denote the length of a curve γ in a metric space X .

2.2. Setting. We assume some familiarity with the synthetic theory of lower Ricci curvature bounds. In particular, we assume that the reader is familiar with the notion of $RCD(\kappa, N)$ spaces, which we will not define.

In the rest of the paper we fix a space X satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.1. Thus, X is a geodesic, locally compact metric space. By assumption, the space X is $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ with respect to the reference measure \mathcal{H}^2 , whose support is X . In the terminology introduced in [DPG17], this means that X is a *non-collapsed* $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ space.

For $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ we set

$$(2.1) \quad b(x, r) = \mathcal{H}^2(B_r(x)).$$

Recall that the balls satisfy the *Bishop–Gromov property*, thus, for all $s < r$, the quotient $b(x, r)/b(x, s)$ is bounded from above by the corresponding quotient in the 2-dimensional simply connected Riemannian manifold M_κ^2 of constant curvature κ , [Stu06].

Therefore, for any $x \in X$ we have a well-defined positive *density*

$$0 < b(x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{b(x, r)}{\pi r^2} \leq 1,$$

see [DPG17, Corollary 2.13].

Again by the Bishop–Gromov property, the space X is *locally 2-Ahlfors regular*. Thus, for every compact subset K of X there exists some $L > 0$, such that all $x \in K$ and all $0 < r < 1$ we have

$$\frac{1}{L} \cdot r^2 \leq \mathcal{H}^2(B_r(x)) \leq L \cdot r^2.$$

2.3. Convergence and blow-ups. Any sequence (Y_i, y_i) of non-collapsed $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ -spaces has a subsequence converging in the pointed Gromov–Hausdorff topology to a limit space (Y, y) . This limit space Y is an $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ -space with respect to a limiting measure μ , see [AGS14], [GMS15]. If there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{H}^2(B_1(y_i)) \geq \epsilon$, for all i , then the limit space Y is non-collapsed and $\mu = \mathcal{H}^2$, [DPG17, Theorem 1.2].

Moreover, in this situation the densities behave semi-continuously:

$$b(y) \leq \liminf b(y_i).$$

In particular, the density function $b : X \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is lower semi-continuous.

As a special case of [DPG17, Theorem 1.2], for any sequence $x_i \in X$ converging to a point $x \in X$ and any sequence r_i of positive numbers converging to 0, there is a subsequence, such that the rescaled spaces $(\frac{1}{r_i}X, x_i)$ converge to a non-collapsed $RCD(2, 0)$ space (Y, y) . We call any such space (Y, y) a *blow-up* of the space X . By the continuity of \mathcal{H}^2 with respect to the convergence and by the Bishop–Gromov inequalities in X , we have, for all $z \in Y$ and all $s \geq 0$,

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{H}^2(B_s(z)) \geq \pi \cdot b(x) \cdot s^2.$$

2.4. Tangent cones. A blow-up for a constant sequence of base points $x_i = x$ is called a tangent cone of X at the point x . Relying on the volume rigidity of metric cones, [DPG16], it has been shown in [DPG17, Proposition 2.7], that any such tangent cone T of X at the point x is isometric to a Euclidean cone $C(Z)$ over a compact space Z . Moreover, Z is an $RCD(0, 1)$ space of diameter at most π , [Ket15].

As has been proved in [KL16], such a space Z is a closed interval or a circle. Due to the stability of \mathcal{H}^2 and the definition of $b(x)$, the density $b(x)$ coincides with the density of CZ at the vertex 0_x of the cone CZ . Therefore,

$$b(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \mathcal{H}^1(Z).$$

Thus, at any point $x \in X$ at most two different tangent cones can exist.

However, the following lemma, valid for all doubling metric measure spaces and probably well-known to experts shows that there cannot exist exactly two different tangent cones.

Lemma 2.1. *The space \mathcal{T}^x of all metric measure tangent cones (Y, y, \mathcal{H}^2) at the point $x \in X$ is a connected subset of the space \mathbb{X} of isomorphism classes of all pointed, proper metric measure spaces, [GMS15].*

Proof. Consider the map $F : (0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ which sends a number $r > 0$ onto the pointed metric measure space $(\frac{1}{r}X, x, \mathcal{H}^2)$. The map is continuous and the image of F has compact closure in \mathbb{X} .

The set \mathcal{T}^x consists of all limit points $\lim_{r_i \rightarrow 0} F(r_i)$ of this continuous curve. Thus, \mathcal{T}^x is an intersection of a nested sequence of compact

connected sets, the closures of the tails of F . Hence, \mathcal{T}^x is connected. \square

Therefore, we have shown:

Corollary 2.2. *At any $x \in X$ there exists a unique tangent cone. This tangent cone is a Euclidean cone CZ , where Z is a circle or an interval. Moreover, $\mathcal{H}^1(Z) = b(x) \cdot 2\pi$ and the diameter of Z is at most π .*

We denote the unique tangent cone at the point $x \in X$ by $T_x = T_x X$. By above T_x is homeomorphic to a plane or to a half-plane.

2.5. The boundary. We define *the boundary* ∂X of X to be the set of all points $x \in X$ for which the tangent space $T_x X$ is homeomorphic to a half-plane.

Lemma 2.3. *The boundary ∂X is a closed subset of X which contains only points x with $b(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. By definition, $x \in \partial X$ if and only if T_x is isometric to CZ , where Z is an interval. Since Z has length $b(x) \cdot 2\pi$ and diameter at most π , this implies $b(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

Let $x \in X \setminus \partial X$ be arbitrary. Then T_x is a cone over a circle, thus for any point z in T_x but the vertex 0_x , the density of T_x at z is 1. For any sequence $x_i \in X \setminus \{x\}$ converging to x , we choose $r_i = d(x, x_i)$. Then (possibly after choosing a subsequence) under the convergence of $(\frac{1}{r_i} X, x)$ to $(T_x, 0_x)$ the points x_i converge to a point z at distance 1 from 0_x . The semi-continuity of densities implies that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} b(x_i) = 1$. In particular, x_i is not in ∂X , for i large enough.

Hence, $X \setminus \partial X$ must be open. \square

As a consequences of the splitting theorem we obtain:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $x \in X$ be a point which is an interior point of a geodesic. If $x \in \partial X$ then T_x is isometric to the Euclidean half-plane. If $x \in X \setminus \partial X$ then $T_x X$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^2 .*

Proof. The assumption implies that $T_x X$ contains a line (the tangent space to the geodesic through x). By the splitting theorem [Gig13], the space T_x splits off a line. This implies the claim, since T_x is a cone over an interval or a circle. \square

3. ALMOST REGULAR PARTS

For any $\delta > 0$, we call a point $x \in X$ a δ -regular point if $b(x) > 1 - \delta$. By X^δ we denote the set of all δ -regular points in X . We have the following discreteness statement:

Lemma 3.1. *The set X^δ is open in X , for any $\delta > 0$. For any $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$, the set X^δ is disjoint from ∂X and the complement $(X \setminus \partial X) \setminus X^\delta$ is discrete in $X \setminus \partial X$.*

Proof. The semi-continuity of the density function shows that X^δ is open. Due to Lemma 2.3, the set X^δ is disjoint from ∂X , for $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$.

Finally, the last argument in the proof of Lemma 2.3 implies that any point in $X \setminus \partial X$ has a punctured neighborhood completely contained in X^δ . This implies the last claim. \square

The following observation is a very special and rough case of the results obtained in [CC97] and [CM18].

Lemma 3.2. *There exists some $\delta, C > 0$ with the following property. Every point $x \in X^\delta$ has a neighborhood U_x homeomorphic to D , such that for any subset K of U_x homeomorphic to \bar{D} ,*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^2(K) \leq C \cdot (\mathcal{H}^1(\partial K))^2.$$

Proof. Due to [DPG17, Theorem 1.2] and the Cheeger–Colding–Reifenberg theorem, [CC97, Theorem A.1], there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that any point $x \in X^\delta$ has a neighborhood U_x homeomorphic to D .

It remains to prove, that, for sufficiently small δ , we have the isoperimetric inequality (3.1), for any closed topological disc K in some neighborhood of any point in X^δ .

This statement is proved in [CM18, Corollary 1.6] (in a much more general and precise form) with $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial K)^2$ on the right hand side of (3.1) replaced by $m^2(K)$, where $m(K)$ is the *outer Minkowski content*

$$m(K) := \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{H}^2(B_r(K)) - \mathcal{H}^2(K)}{r}.$$

Here $B_r(K)$ denotes the set of points with distance at most r to K .

It suffices to prove $4\pi \cdot \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K) \geq m(K)$ for any subset K of X homeomorphic to a closed disc, compare [Fed69, Theorem 3.2.39].

If ∂K is not rectifiable there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, for any natural n , we set $r = \frac{1}{2n} \cdot \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K)$ and find an r -dense subset A_n in ∂K with n points. Then $B_r(\partial K) \subset B_{2r}(A_n)$.

By the Bishop–Gromov property, we deduce, for r small enough,

$$\mathcal{H}^2(B_r(\partial K)) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(B_{2r}(A_n)) \leq n \cdot 2 \cdot \pi \cdot (2r)^2 = 4\pi \cdot r \cdot \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K).$$

This implies $m(K) \leq 4\pi \cdot \mathcal{H}^1(\partial K)$ and finishes the proof. \square

4. CONFORMAL PARAMETRIZATION

4.1. Choice of a domain. Let $\delta, C > 0$ be as in Lemma 3.2, let $x_0 \in X^\delta$ be arbitrary and let U_{x_0} be an open neighborhood of x_0 in X provided by Lemma 3.2.

Any Jordan curve Γ in U_{x_0} determines a *Jordan domain* $\Omega \subset U_{x_0}$ homeomorphic to D , such that $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega \cup \Gamma$ is homeomorphic to \bar{D} .

Starting with any Jordan curve Γ in U_{x_0} whose Jordan domain Ω contains x_0 , we can replace Γ by a nearby curve and assume that Γ is biLipschitz to the round circle S^1 , see [LW17b, Lemma 4.3].

We fix this curve Γ and domain Ω for the rest of the section.

4.2. Metric properties of Ω . Consider the set $\bar{\Omega}$ with its intrinsic metric d_Ω . Since Γ is a biLipschitz embedding of a circle, the metric d_Ω is biLipschitz to the induced metric d_X on $\bar{\Omega}$. Moreover, d_Ω and d_X locally coincide on Ω .

In order to apply the parametrization results of [LW17b], we need to make sure that $\bar{\Omega}$ is Ahlfors 2-regular and is *linearly locally connected* in the following sense.

A *continuum* is a compact connected space. A metric space Y is called *linearly locally connected* if there exists a positive constant $0 < C < 1$, such that for all $y \in Y$ and all $0 < r < \text{diam}(Y)$ the following holds true. Any pair of points $z_1, z_2 \in B_{C \cdot r}(y)$ is contained in a continuum $P \subset B_r(y)$; any pair of points $z_1, z_2 \in Y \setminus B_r(y)$ is contained in a continuum $P \subset Y \setminus B_{C \cdot r}$.

If the space Y is geodesic, the first condition is always satisfied. Linear local connectedness is preserved under biLipschitz transformations.

Lemma 4.1. *The space $(\bar{\Omega}, d_\Omega)$ is 2-Ahlfors regular and linearly locally connected.*

Proof. Since the \mathcal{H}^2 -measures with respect to d_X and d_Ω coincide on $\bar{\Omega}$, a quadratic upper bound on the \mathcal{H}^2 -area of balls in Ω follows from the corresponding upper bound on the area of balls in X .

The existence of a lower quadratic bound on the area of balls in $\bar{\Omega}$ is essentially proved in [LW18a, Theorem 9.4], as a consequence of the quadratic isoperimetric inequality (3.1). We provide a simplified version of the argument here.

Relying on the lower bound on the area of balls in X , it is sufficient to find a constant $C_0 < 1$ with the following property: For all small r and any $z \in \Gamma$ the ball $B_{2r}(z)$ contains a point $y \in \Omega$ with distance at least $C_0 \cdot r$ to Γ .

By topological reasons, the distance sphere of radius r around z must contain a continuum P , joining two points on Γ , locally separated on Γ by z . From the biLipschitz property of the boundary curve Γ , we now deduce the existence of $C_0 < 1$, such that the continuum P contains a point y as claimed above.

This finishes the proof of the Ahlfors 2-regularity of $\bar{\Omega}$.

In order to prove that $\bar{\Omega}$ is linearly locally connected, recall first from [LW18a, Theorem 8.6], that the isoperimetric property (3.1) implies the following statement. There exists a constant $C_1 > 1$ such that, for any $y \in \bar{\Omega}$ and any $r > 0$, the ball $B_r(y)$ is contractible inside $B_{C_1 \cdot r}(y)$.

The space $\bar{\Omega}$ is geodesic and the boundary Γ is linearly locally connected. Thus it suffices to prove the following claim. There exists some $C_2 < 1$, such that, for every $y \in \bar{\Omega}$, every $r < \text{diam}(\bar{\Omega})$ and every $z \in \bar{\Omega} \setminus B_r(y)$ there is a curve connecting z with Γ outside of $B_{C_2 \cdot r}(y)$.

Assume the contrary. By the Jordan curve theorem, there exists a Jordan curve T in $B_{C_2 \cdot r}(y)$, whose Jordan domain contains the point

z . But this implies that $B_{C_2, r}(y)$ is not contractible in $B_r(y)$, which provides a contradiction to the result [LW18a, Theorem 8.6], mentioned above, once C_2 is sufficiently small.

This finishes the proof of the Lemma. \square

4.3. Moduli of families of curves and Newton-Sobolev maps.

For the convenience of the reader, we recall the notions of moduli of families of curves and of Newton-Sobolev maps with values in a metric space, [HKST15, Sections 5-7], in the special case used here.

Let Y be a metric spaces with finite $\mathcal{H}^2(Y)$. For a family of curves \mathcal{C} in Y , a Borel function $\sigma : Y \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called *admissible for \mathcal{C}* if $\int_\gamma \sigma \geq 1$ for every locally rectifiable curve in \mathcal{C} . The *modulus* (more precisely the 2-modulus) of the family is defined as

$$\text{mod}(\mathcal{C}) := \inf_{\sigma} \int_Y \sigma^2 d\mathcal{H}^2,$$

where the infimum is taken over all Borel functions admissible for \mathcal{C} .

A statement holds for *almost every curve* in Y , if the family \mathcal{C} of all curves in Y for which the statement does not hold has modulus 0.

A measurable map $u : Y \rightarrow Z$ into a separable metric space Z is contained in the Newton-Sobolev space $N^{1,2}(Y, Z)$ if for some $z \in Z$ the composition $d_z \circ u : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is contained in $L^2(Y)$ and the following statement holds true. There exists a function $\rho \in L^2(Y)$, called a *weak upper gradient* of u , such that for almost any curve γ in Y the composition $u \circ \gamma$ is absolutely continuous and

$$(4.1) \quad \ell(u \circ \gamma) \leq \int_\gamma \rho.$$

There is a unique *weak minimal upper gradient* $\rho_u \in L^2(Y)$ of u such that $\rho_u \leq \rho$ almost everywhere, for any *weak upper gradient* ρ of u .

$$Ch(u) = Ch_Y^2(u) := \frac{1}{2} \int_Y \rho_u^2 d\mathcal{H}^2$$

is called the *Cheeger energy* of u . In [LW17b], [LW17a] the equivalent notion of *Reshetnyak energy* $E_+^2(u) = 2 \cdot Ch(u)$ has been used.

4.4. Canonical parametrization. We will not recall the definition of *quasisymmetric maps*, see [HK98]. Instead we will use the theory of quasisymmetric maps as a black-box, providing references for each required statement.

From [LW17b, Theorem 1.1] and Lemma 4.1 above we deduce:

Corollary 4.2. *Among all homeomorphisms $u : \bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$ there exist a homeomorphism $\phi \in N^{1,2}(\bar{D}, \bar{\Omega})$ with minimal Cheeger energy $Ch_{\bar{\Omega}}(\phi)$. This homeomorphism ϕ is quasisymmetric.*

The inverse $\phi^{-1} : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{D}$ is quasimetric as well, [Hei01, Proposition 10.6]. Since the disc \bar{D} satisfies the 1-Poincaré inequality, [HKST15, Section 8], the space $\bar{\Omega}$ satisfies the q -Poincaré inequality for some $q < 2$, [KM98, Theorem 2.3].

The map ϕ and its inverse have *Lusin's property N*, thus ϕ and ϕ^{-1} preserve the class of sets of \mathcal{H}^2 -measure 0, [HKST01, Theorem 8.12].

Due to [HK98, Theorem 9.3], $\phi \in N^{1,2}(\bar{D}, \bar{\Omega})$ and $\phi^{-1} \in N^{1,2}(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{D})$. By [HKST01, Theorem 9.8], a family \mathcal{C} of curves in \bar{D} has modulus zero if and only if the image $u \circ \mathcal{C}$ of this family has modulus 0 in $\bar{\Omega}$.

4.5. Conformality and its consequences. No tangent space of the space X contains a non-Euclidean normed vector space. Due to [LW17a, Proposition 11.2], X satisfies the property ET, introduced in [LW17a, Definition 11.1]. The metric on Ω locally coincides with d_X . Since Γ has vanishing \mathcal{H}^2 -measure, the space $\bar{\Omega}$ has the property ET as well.

Due to [LW17a, Theorem 11.3], the energy minimizer ϕ is a conformal map in the sense of [LW17a, Definition 6.1], meaning that almost all *approximate metric differentials* of ϕ are multiplies of the (fixed) Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^2 . Using [LW18a, Lemma 3.1] this reads as

$$(4.2) \quad \ell_{\Omega}(\phi \circ \gamma) = \int_{\gamma} \rho_{\phi},$$

for almost all curves γ in D . Here, as before, ρ_{ϕ} denotes a weak minimal upper gradient of ϕ .

For any Borel subset $E \subset \bar{D}$ we have, [LW18a, Lemma 3.3]

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{H}_X^2(\phi(E)) = \int_E \rho_{\phi}^2 d\mathcal{H}_D^2.$$

Since the inverse ϕ^{-1} has Lusin's property *N*, the weak minimal upper gradient ρ_{ϕ} must be positive almost everywhere.

From (4.2), [LW18a, Lemma 3.1] and the absolute continuity on almost all curves of the Sobolev maps ϕ, ϕ^{-1} , [HKST15, Proposition 6.3.2], we deduce that for any non-negative Borel function $h : \bar{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and almost every curve γ in \bar{D}

$$(4.4) \quad \int_{\phi \circ \gamma} h \circ \phi^{-1} = \int_{\gamma} \rho_{\phi} \cdot h.$$

Therefore, the Borel function

$$g := \frac{1}{\rho_{\phi} \circ \phi^{-1}} : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

satisfies

$$\int_{\eta} g = \ell_{\bar{D}}(\phi^{-1} \circ \eta),$$

for almost every curve η in $\bar{\Omega}$. This implies that g is a weak minimal upper gradient of $\phi^{-1} \in N^{1,2}(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{D})$.

5. CONFORMAL FACTOR

5.1. Setting and aim. We continue to use the notations from the previous section. Thus, we have a domain $\Omega \subset X$ and a conformal homeomorphism $\phi : \bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{\Omega}$, which is contained in $N^{1,2}(\bar{D}, \bar{\Omega})$. We let $f := \rho_\phi : \bar{D} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ be a weak minimal upper gradient of ϕ .

The aim of this section is the following result and its consequence, Corollary 5.2.

Proposition 5.1. *The function f^{-2} is contained in $L_{loc}^\infty(D)$. For any harmonic function $v : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the distributional Laplacian $\Delta_D(f^{-2}|\nabla v|^2)$ is a Radon measure on D and satisfies as a measure*

$$(5.1) \quad \Delta_D(f^{-2} \cdot |\nabla v|^2) \geq 2\kappa \cdot |\nabla v|^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_D^2.$$

The proof will be a direct consequence of the Bakry-Émery inequality on the $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ space X , once we have identified via the conformal homeomorphism ϕ the Sobolev spaces and Laplacians on D with the corresponding objects on X .

5.2. Identifications. Whenever no confusion is possible we will use the homeomorphism ϕ^{-1} to identify $\bar{\Omega}$ with \bar{D} .

Due to (4.3), under this identification we have

$$(5.2) \quad \mathcal{H}_X^2|_\Omega = \mathcal{H}_\Omega^2 = f^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_D^2.$$

We are going to identify the space of Sobolev functions $N^{1,2}(\Omega) = N^{1,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ with the "classical" space $N^{1,2}(D) = W^{1,2}(D)$.

From (4.4) we draw the following conclusion. Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable. A Borel function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a weak upper gradient of u , thus satisfies (4.1) for almost every curve γ in Ω , if and only if $(\rho \circ \phi) \cdot f : D \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a weak upper gradient of the composition $u \circ \phi : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Due to (5.2), $\rho \in L^2(\Omega)$ if and only if $(\rho \circ \phi) \cdot f \in L^2(D)$.

Since \bar{D} and $\bar{\Omega}$ satisfy the 2-Poincaré inequality, the 2-integrability of a weak upper gradient implies that the function itself is 2-integrable, [HKST15, Lemma 8.1.5, Theorem 9.1.2].

This shows that a map $v : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is contained in $N^{1,2}(D)$ if and only if $u := v \circ \phi^{-1}$ is contained in $N^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Moreover, in this case the weak minimal upper gradients satisfy

$$(5.3) \quad \rho_u = \frac{\rho_v}{f} \circ \phi^{-1} = \frac{|\nabla v|}{f} \circ \phi^{-1}.$$

Combining with (5.2) and identifying D and Ω this shows

$$(5.4) \quad |\nabla v|^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_D^2 = \rho_u^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_\Omega^2 \quad \text{and} \quad Ch_\Omega(u) = Ch_D(v).$$

5.3. Laplacians. By the RCD property, the spaces X and \mathbb{R}^2 are *infinitesimally Hilbertian*, meaning that Ch_X and $Ch_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ are quadratic forms on $N^{1,2}(X)$ and $N^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, respectively. Thus, D and Ω are infinitesimally Hilbertian as well, [Gig15, Proposition 4.22].

For $Y = X, \Omega, D, \mathbb{R}^2$ we consider the corresponding bilinear forms $\mathcal{E}_Y : N^{1,2}(Y) \times N^{1,2}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, called *Dirichlet forms*,

$$\mathcal{E}_Y(u_1, u_2) = \frac{1}{2}(Ch_Y(u_1 + u_2)^2 - Ch_Y(u_1 - u_2)^2).$$

From (5.4) we see that for $v_{1,2} \in N^{1,2}(D)$ and $u_{1,2} = v_{1,2} \circ \phi^{-1} \in N^{1,2}(\Omega)$

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{E}_\Omega(u_1, u_2) = \mathcal{E}_D(v_1, v_2).$$

For $Y = D, \Omega$, a function $u \in N^{1,2}(Y)$ is in the domain of the (measure valued) Laplacian on Y if there exists a Radon measure ν on Y with the following property, [Gig15, Definition 4.4, Proposition 4.7, Lemma 4.26]: For all $w \in N^{1,2}(Y)$ which are continuous and have compact support in Y the equality

$$\mathcal{E}_Y(u, w) = - \int_Y w \, d\nu$$

holds true. In this case, we set $\Delta_Y(u) := \nu$.

From (5.5), a function $u \in N^{1,2}(\Omega)$ is contained in the domain of the Laplacian, if and only if $v = u \circ \phi$ is in the domain of the Laplacian on D . Moreover, in this case

$$(5.6) \quad \Delta_D(v) = \Delta_\Omega(u),$$

where we identify Radon measures on D and Ω via ϕ .

5.4. The proof of Proposition 5.1. Due to (5.6), for any harmonic function $v : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the composition $u = v \circ \phi^{-1}$ satisfies $\Delta_\Omega(u) = 0$, thus u is a *harmonic function on Ω* .

Due to the regularity of harmonic functions on RCD spaces, the function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally Lipschitz ([Jia14, Theorem 1.1], which is a combination of [AGS14, Theorem 6.2], [AGS15, Corollary 2.3] and [KRS03, Theorem 1.1, Proposition 5.1]). Applying this observation to the coordinate functions $v_{1,2}$ we deduce that $\phi^{-1} : \Omega \rightarrow D$ is locally Lipschitz. Since $\frac{1}{f} \circ \phi^{-1}$ is a weak minimal upper gradient of $\phi^{-1} : \Omega \rightarrow D$, we deduce that f^{-1} is locally bounded on D .

Let now $v : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a harmonic function. Consider the composition $u = v \circ \phi^{-1} \in N^{1,2}(\Omega)$. By (5.6), $\Delta_\Omega(u) = 0$. Due to (5.3) and (5.4) the right hand side of (5.1) is given by $2\kappa \cdot \rho_u^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_\Omega^2$, where ρ_u is the weak minimal upper gradient of u . Using (5.3) again, it remains to show the following claim for any open subset $O \subset \bar{O} \subset \Omega$. A representative of ρ_u^2 is contained in the domain of the Laplacian in $N^{1,2}(O)$ and we have the comparison of measures

$$(5.7) \quad \Delta_O(\rho_u^2) \geq 2\kappa \cdot \rho_u^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_O^2.$$

The proof of (5.7) follows from the Bochner inequality [Gig15, Proposition 4.36], [AGS14, Remark 6.3], [AGMR15] by localization, as follows.

If the function u is a restriction to O of a *test function* $\hat{u} \in N^{1,2}(X)$ in the sense of [Amb18, Equation (7.2)] then (5.7) is precisely [Gig15, Proposition 4.36], since $\Delta_O(u) = 0$. In general, we multiply u by a test function which is constant 1 on O and has support in Ω (the existence of such cut-off functions has been verified in [AMS16, Lemma 6.7]). This provides a function $\hat{u} \in N^{1,2}(X)$ which restricts to u on O and is a test function on X , [Gig15, Proposition 4.17, Theorem 4.29].

This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.1.

5.5. An analytic conclusion. By a combination of a smoothing argument and a pointwise computation we are going to conclude:

Corollary 5.2. *The function $\log(f^2)$ is contained in $L^1_{loc}(D)$. The distributional Laplacian $\Delta(\log(f^2))$ is a Radon measure on D and satisfies*

$$(5.8) \quad \Delta(\log(f^2)) \leq -2\kappa \cdot f^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_D^2.$$

For any domain O , compactly contained in D there exist a sequence of smooth functions $f_n : O \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that f_n satisfy (5.8) on O , such that $\log(f_n)$ converges to $\log(f)$ in $L^1(O)$ and such that $\Delta(\log(f_n^2))$ weakly converge to $\Delta(\log(f^2))$ as measures on O .

Proof. Consider the function $h = f^{-2}$. Due to Proposition 5.1, the function h is locally bounded on D . Moreover, for any harmonic function v on \mathbb{R}^2 , the function h satisfies in the sense of measures on D

$$(5.9) \quad \Delta(h \cdot |\nabla v|^2) \geq 2\kappa \cdot |\nabla v|^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_D^2.$$

We fix a ball $O = B_{1-\delta}(0) \subset D$ for the rest of the proof. For all $\delta > 2 \cdot \epsilon > 0$ consider the mollifications $h_\epsilon : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ obtained by a convolution of h with the usual smooth mollifiers $\rho_\epsilon : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ whose support is in $B_\epsilon(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Since the function h is positive almost everywhere, the smooth functions h_ϵ are positive on O . By a direct computation (or using the observation that (5.9) is a system of linear inequalities on the function h , which is moreover, equivariant with respect to translations), we see that h_ϵ satisfies (5.9) on O for all harmonic functions v on \mathbb{R}^2 .

The function h is bounded from above on the ϵ -neighborhood of O , hence so is $\log(h)$. On the other hand, $-\log(h) = \log(\frac{1}{h}) \leq \frac{1}{h}$. Thus, the integrability of $f^2 = \frac{1}{h}$ shows $\log(h) \in L^1(O)$.

The convexity of the function $t \rightarrow \frac{1}{t}$ and Jensen's inequality imply

$$\frac{1}{h_\epsilon} \leq \left(\frac{1}{h} \right)_\epsilon,$$

where on the right side we have the mollifications of the function $\frac{1}{h}$. Since $(\frac{1}{h})_\epsilon$ converge in $L^1(O)$ to $\frac{1}{h}$ as ϵ goes to 0, we deduce that $\frac{1}{h_\epsilon}$ converges to $\frac{1}{h}$ is $L^1(O)$ as well.

Similarly, $t \rightarrow -\log(t) = \log(\frac{1}{t})$ is convex and arguing as above with Jensen's inequality we see that $\log(h_\epsilon)$ converges in $L^1(O)$ to $\log(h)$ as ϵ goes to 0.

For all $n > \frac{2}{\delta}$ consider the smooth function f_n on O such that $f_n^{-2} = h_{\frac{1}{n}}$. Like above, $\log f_n = -2 \log h_{\frac{1}{n}}$ converge to $\log f$ in $L^1(O)$. The remaining statements follow by a continuity argument, once we have verified $\Delta(\log(f_n^2)) \leq -2\kappa \cdot f_n^2$ on O .

As we have seen above, the smooth positive functions $h_{\frac{1}{n}}$ satisfy (5.9) on O , for all harmonic functions $v : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, we only need to verify that for a *smooth positive* function h on a domain U in \mathbb{R}^2 the validity of (5.9) for all harmonic functions $v : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ implies

$$(5.10) \quad \Delta(\log(h)) = \frac{\Delta(h)}{h} - \frac{|\nabla h|^2}{h^2} \geq \frac{2\kappa}{h}.$$

It is sufficient to verify this pointwise statement at a single point $z \in U$ which we may assume to be $z = 0$.

Set $e := \nabla h(0)$. If $e = 0$ we choose v to be a linear non-zero function on \mathbb{R}^2 . Then (5.9) implies $\Delta(h)(0) \geq 2 \cdot \kappa$, hence, (5.10).

If $e \neq 0$, fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the uniquely determined symmetric traceless matrix $A : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ with $A(e) = \lambda \cdot e$. The function

$$v(z) := \langle z, A(z) + e \rangle$$

is harmonic on \mathbb{R}^2 and satisfies $\nabla v(z) = e + 2 \cdot A(z)$. Therefore,

$$\nabla(|\nabla v|^2)(z) = 4\lambda \cdot e + 8 \cdot A^2(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(|\nabla v|^2)(z) = 16\lambda^2.$$

Thus, the right hand side of (5.9) at $z = 0$ is just $2\kappa \cdot |e|^2$.

For the left hand side of (5.9) at the point $z = 0$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta(h) \cdot |\nabla v|^2 + 2 \langle \nabla h, \nabla(|\nabla v|^2) \rangle + h \cdot \Delta(|\nabla v|^2) = \\ & = \Delta(h)(0) \cdot |e|^2 + 8\lambda \cdot |e|^2 + 16 \cdot \lambda^2 \cdot h(0). \end{aligned}$$

For $\lambda = -\frac{|e|^2}{4h(0)}$ the inequality (5.9) now reads

$$|e|^2 \cdot \left(\Delta(h)(0) - \frac{|e|^2}{h(0)} \right) \geq 2\kappa \cdot |e|^2.$$

Dividing by $h(0) \cdot |e|^2$ we deduce (5.10).

This finishes the proof of Corollary 5.2. \square

6. CURVATURE BOUND IN THE REGULAR PART

6.1. Preliminaries from Alexandrov geometry. We refer to [BBI01] for basics about Alexandrov geometry and just agree on notation here, following [Pet16]. Let κ be a fixed real number as before. For points p, x_1, x_2 in a metric space Y , we denote by $\tilde{Z}^\kappa(p_{x_2}^{x_1})$ the κ -comparison angle, whenever it exists. Thus, $\tilde{Z}^\kappa(p_{x_2}^{x_1})$ is the angle in the constant curvature surface M_κ^2 at the vertex \tilde{p} of a triangle $\tilde{p}\tilde{x}_1\tilde{x}_2$ with the same side-lengths as px_1x_2 .

A subset O of a metric space Y satisfies the $(1+3)$ -points comparison if for any quadruple of points $p; x_1, x_2, x_3 \in O$ the inequality

$$\tilde{Z}^\kappa(p_{x_2}^{x_1}) + \tilde{Z}^\kappa(p_{x_3}^{x_2}) + \tilde{Z}^\kappa(p_{x_1}^{x_3}) \leq 2\pi$$

holds true or one of the κ -comparison angles is not defined.

A metric space Y has curvature $\geq \kappa$ if every point $y \in Y$ has a neighborhood O which satisfies the $(1+3)$ -points comparison and such that every pair of points in O is connected in Y by a geodesic.

A complete geodesic metric space of curvature $\geq \kappa$ is called an *Alexandrov space* of curvature $\geq \kappa$.

If Y has curvature $\geq \kappa$, the ball $\bar{B}_{2R}(y) \subset Y$ is compact and any pair of points in $B_R(y)$ is connected in Y by a geodesic, then $B_R(y)$ satisfies the $(1+3)$ -point comparison, [Pet16, p. 3].

Note finally that the $(1+3)$ -point comparison property (of subsets) is stable under Gromov–Hausdorff convergence.

The aim of this section is the following

Proposition 6.1. *The subspace X^δ of δ -regular points in X has curvature bounded from below by κ .*

6.2. Reshetnyak’s theory. We continue to use the notation from Section 4 and Section 5. For a homeomorphism $\phi : D \rightarrow \Omega \subset X$ the length $\ell_X(\phi \circ \gamma)$ is given by (4.2), for almost all curves γ in D . The conformal factor $f = \rho_\phi$ satisfies the conclusion of Corollary 5.2.

By Corollary 5.2, the function $\Delta(\log f)$ is a Radon measure. Thus, on any compactly contained domain $O \subset D$ we can canonically represent $\log(f)$ as a sum of a harmonic function and a *Riesz potential*, [Res93, p. 99]. Using this representative of f , the f -length $\ell_f(\gamma)$ of any rectifiable curve γ on O is defined in [Res93, p. 100] by the formula (4.2).

This induces a new metric d_f on O by letting $d_f(z_1, z_2)$ be the infimum of all f -lengths of rectifiable curves connecting z_1 and z_2 . The metric d_f induces the original Euclidean topology on O , [Res93, Theorem 7.1.1]. We define the metric space $O_f = (O, d_f)$ to be the disc O equipped with the metric d_f .

The following statement is implicitly contained in [Res93, p. 140]. For convenience of the reader, we reduce the result to other more explicit statements in [Res93].

Lemma 6.2. *The space O_f has curvature bounded from below by κ .*

Proof. We find smooth positive functions $f_n : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ approximating f as in Corollary 5.2. By [Res93, Theorem 7.3.1], the distance functions d_{f_n} converge on O locally uniformly against d_f .

On the other hand, d_{f_n} is a smooth Riemannian metric. Its curvature can be computed pointwise by the classical formula $-\frac{\Delta(\log(f_n))}{f_n^2}$, [Res93, p. 40]. Thus, (5.8) shows that the Riemannian manifold O_{f_n} has sectional curvature bounded from below by κ .

Hence, O_{f_n} has curvature bounded from below by κ in the sense of Alexandrov, [BBI01, Theorem 6.5.6]. Therefore, for any compact metric ball B in (O, d_f) and the concentric ball B' with one-third the radius of B , the set $B' \subset O_{f_n}$ satisfies the $(1+3)$ -point comparison, for all large n . By continuity, B' satisfies the $(1+3)$ -point comparison, when considered as a subset of O_f . This completes the proof. \square

6.3. Sobolev-to-Lipschitz. By construction, for *almost all* curves γ in O , the length of $\phi \circ \gamma$ in X is equal to the f -length of γ , hence to the length of γ in the metric space O_f . The easiest way to upgrade the equality statement from *almost all* curves to *all* curves, is via an application of the *Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property* of RCD-spaces, stated as follows, [Gig13, p. 48], [AGS15]:

For any $RCD(\kappa, 2)$ space X , any open subset W of X and any $u \in N^{1,2}(W)$ for which the constant function $\rho = 1$ is a weak upper gradient, the function u has a locally 1-Lipschitz representative.

In fact, the Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property is defined and verified in [Gig13, p. 48] only in the global case $W = X$, but the proof presented there covers the local version formulated above.

Lemma 6.3. *The open embedding $\phi : O_f \rightarrow X$ is a local isometry.*

Proof. Set $W = \phi(O_f)$ and consider the inverse map $\psi = \phi^{-1} : W \rightarrow O_f$. By construction, ψ preserves the length of almost any curve γ in W . Therefore, the map ψ is contained in the Sobolev space $N^{1,2}(W, O_f)$ and the constant function 1 is a weak upper gradient of ψ .

Therefore, for any point $y \in O_f$, the composition $\psi_y \in N^{1,2}(W)$ of ψ with the distance function in O_f to the point y has the constant function 1 a weak upper gradient. By the Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property, this implies that ψ_y is locally 1-Lipschitz. Since X is a geodesic space, and y was arbitrary, this implies that ψ is locally 1-Lipschitz.

In order to prove that ϕ is locally 1-Lipschitz, we apply the same argument. (Alternatively, this can be seen directly, as in [LW18b, Lemma 9.3]). Firstly, $\mathcal{H}_{O_f}^2 = f^2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_O^2$ and the same computation as in Section 4 shows that any family of curves of modulus 0 in O has modulus 0 in O_f . Thus, the map ϕ preserves the lengths of almost all curves in O_f . Therefore, $\phi \in N^{1,2}(O_f, X)$ and the constant function 1 is a weak upper gradient of ϕ . Arguing as above we deduce that ϕ is locally 1-Lipschitz, once the Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property has been verified locally in O_f .

But any point in O_f has a compact neighborhood isometric to an Alexandrov space, by [Pet07, Theorem 7.1.3]. This implies the Sobolev-to-Lipschitz property, as a consequence of [Pet11] and [Gig13, p. 40].

Since ϕ and ϕ^{-1} are locally 1-Lipschitz, ϕ is a local isometry. \square

For any δ -regular point $x_0 \in X$, we choose a domain Ω containing x_0 as in Section 4. Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.2 imply the existence of

a neighborhood of x_0 in Ω which has curvature bounded below by κ . This finishes the proof of Proposition 6.1.

7. EXTENSION TO THE SINGULAR POINTS

7.1. Topological statement. Most of this rather long section is devoted to the proof of the following topological statement.

Proposition 7.1. *Any point $z \in \partial X$ with $b(z) = \frac{1}{2}$ has an open neighborhood U in X homeomorphic to the closed half-plane H , such that z lies in the boundary line ∂H .*

Before we embark on the proof of this proposition, we explain why this statement is sufficient to finish the proof of our main theorem.

Lemma 7.2. *The validity of Proposition 7.1 implies that the set X^δ is strongly convex in X . Thus any geodesic γ with endpoints $x, y \in X^\delta$ is completely contained in X^δ .*

Proof. Assume the contrary and consider a point $z \in X \setminus X^\delta$ on γ closest to the point x .

Due to Lemma 2.4, the point z is contained in ∂X and satisfies $b(z) = \frac{1}{2}$. Applying Proposition 7.1 we find a neighborhood U of z homeomorphic to H , such that z lies on the boundary line ∂H .

The part γ^+ of the geodesic γ between x and z is contained in X^δ (up to the point z) hence it intersects ∂H only in the point z . By choosing the neighborhood U smaller we can therefore assume that γ^+ separates U into two components.

Fix a point q on the part of γ between z and y sufficiently close to z and let U^+ be the component of $U \setminus \gamma^+$ which does not contain q . Thus, for any point $m \in U^+$, sufficiently close to z , any geodesic between q and m intersects γ^+ .

In particular, the point z lies on a geodesic between m and q . This statement, valid for the fixed point q and an open set of points m , contradicts the essentially non-branching property of the RCD space X , [GRS16, Theorem 1.2, Corollary 1.4]. \square

Therefore, the validity of Proposition 7.1 implies that the space X^δ is a geodesic space. Since X is the completion of X^δ , we would deduce from [Pet16] that X is an Alexandrov space with curvature $\geq \kappa$ and finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

7.2. Interior points. Consider a point $x \in X \setminus \partial X$. Assume that x is not contained in X^δ . By Lemma 3.1, we find some $r > 0$ such that $B_{2r}(x) \setminus X^\delta$ contains only the point x . By Proposition 6.1, $B_{2r}(x) \setminus \{x\}$ has curvature $\geq \kappa$ in the sense of Alexandrov.

Due to Lemma 2.4, for any $y, z \in B_r(x) \setminus \{x\}$, any geodesic connecting y and z in X is contained in $B_{2r}(x) \setminus \{x\}$. Toponogov's globalization

theorem in the version of [Pet16], now shows that $B_r(x) \setminus \{x\}$ satisfies the $(1 + 3)$ -point comparison. By continuity, $B_r(x)$ satisfies the $(1 + 3)$ -point comparison as well.

We have just verified:

Corollary 7.3. *The subspace $X \setminus \partial X$ of X has curvature $\geq \kappa$.*

7.3. Setting. We now fix a point $z \in \partial X$ with $b(z) = \frac{1}{2}$. We consider a sequence of points $x_i \in X$ converging to z and a sequence r_i of positive numbers converging to 0. After choosing a subsequence we may and will assume that the blow-up $(Y, y) = \lim_{r_i}(\frac{1}{r_i}X, x_i)$ exists.

Furthermore, we consider the sequence of non-negative numbers $s_i = d(x_i, \partial X)$. By choosing a further subsequence, we may and will assume that the following limit exists:

$$A := \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_i}{r_i} \in [0, \infty].$$

As we have seen in Section 2, any ball of any radius t in the blow-up Y has \mathcal{H}^2 -measure at least $\frac{\pi}{2}t^2$. From the volume-cone rigidity, [DPG16], and Lemma 2.3 we deduce:

Lemma 7.4. *The $RCD(0, 2)$ space Y can have non-empty boundary only if Y is isometric to the flat half-plane H .*

Our next aim is to show that (non) boundary points of X converge to (non) boundary points in the blow-up Y . After that we will show that the blow-up Y is isometric to a plane or a half-plane.

7.4. Stability of the boundary. In the previous notation we are going to show:

Lemma 7.5. *If $A > 0$ then the point y is not contained in ∂Y .*

Proof. Assume the contrary. By Lemma 7.4, Y is isometric to the half-plane H and $y \in \partial H$.

By rescaling, we may assume that $A > 9$. Thus, for all i large enough, the compact ball \hat{B}_i in $X_i = \frac{1}{r_i}X$ of radius 6 around x_i does not contain boundary points. Due to Corollary 7.3, the open ball B_i of radius 3 around x_i in X_i satisfies the $(1 + 3)$ -point comparison, see Section 6 and [Pet16].

A contradiction to the fact that the surfaces without boundary B_i converge to a surface with boundary (the ball in H around the limit point y) can now be deduced in several ways. We choose a way relying on (the simplest case of) Perelman's topological stability theorem, [Per91], [Kap07].

From [Pet07, Theorem 7.1.3] we deduce the existence of some $\delta > 0$ and closed compact convex subsets $C_i \subset B_i$ containing the ball $B_\delta(x_i) \subset B_i$. The spaces C_i are compact 2-dimensional Alexandrov spaces converging (after choosing a subsequence) to an Alexandrov

space $C \subset H$ which contains the ball $B_\delta(y) \subset H$. By Perelman's stability theorem [Per91], [Kap07], for all large i , there exists a homeomorphism $\Phi_i : C_i \rightarrow C$ close to the identity. Since $B_\delta(x_i)$ is a 2-manifold without boundary, we deduce that y must have in Y a neighborhood homeomorphic to a 2-manifold without boundary which is impossible.

This contradiction finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 7.6. *If $A = 0$ then Y is isometric to the half-plane H and y is on the boundary ∂H .*

Proof. Consider points $z_i \in \partial X$ with $d(z_i, x_i) = s_i = d(\partial X, x_i)$. The assumption $A = 0$ implies that the points $z_i \in X_i = \frac{1}{r_i}X$ converge to the same point $y \in Y$.

Since $z_i \in \partial X$, we see that the density $b(y)$ at Y is at most $\frac{1}{2}$. The volume-cone rigidity argument implies that $b(y) = \frac{1}{2}$ and Y is isometric to the Euclidean cone $T_y Y$. It remains to show that $T_y Y$ cannot be the Euclidean cone over the circle of length π .

We assume that Y is a Euclidean cone over a circle and are going to derive a contradiction.

For all i large enough, there exist no points p_i in ∂X with $r_i < d(p_i, z_i) < 2r_i$, since $Y \setminus \{y\}$ is locally Euclidean. Denote by K_i the set $\partial X \cap \bar{B}_{r_i}(z_i)$ and by \hat{K}_i the complement $\partial X \setminus K_i$. Then, for all i large enough, K_i is compact and \hat{K}_i is closed in ∂X . Moreover,

$$d(z, z_i) \geq t_i := d(K_i, \hat{K}_i) \geq r_i.$$

Consider points $k_i \in K_i$ and $\hat{k}_i \in \hat{K}_i$ realizing the distance between K_i and \hat{K}_i and take the blow-up (choosing a subsequence) $(\hat{Y}, k) = \lim_{t_i} (\frac{1}{t_i}X, k_i)$.

As before, the volume-cone rigidity implies that \hat{Y} is either a half-plane or a cone over a circle. However, the points \hat{k}_i converge (after taking a subsequence) to a non-Euclidean point $\hat{k} \in \hat{Y}$ with distance 1 to k . Therefore, \hat{Y} must be isometric to H and the geodesic between k and \hat{k} must lie on the boundary ∂H .

Hence, the midpoints m_i of any geodesic between k_i and \hat{k}_i in X converge to a point on the boundary of \hat{Y} .

But, by construction, the point m_i in X has distance $\frac{t_i}{2}$ from ∂X . We obtain a contradiction with Lemma 7.5 and finish the proof. \square

Lemma 7.7. *If $A = \infty$ then Y is isometric to \mathbb{R}^2 .*

Proof. Due to Lemma 7.6 and Lemma 7.5, the sequence $(\frac{1}{s_i}X, x_i)$ converges to a half-plane (H, \hat{y}) where \hat{y} has distance 1 from ∂H . Therefore, $\mathcal{H}^2(B_1(\hat{y})) = \pi$. Stability of the Hausdorff measures implies,

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}^2(B_{s_i}(x_i))}{s_i^2} \rightarrow \pi.$$

Applying the Bishop–Gromov inequality, and the assumption $A = \infty$, we see that for any fixed $t > 0$,

$$\frac{b(x_i, t \cdot r_i)}{r_i} \rightarrow \pi t^2.$$

Thus, the ball $B_t(y)$ in Y has \mathcal{H}^2 -measure $\pi \cdot t^2$. Since t is arbitrary, the volume-cone rigidity implies that Y is isometric to $T_y Y = \mathbb{R}^2$. \square

Combining the last three statements we easily arrive at

Corollary 7.8. *The space Y is either \mathbb{R}^2 or the half-plane H . The case $Y = H$ happens if and only if $A < \infty$. Moreover, in this case ∂H coincides with the limit of the boundary ∂X .*

Proof. The only statement not directly contained in Lemma 7.5, Lemma 7.6 and Lemma 7.7 is that for $0 < A < \infty$ the space Y is isometric to H . However, if $A < \infty$ we can replace the base points x_i by closest points $z_i \in \partial X$ and apply Lemma 7.6 to deduce the statement. \square

7.5. Reifenberg’s lemma twice. We can now finish the

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Due to Corollary 7.8, for any sequence $z_i \in \partial X$ converging to z and any sequence $r_i \rightarrow 0$ the sequence $(\frac{1}{r_i} \partial X, z_i)$ converges to the line $\partial H = \mathbb{R}$. Applying the Cheeger–Colding–Reifenberg Lemma, [CC97, Theorem A1], we deduce that a neighborhood of z in ∂X is homeomorphic to an interval.

Consider now the doubling $W = X \cup_{\partial X} X$ of X with its natural length metric, compare [Per91, Section 5].

We claim that for any sequence $x_i \in W$ converging to z and any sequence of positive numbers r_i converging to 0 the blow-up $\lim(\frac{1}{r_i} W, x_i)$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^2 .

Choosing a subsequence and using the symmetry we may assume that $x_i \in X \subset W$ and that for $s_i := d(x_i, \partial X)$ the quotients s_i/r_i converge to a number $A \in [0, \infty]$. Applying Corollary 7.8, we see that in the case $A = \infty$, the blow-up coincides with $\lim(\frac{1}{r_i} X, x_i) = \mathbb{R}^2$.

On the other hand, if $A < \infty$, we can change the base points x_i and assume $x_i \in \partial X$, without changing the isometry class of the blow-up. Then the limit $\lim(\frac{1}{r_i} W, x_i)$ is the doubling of $H = \lim(\frac{1}{r_i} W, x_i)$ along the boundary $\partial H = \lim(\frac{1}{r_i} \partial X, z_i)$.

Having proved the claim, we can now apply the Cheeger–Colding–Reifenberg Lemma a second time and deduce that a neighborhood V of z in W is homeomorphic to an open disc. Passing to a smaller subdisc if necessary, we obtain a homeomorphism between V and the plane which takes $V \cap \partial X$ to a line.

By connectedness reasons we see that $X \cap V$ must be homeomorphic to a half-plane. \square

REFERENCES

- [AGMR15] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, Andrea Mondino, and Tapio Rajala. Riemannian Ricci curvature lower bounds in metric measure spaces with σ -finite measure. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(7):4661–4701, 2015.
- [AGS14] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014.
- [AGS15] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(1):339–404, 2015.
- [Amb18] L. Ambrosio. Calculus, heat flow and curvature-dimension bounds in metric measure spaces. *Proceedings of the ICM 2018*, 2018.
- [AMS16] L. Ambrosio, A. Mondino, and G. Savaré. On the Bakry-Émery condition, the gradient estimates and the local-to-global property of $RCD^*(K, N)$ metric measure spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 26(1):24–56, 2016.
- [BBI01] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*, volume 33 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [BS18] E. Brué and D. Semola. Constancy of the dimension for $RCD(K, N)$ spaces via regularity of Langranian flows. *arXiv:1804.07128*, 2018.
- [CC97] J. Cheeger and T. Colding. On the structure of spaces with Ricci curvature bounded below. I. *J. Differential Geom.*, 46(3):406–480, 1997.
- [CM15] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. Sharp and rigid isoperimetric inequalities in metric measure spaces with lower ricci curvature bounds. *Invent. Math.*, to appear, 2015.
- [CM18] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. Almost euclidean isoperimetric inequalities in spaces satisfying local ricci curvature lower bounds. *arXiv:1703.02119*, 2018.
- [CN12] T. Colding and A. Naber. Sharp Hölder continuity of tangent cones for spaces with a lower Ricci curvature bound and applications. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(2):1173–1229, 2012.
- [DPG16] G. De Philippis and N. Gigli. From volume cone to metric cone in the nonsmooth setting. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 26(6):1526–1587, 2016.
- [DPG17] G. De Philippis and N. Gigli. Non-collapsed spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. *preprint arXiv:1708.02060*, 2017.
- [Fed69] H. Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 153. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1969.
- [Gig13] N. Gigli. Splitting theorem in the non-smooth context. *arXiv:1302.5555*, 2013.
- [Gig15] N. Gigli. On the differential structure of metric measure spaces and applications. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 236(1113):vi+91, 2015.
- [GMS15] Nicola Gigli, Andrea Mondino, and Giuseppe Savaré. Convergence of pointed non-compact metric measure spaces and stability of Ricci curvature bounds and heat flows. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 111(5):1071–1129, 2015.
- [GRS16] N. Gigli, T. Rajala, and T. Sturm. Optimal maps and exponentiation on finite-dimensional spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 26(4):2914–2929, 2016.
- [Hei01] J. Heinonen. *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

- [HK98] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela. Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry. *Acta Math.*, 181(1):1–61, 1998.
- [HKST01] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam, and J. Tyson. Sobolev classes of Banach space-valued functions and quasiconformal mappings. *J. Anal. Math.*, 85:87–139, 2001.
- [HKST15] J. Heinonen, P. Koskela, N. Shanmugalingam, and J. Tyson. *Sobolev spaces on metric measure spaces*, volume 27 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [Jia14] R. Jiang. Cheeger-harmonic functions in metric measure spaces revisited. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 266(3):1373–1394, 2014.
- [Kap07] V. Kapovitch. Perelman’s stability theorem. In *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. XI*, pages 103–136. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2007.
- [Ket15] C. Ketterer. Cones over metric measure spaces and the maximal diameter theorem. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 103(5):1228–1275, 2015.
- [KK17] V. Kapovitch and C. Ketterer. CD meets CAT. *arXiv:1712.02839*, 2017.
- [KL16] Y. Kitabeppu and S. Lakzian. Characterization of low dimensional $RCD^*(K, N)$ spaces. *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces*, 4:187–215, 2016.
- [KM98] P. Koskela and P. MacManus. Quasiconformal mappings and Sobolev spaces. *Studia Math.*, 131(1):1–17, 1998.
- [KRS03] P. Koskela, K. Rajala, and Nageswari S. Lipschitz continuity of Cheeger-harmonic functions in metric measure spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 202(1):147–173, 2003.
- [LV09] J. Lott and C. Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 169(3):903–991, 2009.
- [LW17a] A. Lytchak and S. Wenger. Area Minimizing Discs in Metric Spaces. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 223(3):1123–1182, 2017.
- [LW17b] A. Lytchak and S. Wenger. Canonical parametrizations of metric discs. *preprint arXiv:1701.06346*, 2017.
- [LW18a] A. Lytchak and S. Wenger. Intrinsic structure of minimal discs in metric spaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 22:591–644, 2018.
- [LW18b] A. Lytchak and S. Wenger. Isoperimetric characterization of upper curvature bounds. *Acta Math.*, 221, 2018.
- [MN17] A. Mondino and A. Naber. Structure theory of metric measure spaces with lower Ricci curvature bounds. *arXiv:1405.2222v3*, to appear in *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2017.
- [Per91] G. Perelman. A. D. Alexandrov spaces with curvature bounded below II. *preprint*, 1991.
- [Pet07] A. Petrunin. Semiconcave functions in Alexandrov’s geometry. In *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. XI*, volume 11 of *Surv. Differ. Geom.*, pages 137–201. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2007.
- [Pet11] A. Petrunin. Alexandrov meets Lott-Villani-Sturm. *Münster J. Math.*, 4:53–64, 2011.
- [Pet16] A. Petrunin. A globalization for non-complete but geodesic spaces. *Math. Ann.*, 366(1-2):387–393, 2016.
- [Res93] Yu. G. Reshetnyak. Two-dimensional manifolds of bounded curvature. In *Geometry, IV*, volume 70 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 3–163. Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [RS14] T. Rajala and K. Sturm. Non-branching geodesics and optimal maps in strong $CD(K, \infty)$ -spaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 50(3-4):831–846, 2014.
- [Stu06] T. Sturm. On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I, II. *Acta Math.*, 196(1):65–177, 2006.

- [Vil16] C. Villani. Synthetic theory of Ricci curvature bounds. *Jpn. J. Math.*, 11(2):219–263, 2016.

ALEXANDER LYTCHAK: MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT KÖLN,
WEYERTAL 86–90, 50931, KÖLN, GERMANY
E-mail address: `alytchak@math.uni-koeln.de`

STEPHAN STADLER: MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT DER UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN,
THERESIENSTR. 39, D-80333 MÜNCHEN, GERMANY
E-mail address: `stadler@math.lmu.de`