

APRIL 7, 2019

by

J.H. Martel

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
Graduate Department of Mathematics  
University of Toronto

© Copyright 2019 by J.H. Martel

# Abstract

April 7, 2019

J.H. Martel

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Department of Mathematics

University of Toronto

2019

We describe new applications of optimal transportation to algebraic topology, and develop a method for building Spines/Souls using a definition of Singularity based on Kantorovich duality. Given an initial manifold-with-corners  $X$ , we construct continuous homotopy-reductions from  $X$  onto large-codimension subvarieties  $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow X$ . The subvarieties  $\mathcal{Z}$  are assembled from a contravariant functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ , where  $Z = Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$  is defined by a source  $(X, \sigma)$ , target  $(Y, \tau)$ , and cost  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Our Theorems A, B describe criteria for inclusions  $Z(Y_I) \hookrightarrow Z(Y_J)$  to be homotopy-isomorphisms and find a maximal index  $J \geq 1$  for which  $(\mathcal{Z} := Z_{J+1}) \hookrightarrow X$  is a codimension- $J$  homotopy-isomorphism. Our Theorem C is an application which exhibits new small-dimensional  $E\Gamma$  classifying spaces where  $\Gamma$  is finite-dimensional Bieri-Eckmann duality group, e.g. Spines of  $\Gamma = GL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ ,  $GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ , etc. The singularity functor  $Z$  is a new reduction theory for  $E\Gamma$  models based on convex excisions, and a subprogram we call "Closing the Steinberg symbol" which is a convex interpretation of Bieri-Eckmann's homological duality. "Closing Steinberg" replaces  $X$  with a chain sum  $\underline{F}$  on which  $\Gamma$  freely acts as shift operator. Finally we construct "repulsion" costs  $\tilde{c}$  and "visibility" costs  $v$  on  $\underline{F}$  whose functors  $Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$  satisfy sufficient conditions to produce large-codimension  $\Gamma$ -equivariant homotopy-reductions  $\mathcal{Z}$  of  $X$ .



## Acknowledgements

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Kantorovich: the Bridge from Measure to Topology . . . . .	2
1.2	Reduction-to-Singularity Principle . . . . .	4
1.3	Cost Assumptions . . . . .	5
1.4	Deformation Retracts and Topological Theorems A,B . . . . .	7
1.5	Closing the Steinberg symbol and Theorem C . . . . .	10
1.6	Thesis Outline . . . . .	16
1.7	Conventions and Notations . . . . .	17
<b>2</b>	<b>Semicoupling Programs and Topological Theorem A</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1	Optimal Semicouplings and Cost . . . . .	21
2.2	Existence of $c$ -Optimal Semicouplings . . . . .	22
2.3	Kantorovich Duality . . . . .	24
2.4	Uniqueness of Activated Domain . . . . .	31
2.5	Uniqueness of Optimal Semicouplings . . . . .	34
2.6	Deforming $X \rightsquigarrow A$ : Topological Theorem A . . . . .	39
<b>3</b>	<b>Kantorovich Singularity and Topological Theorem B</b>	<b>46</b>
3.1	Kantorovich's Contravariant Singularity Functor . . . . .	46
3.2	Local Topology and Local Dimensions of $Z$ . . . . .	49
3.3	The Descending Filtration $Z_j, j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . . . . .	53
3.4	Local–Global Homotopy Reductions: (UHS) Conditions . . . . .	56
<b>4</b>	<b>Repulsion Costs</b>	<b>62</b>
4.1	Chain sums and Well-Separated Gates . . . . .	62
4.2	Hypotheses and Practical Applications . . . . .	63
4.3	Definition of Repulsion Costs . . . . .	66
4.4	Two-Pointed Repulsion Costs . . . . .	71

4.5	Convex-Excisions . . . . .	73
4.6	Visibility . . . . .	74
4.7	$\epsilon$ -Regularizations . . . . .	76
4.8	Barycentres and Krein-Milman . . . . .	79
4.9	Visible Repulsion Costs . . . . .	80
<b>5</b>	<b>Symmetry and Dimension</b>	<b>85</b>
5.1	Proper Classifying Spaces $E\Gamma$ . . . . .	85
5.2	Group Cohomology: Algebraic Background . . . . .	88
5.3	Excision versus Compactification . . . . .	90
5.4	Bieri-Eckmann Duality . . . . .	95
5.5	Arithmetic Groups: Excision . . . . .	97
<b>6</b>	<b>Closing the Steinberg symbol</b>	<b>101</b>
6.1	Stitching Footballs from Regular Panels : Motivation . . . . .	101
6.2	Closing Steinberg : Definition and Consequence . . . . .	102
6.3	Closing Steinberg on $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ : First Example . . . . .	105
6.4	Closing Steinberg on $GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ : Example . . . . .	108
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>113</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>114</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	When $\partial(A + B + C) = 0 \pmod{2}$ , we define $F = \text{conv}(A, B, C)$	13
1.2	A chain sum $\underline{F} = \sum_{i \in I} F_i$ with well-separated one-dimensional gates	14
2.1	Disconnected Active Domain	34
2.2	Connected Active Domain when $\text{mass}[\sigma]/\text{mass}[\tau] \approx 1^+$	34
2.3	Halfspace Conditions fail and active domain is not homotopy-equivalent to source.	39
3.1	Singularity structure $Z$ on active domain $A = Z_1$	48
3.2	Singularity structure on $Z_2$	48
3.3	Horospherically truncated pair of pants, with active domain relative to a repulsion cost (See Definition 4.3.3 from Section 4.3). Halfspace Conditions fail. $P \rightsquigarrow Z_1 \rightsquigarrow Z_2$ are homotopy equivalent, where $P$ is pair of pants. But $Z_2$ does not deformation retract to $Z_3$	61
4.1	Singularity structures of $\tilde{c}$ on regular 2-simplex and regular square satisfy properties (D0)–(D5)	66
4.2	The yellow line designates the one-dimensional gate $G$ . The blue line designates the interpolated singularity structure with respect to the gated-visibility cost $v^*$ .	67
4.3	Graph of repulsion cost $x \mapsto c \mathcal{H}_Y(x, 0)$ . The assymmetry reflects the “home-preference” of $x$ to $y = 0$	69
4.4	Graph of repulsion cost $x \mapsto c \mathcal{H}_Y(x, (1, 0))$ . The “home-preference” implies the pole at $y = (1, 0)$ has smaller diameter than the other poles.	70
4.5	Illustrating the projection map $\text{proj} : F \rightarrow \partial F$ defining two-pointed repulsion cost $\tilde{c}$ for ellipse $F$ where $\partial F = \mathcal{E}[F]$ .	72
4.6	Excision of convex ellipsoid	74
4.7	Excision domain $X = F[t]$ , where $(x, y)$ are visible in $X$ and $(x, w)$ is not visible in $X$	76

4.8	The outer boundary is the boundary of the closed outward $\epsilon$ -neighborhood $\partial((X[t]))_{\leq \epsilon}$ of the excision boundary $Y = \partial_* X[t]$ . The inner hypersurface is the smooth $\epsilon$ -regularization $Y_\epsilon$ . . . . .	78
4.9	The subdomain $\Omega$ is geodesically convex . . . . .	82
4.10	Evaluating visibility cost $v(x, z)$ for pair $(x, z) \in \Omega \times \partial_* F$ . . . . .	83
5.1	(a) Deep Zones are disjoint from $\Gamma$ -orbit. (b) Excise the Deep Zones from $X$ . (c) Optimal Semicoupling, with respect to repulsion cost, between target excision boundary (in blue) and activated source measure (in red). (d) Singularity structure (in yellow) of an optimal semicoupling between source and target with respect to repulsion cost. . . . .	93
6.1	Stitching a football $F$ from identical regular hexagons or pentagons $P_i$ . .	101
6.2	Adidas’ “Telstar” design is football stitched from white hexagon and black pentagon panels. A football can also be stitched from black triangular and white pentagonal panels. . . . .	102
6.3	Convex excision $X[t]$ relative a $\Gamma$ -equivariant excision parameter $t : \mathbb{Q}P^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . . . . .	108
6.4	Steinberg symbol in $X[t] \times \partial X[t]$ is represented as relative 1-cycle $P$ with boundary $\partial P$ equal to 0-sphere. . . . .	109
6.5	The translates by $I_0 = \{Id, \gamma, \gamma'\}$ successfully Close the Steinberg symbol. . . . .	109
6.6	Evaluating the repulsion cost relative to the repulsion-cost $\tilde{c}$ at various source points $x, x', x'', \dots$ etc. in $X[t]$ . . . . .	110
6.7	Active Domain for optimal semicoupling with respect to repulsion cost is homotopy-equivalent to the source, c.f. Theorem A. . . . .	110
6.8	Singularity Structure of optimal semicoupling. The active domain is homotopy-equivalent to one-dimensional tree, c.f. Theorem B. . . . .	111

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Our thesis develops new applications of optimal transportation to algebraic topology. Everything proceeds from a definition of “Singularity” based on Kantorovich duality, which is the fundamental linear duality of mass transport. This author is amazed by the subject of mass transportation, and has found it surprising tool for numerous topological applications. Especially surprising is the application of Singularity to explicitly constructions of new Spines long sought by geometers (e.g. [Ash84], [Thu86]).

Let  $X$  be an oriented Riemannian manifold-with-corners with boundary  $Y = \partial X$ . A topologist initially interprets Singularity as the “locus-of-discontinuity” of deformation retract maps  $r : X \rightarrow Y$ , but this definition is not topological since *continuous* retracts  $r$  from  $X$  to  $Y$  do not exist. However optimal transportation is useful setting to formally define Singularity in the category of Topology. This formalization is summarized by contravariant functors  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  between the categories of closed subsets of  $X, Y$ . The contravariant functor  $Z$  is defined via maximizers of the dual program to semicouplings programs  $Z = Z(\sigma, \tau, c)$ , introduced by [HS13, 1.(d)].

Mass transport motivates an economic definition: we say Singularity arises wherever there is competition for limited common resources. Formally we topologize this definition using duality of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings, where  $c$  is a choice of cost  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  on a given source space  $(X, \sigma)$ , target space  $(Y, \tau)$ , and defined whenever the source  $\sigma$  is *abundant* with respect to the prescribed target  $\tau$ , i.e.

$$\int_X \sigma \geq \int_Y \tau. \tag{1.1}$$

Kantorovich duality characterizes the topology of Singularity in a contravariant functor  $Z = Z(\sigma, \tau, c) : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ , defined by  $Z(Y_I) = \cap_{y \in Y_I} \partial^c \psi(y)$  whenever equation (1.1) is satisfied. Here  $\partial^c \psi(y)$  designates the  $c$ -subdifferential of a  $c$ -concave potential  $\psi^{cc} =$

$\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ . The formal definition of  $\partial^c \psi(y)$  is provided in 2.3.3. Briefly the  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c \psi(y)$  consists of all  $x \in X$  for which

$$y \in \operatorname{argmax}\{\psi(y') - c(x, y') + c(x, y) \mid y' \in Y\}.$$

The basic theory of  $c$ -concavity and  $c$ -subdifferentials is nonlinear analogue of the convexity and subdifferentials of convex lower semicontinuous functions à la Fenchel, Alexandrov, etc., for the choice of quadratic cost  $c = \operatorname{dist}^2/2$ . See [ET99], [Vil09, Ch.5] for standard definitions.

Our end goal is to apply our general theory to concrete examples and build new explicit “Spines” and “Souls” of various spaces of interest to geometers and group theorists alike. As such, this thesis has two phases. The first phase is general, and will identify hypotheses on costs  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which ensures the existence of large-codimension homotopy reductions. Our main general results are Theorems A, B, described below. In this first phase we thus introduce some general principles of Reduction-to-Singularity, as arising from duality of mass transport. The second phase is practical, and concerns the numerical applications of these general theorems. Our main practical results are Theorem C and the introduction of a subprogram we call ”Closing the Steinberg symbol” (Chapter 6), and specially designed for constructing small-dimensional  $E\Gamma$ -classifying spaces when  $\Gamma$  is a finite-dimensional Bieri-Eckmann duality group. Essentially, Closing Steinberg is a combinatorial obstruction to applying our general theorems in specific instances. We provide some proofs-of-concept of all these ideas in §§6.3–6.4 for the groups  $\Gamma = PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ ,  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ . Finally we include several conjectures, especially Conjecture 1.5.2, which assert that specific costs (namely visible repulsion costs  $c = v$ , §4.9.5) satisfy sufficient hypotheses of Theorems A and B to produce new examples of minimal spines of various  $E\Gamma$  models. We begin elaborating these ideas below.

## 1.1 Kantorovich: the Bridge from Measure to Topology

The symbols  $X, Y$  are reserved for finite-dimensional Riemannian manifolds-with-corners. We let  $\sigma, \tau$  denote Radon measures on  $X, Y$ , called the “source” and “target” measures. Typically  $\sigma \ll \operatorname{vol}_X$ ,  $\tau \ll \operatorname{vol}_Y$  are absolutely continuous with respect to the Riemannian volume measures on  $X, Y$ . Or equivalently, absolutely continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measures  $\mathcal{H}_X, \mathcal{H}_Y$ .

The present thesis develops a bridge between measure theory and algebraic topology,

as inspired from Kantorovich duality in optimal transport. The bridge leads to a new general method for constructing explicit “souls” and “spines” in numerous geometric settings. The bridge is categorical, being a contravariant functor  $Z = Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$  defined by a cost  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  between source  $(X, \sigma)$  and target  $(Y, \tau)$  measure spaces. If  $2^X, 2^Y$  denote the category of closed subsets of  $X, Y$  respectively, then  $Z$  can be represented as a contravariant correspondance  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  between closed topological subsets of  $Y$  and  $X$ . The contravariance of  $Z$  means morphisms  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y_J$  between objects of  $2^Y$  are mapped by  $Z$  to morphisms  $Z(Y_I) \hookleftarrow Z(Y_J)$  between closed subsets (i.e. objects)  $Z(Y_I), Z(Y_J)$  of  $2^X$ . See Chapter 3 and Definition 3.1.1 for details.

Contravariance has concrete consequences, producing explicit equations describing singular chains. For  $X$  a topological space, one obtains the category  $2^X$  whose objects  $X_I$  are the closed subsets of  $X$ , and whose morphisms are the inclusions  $X_I \hookrightarrow X_J$  between closed subsets  $X_I, X_J$  of  $X$  when such inclusions exist. We use the functor  $Z$  to parameterize closed subsets  $Z(Y_I) \hookrightarrow X$  according to closed subsets  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y$ , and where inclusions  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y_J$  correspond to the reverse inclusions  $Z(Y_I) \hookleftarrow Z(Y_J)$ . Assembling these elementary inclusions, we find a new “cellular” decomposition  $\{Z(Y_I)\}_{Y_I}$  of our source space  $X$ , and contravariantly parameterized by closed subsets  $Y_I$  of the target space  $Y$ . Thus we propose Kantorovich’s bridge as a contravariant functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  and a new measure-theoretic tool for explicitly constructing topologically-nontrivial subvarieties. Our thesis yields a new response to Gromov’s questions [Gro10], and illustrates the idea expressed in [Gro14a, §5.3] that “singular spaces” be replaced by contravariant functors between suitable categories. In short, a “singular space” is not a space but an object, namely a contravariant functor. These functors  $Z$  depend on the source  $\sigma$ , target  $\tau$ , choice of continuous cost function  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Our main theorems identify a local condition, which we call uniform Halfspace (UHS) conditions (see Definition 3.4.1), and our main topological Theorems A, B (see Theorems 3.4.2, 3.4.3) identifies an index  $J \geq 1$  for which the source space  $X$  can be continuously reduced via strong deformation retract to a codimension- $J$  subvariety  $Z_{J+1} \hookrightarrow X$ . This is the main topological application of our thesis. The existence of effective homotopy reductions is a fundamental problem in algebraic-topology, and especially in homological computations on large-dimensional manifolds arising as  $E\Gamma$ -models, where  $\Gamma$  is an infinite discrete (torsion-free) group. We propose a reduction-to-singularity  $X \rightsquigarrow \underline{Z}$  method constructing efficient small-dimensional classifying spaces, c.f. Chapters 5, 6, and §1.2 below. A general homotopy-reduction procedure is expressed in Theorem C, 1.5.1, which follows from our Closing Steinberg symbol construction (Definition 6.2.1 and Theorem 6.2.4).

## 1.2 Reduction-to-Singularity Principle

This section reinterprets some standard facts from algebraic topology. The author first learned the subject from [GJ81]. Standard references include [Bre93], [Bro82]. Algebraic topology is foremost based upon the singular homology functors  $H_i(-; \mathbb{Z}) : TOP \rightarrow MOD_{\mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which is the covariant functor  $X \mapsto H_*(X) = H_*(X; \mathbb{Z})$  from the category of nonpointed topological spaces to the category  $MOD_{\mathbb{Z}}$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules (additive abelian groups). The homology groups are defined on topological spaces  $X$  according to the singular chain complexes  $\{C_*^{sing}(X; \mathbb{Z}), \partial_*\}$ , and the contravariant cohomology functors  $H^*(-; \mathbb{Z}) : TOP \rightarrow MOD_{\mathbb{Z}}$  are defined via the cochain complexes  $\{C^*(X; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{Z}\}, \delta^*\}$  where  $C^*(X; \mathbb{Z}) = Hom(C_*^{sing}(X; \mathbb{Z}), \mathbb{Z})$ . The first definitive computations distinguish the one-dimensional sphere  $S^1$  from the one-dimensional line  $\mathbb{R}^1$ .

Next one deduces the nonexistence of continuous deformation retracts from the two-dimensional disk  $D$  to its boundary  $\partial D$ . It is useful to emphasize the formal negative nature of this previous sentence. The expression “there does not exist continuous deformation retracts  $D \times I \rightarrow \partial D$ ” is of course true in  $TOP$ . It is a logical deduction based on the following algebraic observation: the identity morphism  $Id : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , defined by  $n \mapsto n$  of the additive abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}$  is distinct from the zero morphism  $0_{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \mapsto 0$ . Yea  $Id_{\mathbb{Z}} \neq 0_{\mathbb{Z}}$  in  $Hom(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$ . More formally, recall the following useful definition.

**Definition 1.2.1.** Let  $X$  be a topological space, and  $Y \hookrightarrow X$  be a subset. We say  $Y$  is a strong deformation retract of  $X$  (or,  $X$  deformation retracts onto  $Y$ ) if there exists a continuous mapping  $r : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  with the following properties:

- (i) for all  $x \in X$ , we have  $r(x, 1) \in Y$  and  $r(x, 0) = x$ ;
- (ii) for all  $y \in Y$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $r(y, t) = y$ .

If  $X$  deformation retracts onto  $Y$ , then the inclusion  $i : Y \rightarrow X$  is a homotopy isomorphism and induces an isomorphism  $H_*(i) : H_*(Y; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_*(X; \mathbb{Z})$  of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules. A continuous retraction  $r : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  produces a continuous mapping  $r(x) := r(x, 1) : X \rightarrow Y$ , and this mapping induces an isomorphism  $H_*(r) : H_*(X) \rightarrow H_*(Y)$  which is inverse to  $H_*(i)$ .

**Lemma 1.2.2.** *Let  $X$  be a connected, oriented, aspherical topological space, and let  $Y \subset X$  be a homologically nontrivial closed subspace. Then there exists no continuous deformation retracts from  $X$  onto  $Y$ .*

*Proof.* The hypotheses imply  $H_*(X) = 0$  and  $H_*(Y) \neq 0$ . Suppose  $r : X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous retraction. Applying homology functors we find the composition  $H_*(r \circ i)$

$= H_*(r) \circ H_*(i)$  defines an endomorphism (algebraic self-mapping) of  $H_*(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ . Since  $X$  is homologically trivial, the induced mapping  $H_*(i)$  has zero image, and we find  $H_*(r \circ i) = H_*(r) \circ H_*(i)$  coincides with the zero endomorphism of  $H_*(Y; \mathbb{Z})$ . However if  $r$  is a strong deformation retract of  $X$  onto  $Y$ , then the composition  $r \circ i$  coincides with the identity mapping  $Id_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$ . Therefore  $H_*(r \circ i) = H_*(Id_Y)$  coincides with the identity automorphism of  $H_*(Y; \mathbb{Z})$  by functoriality. This is a formal contradiction unless  $Y$  is homologically trivial.  $\square$

The hypotheses are satisfied when  $X$  is contractible, and  $Y = \partial X$ . The topologist applies this reductio ad absurdum to deduce the following: if an oriented aspherical space  $X$  has homologically nontrivial boundary  $Y = \partial X$ , then there exists no continuous deformation retracts from  $X$  onto the boundary  $\partial X$ . Thus some essential obstruction exists.

The motivating example is this: let  $X = D^2$  be two-dimensional unit disk, with boundary  $Y = \partial X = S^1$ . Suppose the topologist attempts to construct a simple deformation retract from  $X$  to the boundary  $S^1$  and proposes the radial projection  $r(x) = x \cdot |x|^{-1}$ . Then  $r$  corresponds to a “mapping”  $X \rightarrow Y$  which is almost continuous, but having locus-of-discontinuity a single point  $\{o\}$ . Observe the inclusion of the locus-of-discontinuity  $\{o\} \hookrightarrow X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism, i.e. the singleton  $\{o\}$  is homotopic to the disk  $X$ . We claim this homotopy-isomorphism is no coincidence, but rather indicates a general principle. A further example: if  $X$  is closed disk with boundary  $Y = \partial D$ , then there exists no deformation retract  $h : X \rightarrow Y$  which has singularity equal to two distinct points  $\{a, b\}$ . Our informal proof: the inclusion  $\{a, b\} \hookrightarrow X$  is not a homotopy-isomorphism! We make these ideas rigorous in Chapters 2 and 3.

### 1.3 Cost Assumptions

Our strategy replaces continuous retracts  $r : X \rightarrow \partial X$  with  $c$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi$  from source  $(X, \sigma)$  to target  $(\partial X, \tau)$ . We present the basic theory and definitions of the semicoupling program in Chapter 2. Briefly, a semicoupling from a source  $(X, \sigma)$  to target  $(Y := \partial X, \tau)$  is a Borel measure  $\pi$  on the Cartesian product  $X \times Y$  whose marginals satisfy  $proj_X \# \pi \leq \sigma$  and  $proj_Y \# \pi = \tau$ . Here  $proj \# \pi$  denotes the pushforward measure of  $\pi$  by projection  $proj : X \rightarrow X$ , defined  $proj \# \pi[U] = \pi[proj^{-1}(U)]$ . The set of all semicouplings between source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$  is a weak-\* compact subset  $\Pi_{SC}(\sigma, \tau)$ . A  $c$ -optimal semicoupling is a semicoupling which minimizes the total cost of transport with respect to  $c$  on  $\Pi_{SC}(\sigma, \tau)$ ; see Theorems 2.3.5 and §2.2.

As we've seen, continuous retracts  $r : X \rightarrow \partial X$  are nonexistent; but optimal semi-couplings generally exist whenever  $\sigma[X] \geq \tau[Y]$ . We propose semicouplings as measure-theoretic alternatives to retractions from  $(X, \sigma)$  to  $(\partial X, \tau)$ . We measure the total cost of transport with respect to functions  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . The function  $c = c(x, y)$  represents the cost of transporting a unit mass at source  $x$  to target at  $y$ . That  $\dim(X) > \dim(\partial X)$  has important consequences throughout our thesis, especially concerning (Twist) conditions 2.5.1.

Topology forces the nonexistence of continuous retracts. Similarly the geometry of the cost  $c$  controls the topology of the locus-of-discontinuity of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings. For topology to emerge from the measure theory, we require geometric assumptions on the cost. The proofs of our Theorems A, B, C below require cost functions  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  satisfying basic assumptions labelled (A0), ..., (A5). We abbreviate  $c_y(x) := c(x, y)$ . If  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$  is a function, we let  $\text{dom}(f) := \{x \in X \mid f(x) \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . We assume  $X$  is Riemannian such that functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  have well-defined gradients  $\nabla_x f$  with respect to the  $x$ -variable. The assumptions are the following:

- (A0) The cost function  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is continuous throughout  $\text{dom}(c) \subset X \times Y$  and uniformly bounded from below, e.g.  $c \geq 0$ . Moreover we assume the sublevels  $\{x \in X \mid c(x, y) \leq t\}$  are compact subsets of  $X$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $y \in Y$ . That is, we assume  $x \mapsto c(x, y)$  is *coercive* for every  $y \in Y$ .
- (A1) The cost is twice continuously differentiable with respect to the source variable  $x$ , uniformly in  $y$  throughout  $\text{dom}(c)$ . So for every  $y \in Y$ , the Hessian function  $x \mapsto \nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y)$  exists and is continuous throughout  $\text{dom}(c_y)$ .
- (A2) The function  $(x, y) \mapsto \|\nabla_x c(x, y)\|$  is upper semicontinuous throughout  $\text{dom}(c)$ . So for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  the superlevel set  $\{\|\nabla_x c(x, y)\| \geq t\}$  is a closed subset of  $\text{dom}(c)$ .
- (A3) For every  $y \in Y$ , we assume  $x' \mapsto \nabla_x c(x', y)$  does not vanish identically on any open subset of  $\text{dom}(c_y)$ .
- (A4) The cost satisfies (Twist) condition with respect to the source variable throughout  $\text{dom}(c)$ . So for every  $x'$  the rule  $y \mapsto \nabla_x c(x', y)$  defines an injective mapping  $\text{dom}(c_{x'}) \rightarrow T_{x'} X$ . See Definition 4.3.5.

The above assumptions (A0)–(A4) are familiar hypotheses from mass transport. We will prove (A0)–(A4) implies the general uniqueness of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings. Peculiar to the semicoupling setting is (A4), which requires injectivity of mappings  $y \mapsto \nabla_x c(x, y) : Y \rightarrow T_x X$  for every  $x \in X$ , where  $\dim(Y) < \dim(X)$ .

A further assumption (A5) is convenient for the deformation retracts constructed in the present thesis. These retracts depend on the nonvanishing of certain “averaged” vector fields denoted  $\eta_{avg}(x) \in T_x X$  (see Equations (2.15), (2.18) and Definition 3.4.1). The formal definition of  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  is technical, but can be summarized as follows.

- (A5)** The averaged vectors  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  defined in (2.15), (2.18), 3.4.1 are bounded away from zero, uniformly with  $x \in X_0$ , for appropriate subsets  $X_0$  of  $X$  (see hypotheses of Theorems 2.6.2, 3.4.2, 3.4.3).

A precise formulation of (A5) is the Property (C) defined in 2.6.4 and (2.14), and the Uniform Halfspace (UHS) Conditions defined in 3.4.1.

The consequences of Assumptions (A0), (A1), ... will be clarified as our thesis progresses. In the simplest case where the source and target spaces  $X, Y$  are compact, and  $c$  is smooth and finite-valued throughout  $X \times Y$ , then Assumptions (A0)–(A2) are readily confirmed. Assumption (A3) forbids the cost  $c(x, y)$  from being locally constant on any open subset of  $X$ . Assumption (A4) is more discriminate. Indeed the continuously differentiable functions  $x \mapsto c_\Delta(x; y, y')$  necessarily have critical points if  $X$  is closed compact space. The Assumption (A4) implies the cross-differences  $\nabla_x c_\Delta(x, y, y')$  are nonzero for distinct  $y, y'$ , where  $c_\Delta(x; y, y') := c(x, y) - c(x, y')$  is the two-pointed cross difference. In practice, costs  $c$  which have poles, e.g.  $c(x, y) = +\infty$  when  $x = y$ , will more readily satisfy (A4).

There is further technically convenient assumption on the cost:

- (A6)** For every  $x \in X$ , the function  $y \mapsto c(x, y)$  is continuously differentiable; and for every  $y \in Y$ , the gradients  $\nabla_y c(x, y)$  are bounded on compact subsets  $K \subset X$ .

The Assumption (A6) is useful in the construction of our deformation retracts in Theorems 2.6.2, 3.4.2, 3.4.3 below.

## 1.4 Deformation Retracts and Topological Theorems A,B

We continue to assume  $X, Y$  are Riemannian manifolds-with-corners, and suppose  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is a cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4). Let  $\mathcal{H}_Y$  be the Hausdorff measure on the Riemannian manifold-with-corners  $Y$ .

For abundant source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$ , there exists a unique  $c$ -optimal semicoupling  $\pi_{opt}$  from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$ . See §§2.4–2.5 below. Uniqueness results also established in [HS13], [CM10].

According to Kantorovich's duality theorem (§2.3), there exists  $c$ -concave potentials  $\psi^{cc} = \psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  whose  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c \psi : Y \rightarrow 2^X$  is uniquely prescribed by  $\pi_{opt}$ . Thus  $\pi_{opt}$  is supported on the graph of a measurable mapping  $\partial^c \psi^c$  in  $X \times Y$ . This is the central idea of our thesis, and developed further in §2.2 below.

The  $c$ -optimal semicoupling will not “activate” all the source measure for transport to  $\tau$  whenever  $\sigma[X] > \tau[Y]$ . Equivalently, the domain  $dom(\psi^c)$  is a nontrivial subset of the source  $X$ . Informally,  $c$ -optimal semicouplings will first allocate as much as possible from low-cost regions of the source. The union of all these activated low-cost regions defines a closed domain designated  $A \hookrightarrow X$ . Specifically we define  $A := \cup_{y \in Y} \partial^c \psi(y)$ .

Our first Theorem A describes a criteria to ensure the activated source  $A \hookrightarrow X$  includes into the source as homotopy-isomorphism.

**Theorem A.** *Let  $c$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4) and (A6). Suppose the source  $\sigma$  and target measure  $\tau$  are absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}_X$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_Y$ , respectively. Let  $A$  be the active domain of a  $c$ -optimal semicoupling from source  $(X, \sigma)$  to target  $(Y, \tau)$ .*

*Suppose every  $x_0 \in X - A$  has property that the closed convex hull*

$$\{\nabla_x c(x_0, y) \mid y \in dom(c_{x_0})\}$$

*in  $T_{x_0} X$  does not contain the origin  $0 \in T_{x_0} X$ ; and moreover suppose*

$$\|\nabla_x c(x_0, y)\| \geq C > 0$$

*for a constant  $C$  uniform in  $y \in dom(c_{x_0})$ . Then the inclusion  $A \hookrightarrow X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism and there exists a strong deformation retract.*

In fact we prove a stronger result in Theorems 3.4.2, 3.4.3 below and replace the hypothesis on the convex hull of  $\{\nabla_x c(x', y)\} \subset T_{x'} X$  with our Uniform Halfspace (UHS) condition. See Definition 3.4.1. Briefly, we say (UHS) conditions are satisfied throughout  $X - A$  if there exists a constant  $C > 0$  such that for every  $x' \in X - A$ , the average of  $\{\nabla_x c(x', y) \mid y \in dom(c_{x'})\}$  with respect to the Hausdorff measure  $\mathcal{H}_Y$  on  $dom(c_{x'})$  in  $T_{x'} X$  is nonzero, and this average

$$\eta_{avg}(x') := (\mathcal{H}_Y[Y])^{-1} \int_{dom(c_{x'})} \nabla_x c(x', y) d\mathcal{H}_Y(y)$$

has norm bounded below

$$\|\eta_{avg}(x')\| \geq C \int_{\text{dom}(c_{x'})} \|\nabla_x c(x', y)\| d\mathcal{H}_Y(y).$$

The assumption (A5) is key technical hypothesis for constructing the deformation retract in Theorem A. Without the inequality, our methods could only conclude that the source  $X$  deformation retracts onto  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood  $A_\epsilon = \{x \in X | d(x, A) < \epsilon\} \hookrightarrow X$  of  $A \hookrightarrow X$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$  is a sufficiently small real number. We strengthen the Assumption (A5) with our so-called uniform Halfspace (UHS) condition. These ideas are detailed in §§2.6, 3.4.

*Remark.* Theorem A has the following application to quadratic costs  $c = d^2/2$ . Specifically we consider quadratic costs  $c(x, y) = \|x - y\|^2/2$  for closed subsets  $X, Y$  in some Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . Observe the closed convex hull  $\{\nabla_x c(x_0, y)\}_{y \in Y}$  contains the origin if and only if  $x_0$  lies in the convex hull of  $Y$ . Therefore if the activated domain  $A$  of a  $d^2/2$ -optimal semicoupling contains the convex hull  $\text{conv}(Y) \subset A$ , then Theorem A implies the inclusion  $A \subset X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism. The proof of Theorem A constructs an explicit strong deformation retract of  $X$  onto  $A$ . We find  $A$  contains  $\text{conv}(Y)$  whenever the ratio  $\int_X \sigma / \int_Y \sigma > 1$  is sufficiently close to  $1^+$ , i.e. whenever the active domain  $A$  is a sufficiently large subset of  $X$ .

The applications of quadratic cost to closed convex sets  $X$  with target  $Y = \mathcal{E}[X]$  equal to the extreme points of  $X$  is limited. Indeed the active domain  $A$  of optimal semicouplings is a strictly proper subset of  $X$ , and every point  $x_0 \in X - A$  in the complement fails to satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem A. For applications to source convex subsets  $X$  and targets  $Y = \mathcal{E}[X]$ , the observations of the previous paragraph motivate our introduction of anti-quadratic costs called “repulsion” costs. As we develop our applications below, we shall verify our repulsion costs satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem A for general semicouplings.

Now Theorem A is but a first step. Our next Theorem B constructs further homotopy-reductions from the active domains  $A \subset X$  to higher codimension closed subvarieties  $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow A$ . We use “subvariety” in the original sense of Poincaré and Thom: a subvariety is a subset described by the vanishing of a collection of continuously differentiable functions. In practice one finds the singularity structure naturally cellulated by “local cells” and admits a filtration

$$(X =: Z_0) \hookleftarrow (A =: Z_1) \hookleftarrow Z_2 \hookleftarrow Z_3 \hookleftarrow \dots$$

of  $X$  into closed subvarieties  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$ . For every integer  $j \geq 1$ , we heuristically define  $Z_j$  to be the subset of  $x \in X$  where the local tangent cone is at least  $j$ -dimensional at  $x$ ; the formal definition is provided in §3.3, c.f. Propositions 3.2.3, 3.3.4. Our next result identifies the maximal index  $J \geq 0$  such that  $X \hookrightarrow Z_{J+1}$  is a homotopy-isomorphism, and indeed a strong deformation retract.

**Theorem 1.4.1** (Theorem B). *Let  $c$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A5). Let  $j \geq 1$  be integer. Suppose*

- (i) *for every  $x' \in Z_j - Z_{j+1}$  the collection of tangent vectors  $\{\eta(x', y) | y \in \text{dom}(c_{x'}) - \partial^c \psi^c(x')\}$  defined in (3.6) satisfies (UHS) condition, and*
- (ii) *for every  $x' \in Z_j - Z_{j+1}$  the intersection  $\partial^c \psi^c(x') \cap Z_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Then the inclusion  $Z_{j+1} \hookrightarrow Z_j$  is a homotopy-isomorphism.*

*Furthermore if  $J \geq 1$  is the maximal integer such that every  $x' \in Z_J - Z_{J+1}$  satisfies conditions (i) and (ii), then the inclusion  $Z_{J+1} \hookrightarrow Z_1$  is a homotopy-isomorphism and there exists an explicit strong deformation retract.*

In practice the hypotheses (i), (ii) of Theorem 1.4.1 may be difficult to verify. The condition (i) requires specific “average” vectors  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  and their projections  $\text{proj}_{Z'} \eta_{avg}(x)$  be simultaneously nonvanishing for a descending chain of subvarieties  $\{Z'\}$ . We elaborate further in Chapter 2.3.

Interesting applications arise when the target is the boundary  $Y = \partial X$  of the source  $X$ . Combining Theorems A, B, we find cost functions  $c : X \times \partial X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A6) and sufficient (UHS) conditions produce codimension- $J$  deformations of the initial source space  $X$  onto locally-lipschitz subvarieties  $Z_{J+1}$ , where  $J$  is an index  $\geq 1$ . We propose the subvarieties  $Z_{J+1}$  produced by Theorems A and B explicitly construct “souls” generalizing the Cheeger-Gromoll-Perelman methods and illustrate examples in Chapters 4, 5, 6.

## 1.5 Closing the Steinberg symbol and Theorem C

The second phase of our thesis develops a method of constructing small-dimensional  $E\Gamma$  classifying spaces, where  $\Gamma$  is an infinite discrete Bieri-Eckmann duality group of dimension  $\nu$  and with dualizing module  $\mathbf{D}$ . The setting implies  $\Gamma$  is finitely-generated, virtually-torsion free. Ex.  $\Gamma = GL(\mathbb{Z}^2), GL(\mathbb{Z}^3), Sp(\mathbb{Z}^4), G(\mathbb{Z})$  arithmetic groups, mapping class groups  $MCG(\Sigma_g)$  of closed surfaces, knot-groups, etc. Our goal:

Given a finitely generated group  $\Gamma$  satisfying Bieri-Eckmann’s homological duality [BE73], to display an  $E\Gamma$ -model  $X$  with proper-discontinuous free

action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  having topological dimension  $\dim(X)$  equal to the virtual cohomological dimension  $vcd(\Gamma)$  of the group  $\Gamma$ .

This problem has been intensively studied since Borel-Serre's computation  $vcd(G(\mathbb{Z})) = \dim(K \backslash ^0 G(\mathbb{R})) - \text{rank}_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ , where  $G$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split reductive linear algebraic group scheme, c.f. [BS73], [Ser71]. For instance  $vcd(GL(\mathbb{Z}^2)) = 2-1 = 1$ ,  $vcd(Sp(\mathbb{Z}^4)) = 5-2 = 3$ . For groups  $G$  with  $\mathbb{Q}$ -rank equal to one, the problem simplifies since numerous adhoc methods are available for continuously retracting an open manifold onto a codimension-one hypersurface, c.f. [Yas07]. But a general method has been apparently hidden from sight for higher codimensions, with the notable exceptions of [Gro91], [Ash84], [Sou78], [MM93].

We propose our Theorems A, B yield a new technique for constructing homotopy-reductions of large-codimension based on the reduction-to-singularity idea. To implement the Theorems A, B however require some further ideas. We assume a user first has an explicit geometric  $E\Gamma$  model  $X$  available for sampling, e.g.  $(X, d)$  an finite-dimensional Cartan-Hadamard space with isometric group action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  which is proper discontinuous, free, and with finite volume quotient. Typically the space dimension  $\dim(X)$  is much larger than the cohomological dimension  $\nu := cd(\Gamma)$ ,  $\nu \ll \dim(X)$ . To effectively construct  $E\Gamma$  models  $\mathcal{Z}$  with  $\dim(\mathcal{Z}) = \nu$  is largely unsolved problem. Our thesis constructs new  $\Gamma$ -invariant closed subsets  $\mathcal{Z}$  with  $\dim(\mathcal{Z}) \ll \dim(X)$  and for which  $\mathcal{Z} \hookrightarrow X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism and construct  $\Gamma$ -equivariant homotopy-reductions  $X \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{Z}$ . Our retractions are geometric-flows which continuously collapse  $X$  onto a large-codimension subvariety  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

Given an initial  $E\Gamma$ -model  $X$ , our technique exhibits the large-codimension retract as the locus-of-discontinuity of a “retraction” (i.e.  $c$ -optimal semicoupling) from  $X$  to the boundary  $\partial X$ . *But which boundary, which cost?*

Our thesis studies these questions with our rational excision models and repulsion costs. The excision models  $X[t] := X - \cup_{\{t\}} W_t$  are obtained by equivariantly scooping-out/excising  $\Gamma$ -rational horoballs  $W_t$  from  $X$ . The family of horoballs  $\{W_t\}$  are constant-curvature halfspaces far at-infinity. The  $\Gamma$ -rationality implies  $X[t]$  and  $\partial X[t]$  are  $\Gamma$ -invariant subsets of  $X$ . Crucially they inherit proper-discontinuous actions

$$X[t] \times \Gamma \rightarrow X[t], \quad \partial X[t] \times \Gamma \rightarrow \partial X[t].$$

The key property of our excisions  $X[t]$  is that the reduced-homology of the boundary  $\mathbf{D} := \tilde{H}_*(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$ , with its natural  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module structure, is explicit resolution of the Bieri-Eckmann dualizing module for  $\Gamma$ .

The homological modules  $\mathbf{D} := \tilde{H}_*(\partial X[t])$  are called Steinberg modules. The  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $\mathbf{D}$  is principal and infinite cyclic, generated by a cycle  $[B]$ . I.e.  $[B]$  is a basic “sphere-at-infinity” and are called Steinberg symbols. Contractibility of  $X[t]$ , the standard long-exact sequence of relative homology, and the  $\kappa \leq 0$  geometry of  $X$  implies the boundary map  $\partial : H_{*+1}(X[t], \partial X[t]) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_*(\partial X[t])$  is an isomorphism and with inverse given by “flat filling”. Now the relative cycle  $FILL[B]$  is also called a Steinberg symbol and is a disk. The dimension of this disk is precisely the maximal codimension of a spine. Homological duality implies this disk  $FILL[B]$  is dual, with respect to intersection homology, to the spine fundamental class. Therefore minimal spines are transverse to Steinberg symbols and intersect precisely at a point. But we see how the Steinberg symbol retracts to a point  $FILL[B] \sim pt$ . Our goal is to interpolate this retraction throughout  $X[t]$  to obtain  $X[t] \sim Z$ . We achieve this interpolation using the singularity functor arising from our two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}$  defined in §4.4 and extended to visibility costs in §4.9.5.

Next we replace the excision  $X[t]$  with a chain sum  $\underline{F}$ , where  $\Gamma$  acts on  $\underline{F}$  as a type of shift operator. For formal definition of “chain sum” we refer the reader to [GJ81] or any reference of singular homology. The chain summands of  $\underline{F}$  are a principal  $\Gamma$ -set, and the action  $\underline{F} \times \Gamma \rightarrow \underline{F}$  is equivariantly isomorphic to  $\Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ . These chain sums are defined by the user solving an elementary combinatorial subprogram we call Closing the Steinberg symbol, to be introduced in Chapter 6. The problem of Closing Steinberg is motivated by the following question. Suppose we have a countable collection of embedded isometric equilateral triangles  $\{\blacktriangle_i\}_{i \in I}$ , where each  $\blacktriangle_i$  has a prescribed embedding  $\blacktriangle_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  into some  $d$ -dimensional affine space. Evidently each triangle  $\blacktriangle$  is 2-dimensional with boundary  $\partial\blacktriangle = \Delta$ . The question is: can we determine a finite subset  $I' \subset I$  for which the chain sum  $\sum_{I'} \blacktriangle_i$  has chain boundary

$$\partial(\sum_{I'} \blacktriangle_i) = \sum_{I'} \partial\blacktriangle_i = \sum_{I'} \Delta_i$$

vanishing over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -coefficients? In otherwords, can we arrange the triangles  $\blacktriangle_i$  to form the boundary of a cube, or regular platonic solid, or some other closed convex polyhedron? The reference [GS80] contains useful related background information.

There is important interpretation of Closing Steinberg in terms of algebraic topology and group-cohomology. Let  $C_q$  be the  $q$ -th singular homology groups. Algebraically we find the finite subset  $I$  of  $\Gamma$ , which Closes Steinberg and defines the convex base-chain  $F = F(I)$  in  $\underline{F}$  corresponds to a symbol  $\xi \in C_q(X, \partial X; \mathbb{Z}/2)$  satisfying  $\partial_0 \xi = 0$  with respect to the formal boundary operator  $\partial_0 : C_q(X, \partial X; \mathbb{Z}/2) \rightarrow C_{q-1}(\partial X; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ . This




Figure 1.1: When  $\partial(A + B + C) = 0 \pmod{2}$ , we define  $F = \text{conv}(A, B, C)$

algebraic-topological interpretation is further developed in Chapters 5.

Our method is defined for groups  $\Gamma$  satisfying Bieri-Eckmann's homological duality generalizing Poincaré duality [BE73]. Specifically, Closing Steinberg amounts to constructing a nontrivial 0-cycle  $\xi \in H_0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma \otimes \mathbf{D})$ . Here  $\mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma := \underline{\mathbb{Z}/2} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$  is the induced  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module with coefficients over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ , considered as trivial  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module. We remark that Bieri-Eckmann duality implies  $H_0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma \otimes \mathbf{D}) \approx H^\nu(\Gamma; \underline{\mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma}) \neq 0$  where  $\nu = vcd(\Gamma)$ .

In applications below the triangles  $\blacktriangle$  are replaced with a flat-filled relative chain  $B \in C_q(X[t], \partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$  whose chain-boundary  $\partial[B]$  is generator of Steinberg module  $\mathbf{D}$ . To Close the Steinberg symbol requires finding a finite subset  $I$  of  $\Gamma$  for which the translates  $B.I$  have positions in  $(X[t], \partial X[t])$  bounding a closed geodesically convex domain  $F = \text{conv}[B.I]$ . The symmetry group  $\Gamma$  acts isometrically on  $X[t] \times \partial X[t]$ , and we form the chain sum  $\underline{F} := \text{SUM}[F(I).\Gamma]$ , of the  $\Gamma$ -translates of the convex base chain  $F = F(I)$ . Our hypotheses ensure the chain sum  $\underline{F}$  becomes a cubical fundamental class. The chain sum  $\underline{F}$  can be interpreted as a “partition-of-unity” of the support  $\text{supp}(\underline{F}) \subset X$ . To successfully close the Steinberg symbol allows the user to replace a space  $X$  with  $\text{supp}(\underline{F})$  and the chain sum  $\underline{F}$ . Our hypotheses of Closing Steinberg (see 6.2.1, 6.2.4) ensures the support  $\text{supp}(\underline{F})$  is aspherical and homotopy-equivalent to  $X$ .

The above Theorems A, B are general topological theorems obtained by our semi-coupling methods. The theorems require costs  $c$  which satisfy the necessary hypotheses. As we elaborated above, the quadratic costs are not sufficient, and we find best results obtained with our anti-quadratic repulsion costs. The preferred cost for our applications are the “visibility costs” defined in Chapter 4 below. The following Theorem C summarizes our applications of the previous Theorems A, B. The theorem is a multi-stepped




Figure 1.2: A chain sum  $\underline{F} = \sum_{i \in I} F_i$  with well-separated one-dimensional gates

reduction program with input a geometric  $E\Gamma$  model  $X$ , and outputs a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant homotopy reduction of  $X$  onto a codimension- $J$  closed subvariety  $\underline{Z}$  where the index  $J \geq 0$  is defined according to the hypotheses of Theorems A, B.

**Theorem 1.5.1** (Reduction Program). *Let  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  be a geometric  $E\Gamma$ -model with  $\Gamma$ -invariant volume measure  $\sigma$ . (c.f. Definition 5.1.2). Then we identify an index  $J \geq 0$  and a codimension- $J$  closed subvariety  $\underline{Z}$  by executing the following steps:*

(i) *Construct a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant excision  $X[t]$  for which  $\mathbf{D} := \tilde{H}_q(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$  is the Steinberg module of  $\Gamma$ . (c.f. Chapter 5). Let  $\tau$  be a  $\Gamma$ -invariant volume measure on  $\partial X[t]$  such that*

$$\int_{X[t]/\Gamma} \sigma / \int_{\partial X[t]} \tau > 1.$$

(ii) *Find a finite subset  $I \subset \Gamma$  which successfully Closes the Steinberg symbol, and replace the excision model  $X[t] \times \partial X[t]$  with the chain sum  $\underline{F} \times \partial_*[\underline{F}]$ , where  $\underline{F} := \text{SUM}[F, \Gamma]$  and  $F := \text{conv}[B, I]$ . (c.f. Definition 6.2.1 and Theorem 6.2.4).*

(iii) *Let  $v : \underline{F} \times \partial_*[\underline{F}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be the visible repulsion cost (§4.9), and solve the  $v$ -optimal semicoupling program between source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$ . Kantorovich duality yields dual potentials  $\psi^v, \psi$  on  $\underline{F}, \partial_*[\underline{F}]$ , where  $\psi = \psi^{vv}$  is  $v$ -concave potential; obtain Kantorovich's singularity functor  $Z : 2^{\partial X[t]} \rightarrow 2^{X[t]}$  via Definition 3.1.1.*

(iv) *Using the singularity functor  $Z$ , filtrate the source  $Z_0 \leftarrow Z_1 \leftarrow Z_2 \leftarrow \dots$ , where*

$$Z_j = \{x \in Z_1 \mid \dim_x Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x)) \geq j\}$$

for index  $j \geq 1$ . Construct homotopy-reductions  $Z(Y_I) \rightsquigarrow Z(Y_J)$  for  $Y_I \subset Y_J$ , wherever sufficient Halfspace Conditions are satisfied according to Theorems A, B. (c.f. Theorems 2.6.2, 3.4.2, 3.4.3).

**(Output)** Let  $J \geq 1$  be maximal index where sufficient Halfspace conditions are satisfied throughout  $Z_J$ . Obtain the continuously assembled  $\Gamma$ -equivariant chain sum  $\underline{Z} := Z_{J+1}$ . Then  $\underline{Z} \hookrightarrow X[t]$  is a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant codimension- $J$  homotopy reduction of  $X$ .

We emphasize that the primary obstruction to the reduction program of Theorem C is verifying the uniform Halfspace (UHS) conditions throughout the necessary subdomains. For general costs this appears difficult problem. The (UHS) conditions amount to requiring an average gradient vector  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  (defined in (3.7)) be nonzero, and have a sequence of nonzero projections  $proj_{Z'}\eta_{avg}(x) \neq 0$  for select closed subvarieties  $Z'$  containing  $x$  in  $X$ . See §3.4 and Definition 3.4.1 for details.

The definition of Closing Steinberg is specially adapted to geometric  $E\Gamma$  models as described in §§6.3, 6.4 below when  $\Gamma$  is a standard arithmetic group. Thus we conjecture that Theorems A,B yield singularity structures which can be homotopy-reduced to the maximal codimension, and thus we propose new  $E\Gamma$ -models  $\underline{Z}$  with space dimension equal to the cohomological dimension of  $\Gamma$ . We conjecture that our two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}$  and visibility cost  $v$  satisfy the Conditions (D0)–(D4) from §4.2.

**Conjecture 1.5.2.** *Under the hypotheses of Theorem C (1.5.1), we conjecture that*

*(i) the visible repulsion cost  $v$  satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A5); and*

*(ii) when the ratio*

$$\int_{X[t]/\Gamma} d\sigma(x) / \int_{\partial X[t]/\Gamma} d\tau(y)$$

*is sufficiently close to  $1^+$ , the activated source  $A = Z_1$  of the unique  $v$ -optimal semicoupling is a continuous equivariant deformation retract of the source domain  $X[t] \approx X$ ;*

*(iii) and the maximal index  $J \geq 1$  for which (UHS) conditions are satisfied is equal to  $J = q + 1$ , where  $q$  is the topological dimension of spheres generating the Steinberg module  $\mathbf{D}$  ;*

*(iv) and the inclusion  $Z_{J+1} \hookrightarrow X$  is a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant homotopy-isomorphism, and even a strong deformation retract with  $\dim(Z_{J+1}) = cd(\Gamma)$ .*

Thus Conjecture 1.5.2 proposes the subvariety  $Z_{J+1} \hookrightarrow X$  is a minimal-dimension spine of  $E\Gamma$ , and our Theorems A, B describes explicit deformation retract. The Conjecture 1.5.2 demands several steps be verified. First we need verify the differential-geometric (Twist) condition for  $v$  in (C1). This requires the function  $dom(v_{x'}) \rightarrow T_{x'}\underline{F}$  defined by the rule  $y \mapsto \nabla_x v(x', y)$  be injective for every choice of  $x'$  in  $\underline{F}$ . The second step (C2)

establishes the homotopy-isomorphism between the activated source domains inclusion  $(Z_1 = A) \hookrightarrow (Z_0 = \underline{F})$  of the  $v$ -optimal semicoupling. Step (C3) requires verifying that maximal (UHS) conditions are satisfied throughout the subvarieties  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  and their local “cells”  $Z' = Z(\partial^v \psi^v(x'))$ , where  $\psi^v$  is the  $v$ -convex potential output by Kantorovich duality. The author is presently incapable of establishing the steps (C1), (C2), .... We leave this to future investigations.

## 1.6 Thesis Outline

Now we outline the contents of our thesis. Our thesis has two phases. The first phase is general, and develops our applications of optimal transport (and specifically the category of semicouplings) to algebraic topology. In Chapter 2 we develop the principles of the semicoupling program: existence, uniqueness, and Kantorovich duality for costs satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4), and we conclude Chapter 2 with the proof of Theorem A, which is the base case for the larger-codimension retracts constructed in the next chapters. The key technical hypothesis called uniform Halfspace (UHS) conditions is detailed in Definition 2.6.4 (especially estimate (2.14)). The (UHS) conditions gives a strong form of Assumption (A5) necessary for the deformation retracts constructed throughout our thesis.

Our Chapter 3 develops the basic geometric properties of Kantorovich’s contravariant singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ . §3.1 is central to our thesis, especially Definition 3.1.1. §3.2 describes the local topology of the singularities and proves a useful codimension estimate. Assuming the cost satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A5) and sufficient (UHS) conditions, we conclude Chapter 3 with the proof of our Theorem B; see Theorems 3.4.2, 3.4.3 from §3.4. Thus with Chapters 2, 3 we establish general method for constructing strong deformation retracts based on Kantorovich duality and optimal transport.

The general results of the previous chapters require special costs for our applications. Chapter 4 introduces a new class of cost functions, so-called “repulsion”, “(average) two-point repulsion”, and “visibility” costs. These repulsion costs are distinct from the familiar “attraction” costs, e.g. quadratic costs  $c = d^2/2$ . Our repulsion costs have natural physical interpretations in terms of electron–electron interactions described below. To apply the homotopy-reductions of Theorems A, B however require we verify the repulsion costs satisfy the necessary Assumptions (A0)–(A5). In this direction, our thesis admittedly achieves only partial results. Specifically, we easily find the costs satisfy Assumptions (A0)–(A3). We only succeed in demonstrating (A4) for the repulsion cost denoted  $c|\tau$  (Definition 4.3.3, Prop. 4.3.5). However we present simple heuristics

suggesting the costs satisfy the Assumption (A4), i.e. (Twist).

The remaining Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 develop the applications of our repulsion costs and singularity functors to constructing finite-dimensional  $E\Gamma$  models. In Chapter 5 we let  $\Gamma$  designate a countable discrete group, and describe the background on  $E\Gamma$ -models  $X$ , and their  $\Gamma$ -equivariant excision models  $X[t]$ , which are manifolds-with-corners having  $\Gamma$ -invariant topological boundary  $\partial X[t]$ . The results of Chapter 5 are surely well-known to the experts, although our emphasis on excisions rather than bordifications has perhaps been unappreciated hitherto. This is the key to applying our semicoupling methods to  $E\Gamma$  models, and we outline the basic ideas in §5.3. The excision construction, and its relation to Bieri-Eckmann's homological duality is described in §5.4 and summarized in Theorem 5.5.2. This theorem appears in various forms throughout the literature, e.g. it is effectively Borel-Serre's rational bordification model from [BS73], coupled with our own variation of Grayson's construction [Gra84]. The final Chapter 6 introduces the problem of Closing the Steinberg symbol, which is a homological subprogram we discovered to replace the excision model  $X[t]$  with a cubical chain sum  $\underline{F}$ . This idea is defined and established in Definition 6.2.1 and Theorem 6.2.4, respectively. Successfully Closing Steinberg is key step towards the effective application of our semicoupling method to topological  $E\Gamma$  models. The key feature of  $\underline{F}$  is that  $\Gamma$  acts as shift-operator on the summands of  $\underline{F}$ . The summands of  $\underline{F}$  are closed convex bodies on which we install the repulsion costs from previous Chapter 4, and can therefore implement the reduction-program detailed in Theorem C. We conclude with some basic examples of Closing Steinberg in the remaining §§6.3 and 6.4.

## 1.7 Conventions and Notations

Throughout the thesis we adopt the following conventions: we let  $X, Y$  denote manifolds-with-corners, equipped with a riemannian distance functions  $d = dist_X, dist_Y$ . See [BS73, Appendix] for formal definitions regarding “les variétés à coins”. Briefly we recall a space  $X$  is a manifold-with-corners if  $X$  is locally modelled (via diffeomorphisms) to sectors  $\mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$  for various integers  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , where  $n = \dim(X)$  and  $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, +\infty)$ . We let  $vol_X$  and  $vol_Y$  be the volume measures on  $X, Y$ . Alternatively the Hausdorff measures  $\mathcal{H}^n$  of dimensions  $n = \dim(X), \dim(Y)$  respectively. We abbreviate  $\mathcal{H}_X = \mathcal{H}^{\dim(X)}$ . We reserve  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  for Radon measures on  $X$  and  $Y$ , called “source” and “target” measures, respectively. Typically  $\sigma, \tau$  are absolutely-continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measures  $\mathcal{H}_X, \mathcal{H}_Y$ . The support  $supp(\mu)$  of a Radon measure  $\mu$  is the minimal closed subset of full  $\mu$ -measure. The domain  $dom(f)$  of a function  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  consists

of all points  $x$  where  $f(x) < +\infty$ .

The singularity structures arising from our thesis are assembled from closed subvarieties of the source space. We follow Poincaré's original terminology of “varieties” and “subvarieties” from [Poi95, §§10–12]. In this thesis a subvariety  $Z$  of  $X$  is a closed subset defined by a collection of explicit equations (c.f. §3.2). If the equations are described by Lipschitz (or DC) functions, then we call  $Z$  a Lipschitz (or DC) subvariety.

A topological space  $X$  is aspherical if  $X$  is connected and all homotopy-groups of the universal cover  $\tilde{X}$  are trivial. If  $X$  has the structure of a locally finite cell complex, then  $X$  is aspherical if and only if  $\tilde{X}$  is contractible. A continuous map  $f : X \rightarrow X'$  between topological spaces is a homotopy-isomorphism if the induced maps  $\pi_i(f) : \pi_i(X) \rightarrow \pi_i(X')$  are isomorphisms for all homotopy groups  $\pi_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . According to Whitehead's Theorem [Bre93, §VII.11],  $f$  is a homotopy-isomorphism if and only if the morphisms induced on homology  $H_i(f) : H_i(X) \rightarrow H_i(X')$  are isomorphisms for all  $i$ . A space  $X$  deformation retracts onto the subspace  $A$  if there exists a continuous map  $h : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  such that  $h(x, 0) = x$ ,  $h(x, 1) \in A$ ,  $h(a, t) = a$  for all  $x \in X$ ,  $a \in A$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ . A deformation retract  $h$  defines homotopy-isomorphisms  $x \mapsto h(x, 1)$ . For the formal definitions of chain complexes, chain maps, cochain complexes, cochain maps, and the Koszul complex, we refer the reader to [Lan05, §§XX.1-2, XXI.1,2,4]. The singular chain groups  $\{C_q^{sing}(X) | q = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  on a topological space  $X$  are formally defined in [GJ81], or [Bre93, Chapter IV]. For the definition of simplicial chain groups, see [Bre93, p. IV.21].

The identity mapping on whatever set is denoted  $Id$ . A category  $C$  is a collection of objects  $Obj(C)$  (a set), and a collection of morphisms between objects  $Hom_C(X, Y)$  (the set of morphisms in  $C$  between objects  $X, Y$ ) with the property that compositions of morphisms is well-defined in  $C$  and associative, and for every object  $X$  the identity mapping  $Id_X \in Hom_C(X, X)$ . A subcategory  $C'$  of  $C$  is a category whose objects are a subset of the objects of  $C$ , and where  $Hom_{C'}(X, Y) \subset Hom_C(X, Y)$  for every pair of objects in  $C'$ . A functor  $F : C \rightarrow D$  between categories  $C, D$  is for every object  $X$  in  $C$ , and object  $F(X)$  in  $D$ , and for every morphism  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $C$ , a morphism  $F(f) : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y)$  in  $D$ . The functor  $F$  is contravariant if  $F(f \circ g) = F(g) \circ F(f)$  for every pair of morphisms  $f, g$  in  $C$  with composition  $f \circ g$  in  $C$ . The functor is covariant if  $F(f \circ g) = F(f) \circ F(g)$ . See [Lan05, p. 1.11] for complete definitions. We let  $F$  denote a geodesically convex compact subset in a complete riemannian manifold, and  $\mathcal{E}$  denotes the extreme-point functor, where  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  consists of the extreme-points on  $F$ .

The symbol  $\Gamma$  designates an infinite torsion-free discrete group. Following standard notation,  $E\Gamma$  is the universal cover  $\tilde{X}$  of an Eilenberg–MacLane space  $X = K(\Gamma, 1)$ . We

let  $cd(\Gamma)$  denote the cohomological dimension of  $\Gamma$ , and equal to the unique integer  $\nu \geq 0$  for which the group-theoretic cohomology group  $H^\nu(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$  is nonzero. A *conv $\mathcal{E}$ -chain sum* is a simplicial chain sum, where each summand has image isometric to a compact convex set. A cubulation of a group  $\Gamma$  is an  $E\Gamma$ -model which has explicit cellular structure defined in terms of isometric identifications between cubes  $I^n = [0, 1]^n$  for  $n \geq 0$ , with additional “wall-structures”. Precise definitions are given in §6.2 in terms of chain sums and “gates”, e.g. Definition 4.1.1.

# Chapter 2

## Semicoupling Programs and Topological Theorem A

Our thesis relates algebraic topology to measure theory by replacing “*continuous deformation retracts*  $r : X \rightarrow Y$ ” (which are nonexistent according to Brouwer’s theorem, §1.2), with “*c-optimal semicouplings*  $\pi_{opt}$ ” between a source  $(X, \sigma)$  and target  $(Y, \tau)$ , where  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is a cost function satisfying various Assumptions (A0), (A1), . . . introduced in Section 1.3.

We begin with the definition of semicoupling. A semicoupling is a Radon measure  $\pi$  on the Cartesian product  $X \times Y$ , and  $c$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi_{opt}$  are extremal semicoupling measures with precisely peculiar geometry. The main theme of our thesis is to replace the graphs of continuous retracts  $r$ , with semicouplings and specifically  $c$ -minimal semicouplings (see the minimization program (2.5) in Section 2.3 below). Following Kantorovich’s linear duality, we study the dual maximization program to obtain Kantorovich’s contravariant singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  defined by the rule  $Y_I \mapsto Z(Y_I) = \cap_{y_* \in Y_I} \partial^c \psi(y_*)$  for closed subsets  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y$ . The dual Kantorovich potentials  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  are  $c$ -concave functions, see §2.3. The functor  $Z$  produces subvarieties  $Z(Y_I) \hookrightarrow X$  described explicitly by the dual potentials  $\psi, \psi^c$  and  $c$ , see §3.2 for explicit local equations.

**Example.** If  $\sigma, \tau$  are uniform measures on  $X, Y = \partial X$ , and if  $X$  is aspherical and  $\partial X$  is homologically nontrivial, then Kantorovich’s singularity functor  $Z : 2^{\partial X} \rightarrow 2^X$  produces closed locally DC-subvarieties  $Z'$  of  $X$  for which the inclusions  $Z' \hookrightarrow X$  are homotopy-isomorphisms. See Theorems 3.4.2, 3.4.3 for details.

*Remark.* Before we proceed to the main line of this thesis, we must first remark on the definition of “probability” and its relation to optimal transportation methods. The stan-

dard methods of couplings and Monge-Kantorovich duality [Vil09], [San15] are contingent on the hypothesis that source and target measures have identically equal masses. That is, source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$  must satisfy

$$\int_X \sigma - \int_Y \tau = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

The advantages of ignoring the normalization condition (2.1) has been studied by some authors, notably [HS13], [CM10], [Fig10b]. In this thesis, our applications to arithmetic groups (see §5) would be immediately obstructed if we required users to explicitly normalize the relevant Haar measures. This requires exactly calculating the volumes of polyhedral fundamental domains, and this calculation is practically impossible, e.g. compare [Lan66]. So from the beginning, our applications do not require precise normalization factors.

The present thesis develops in the *semicoupling category*, and replaces (2.1) with the hypothesis that source measures  $\sigma$  be “abundant” with respect to a target measure  $\tau$ , namely:

$$\int_X 1.d\mu(x) - \int_Y d\tau(y) \geq 0. \quad (2.2)$$

So where couplings are nonexistent, semicouplings are abundant. However we also admit that the existence of the renormalization factor  $\int_X 1.d\mu(x) < +\infty$  is an exceedingly useful hypothesis. For instance, we prove the à priori existence of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings in §2.2, and our proofs shall assume the target measure  $\tau$  has been renormalized to a probability measure. But the practical construction of the dual Kantorovich potentials does not require the renormalization, and nor does our proof of the existence of Kantorovich minimizers in §2.3. This again illustrates the logical convenience of assuming an inequality  $\int_X 1.d\mu(x) < +\infty$ , rather than exactly evaluating some real number  $1/\int_X d\mu(x)$ .

## 2.1 Optimal Semicouplings and Cost

Now we introduce the optimal semicoupling program. We reserve  $X, Y$  for complete finite-dimensional manifolds-with-corners of topological dimensions  $d, e$  respectively. We abbreviate  $\mathcal{H}_X^d$  and  $\mathcal{H}_Y^e$ . In general  $d, e$  are distinct, and our main motivation is studying  $Y = \partial X$ , and especially where  $X = X[t]$  is a convex excision model, see Chapters 4, §4.5. Let  $proj_X : X \times Y \rightarrow X$ ,  $proj_Y : X \times Y \rightarrow Y$  be the canonical continuous projections. We exclusively study Radon measures  $\sigma, \tau$  on the source and target  $X, Y$ , and usually

assume they are absolutely-continuous with respect to the uniform measures  $d\text{vol}_X, d\text{vol}_Y$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.1.1** (Semicoupling). A *semicoupling* between source  $(X, \sigma)$  and target  $(Y, \tau)$  is a Borel measure  $\pi$  on the product space  $X \times Y$  with target-marginal satisfying  $\text{proj}_Y \# \pi = \tau$ , and source-marginal satisfying  $\text{proj}_X \# \pi \leq \sigma$ .

The inequality “ $\leq$ ” says that for every Borel subset  $O$  the numerical inequality  $(\text{proj}_X \# \pi)[O] \leq \sigma[O]$  holds. We remark that  $\pi$  is a coupling between  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  when  $\text{proj}_X \# \pi = \sigma$ .

Next let  $SC(\sigma, \tau) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\geq 0}(X \times Y)$  denote the set of all semicoupling measures  $\pi$  between source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$ . One finds  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  is empty unless  $\sigma[X] \geq \tau[Y]$ , in which case we say “the source  $\sigma$  is abundant relative to the target  $\tau$ ”. Informally a semicoupling  $\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)$  describes an allocation of some activated source particles which fill (or saturate) a prescribed target.

A standard argument using Prokhorov’s compactness criterion implies the following lemma, c.f. [Vil09, Lemma 4.4, pp.44]. We recall that a sequence of semicouplings  $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1,2,\dots}$  converges to  $\pi_\infty$  in the narrow-topology if  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{X \times Y} f(x, y) \cdot d\pi(x, y)$  for every bounded continuous function  $f \in BC(X)$ .

**Lemma 2.1.2.** *The set of semicouplings  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  is compact convex subset of  $\mathcal{M}_{\geq 0}(X \times Y)$  with respect to the narrow topology.*

*Proof.* The convexity of semicouplings is clear. For every  $\epsilon > 0$  both  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  admit compact subsets  $K_\epsilon, L_\epsilon$  such that  $\sigma[X - K_\epsilon] < \epsilon$  and  $\tau[Y - L_\epsilon] < \epsilon$ . But for any semicoupling  $\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)$ , we find

$$\pi[(X - K_\epsilon) \times (Y - L_\epsilon)] \leq \pi[(X - K_\epsilon) \times Y] + \pi[X \times (Y - L_\epsilon)] < 2\epsilon,$$

since  $\pi[(X - K_\epsilon) \times Y] = \sigma[X - K_\epsilon]$  and  $\pi[X \times (Y - L_\epsilon)] = \tau[Y - L_\epsilon]$ . Therefore  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  is precompact with respect to the weak-\* topology by Prokhorov’s theorem. But it’s immediate that  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  is weak-\* closed, and therefore the set is weak-\* compact.  $\square$

## 2.2 Existence of $c$ -Optimal Semicouplings

Now we introduce costs. There is no canonical semicoupling without, say, selecting a linear functional on  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  and then minimizing. In our earlier §1.3 we enumerated several assumptions our cost functions should possess, labelled (A0)–(A5). The Assumptions (A0)–(A3) are rather generic. The Assumption (A4) implies the general uniqueness

of semicouplings, see Proposition 2.5.8. The uniqueness of such optimal semicouplings is important for our topological applications, since we are proposing the singularity structure of optimal semicouplings as canonical topological model. The final basic assumption our thesis requires is Assumption (A5), and more precisely described by Condition (C) in §2.6, 2.6.4. The Condition (C) is a “small-cancellation” hypothesis on local tangent vectors which ensures that specific “average vectors” are nonvanishing. The nonvanishing of these “average vectors” is necessary for the continuity of the deformation retracts constructed in Chapter 2.3.

The existence of  $c$ -optimal couplings (not semicouplings!) for costs satisfying (A0) – –(A2) is a standard consequence of Fatou’s lemma and Prokhorov’s precompactness theorem. If  $\pi$  is a Radon measure  $X \times Y$ , then we define  $C[\pi] := \int_{X \times Y} c(x, y) d\pi(x, y)$ .

**Proposition 2.2.1.** *Let  $\sigma, \tau$  be source and target measures with  $\int_Y 1 d\tau = 1$ . Then  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  is compact with respect to the narrow-topology. When  $c$  is continuous cost, then  $c$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi_{opt}$  exists such that*

$$C[\pi_{opt}] = \inf_{\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)} C[\pi].$$

Closer inspection reveals that Proposition 2.2.1 only requires  $c$  be lower semicontinuous, c.f. [Vil09], [San15].

We can leverage the existence of optimal couplings to the case of semicouplings. Indeed the transportation literature finds two different approaches to questions of existence and uniqueness of optimal semicouplings. The method of [CM10] interprets semicouplings as conventional couplings by formally adjoining a graveyard point  $\{\dagger\}$  to the target, enlarging  $Y$  to  $Y_+ = Y \coprod \{\dagger\}$ . The target measure  $\tau$  is then extended (relative to the source  $\sigma$ ) to the measure  $\tau_+ := \tau + \alpha \cdot \delta_\dagger$ , where  $\alpha$  is the positive scalar  $\alpha := \int_X 1 \cdot \sigma - \int_Y 1 \cdot \tau$  and  $\delta_\dagger$  is the Dirac measure supported at the graveyard point  $\{\dagger\}$ . The cost is extended to  $c_+ : X \times (Y \cup \{\dagger\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by declaring  $\{\dagger\}$  a “tariff-free reservoir”. Concretely we assume  $c_+(x, y) > 0$  whenever  $y \in Y$ , and  $c_+(x, \dagger) = 0$ , for every  $x \in X$ . There is then a natural correspondance between semicouplings  $\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)$  and couplings  $\pi_+$  between  $\sigma$  and  $\tau_+$ . We observe that  $c_+$  is continuous if and only if  $c$  is continuous.

An alternative approach to semicouplings and uniqueness is developed in [HS13], wherein a different reduction to the coupling theory is described. Recall that the support of a measure space  $(X, \sigma)$  is denoted  $spt(\sigma)$ , and defined to be the smallest closed subset of  $X$  of full measure. The argument in [HS13] regarding uniqueness is two-stepped. First one determines conditions on the cost for the activated source domain  $A = spt(\text{proj}_X \# \pi_{opt})$  to be uniquely determined. In the second step, the semicoupling is restricted to the activated

source, and the restriction defines a coupling between  $1_A.\sigma$  and target  $\tau$ . Thus we are reduced to standard coupling theory. By standard arguments, one finds (Twist) condition the main hypothesis controlling uniqueness of the optimal coupling. We elaborate further in the next section.

## 2.3 Kantorovich Duality

In the following sections we prove that  $c$ -optimal semicouplings satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4) have  $\sigma$ -a.e. uniquely defined active domain  $A \hookrightarrow X$ . Restricting to the active domain, we obtain a coupling  $1_{A \times Y}.\pi$  between  $1_A.\sigma$  and  $\tau$  which is optimal with respect to the restricted cost

$$c|_A(x, y) = \begin{cases} c(x, y), & \text{if } x \in A, \\ +\infty, & \text{if else.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Uniqueness of the optimal semicoupling now reduces to the question of whether the  $c|_A$ -optimal coupling is unique. In the following sections we describe how so-called (Twist) conditions on the cost implies a general uniqueness of optimal couplings. The meaning of (Twist) is best illustrated through Kantorovich duality which we introduce below. Standard references for Kantorovich duality with respect to continuous costs include [Vil09, Ch.5], or [San15]. The following definitions are exceedingly useful.

**Definition 2.3.1** ( $c$ -transforms). When  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  is a function on the target  $Y$ , then the  $c$ -Legendre transform  $\psi^c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is defined by  $\psi^c(x) := \sup_{y \in Y} [\psi(y) - c(x, y)]$ , for  $x \in X$ . When  $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is a function on the source, then the  $c$ -Legendre transform  $\phi^c : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  is defined by the rule  $\phi^c(y) = \inf_{x \in X} [c(x, y) + \phi(x)]$ .

**Definition 2.3.2** ( $c$ -concavity). A function  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  is  $c$ -concave if  $\psi^{cc} = (\psi^c)^c$  coincides pointwise with  $\psi$ . Equivalently  $\psi$  is  $c$ -concave if there exists a lower semicontinuous function  $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  such that  $\phi^c = \psi$  pointwise.

The definitions imply  $\psi, \psi^c$  satisfy the pointwise inequality

$$-\psi^c(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y) \quad (2.4)$$

for all  $x \in X$ ,  $y \in Y$ . The inequality (2.4), and especially the case of equality is fundamental.

**Definition 2.3.3** ( $c$ -subdifferential). Let  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  be  $c$ -concave potential  $\psi^c = \psi$ . Select  $y_0 \in Y$  where  $\psi(y_0)$  is finite-valued. The subdifferential  $\partial^c\psi(y_0) \subset X$  consists of those points  $x' \in X$  such that

$$-\psi^c(x') + \psi(y_0) = c(x', y_0).$$

Or equivalently such that for all  $y \in Y$ ,

$$\psi(y) - c(x', y) \leq \psi(y_0) - c(x', y_0).$$

These definitions of  $c$ -convexity and  $c$ -subdifferentials are fundamental to this thesis. Our Assumptions (A0), ..., (A4) on the cost  $c$  imply various properties of  $c$ -convex potentials and  $c$ -subdifferentials. The first useful property is that  $c$ -subdifferentials are nonempty wherever the potentials  $\phi(x)$  or  $\psi(y)$  are finite, see Lemma 2.3.4 below. Recall the domain of  $\phi$  is defined  $\text{dom}(\phi) := \{x \in X \mid \phi(x) < +\infty\}$ .

**Lemma 2.3.4.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A2). Let  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  be a  $c$ -concave potential  $(\psi^c)^c = \psi$ . Abbreviate  $\phi = \psi^c$ . Suppose there exists  $y' \in Y$  such that  $\psi(y') \neq -\infty$ . Then:*

- (i)  $\psi$  is an upper semicontinuous function; and
- (ii)  $\partial^c\psi(y)$  is a nonempty closed subset of  $X$  for every  $y \in \text{dom}(\psi)$ ; and
- (iii)  $\phi$  is lower semicontinuous function; and
- (iv)  $\partial^c\psi(y)$  is a nonempty closed subset of  $Y$  for every  $x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ .

*Proof.* The Assumption (A0) implies  $\psi(y) = \inf_{x \in X} [c(x, y) + \psi^c(x)]$  for every  $y \in Y$  is an upper semicontinuous function of  $y$ . Indeed  $\psi$  is equal to the pointwise infimum of a family of continuous functions, namely the  $X$ -parameter family of continuous functions  $y \mapsto c(x, y) + \psi^c(x)$ . Likewise the  $c$ -transform  $\psi^c(x)$  is a lower semicontinuous function of the source variable  $x$ . This proves (i), (iii).

The inequality (2.4) is an equality precisely when  $x \in \partial^c\psi(y)$ , or equivalently  $\psi(y) \geq c(x, y) + \psi^c(x)$ . So the subdifferential  $\partial^c\psi(y)$  coincides with a sublevel set of  $x \mapsto \psi^c(x) + c(x, y)$  and is therefore closed according to Assumption (A2). Thus  $\partial^c\psi(y)$  is a closed subset of  $X$  for every  $y \in Y$ . Likewise  $\partial^c\psi^c(x)$  is closed subset of  $Y$  for every  $x \in \text{dom}(\psi^c)$ .

It remains to show the  $c$ -subdifferentials are nonempty on the appropriate domains. Observe that  $\phi = \psi^c$  is bounded from below on  $X$  unless  $\psi$  is identically  $-\infty$ . Indeed if  $\{x_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots}$  is a sequence in  $X$  such that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \phi(x_j) = -\infty$ , then  $\psi \equiv -\infty$ . This is clear from the definition  $\phi(x) = \sup_{y \in Y} [\psi(y) - c(x, y)]$ , and the Assumption (A0) that  $c$  is uniformly bounded below on  $X \times Y$ .

Moreover the Assumptions (A0)–(A1) imply the infimum defining  $\psi(y)$  can be restricted to a compact subset of  $X$ . Indeed (A1) includes the hypothesis that the sublevels  $\{x \in X | c_y(x) \leq t\}$  are compact subsets of  $X$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $\psi(y)$  is finite, then we claim the infimum defining  $\psi(y)$  can be restricted to a sublevel set. But observe that  $\{x_k\}_k$  cannot be a minimizing sequence with  $c(x_k, y)$  diverging to  $+\infty$  when  $\psi(y)$  is finite. So there exists  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\psi(y) = \inf_{\{x \mid c(x, y) \leq t\}} [\phi(x) + c(x, y)].$$

But lower semicontinuous functions restricted to compact subsets attain their minima. Therefore  $\partial^c \psi(y)$  is nonempty whenever  $\psi(y) < +\infty$ . Since  $x \in \partial^c \psi(y)$  if and only if  $y \in \partial^c \phi(x)$  whenever  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  and  $\phi = \psi^c$ , we find  $\partial^c \phi(x)$  nonempty whenever  $x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ , as follows from the definition 2.3.3 and the arguments above. This establishes (ii), (iv).

□

Several further properties of  $c$ -convex potentials are developed in Section 2.5 below, c.f. Lemmas 2.5.2, 2.5.5, and Proposition 2.5.7.

For the remainder of this section, we suppose the unique active domain  $A$  has been specified (Proposition 2.4.7) and we set  $c = c|A$ . The semicoupling program then reduces to the coupling program. Both the semicoupling and coupling programs are driven by the “cost” of transporting a unit source mass to a unit target mass. The standard interpretation imagines some industrialist having source  $(A, 1_A \cdot \sigma)$  and prescribed target measure  $(Y, \tau)$ . The industrialist looks to activate a source domain in order to transport measure to the target – and all the while minimizing the total transit cost. As we’ve seen, this is a linear minimization program over a convex compact set.

On the other hand, Kantorovich’s dual program is defined in terms of “prices”. And here one imagines an autonomous transporter who negotiates prices with the industrialist. The transporter offers to purchase units of source measure at price  $\phi(x)$ , and then sells these units at various target locations at the price  $\psi(y)$ . The industrialist knows the cost of direct transport from source  $x$  to target  $y$  is  $c(x, y)$ , so the transporter must propose competitive prices to the industrialist. These competitive prices imply a constraint on prices, namely

$$-\phi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x \in A, y \in Y.$$

Now the transporter is seeking to maximize his/her own total surplus, namely the maximization program

$$\sup_{(\phi, \psi)} \left[ - \int_A \phi(x) d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi(y) d\tau(y) \right],$$

the supremum taken over all pairs of functions  $\phi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ ,  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  satisfying the pointwise constraint  $-\phi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y)$ .

Now suppose the transporter has competitive prices  $(\phi, \psi)$ . How may the diligent transporter improve these prices to a pair  $(\phi', \psi')$  having greater profit? For given source point  $x'$ , the transporter is obliged to satisfy  $\psi(y) - c(x', y) \leq \phi(x')$  for all  $y \in Y$ . This says  $\sup_{y \in Y} [\psi(y) - c(x', y)] \leq \phi(x')$ . But to minimize purchase price, the observant transporter replaces  $\phi$  with  $\phi'(x') = \sup_{y \in Y} [\psi(y) - c(x', y)]$ . Similarly for target point  $y'$ , the transporter wants to maximize the retail price subject to the constraint, and this maximum price is  $\psi'(y') := \inf_{x \in A} [\phi'(x) + c(x, y')]$ . One readily sees the prices  $(\phi', \psi')$  are at least as profitable than the original  $(\phi, \psi)$ . So the maximization program can be restricted to those pairs of functions  $(\phi, \psi)$  which are maximally-competitive with respect to the cost  $c$ . This leads to the fundamental definitions of the  $c$ -Fenchel-Legendre transform,  $c$ -concavity, and the  $c$ -subdifferential as defined above.

We denote the weak-\* convex compact subset of couplings between  $1_A \sigma$  and  $\tau$  by  $\Pi_C(1_A \cdot \sigma, \tau)$ . The pointwise inequality (2.4) implies the inequality

$$\sup_{\psi \text{ } c\text{-concave}} \left[ - \int_A \psi^c(x).d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi(y).d\tau(y) \right] \leq \inf_{\pi \in \Pi_C(1_A \cdot \sigma, \tau)} c[\pi]. \quad (2.5)$$

Kantorovich duality says the inequality (2.5) is an equality where “ $\sup = \inf$ ”. The equality “ $\sup = \inf$ ” says there is “no duality gap” between the primal minimization and the dual maximization program. There are two basic questions to be addressed regarding (2.5):

- (i) Is the supremum realized by  $c$ -concave potentials  $\psi$ ?,
- (ii) Is the infimum realized by a  $c$ -optimal semicoupling  $\pi$ ?

The Assumption (A0) that our costs  $c$  are continuous implies the answers to (i) and (ii) are well-known. The following Theorem is quoted from [Vil09, Theorem 5.10, pp.57].

**Theorem 2.3.5.** *Let  $c : A \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded nonnegatively-valued continuous cost. Then*

- (1) *there is no duality gap between the primal program and the dual program, and*

$$\sup_{\psi \text{ } c\text{-concave}} \left[ \int_A -\psi^c(x)d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi(y)d\tau(y) \right] = \min_{\pi \in \Pi_C(1_A \cdot \sigma, \tau)} c[\pi].$$

- (2) *The dual program is solvable, and there exists a  $c|A$ -concave potential  $\psi_* : Y \rightarrow$*

$\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  such that

$$\int_A -\psi_*^c(x)d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi_*(y)d\tau(y)] = \sup_{\psi \text{ c-concave}} [\int_A -\psi^c(x)d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi(y)d\tau(y)].$$

To prove the existence of Kantorovich potentials dual to  $c$ -optimal semicouplings, it is again convenient to follow [CM10]. We first adjoin a tariff-free reservoir  $\{\dagger\}$  to  $Y$ , obtaining an auxiliary target space  $Y_+ := Y \coprod \{\dagger\}$  with target measure  $\tau_+$  and  $c_+$  as defined above.

The hypotheses of 2.3.5 are satisfied. Therefore there exists maximizers  $(\phi_+, \psi_+)$  to the dual program

$$\sup_{\substack{-\phi_+(x)+\psi_+(y)\leq c_+(x,y) \\ x\in X, y\in Y_+}} J_+[\phi_+, \psi_+], \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$J_+[\phi_+, \psi_+] := - \int_X \phi_+(x)d\sigma(x) + \int_{Y_+} \psi_+(y)d\tau(y).$$

Let  $(\phi_+, \psi_+)$  be maximizers for the program (2.7). Then  $\phi_+ = (\psi_+)^{c_+}$  is  $c_+$ -convex and  $(\psi_+^{c_+})^{c_+} = \psi_+$ . Now we apply a standard restriction argument to  $(\phi_+, \psi_+)$  to obtain a  $c$ -convex potential  $\phi_0 = \psi_0^c$  on the subset  $A := \cup_{y \in Y} \partial^{c_+} \psi_+(y)$  of  $X$ . We refer the reader to [Vil09, Lemma 5.18, pp.75] for details.

**Lemma 2.3.6.** *In the above notation, let  $(\phi_+, \psi_+)$  be  $c_+$ -dual potentials maximizing Kantorovich's dual program (2.7) for the extended cost  $c_+$ . Restricting  $\psi_+$  to  $Y \hookrightarrow Y_+$ , we obtain a  $c$ -concave potential maximizing Kantorovich's dual program on the subdomain  $A := \cup_{y \in Y} \partial^c \psi_0(y)$  in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* We replace the  $c_+$ -convex potential  $\phi_+ = (\psi_+)^{c_+}$  with a  $c$ -convex potential  $\phi_0$  by the following construction. Define  $\psi_0(\dagger) := -\infty$  and  $\psi_0(y) = \psi_+(y)$  for  $y \in Y$ . Then

$$\phi_0(x) := (\psi_0)^c(x) = \sup_{y \in Y} [\psi_0(y) - c(x, y)]$$

is  $c$ -convex. Moreover we see:

- (i)  $\psi_0 \leq \psi_+$  pointwise throughout  $Y$ ; and
- (ii)  $\phi_0 \geq \phi_+$  pointwise throughout  $X$ ; and
- (iii)  $\phi_0(x) = \phi_+(x)$  whenever there exists  $y \in Y$  with  $x \in \partial^{c_+} \psi_+(y)$ ; and
- (iv)  $\partial^{c_+} \phi_+(x) \subset \partial^c \phi_0(x)$  whenever there exists  $y \in Y$  with  $x \in \partial^{c_+} \psi_+(y)$ .

Thus restricting to  $A := \cup_{y \in Y} \partial^c \psi_0(y)$  in  $X$ , we obtain a  $c$ -convex potential  $\phi_0$  supported on  $A$ .  $\square$

The restrictions  $(\phi_0, \psi_0)$  are  $c$ -dual potentials, and we find  $(\phi_0, \psi_0)$  are maximizers to the restricted dual program

$$\sup_{\substack{-\phi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y) \\ x \in A, y \in Y}} J_A[\phi, \psi], \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$J_A[\phi, \psi] := - \int_A \phi(x) d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi(y) d\tau(y).$$

Then  $-\phi_0, \psi_0$  are  $c$ -concave with  $\phi_0 = \psi_0^c$ . As we assume  $c$  satisfies (A0)–(A4), we can now develop a perturbation argument based on [McC01, Proof of Thm. 9] and prove the existence of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings between  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ . We recall that Assumptions (A0)–(A2) imply  $c$ -convex potentials  $\phi$  are differentiable  $\mathcal{H}_X$ -almost everywhere on their domains. With further Assumptions (A3), (A4), we use (Twist) condition to characterize the transport as a measurable mapping

$$T : \text{dom}(\phi) \rightarrow Y, \quad T(x) := \nabla_x c(x, \cdot)^{-1}(-\nabla_x \phi(x)),$$

for  $x \in \text{dom}(D\phi)$ . The main identity implied by (A0)–(A4) is

$$T(x) \in \partial^c \phi(x)$$

for almost-every  $x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ , where  $\phi = \psi^c$  is  $c$ -convex.

The perturbation argument begins with a continuous function  $h : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . For  $\epsilon > 0$ , define  $\psi_\epsilon(y) := \psi(y) + \epsilon.h(y)$ . Then

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = \sup_{y \in Y} [\psi(y) + \epsilon.h(y) - c(x, y)] \quad (2.8)$$

for  $x \in A$ . If we presuppose that  $Y$  is compact and  $c$  is continuous, then the supremum defining  $\phi_\epsilon(x)$  would obviously be attained by some  $y_\epsilon = y_\epsilon(x) \in Y$ . This remains true if  $c$  satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A4), as demonstrated in the following

**Lemma 2.3.7.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfy Assumptions (A0)–(A4). Let  $\phi = \psi^c$  be a  $c$ -convex potential. Then almost-every  $x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$  has nonempty  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c \phi(x)$ , and the supremum defining  $\phi(x)$  in equation (2.8) is uniquely attained.*

*Proof.* Lemma 2.5.5 and Proposition 2.5.7 proves  $\phi = \psi^c$  is locally semiconvex on  $\text{dom}(\phi)$  and almost-everywhere uniquely differentiable. But  $\text{dom}(\phi)$  coincides with the image  $Z_1 := \cup_{y \in Y} \partial^c \psi(y)$ . The (Twist) condition ensures  $T(x) \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)$  for almost-every

$x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ , recall equation (2.13).  $\square$

The supremum defining  $\phi_\epsilon(x)$  is attained under Assumptions (A0)–(A4), and we denote this maximizer  $y_\epsilon = y_\epsilon(x)$ . Indeed the supremum defining (2.8) can be restricted to a compact subset of  $Y$  and the function  $y \mapsto \psi(y) + \epsilon.h(y) - c(x, y)$  is upper semicontinuous. These two conditions imply the supremum is attained.

At  $x \in X$  where the supremum is uniquely attained, sufficiently small  $\epsilon$  will imply

$$y_\epsilon = T(x) + o(1).$$

Thus

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = \psi(y_\epsilon) + \epsilon.h(y_\epsilon) - c(x, y_\epsilon).$$

But

$$\psi(y_\epsilon) - c(x, y_\epsilon) \leq \psi(T(x)) - c(x, T(x)),$$

and

$$\psi(T(x)) + \epsilon.h(T(x)) - c(x, T(x)) \leq \phi_\epsilon(x) \leq \psi(T(x)) - c(x, T(x)) + \epsilon.h(y_\epsilon).$$

From this last inequality, we deduce

$$\phi_\epsilon(x) = \phi_0(x) + \epsilon.h(T(x)) + \epsilon.o(1).$$

Consider the one-parameter family of potentials  $(\phi_\epsilon, \psi_\epsilon)$ . If we define

$$J(\phi, \psi) := \int_A (-\phi(x)) d\sigma(x) + \int_Y \psi(y) d\tau(y),$$

then  $(\phi_0, \psi_0)$  maximizing Kantorovich's dual program implies

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{J(\phi_\epsilon, \psi_\epsilon) - J(\phi_0, \psi_0)}{\epsilon} = 0.$$

Evaluating this single-variable derivative, we find  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} (J(\phi_\epsilon, \psi_0 \epsilon) - J(\phi_0, \psi_0)) / \epsilon$

$$= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} - \int_A \frac{\phi_\epsilon(x) - \phi_0(x)}{\epsilon} d\sigma(x) + \int_Y h(y) d\tau(y) = - \int_X h(T(x)) d\sigma(x) + \int_Y h(y) d\tau(y),$$

according to Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem. Next the change-of-variables

formula implies  $\int_A h(T(x)).d\sigma(x) = \int_X h(y).d(T\#1_A.\sigma)(y)$ , and therefore

$$-\int_X h(y).d(T\#1_A.\sigma)(y) + \int_Y h(y)d\tau(y) = 0.$$

Since  $h$  is an arbitrary continuous function on  $Y$ , this implies  $T\#1_A.\sigma = \tau$ .

## 2.4 Uniqueness of Activated Domain

The previous Section described the existence of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings for costs  $c$  satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4). Henceforth our discussion shall assume  $c$ -optimal semicouplings exist, and with existence given we next turn to uniqueness. Following the approach of [HS13], our basic uniqueness result for optimal semicouplings is two-stepped. First there is a monotonicity condition, namely Assumption (A3) from Section 1.3 which ensures uniqueness of activated source domains. The further asymmetric (Twist) condition (Assumption (A4)) then proves uniqueness of the optimal coupling, following a standard argument, e.g. [Vil09, Ch.12].

**Lemma 2.4.1.** *Let  $\pi$  be a semicoupling between abundant source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$ . Then  $\text{proj}_X \#\pi$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the source measure  $\sigma$ , and there exists a measurable function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  for which  $f.\sigma = \text{proj}_X \#\pi$  and  $\int_U f(x).d\sigma(x) = \pi[U \times Y]$  for every Borel subset  $U$  of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* The semicoupling  $\pi$  is a Borel measure and  $\text{proj}_X$  is evidently Borel measurable, so  $\text{proj}_X \#\pi$  is a Borel measure on  $X$ . The definition of  $\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)$  implies  $\text{proj}_X \#\pi$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\sigma$ . So Radon-Nikodym theorem implies  $d(\text{proj}_X \#\pi)(x) = f(x)d\sigma(x) + d\nu(x)$ , where  $f(x)d\sigma(x)$  is absolutely-continuous part with respect to  $\sigma$ , and  $d\nu(x)$  is the singular part.

Now we use Lebesgue's density theorem, which says: for  $\sigma$ -almost all  $x \in X$ , the limit

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} (\text{proj}_X \#\pi)[B(x, r)]/\sigma[B(x, r)] =: f(x)$$

exists and is finite. Thus we obtain a Borel measurable function  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f.\sigma = \text{proj}_X \#\pi$ . For further details we refer the reader to [Vil03, Proposition 4.7, pp.132].  $\square$

**Definition 2.4.2** (Active Domain). For given  $\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)$ , let  $f = f_\pi$  be the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\text{proj}_X \#\pi$  with respect to  $\sigma$  as in Lemma 2.4.1. Then  $A := \{f > 0\} \subset X$  is the activated source domain of the semicoupling.

Now we formulate the BangBang principle, which characterizes the activated source of an optimal semicoupling. BangBang is classical and we refer the reader to [HL69, §II.12.1, pp.46], or [HS13, Prop 6.3, pp.2471], or [CM10, Prop 3.1, Thm 3.4].

**Proposition 2.4.3** (BangBang Principle). *Let  $\pi$  be semicoupling in  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  and  $(x', y') \in spt[\pi]$ . For a real number  $t < c(x', y')$ , consider the Low-cost and High-cost regions*

$$L := \{c(-, y') < t\} \cap spt[\sigma], \quad \text{and } H := \{c(-, y') \geq t\} \cap spt[\sigma]$$

*in  $X$ . If  $\sigma[L] > 0$  and  $\sigma[H] > 0$ , and if the restricted density  $1_L \cdot f$  is not measurably identical to  $1_L$ , then we can immediately construct an improved semicoupling  $\tilde{\pi}$  such that  $c[\tilde{\pi}] < c[\pi]$ , and therefore  $\pi$  is not  $c$ -optimal.*

*Proof.* Trivially we have  $1_L \cdot \sigma = 1_L \cdot f \cdot \sigma + 1_L \cdot (1 - f) \cdot \sigma$ . If  $1_L \cdot (1 - f) \cdot \sigma$  is not identically zero, then we can replace the semicoupling  $\pi$  with a semicoupling  $\tilde{\pi}$  of strictly lower cost. Indeed mass is then more efficiently transport to  $y'$  from  $L$  rather than from  $H$ . Any active mass supported on  $H$  at density no greater than  $\sigma[\{1_L \cdot (1 - f) > 0\}]$  is more efficiently routed out of  $L$ . Rerouting the mass defines a semicoupling  $\tilde{\pi}$  with total cost strictly less than  $\pi$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.4.** *The marginal source density  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  defined in 2.4.2 and Lemma 2.4.1 of an optimal semicoupling is measurably identical to the constant unit function  $f = 1$  throughout the support  $\{f > 0\}$ . Therefore  $\text{proj}_X \# \pi_{opt} = 1_A \cdot \sigma$  for every  $c$ -optimal semicoupling  $\pi_{opt}$  and some active domain  $A \subset X$ .*

*Proof.* The BangBang principle says  $c$ -efficient semicouplings  $\pi_{opt}$  draw from high-cost source regions only after the lower-cost resources have been totally exhausted. The active domain  $A$  therefore admits no nontrivial Low-cost/High-cost partitions as in 2.4.3.  $\square$

Next we clarify the role of Assumption (A3) from §1.3, which equivalently says the function  $x \mapsto c(x, y)$  is non-constant on every open subset of  $\text{dom}(c_y)$ , for every  $y \in Y$ .

**Lemma 2.4.5 ((Mono)).** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A3), and let  $\sigma$  be a Radon measure on the source  $X$ . Then for every  $y \in Y$ , the single-variable function  $t \mapsto \sigma[\{c_y < t\}]$  is strictly monotone-increasing for  $t \in spt(c_y \# \sigma) \subset \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $c_y$  is continuous, we find  $\{t_1 < c_y < t_2\}$  is an open subset of  $X$  and  $\text{dom}(c_y)$  for every  $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ . The subset  $\{t_1 < c_y < t_2\}$  is nonempty for  $t_1, t_2 \in spt(c_y \# \sigma)$ . It is sufficient to prove

$$\sigma[\{t_1 < c_y < t_2\}] > 0 \tag{2.9}$$

for every connected interval  $[t_1, t_2] \subset spt(c_y \# \sigma)$ . But by definition of support, the strict-positivity of (2.9) follows. Thus the function  $t \mapsto \sigma[\{c_y < t\}]$  as desired.  $\square$

We say a cost  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is monotone with respect to a source measure  $\sigma$  if the conclusion of Lemma 2.4.5 holds. Equivalently a cost is monotone with respect to  $\sigma$  if for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}, y \in Y$ , we have  $\sigma[\{c_y = t\}] = 0$  whenever  $\sigma[\{c_y \leq t\}] > 0$ .

**Lemma 2.4.6.** *Let cost  $c$  satisfy Assumption (Mono) with respect to source measure  $\sigma$ . If  $A \hookrightarrow X$  is the active domain of an  $c$ -optimal semicoupling, then there exists a unique measurable function  $t : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $A$  can be expressed as the union of closed  $c_y$ -sublevel sets*

$$A := \bigcup_{y \in Y} \{x \mid c(x, y) \leq t(y)\}. \quad (2.10)$$

*Proof.* This is direct consequence of Proposition 2.4.3. For every  $y \in Y$  we define  $t(y)$  as the supremum of all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  for which  $1_A \cdot \sigma[\{c_y > t\}] > 0$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* The measurable function  $t : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  from Lemma 2.4.6 can be identified with a  $c$ -concave potential  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  satisfying the dual maximization program from Theorem 2.3.5, c.f. [CM10]. In otherwords  $t(y) = \psi(y)$  for all  $y \in Y$ . This explicit identification will be useful in §2.6.

**Proposition 2.4.7.** *[Unique Activation] Let  $(X, \sigma)$  be source and  $(Y, \tau)$  target. Suppose the cost  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is monotonic with respect to  $\sigma$  (c.f. Lemma 2.4.5). Then the activated source domain  $A = A_\pi$  of a  $c$ -optimal semicoupling  $\pi \in SC(\sigma, \tau)$  is unique modulo sets of vanishing  $\sigma$ -measure.*


*Proof.* If  $A, A'$  are active source domains of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi, \pi'$ , then  $1/2.\pi + 1/2.\pi'$  is also  $c$ -optimal, and with source-marginal  $1/2.1_A + 1/2.1_{A'}$ . Let  $A \Delta A'$  be the set-theoretic symmetric difference. Then we have trivial identity

$$1/2.1_A + 1/2.1_{A'} = 1_{A \cap A'} + 1/2.1_{A \Delta A'},$$

where  $A \cap A'$  and  $A \Delta A'$  are disjoint. Now suppose  $\sigma[A \Delta A'] > 0$ . Then  $A \Delta A'$  is nonempty. Selecting some  $y \in A \Delta A'$ , we consider the marginal cost  $x \mapsto c_y(x) = c(x, y)$ . If  $c$  satisfies (Mono), then  $c_y$  restricted to  $A \Delta A'$  is nonconstant and  $A \Delta A'$  can be partitioned into Low- and High-cost regions  $L, H$  satisfying the hypotheses of BangBang 2.4.3. But this contradicts the  $c$ -optimality of  $\frac{1}{2}\pi + \frac{1}{2}\pi'$ . So  $\sigma[A \Delta A'] = 0$  and the active domains  $A, A'$  coincide  $\sigma$ -a.e.  $\square$



Figure 2.1: Disconnected Active Domain

Figure 2.2: Connected Active Domain when  $\text{mass}[\sigma]/\text{mass}[\tau] \approx 1^+$ 

## 2.5 Uniqueness of Optimal Semicouplings

Thus far we have established the existence of optimal semicouplings and uniqueness of active domains. Now we describe the (Twist) hypothesis and the uniqueness of optimal couplings when the source measure  $\sigma$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the reference source measure  $\mathcal{H}_X^d$  in  $X$ .

The next definition describes Assumption (A4) from Section 1.3:

**Definition 2.5.1 ((Twist)).** Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be cost function satisfying Assumptions (A0) and (A1). Then  $c$  satisfies (Twist) condition if for every  $x' \in X$  the rule  $y \mapsto \nabla_x c(x', y)$  defines an injective mapping  $\nabla_x c(x', \cdot) : \text{dom}(c_{x'}) \rightarrow T_{x'} X$ .

We remark that (Twist) condition is equivalent to the function  $x \mapsto c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_1)$  admitting no critical points on  $X$ , whenever  $y_0, y_1 \in Y$  are distinct. If  $X$  is compact closed manifold without boundary, then the standard Morse theory applied to  $x \mapsto c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_1)$  implies the existence of critical points, and thus violates (Twist). Our settings assume  $X$  is a manifold-with-corners with nontrivial boundary  $\partial X \neq \emptyset$ . The (Twist) condition requires  $c_\Delta$  admit no critical points on the interior of  $X$ , and all maxima/minima exist on the boundary. For instance, the repulsion cost constructed in Chapter 4 have the property that  $c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_1)$  converges to  $-\infty$  when  $x \rightarrow y_1$ , and converges to  $+\infty$  when

$x \rightarrow y_0$ , and all other level sets  $c_\Delta(-; y_0, y_1)^{-1}(s) \subset X$  are topologically connected and separating  $X$  into two components, for every  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

The Kantorovich duality yields a useful heuristic by which (Twist) condition ensures uniqueness of optimal couplings. The following lemmas are adapted from [GM96, Appendix C]. Recall the source  $X$  is equipped with a riemannian distance function  $d_X$ , and  $\dim(X)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure  $\mathcal{H}_X$ .

**Lemma 2.5.2.** *Let  $c$  be cost function satisfying Assumptions (A0), (A1), and (A2). Let  $D$  be compact geodesic disk in  $X$ , and  $V$  a compact subset of  $Y$  such that  $c(x, y) < +\infty$  for every  $x \in D$ ,  $y \in V$ . Define*

$$L(y) := \sup_{x, x' \in D} \frac{|c(x, y) - c(x', y)|}{d_X(x, x')}$$

for every  $y \in V$ . Then:

- (i) the Lipschitz constant  $L(y)$  is finite for every  $y \in V$ ; and
- (ii) the Lipschitz constant  $y \mapsto L(y)$  is upper semicontinuous function of  $y \in V$ .

*Proof.* According to (A1), for every fixed  $y \in V$  the function  $x \mapsto c(x, y)$  is twice-continuously differentiable. So the supremum defining  $L(y)$  is attained on the compact  $D$ . Moreover the convexity of  $D$  and the mean value theorem implies  $L(y) = \sup_{x \in D} \|\nabla_x c(x, y)\|$ , where the supremum again exists and is finite after (A1). This proves (i).

Suppose  $\{y_i | i = 1, 2, \dots\}$  is sequence in  $V \subset Y$  converging to limit  $y_\infty \in V$ . For each  $y_i$ , select some  $x'_i$  for which  $L(y_i) = \|\nabla_x c(x'_i, y_i)\|$ . But  $D$  is compact, so there exists convergent subsequence of  $\{x'_i\}$ . Extracting a convergent subsequence and relabelling indices, we find  $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} x'_i = x_\infty$  for some limit  $x_\infty$ . Now Assumption (A2) says the function  $(x, y) \mapsto \|\nabla_x c(x, y)\|$  is upper semicontinuous, and therefore

$$\|\nabla_x c(x_\infty, y_\infty)\| \geq \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \|\nabla_x c(x'_i, y_i)\|.$$

But  $\|\nabla_x c(x'_i, y_i)\| = L(y_i)$  for every index  $i$ , and  $L(y_\infty) \geq \|\nabla_x c(x_\infty, y_\infty)\|$  according to the definition of  $L$ . Therefore  $L(y_\infty) \geq \limsup_{i \rightarrow +\infty} L(y_i)$ . This proves (ii). □

**Proposition 2.5.3.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4) and (A6). Let  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  be a  $c$ -concave potential. Then  $\psi$  is locally Lipschitz on its domain  $\psi : \text{dom}(\psi) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* The definition of  $c$ -concavity says  $\psi(y) = \inf_{x \in X} \{\phi(x) + c(x, y)\}$  for some function  $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . Thus  $\psi$  is the pointwise infimum of the  $X$ -family of functions  $y \mapsto \phi(x) + c(x, y)$ . Now we observe the infimum defining  $\psi(y)$  can be restricted to a compact subset  $K \subset X$ , where  $K$  depends on  $y$ . Indeed the assumption (A1) implies  $c(x, y)$  diverges to  $+\infty$  whenever  $x$  diverges in  $X$ . Moreover if  $\phi$  is  $c$ -convex, then  $\phi$  is lower semicontinuous and attains its maximum on any compact subset  $K$  of  $X$ . Therefore  $\phi(x) + c(x, y)$  is bounded on compact subsets of  $X$ , and the infimum defining  $\psi$  can be restricted to a compact subset  $K$  wherever  $\phi(y) \neq -\infty$ . So  $\psi(y) = \inf_{x \in K} \{\phi(x) + c(x, y)\}$ , and Assumption (A6) implies this family is uniformly Lipschitz. Therefore  $\psi(y)$  is locally Lipschitz function for  $y \in \text{dom}(\psi)$ .  $\square$

Let the reader recall the definition of semiconvexity, c.f. [Vil09, Definition 10.10, pp.228].

**Definition 2.5.4** (Semiconvexity). A function  $\phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is semiconvex on an open subset  $U$  of  $X$  “with modulus  $C > 0$ ” at  $x_0 \in X$  if for every constant-speed geodesic path  $\gamma(t)$ , for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$  whose image is included in  $U$ , the inequality

$$\phi(\gamma(t)) \leq (1-t)\phi(\gamma(0)) + t\phi(\gamma(1)) + t(1-t)C\text{dist}(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))^2 \quad (2.11)$$

is satisfied for  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . The function is locally semiconvex if  $\phi$  is semiconvex at every  $x_0 \in U$  and the modulus  $C > 0$  depending uniformly on  $\gamma(0), \gamma(1)$  which vary in a compact subset  $K$  of  $U$ .

**Lemma 2.5.5.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A2). Then every  $c$ -convex potential  $\psi^c$  defined on  $X$  is  $\mathcal{H}_X$ -almost everywhere locally-Lipschitz on its domain  $\text{dom}(\psi^c) \subset X$ . Furthermore every  $c$ -convex potential is locally-semiconvex on  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$ .*

*Proof.* The definition of  $c$ -convexity implies  $\psi^c(x) = \sup_{y \in Y} \{\psi(y) - c(x, y)\}$  for every  $x \in X$ . Assumption (A0) implies the cost  $(x, y) \mapsto c(x, y)$  is bounded with bounded sublevels. So for every  $x$  such that  $\psi^c(x) < +\infty$ , the supremum defining  $\psi^c(x)$  can be restricted to a compact subset  $Y' \subset Y$ , where  $Y' = Y'(x)$  varies with  $x$ . From Lemma 2.5.2 the family of functions  $\{x \mapsto \psi(y) - c(x, y) \mid y \in \text{dom}(c_x)\}$  are locally Lipschitz, with respect to some finite Lipschitz constant  $L$  and independant of  $y$ . Indeed the upper semicontinuity of  $y \mapsto L(y)$  implies  $\sup_{y \in Y'} L(y)$  is attained and finite over the compact  $Y'$ . This implies  $\psi^c$  is locally Lipschitz, with finite Lipschitz constant as satisfied by the family  $\{\psi(y) - c(x, y) \mid y \in Y'\}$ . Furthermore, from the definition of  $c$ -concavity, for

every  $x \in \text{dom}(\psi^c) \subset X$  we find  $\psi^c(x)$  inherits the same local semiconvexity constants as the family of functions  $\{\psi(y) - c(x, y) \mid y \in Y'\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.6.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A2). Let  $\phi = \psi^c$  be a  $c$ -convex potential on  $X$ . Then the  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c \phi(x)$  is lower semicontinuous with respect to  $x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ . So if  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  is a sequence in  $\text{dom}(\phi)$  converging to  $x_\infty \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ , then the Gromov-Hausdorff limit  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \partial^c \phi(x_k)$  is contained in  $\partial^c \phi(x_\infty)$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 2.3.4 implies  $\phi$  and  $\psi = \phi^c$  are lower semicontinuous and upper semicontinuous, respectively. Let  $(x_k, y_k)$  be a sequence in  $\text{dom}(\phi) \times \text{dom}(\psi)$  with  $y_k \in \partial^c \phi(x_k)$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ . Then  $-\phi(x_k) + \psi(y_k) = c(x_k, y_k)$  for all  $k$ . But semicontinuity implies

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi(x_k) \geq \phi(x_\infty), \quad \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(y_k) \leq \psi(y_\infty).$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} -\phi(x_k) + \psi(y_k) \geq c(x_\infty, y_\infty),$$

which implies  $y_\infty \in \partial^c \phi(x_\infty)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.5.7.** *Let  $c$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A2). Then  $c$ -convex potentials  $\psi^c$  are  $\mathcal{H}_X$ -almost everywhere differentiable on  $\text{dom}(\psi^c) \subset X$ . Thus  $\text{dom}(D\psi^c)$  is a full  $\mathcal{H}_X$ -measure subset of  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$ .*

*Proof.* According to Lemma 2.5.5, the  $c$ -convex potentials  $\psi^c$  are locally Lipschitz on their domains  $\text{dom}(\psi^c) \subset X$ . Rademacher's theorem, [Vil09, Thm 10.8, pp.222], says locally Lipschitz functions are almost-everywhere differentiable on  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$  with respect to volume measure  $\mathcal{H}_X$  on their domains. Therefore  $\nabla_x \psi^c$  exists almost everywhere on  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$  as desired.  $\square$

Given Lemmas 2.5.2, 2.5.5, 2.5.7, we can now describe how Assumption (A4), namely (Twist), leads to the uniqueness of optimal semicouplings. The Lemma 2.5.7 states  $\psi^c$  is  $d\mathcal{H}_X$ -almost everywhere differentiable on its domain  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$ . Let  $\text{dom}(D\psi^c)$  denote the domain of differentiability in  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$ . So  $\text{dom}(D\psi^c)$  is full-measure subset of  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$ . Next consider the inequality

$$\psi^c(x) - \psi^c(x') \leq c(x', y) - c(x, y) \tag{2.12}$$

which holds almost-everywhere through the support of the optimal semicoupling. If

$x = x_0$  belongs to  $\text{dom}(D\psi^c)$ , then inequality (2.12) becomes an equation in  $y$ , namely

$$\nabla_x \psi^c(x_0) + \nabla_x c(x_0, y) = 0.$$

The equation characterizes membership  $y \in \partial^c \psi^c(x_0)$ . Under the (Twist) condition, the rule

$$T(x) := \nabla_x c(x, \cdot)^{-1}(-\nabla_x \psi^c(x)) \quad (2.13)$$

is a well-defined map  $T : \text{dom}(D\psi^c) \rightarrow Y$ . So  $T$  is a map defined  $\mathcal{H}_X$ -almost everywhere on  $\text{dom}(\psi^c)$ . Under the above hypotheses, we find  $T$  defines a Borel-measurable map  $T : \text{dom}(\psi^c) \rightarrow Y$  which pushes forward the restricted source  $1_{\text{dom}(\psi^c)}\sigma$  to  $\tau$ . Thus the pushforward  $(Id \times T)\#1_{\text{dom}(\psi^c)}\sigma$  defines a semicoupling  $\pi^*$  in  $SC(\sigma, \tau)$  which minimizes the Monge-transportation program. Therefore the graph of  $T$  defines a semicoupling from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$ , namely  $\pi := (Id, T)\#(1_{\text{dom}(\psi^c)}\sigma)$ . But we find  $\pi$  is necessarily  $c$ -optimal, since  $-\psi^c(x) + \psi(y) = c(x, y)$  holds almost everywhere on the support of  $\pi$ , and therefore “sup=inf” in (2.5). This discussion leads to standard uniqueness result, assuming the (Twist), c.f. [Vil09, Thms 10.28, 10.42].

**Proposition 2.5.8.** *Suppose cost  $c$  satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A4). Let source  $\sigma$  be absolutely continuous with respect to the volume measure  $\mathcal{H}_X$  on the source  $X$ . Then there exists unique  $c$ -optimal semicoupling (modulo sets of measure zero) between  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.4.7 we know Assumptions (A0)–(A4) ensure there exists a unique active domain for  $c$ -optimal semicouplings. We assume this unique active domain  $A$  has been identified, and restrict ourselves to the  $c|A$ -optimal coupling problem between  $1_A\sigma$  and  $\tau$ .

From Theorem 2.3.5 we know the dual program admits  $c$ -concave maximizers  $\psi, \psi^c$  on  $Y, X$ , respectively. By Lemma 2.5.7 the  $c$ -convex potential  $\psi^c$  on the source is almost-everywhere differentiable on its domain  $\text{dom}\psi^c \subset X$ . From Theorem 2.4.7 we know  $\text{dom}\psi^c$  coincides, modulo sets of zero measure, with the active domain  $A$ .

Assuming (Twist) condition, the discussion above shows there exists measurable map  $T : \text{dom}\psi^c \rightarrow Y$  whose graph  $(Id, T)\#(1_{\text{dom}\psi^c}\sigma)$  defines a semicoupling between  $\sigma, \tau$ , and this semicoupling is  $c$ -optimal. (See (2.13) for definition of  $T$ ). But the property that optimal semicouplings are supported on the graphs of measurable maps  $T$  implies the semicouplings are unique, modulo sets of zero measure. Indeed the above reasoning shows any  $c$ -optimal semicoupling is supported on the graph of a measurable map. So if  $\pi, \pi'$  are  $c$ -optimal, then their convex combination  $\frac{1}{2}\pi + \frac{1}{2}\pi'$  is again  $c$ -optimal. But




Figure 2.3: Halfspace Conditions fail and active domain is not homotopy-equivalent to source.

this convex combination cannot be supported on the graph of a measurable function, unless the graphs supporting  $\pi, \pi'$  coincide almost-everywhere and then  $\pi, \pi'$  coincide almost-everywhere.

□

## 2.6 Deforming $X \rightsquigarrow A$ : Topological Theorem A

The present section is topological, and our main result is Theorem 2.6.2. A cost satisfying (A0)–(A3) has a uniquely defined closed active domain  $A \subset X$  (recall Lemma 2.4.6 and equation (2.10)). Our goal is to identify conditions for which the inclusion  $A \hookrightarrow X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism. To anticipate some notation from §2.3, we consider the source space  $X =: Z(\emptyset)$ , and define the activated source  $A =: Z_1$ . We prove below that sufficient Halfspace conditions imply  $A \hookrightarrow X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism when cost satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A5). These deformations are generalized in the next chapters, where we introduce Kantorovich’s contravariant singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ , and describe homotopy-reductions  $Z(Y_I) \rightsquigarrow Z(Y_J)$  between various cells for closed subsets  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y_J$ .

**Definition 2.6.1.** A collection  $E = \{\eta_i \mid i \in I\} \subset T_x X$  of tangent vectors satisfies the **Halfspace condition** if there exists a nonzero linear functional  $\ell : T_x X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\ell(\eta_i) > 0$  simultaneously for all  $i \in I$ .

Equivalently, Halfspace condition says the convex hull  $\text{conv}[E] = \text{conv}[\{\eta_i \mid i \in I\}] \subset T_x X$  does not contain the origin  $0 \in T_x X$ .

**Theorem 2.6.2.** Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4) and (A6). Suppose the source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$  are absolutely continuous with respect to

$\mathcal{H}_X$  and  $\mathcal{H}_Y$ , respectively. Let  $A \hookrightarrow X$  be the closed activated source of a  $c$ -optimal semicoupling. Suppose every  $x' \in X - A$  has the property that the collection

$$\{\nabla_x c(x', y) \mid y \in \text{dom}(c_{x'})\} \subset T_{x'} X$$

satisfies Halfspace Condition. Furthermore suppose the gradients

$$\{\nabla_x c(x', y) \mid y \in \text{dom}(c_{x'})\}$$

are uniformly bounded away from zero over  $X - A$ . Then the inclusion  $A \hookrightarrow X$  is a homotopy-isomorphism, and there exists explicit strong deformation retract  $h : X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  of  $X$  onto  $A = h(X, 1)$ .

Our methods are analogous the arguments of [Nee85, §3]. Prior to reparameterizing the flows  $\Psi$ , the arguments of Theorem 2.6.2 demonstrate that the disactivated domain  $X - A$  deformation retracts onto every  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $A$  in  $X$ . I.e.,  $X$  deformation retracts onto

$$(A)_\epsilon := \{x \in X \mid \text{dist}(x, A) \leq \epsilon\}$$

for every  $\epsilon > 0$ . The purpose of 2.6.2 is to obtain continuous deformations at “ $\epsilon = 0$ ”. Our strategy is to study the gradient flow of an “averaged” vector field  $\eta_{avg}(x) = \nabla_x f_{avg}$  generated by an “averaged” potential  $f_{avg}$ . The condition that gradients be uniformly bounded away from zero is a form of Assumption (A5), and detailed below.

Suppose we have a Radon measure  $\bar{\nu}$  absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}_Y$ , and we take the average gradient with respect to  $\bar{\nu}$ . The following lemma formally establishes that this averaged-gradient is indeed the gradient field of a continuously differentiable “averaged” potential.

**Lemma 2.6.3.** *Let  $p > 0$ . Let  $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \dots$  be a sequence of empirical measures, i.e. rescaled sums of atomic Dirac measures, which converge as  $N \rightarrow +\infty$  in the weak-\* topology to the renormalized measure  $(\bar{\nu}[Y])^{-1} \cdot \bar{\nu}$  on  $Y$ . Then:*

(i) *For  $x \in X - A$ , the limit*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \int_Y (c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-\beta} d\nu_N(y)$$

*exists and converges to the finite integral*

$$f_{avg}(x) := (\bar{\nu}[Y])^{-1} \int_Y (c(x, y) - \psi_y)^{-\beta} d\bar{\nu}(y).$$

(ii) The rule  $f_{avg} : X - A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defines a continuously differentiable function with gradient

$$\nabla_x f_{avg} = (\bar{\nu}[Y])^{-1} \int_Y \nabla_x(c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-\beta} d\bar{\nu}(y).$$

*Proof.* If  $c$  satisfies (A0)–(A4), then the limit defining  $f_{avg}$  converges uniformly on compact subsets of  $X - A$ . So the limit in (i) exists and is finite. Moreover the uniform convergence on compact subsets implies (ii), since the approximants are continuously differentiable on  $X - A$ . Therefore  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$  is the averaged-gradient of  $\nabla_x(c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-\beta}$  with respect to  $\bar{\nu}$ , as desired.  $\square$

For  $y \in Y$ , we abbreviate  $f_y(x) := (c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-\beta}$  for  $x \in X - A$  and  $\beta > 0$ . We define  $f_{avg}$  according to Lemma 2.6.3 above.

**Definition 2.6.4 (Property (C)).** The collection of functions  $\{f_y \mid y \in Y\}$  satisfies Property (C) throughout  $X - A$  with respect to the uniform probability measure  $\frac{1}{\bar{\nu}[Y]} \bar{\nu}$  if there exists constant  $C > 0$  such that

$$\|\nabla_x f_{avg}\| \geq C \int_Y \|\nabla_x f_y\| d\bar{\nu}(y) \quad (2.14)$$

pointwise throughout  $X - A$ .

*Remark.* When  $Y$  is finite, the estimate (2.14) requires the ratio

$$\|\nabla_x f_{avg}\| / \max_{y \in Y} \|\nabla_x f_y\|$$

be uniformly bounded away from zero throughout  $X - A$ . In this case, Property (C) and Halfspace Condition 2.6.1 ensures the divergence of the average  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$  whenever a gradient summand  $\nabla_x f_y$  diverges.

When  $Y$  is infinite with positive dimension, then the pointwise divergence of the integrand  $\|f_y\| \rightarrow +\infty$  does not necessarily imply the divergence of the average  $f_{avg}$  for any choice of  $\beta > 0$ . The rate at which  $f_y$  diverges must be sufficiently large. This requires an auxiliary technical lemma, namely that  $\psi$  be, say, Hölder-regular. However Lemma 2.5.3 establishes that  $c$ -concave potentials  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup -\infty$  are locally Lipschitz throughout  $\text{dom}(\psi)$ .

Fix  $y_0 \in Y$ , and abbreviate  $f_0(x) := f_{y_0}(x) = (c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0))^{-\beta}$  for some  $\beta > 0$ ,  $x \in X$ . The function  $f_0$  is well-defined on  $\{c(x, y_0) > \psi(y_0)\} \subset X$ . If  $x$  converges to  $x_\infty \in \{c(x, y_0) \leq \psi(y_0)\}$ , then both  $f_0$ ,  $\nabla_x f_0$  diverge to infinity. The following lemma proves  $f_0$  is strongly convex in the direction of  $\nabla_x c(x, y_0)$  in neighborhoods of the poles  $\{f_0 = +\infty\}$ .

**Lemma 2.6.5.** *Suppose:*

- $c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0)$  has nonvanishing gradient throughout  $X - A$ ; and
- that  $\|\nabla_x c(x, y_0)\|$  is uniformly bounded from below; and
- suppose  $\nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y_0)$  is uniformly bounded above and below throughout  $X - A$ .

Then for every  $K > 0$ , there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\nabla_{xx}^2 f_0 \geq K.Id > 0$  in the direction of  $\nabla_x c(x, y_0)$  throughout the  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\{f_0 = +\infty\}$  in  $X - A$ .

*Proof.* We find  $\nabla_{xx}^2 f_0$  is equal to

$$\beta(1+\beta)(c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0))^{-2-\beta} \nabla_x c(x, y_0) \otimes \nabla_x c(x, y_0) - \beta(c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0))^{-1-\beta} \nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y_0).$$

By Proposition 2.6.4 the gradients  $\nabla_x c(x, y_0)$  are uniformly bounded away from zero in neighborhoods of  $\{f_0 = +\infty\}$ . Assumption (A1) implies  $\nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y_0)$  is uniformly bounded above and below on superlevel sets  $\{f_0 \geq T\}$  for all  $T > 0$ . Factoring out the term  $(c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0))^{-1-\beta}$ , we find  $\nabla_{xx}^2 f_0$  is positively proportional

$$\beta(1+\beta)(c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0))^{-1} \nabla_x c(x, y_0) \otimes \nabla_x c(x, y_0) - \beta \nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y_0),$$

and which diverges to  $+\infty$  with  $(c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0))^{-1}$ . This implies  $\nabla_{xx}^2 f_0$  is positive semidefinite when  $c(x, y_0) - \psi(y_0) > 0$  is sufficiently small, and strongly convex

$$\nabla_{xx}^2 f_0 \geq K > 0$$

in the direction of  $\nabla_x c(x, y_0)$ . By Assumption (A1) the sublevels  $\{x \mid \psi(y_0) \leq c(x, y_0) \leq \psi(y_0) + \epsilon'\}$  are compact subsets of  $X - A$  for every  $\epsilon' > 0$ , and this implies a sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$  exists for which  $\nabla_{xx}^2 f_0 \geq K.Id > 0$  throughout the  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\{f_0 = +\infty\}$  as desired and along the directions  $\nabla_x c(x, y_0)$ .  $\square$

**Example.** To illustrate Lemma 2.6.5, consider the  $f(x) = x^{-\beta}$  for  $x \geq 0$ ,  $\beta > 0$ . The gradient flow  $x' = (-\beta)x^{-1-\beta}$  is bounded away from zero in neighborhoods of the pole at  $x = 0$ , and indeed diverges to  $+\infty$ . Moreover  $f''(x)$  is obviously bounded away zero and diverging to  $+\infty$  as  $x \rightarrow 0^+$ .

For initial condition  $x_0 > 0$ , the integral curve of the negative gradient flow is equal to  $x(s) = (x_0^{2+\beta} - \beta(\beta+2)s)^{1/(2+\beta)}$ , which converges in finite time to the pole at  $x = 0$  over the interval  $0 \leq s \leq \frac{1}{\beta(\beta+2)}x_0^{2+\beta}$ . Thus we find  $\omega(x_0) = \frac{1}{\beta(\beta+2)}x_0^{2+\beta}$  varies continuously with respect to  $x_0 > 0$ , and is even Lipschitz. Compare Lemma 2.6.8 below.

The blow-up in finite time is typical property of the gradient flow defined by the potentials  $f_0$ . Actually our applications require verifying these same properties for the averaged potential  $f_{avg}$  and its gradient  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$ .

**Proposition 2.6.6.** *Let  $f_{avg}$  be the average defined in Definition 2.6.4. If  $x \in X - A$  is sufficiently near  $\partial A$ , then  $f_{avg}$  is strongly convex in the direction of  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $x$  converges to  $\{f_{avg} = +\infty\}$  in  $X - A$ , then there exists a closed subset  $V \subset Y$  such that  $f_y$  diverges to  $+\infty$ .

If  $x$  is sufficiently close to  $\cap_{y \in V} \{f_y = +\infty\}$ , then the gradients  $\{\nabla_x f_y \mid y \in V\}$  satisfy Halfspace Conditions.

If  $x$  is sufficiently close to  $\cap_{y \in V} \{f_y = +\infty\}$ , then  $D^2 f_{avg}$  is asymptotic to the average of the Hessians  $D^2 f_y$ ,  $y \in V$ .

In particular, we find  $D^2 f_{avg}$  is strongly convex in the directions of  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$  for  $x$  sufficiently close to  $\partial A$ .

□

**Lemma 2.6.7** (Finite-time Blow-up). *Suppose the functions  $\{f_y \mid y \in Y\}$  satisfy (2.14) as above. Then for every initial value  $x_0 \in \text{dom}(f_{avg})$ , the gradient flow defined by the average gradient  $x' = \nabla_x f_{avg}$  diverges to infinity in finite time.*

*Proof.* The estimate (2.14) shows the gradient  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$  is uniformly bounded away from zero in the neighborhoods of the poles  $\{f_{avg} = +\infty\}$  in  $X - A$ . Moreover  $f_{avg}$  is asymptotically convex in neighborhoods of the poles using Lemma 2.6.6 along directions of  $\nabla_x f_{avg}$ . This implies the gradient flow blows-up in finite-time and every integral curve has a finite interval of existence. □

Informally the estimate (2.14) implies every step in the discretized gradient flow (e.g., Euler scheme) has a definite size. Meanwhile the asymptotic convexity of Lemma 2.6.5 implies the discretized gradient flow well approximates the continuous gradient flow. But if step-sizes have a definite magnitude, then we definitely approach the poles after a finite number of steps and the integral curves blow-up in finite time.

The blow-up in finite time (Lemma 2.6.7) implies the maximal forward-time interval of existence for the gradient flow is a bounded interval  $I(x_0) := [0, \omega(x_0)) \subset [0, +\infty)$ . For general ordinary differential equations, it's known that  $\omega(x_0)$  is lower semicontinuous as a function of  $x_0$ : for a sequence of initial values  $x_0, x_1, \dots$  converging to some  $x_\infty$ , we have  $\omega(x_\infty) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \omega(x_k)$ . See [Har64, Theorem 2.1, pp.94]. In our particular setting, it is further necessary to establish the continuity of this maximal interval of existence. This is established in Lemma 2.6.8 below.

Now we establish Theorem 2.6.2, whose proof requires two auxiliary lemmas given below.

*Proof of Theorem 2.6.2.* According to Lemma 2.4.6 the active domain  $A$  can be expressed as  $\cup_{y \in Y} \{x \mid c(x, y) \leq \psi(y)\}$  for the Kantorovich potential  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . If Halfspace Condition is satisfied at  $x \in X - A$ , then the collection of gradients  $\{\nabla_x c(x, y) \mid y \in Y\}$  are all nonzero vectors and occupy some common nontrivial halfspace of  $T_x X$ . If we define

$$\eta(x, y) := (c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-1-\beta} \cdot \nabla_x c(x, y),$$

then likewise  $\{\eta(x, y) \mid y \in Y\}$  is a collection of vectors satisfying Halfspace condition. We divide the argument into two cases.

(Case I) Assume  $Y$  is finite with  $N = \#(Y) < +\infty$ . Define

$$\eta_{avg}(x) := N^{-1} \sum_{y \in Y} [(c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-1-\beta} \cdot \nabla_x c(x, y)]. \quad (2.15)$$

Evidently when  $Y$  is finite, the sum (2.15) is finite vector. Then  $x \mapsto \eta_{avg}(x)$  is a well-defined nonvanishing vector field on  $X - A$  which diverges whenever a denominator converges  $c(x, y) \rightarrow \psi(y)^+$ . Thus  $\eta(x, avg)$  is finite if and only if  $x \in X - A$ .

We propose integrating the vector field  $x \mapsto \eta_{avg}(x)$  throughout  $X - A$  to obtain the desired retraction. For every initial point  $x_0 \in X - A$ , there exists a unique solution  $\Psi(x_0, s)$  to the ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{d}{ds}|_{(x_0, s)} \Psi = \eta_{avg}(\Psi(x_0, s)), \quad \Psi(x_0, 0) = x_0, \quad (2.16)$$

and defined over a maximal interval of existence  $I(x_0) = [0, \omega(x_0))$ .

According to Lemma 2.6.8 the maximal interval  $I(x_0)$  varies continuously with respect to  $x_0 \in X - A$ . Moreover orbits  $\{\Psi(x_0, s) \mid s \in I(x_0)\}$  converge in finite-time to the boundary  $\partial(X - A)$  for every initial value  $x_0 \in X - A$ .

Finally, Lemma 2.6.8 below proves the orbits can be continuously reparameterized to obtain a continuous mapping  $\Psi' : (X - A) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  defined by

$$\Psi'(x_0, s) = \Psi(x_0, s\omega(x_0)). \quad (2.17)$$

(Case II) Suppose  $Y$  is infinite set, with uniform measure  $\mathcal{H}_Y$ . We define  $\eta_{avg}(x)$

according to the vector-valued Bochner integral

$$\eta_{avg}(x) := \left( \int_{\text{dom}(c_x)} d\mathcal{H}_Y \right)^{-1} \int_{\text{dom}(c_x)} (c(x, y) - \psi(y))^{-1-\beta} \cdot \nabla_x c(x, y) d\mathcal{H}_Y(y), \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\text{dom}(c_x)$  is closed compact subset of  $Y$  for every  $x \in X$  by Assumption (A0). Assumption (A6) implies the exponent  $p = \dim(Y) + 1$  is suitable according to Proposition 2.5.3. Lemma 2.6.3 implies the vector field  $\eta_{avg}(x) = \nabla_x f_{avg}$  is the gradient of a continuously differentiable potential  $f_{avg}$  defined on  $X - A$ .

The proof proceeds as in (Case I). The vector field  $x \mapsto \eta_{avg}(x)$  is well-defined nonvanishing vector field on  $X - A$  which diverges to  $+\infty$  whenever some denominator converges  $c(x, y) \rightarrow \psi(y)^+$ . We integrate the gradient fields and obtain the retraction of  $X - A$  onto the poles  $\partial A$ . The flow converges in finite-time by Lemma 2.6.7. We reparameterize the flow according to equation (2.17), and obtain a continuous deformation using Lemma 2.6.8.  $\square$

We complete the proof of Theorem 2.6.2 with the following Lemma 2.6.8.

**Lemma 2.6.8.** *Let  $c$  satisfy Assumptions (A0)–(A5). Then the maximal intervals of existence  $I(x_0) = [0, \omega(x_0))$  of solutions to the initial value problem 2.16 vary continuously with respect to the initial point  $x_0$ . In otherwords,  $x_0 \mapsto \omega(x_0)$  varies continuously with  $x \in X - A$ .*

*Proof.* Our assumptions imply the domain  $X - A$  is a complete open set. Furthermore  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  being uniformly bounded away from zero implies the trajectories  $s \mapsto \Psi(x_0, s)$  are finite on compact subsets of  $X - A$ . Therefore  $\omega(x_0)$  is characterized by the two limits

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \omega(x_0)^-} \Psi(x_0, s) \in \partial A, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow \omega(x_0)^-} \|\Psi(x_0, s)\| = +\infty,$$

and here we take advantage of the divergence  $\|\eta_{avg}(x)\| \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \partial A$ .

Moreover the asymptotic concavity (Proposition 2.6.6) of the average potential defining  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  implies the flow defined by 2.16 is asymptotically contracting. This implies  $\omega(x_0)$  is actually a Lipschitz function of  $x_0$ , i.e. satisfying  $|\omega(x_1) - \omega(x_0)| \leq C \cdot \|x_1 - x_0\|$  for some constant  $C = C(x_0)$  depending on  $x_0 \in X - A$ . Hence  $\omega$  is a continuous function, as desired.  $\square$

# Chapter 3

## Kantorovich Singularity and Topological Theorem B

The previous Chapter 2 developed the measure-theoretic background relevant to optimal semicoupling program, and concluded with our topological Theorem A 2.6.2 which describes a topological homotopy isomorphism  $A \subset X$ . Here  $A$  is the unique open activated domain, §2.4, and we suppose HalfSpace Conditions and Property (C) are satisfied, see Definition 2.6.4. The present chapter further develops these ideas, describing topological properties of the singularities of optimal semicouplings. We also present the central definition of our thesis, namely Kantorovich's contravariant singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  defined  $Z = Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$  with respect to a choice of cost  $c$  satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4), and source and target measures  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  on  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively.

### 3.1 Kantorovich's Contravariant Singularity Functor

Our thesis proposes a bridge between measure and algebraic topology. The bridge is realized by the contravariant functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ , where  $2^Y$  designates the category of closed subsets  $Y_I$  of  $Y$ , and where morphisms are the inclusions  $Y_I \subset Y_J$  between closed subsets  $Y_I, Y_J$  whenever they exist. Likewise for  $2^X$ .

The singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  is defined relative to a cost  $c$  on  $X \times Y$  satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A4). Let  $\sigma, \tau$  be absolutely continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measures  $dx := \mathcal{H}_X^d, dy := \mathcal{H}_Y^e$  on  $X, Y$  respectively. By Theorems 2.4.7 and 2.5.8 there exists unique  $c$ -minimizing measures, and  $c$ -concave potentials  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  on  $Y$ . The  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c \psi$  is uniquely determined, but the choice of potentials – i.e. the maximizers in dual maximization program (2.5) – are generally nonunique.

**Definition 3.1.1** (Kantorovich Singularity). The Kantorovich singularities in  $X$  are the closed subvarieties  $Z(Y_I)$  functorially assembled from the closed subsets  $Y_I$  of  $Y$  by the rule

$$Y_I \mapsto Z(Y_I) := \cap \{\partial^c \psi(y) | y \in Y_I\}.$$

We declare  $Z(\emptyset) = X$  for the empty subset  $\emptyset$  of  $Y$ .

The definition  $Z(Y_I) = \cap_{Y_I} Z(y)$  yields a *contravariant functor*  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  where morphisms  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y_J$  correspond to  $Z(Y_I) \hookleftarrow Z(Y_J)$  in  $X$ . The contravariant functor  $Z$  is uniquely prescribed by the choice of  $(c, \sigma, \tau)$  under the above assumptions. For  $(c, \sigma, \tau)$  satisfying the assumptions above, the singularity  $Z = Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$  will generally admit many closed subsets  $Y_I \subset Y$  for which the cells  $Z(Y_I) \subset X$  are empty  $Z(Y_I) = \emptyset$ . It is useful to restrict ourselves to the nontrivial image of  $Z$  and establish formal definition of support.

**Definition 3.1.2.** The support of the contravariant functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  is the subcategory of  $2^Y$ , denoted  $spt(Z)$ , whose objects are those closed subsets  $Y_I$  of  $Y$  for which  $Z(Y_I)$  is nonempty subset of  $X$ . So

$$spt(Z) = \{Y_I \subset Y | Z(Y_I) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that  $\emptyset \subset Y$  is object in subcategory  $spt(Z)$ , since  $Z(\emptyset) = X$  according to Definition 3.1.1.

For given  $x \in X$ , we interpret  $Z'(x) := Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x))$  as a “cellular neighborhood” of  $x$  in the active domain  $A =: Z_1 = \cup_{y \in Y} Z(y)$ . The  $c$ -concavity  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  provides explicit equations describing  $Z'(x)$ . See Section 3.2 and (3.2).



We conclude this section with the observation that the singularity functor  $Z(\sigma, \tau, c)$  is upper semicontinuous with respect to Gromov-Hausdorff limits of  $(\sigma, \tau, c)$ . We refer the reader to any standard textbook on category theory for definition of “natural transformations” of functors, e.g. [Lan05, Ch.1].

**Proposition 3.1.3.** Let  $X, Y$  be Riemannian manifolds-with-corners. Let  $\sigma_k, \tau_k, k \geq 1$ , be a sequence of measures which converge in weak-\* topology to  $\sigma, \tau$ , respectively. Let  $c_k : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a sequence of costs which converge pointwise to a cost  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Then the correspondance

$$(\sigma_k, \tau_k, c_k) \mapsto Z(\sigma_k, \tau_k, c_k)$$

varies upper semicontinuously, and there exists an injective natural transformation be-

Figure 3.1: Singularity structure  $Z$  on active domain  $A = Z_1$ Figure 3.2: Singularity structure on  $Z_2$

tween the functors

$$Z(\sigma, \tau, c) \hookrightarrow \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} Z(\sigma_k, \tau_k, c_k).$$

In particular, for every closed subset  $Y_I$  of  $Y$ , the cell  $Z(Y_I)$  is an embedded subset of the Gromov-Hausdorff limit  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} Z_k(Y_I)$ .

*Proof.* [Vil09, Thm. 28.9, pp.780–790]  $\square$

The point of Proposition 3.1.3 is that the singularities of the limit  $(\sigma, \tau, c)$  are no more complicated than the approximant singularities of  $(\sigma_k, \tau_k, c_k)$ . In fact the singularity often simplifies in various limits. Proposition 3.1.3 is familiar property of lower semicontinuous convex functions: if  $\phi_k : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a sequence of lower semicontinuous convex functions which converge pointwise to a limit  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_k = \phi_0$ , then for every  $x \in X$ , the subdifferential  $\partial\phi_0(x)$  is a subset of the Hausdorff limit  $\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \partial\phi_k(x)$ . In fact the graph of the subdifferential  $Id \times \partial\phi$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ .

## 3.2 Local Topology and Local Dimensions of $Z$

The present section examines the local differential topology and dimensions of Kantorovich's contravariant functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  with respect to costs  $c$  satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A6). Our goal is to describe the basic differential topology of the cells

$$Z'(x) := Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x))$$

of given  $c$ -concave potentials  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  having  $c$ -transform  $\psi^c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . Our main results are Propositions 3.2.3 and 3.3.4. The proof of 3.2.3 is essentially a local adaptation of the recent work of [KM18], and 3.3.4 is obtained as corollary to theorem of Alberti [Alb94]. We are grateful to Prof. R. J. McCann for many useful conversations.

Let the reader recall the definitions of  $c$ -concavity (Section 2.3) and  $c$ -subdifferentials (Definition 2.3.3). The  $c$ -concavity  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  represents a pointwise inequality on  $Y$ , namely

$$-\psi^c(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x, y)$$

for all  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ . The case of equality  $\psi(y) - \psi^c(x) = c(x, y)$  is most important, and occurs if and only if  $y \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)$ , and if and only if  $x \in \partial^c \psi(y)$ . We recall that  $c$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi$  are supported on the graphs of  $c$ -subdifferentials, and hence  $-\psi^c(x) + \psi(y) = c(x, y)$   $\pi$ -a.e.

Now we make some observations. Abbreviate  $c_\Delta(x; y, y') := c(x, y) - c(x, y')$  for the two-pointed cross difference. If  $\psi^c$  is differentiable at  $x \in X$ , then  $\partial^c \psi^c(x)$  is a

singleton, say  $\{y_0\}$ . And  $\pi$  almost-surely we have equality  $\psi^c(x) + c(x, y) = \psi(y)$ . On the other hand, if  $x$  is such  $\partial^c\psi^c(x)$  is not a singleton, say including two distinct points  $y_0, y_1$ , then  $\psi^c(x) + c(x, y_0) = \psi(y_0)$ ,  $\psi^c(x) + c(x, y_1) = \psi(y_1)$ , and consequently  $0 = \psi(y_1) - \psi(y_0) - c_\Delta(x, y_0, y_1)$ . Likewise we find  $x \in \partial^c\psi^c(y)$  if and only if

$$y \in \operatorname{argmax}[\{\psi(y_*) - c(x, y_*) + c(x, y) \mid y_* \in Y\}]. \quad (3.1)$$

For  $x_0 \in X$ , we abbreviate  $Z'(x_0) := Z(\partial^c\psi^c(x_0))$ . We interpret  $Z'(x_0)$  as the “local cell” containing  $x_0$  in the activated domain  $A$  of the  $c$ -optimal semicoupling. If  $x_0 \in X$  is a “singular point”, where  $\psi^c(x_0)$  is not differentiable, then  $\partial^c\psi^c(x_0)$  is not a singleton and the cell  $Z'(x_0)$  is described by the system of equations

$$Z'(x_0) = \{x \in X \mid 0 = \psi(y_0) - \psi(y) - c_\Delta(x; y_0, y), y \in \partial^c\psi^c(x_0), y \neq y_0\} \quad (3.2)$$

according to (3.1).

From the expression (3.2) we obtain the following:

**Lemma 3.2.1.** *Under Assumptions (A0)–(A3), the cell  $Z'(x) = Z(\partial^c\psi^c(x))$  is a closed locally DC-subvariety in  $X$  for every  $x \in \operatorname{dom}(\psi^c)$ .*

*Proof.* Assumption (A1) implies  $x \mapsto \nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y)$  is locally bounded on  $X$ , uniformly in  $y$ . Therefore every  $x$  admits a neighborhood  $U$  and a constant  $C \geq 0$  such that  $\|\nabla_{xx}^2 c(x, y)\| \geq C$  uniformly with respect to  $y$  throughout  $U$ . This implies  $x \mapsto c(x, y)$  is locally semiconvex function on  $X$ , uniformly in  $y$ . But then the cross-differences  $x \mapsto c_\Delta(x; y, y')$  are locally DC-functions, uniformly in  $y, y'$  in  $Y$ . This observation and equation (3.2) implies  $Z'(x)$  is locally-DC subvariety of  $X$ .  $\square$

The reader should observe Lemma 3.2.1 does not specify the dimension of  $Z'(x)$ . We address this question of dimension in the remaining section, c.f. Proposition 3.2.3. A coarse dimension estimate follows from a calculus computation describing the space-of-directions to  $Z'(x)$  at  $x$ , c.f. [Vil09, pp.227]

For given  $c$ -concave potential  $\psi$ , we abbreviate  $A(x, y) := A(x, y, y_0) = c_\Delta(x, y, y_0) - (\psi(y) - \psi(y_0))$ .

**Lemma 3.2.2.** *Let  $x \in X$  be a singular point, where  $\partial^c\psi^c(x)$  is not a singleton. Then the space of directions  $T_x Z'(x)$  is a subset of the orthogonal complement*

$$\operatorname{orthog}[\{\nabla_x c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_1) \mid y_1, y_0 \in \partial^c\psi^c(x)\}]$$

in  $T_x X$ .

*Proof.* We examine the case of equality  $A = 0$  of the inequality  $A \leq 0$ . A first-order deformation  $\eta$  at  $x$  and tangent to  $Z'(x)$  must preserve the system of equations  $\{A(x, y, y') = 0 \mid y, y' \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)\}$ . But this if and only if  $\eta \in T_x X$  satisfies the homogeneous linear equations  $\eta \cdot \nabla_x c_\Delta(x, y, y') = 0$  for every  $y, y' \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)$ .  $\square$

The Lemma 3.2.2 indicates the *expected* Hausdorff dimension of  $Z'(x)$ , namely the dimension of the orthogonal complement  $\{\nabla_x c_\Delta(x, y, y') \mid y, y' \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)\}$ . With Halfspace conditions and ideas from [KM18], we confirm this dimension estimate in Proposition 3.2.3 below.

Some preliminary notation is convenient. Recall  $X$  is a Riemannian manifold-with-corners, equipped with Riemannian exponential mapping  $\exp_x : T_x X \rightarrow X$ . If  $(X, d)$  is complete Cartan-Hadamard space, then  $\exp_x$  is diffeomorphism between  $T_x X$  and the universal covering space  $\tilde{X}$ . On general Riemannian manifold-with-corners  $X$  the exponential map is a local diffeomorphism between sufficiently small open neighborhoods  $U$  of  $x_0 \in X$  with open balls  $U'$  in the tangent space  $T_{x_0} X$ . So we have  $C^1$  diffeomorphisms between local neighborhoods of  $x_0 \in X$  with neighborhoods of 0 in euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $n = \dim(X) = \dim(T_{x_0} X)$ . Thus for every  $x_0 \in X$  there exists a local diffeomorphism splitting  $B_\epsilon(x_0)$  as a product  $B_\epsilon(x'_0) \times B_\epsilon(x''_0)$ , viewed as subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-j} \times R^j$  with  $x_0 = (x'_0, x''_0)$  for  $j \geq 0$ .

Recall  $c$  satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A4). Let  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  be a  $c$ -concave potential. Abbreviate  $Z_1 := \text{dom}(\psi^c)$  and let  $x \in \text{dom}(\psi^c)$ .

**Proposition 3.2.3.** *Suppose the gradients  $\{\nabla_x c_\Delta(x'; y_0, y_1) \mid y_0, y_1 \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)\}$  satisfy (HS) conditions and are bounded away from zero in  $T_{x'} X$ , uniformly with respect to  $x' \in Z'(x) = Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x))$ . Then  $Z'(x)$  is a codimension- $j$  local DC-subvariety of the active domain  $Z_1$ , where*

$$j := \dim[\text{span}\{\nabla_x c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_1) \mid y_0, y_1 \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)\}].$$

Thus whenever the gradients  $\{\nabla_x c_\Delta(x'; y_0, y_1)\}_{y_0, y_1 \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)}$  satisfy Halfspace Conditions and Definition 2.6.4, then

$$\text{codim}_{Z_1} Z_j = j - 1 \text{ for every } j \geq 1. \quad (3.3)$$

Observe that (HS) Conditions fail whenever  $Z_j$  is empty, and evidently the formula (3.3) no longer applies.

*Proof.* Consider the mapping  $G : B_\epsilon(x_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  defined by

$$G(x) = (A(x, y_1), A(x, y_2), \dots, A(x, y_j)).$$

Here we abbreviate  $A(x, y_i) := A(x, y_i, y_0)$  for  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_j \in \partial^c \psi^c(x_0)$  such that

$$\{\nabla_x A(x_0, y_i, y_0)\}_{1 \leq i \leq j}$$

is linearly independant subset of  $T_{x_0}X$  (which necessarily satisfies Halfspace conditions). The map  $G : B_\epsilon(x_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^j$  is local DC-function according to Lemma 3.2.1.

We use exponential mapping to obtain local  $C^1$ -diffeomorphism between an open neighborhood of  $x_0$  in  $X$ . Next we apply the *DC*-implicit function theorem as stated in [KM18, Thm 3.8], and conclude there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  and a biLipschitz DC-mapping  $\phi$  from  $B_\epsilon(x'_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-j}$  to  $B_\epsilon(x''_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^j$  such that, for all  $x = (x', x'') \in B_\epsilon(x'_0) \times B_\epsilon(x''_0) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-j} \times \mathbb{R}^j$  we have  $G(x) = G(x', x'') = 0$  if and only if  $x'' = \phi(x')$ .

The basic subdifferential inequalities (3.2) imply  $G(x) = 0$  if and only if  $x \in Z'(x_0) \cap B(x_0, \epsilon)$ . Now because  $Z'(x)$  can be covered by countably many sufficiently small open balls, we conclude that  $Z'(x)$  is a local DC-subvariety with Hausdorff dimension  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} Z'(x) = n - j$ .  $\square$

N.B. The description of  $T_x Z'(x)$  is symmetric with respect to  $y_1, y_0$ . There is further symmetry from the additive relations between cross-costs

$$c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_1) + c_\Delta(x; y_1, y_2) = c_\Delta(x; y_0, y_2).$$

This implies the obvious estimate  $\text{codim} Z'(x) \leq \#(\partial^c \psi^c(x)) - 1$  under general conditions.

*Remark.* The proof of 3.2.3 does not necessarily require the DC-implicit function theorem, since the cross-differences  $x \mapsto c_\Delta(x, y, y')$  are assumed to be  $C^2$  according to Assumption (A1). We could therefore have applied a standard  $C^1$ - or  $C^2$ -implicit function theorem (e.g. [Spi71, Thm. 2.12]) to conclude  $Z'(x)$  is a  $C^1$  (or  $C^2$ ) subvariety of  $X$ . However we prefer the *DC* perspective, which appears the more natural category for optimal transport methods.

Recently [KM18] obtained an explicit parameterization of singularities arising from Euclidean quadratic costs, employing a hypothesis of affine independance between the connected components of the subdifferentials  $\partial^c \psi^c(x)$ . Their parameterization requires a global splitting  $X = X_0 \times X_1$  of the source domain to express singularities (“tears” in their terminology) as the graphs of *DC*-functions  $G : X_0 \rightarrow X_1$  as above. However further hypotheses on the convexity of source and target are required in their arguments.

### 3.3 The Descending Filtration $Z_j, j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

The Kantorovich functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  leads to a filtration of the source  $X$ . Indeed we follow an idea of Prof. D. Bar-Natan [Bar02a] and “skewer the cube”  $2^X$ , or more accurately the support  $spt(Z)$ , according to local codimensions.

**Definition 3.3.1.** For integers  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , let

$$Z_{j+1} := \{x \in X \mid \dim[span\{\nabla_x c_\Delta(x; y, y') \mid y, y' \in \partial^c \psi^c(x)\}] \geq j\}$$

where  $Z'(x) = Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x))$  for a  $c$ -concave potential  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  on target space  $Y$ .

According to the definition,  $Z_j$  is supported on the subcategory  $spt(Z)$  of  $2^Y$  for every  $j \geq 1$ . In this notation the activated support  $A$  coincides with the support of  $Z_1$ .

Our methods replace the  $c$ -subdifferentials with an important “localized” version using (Twist) condition (A4). The  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c \psi^c$  of a  $c$ -convex function  $\psi^c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is non-local subset of  $Y$ . The subsets  $\partial^c \psi^c \subset Y$  depends on global datum, namely the values of  $c(x, y)$  for all  $y \in \text{dom}(c_x)$ . Hence  $\partial^c \psi^c(x_0)$  depends on the values of  $\psi(y)$  and  $\psi^c(x)$  for every  $y \in Y, x \in X$  and not simply the local behaviour of  $\psi^c$  near  $x_0$ . It is useful to introduce a local subdifferential, namely the so-called “subgradients” of a function  $\psi^c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .

**Definition 3.3.2** (Local Subgradients  $\partial_\bullet \phi$ ). Let  $U$  be open set in  $X$ , sufficiently small such  $U$  is  $C^1$ -diffeomorphic to an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  where  $n = \dim(X)$ . Let  $\phi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function. Then  $\phi$  is subdifferentiable at  $x$  with subgradient  $v^* \in T_x^* X$  if

$$\phi(z) \geq \phi(x) + v^*(z - x) + o(|z - x|) \text{ for all } z \text{ near } x.$$

Let  $\partial_\bullet \phi(x) \subset T_x^* X$  denote the set of all subgradients to  $\phi$  at  $x$ . Here  $o$  is the “little-oh” notation.

Evidently the subgradient  $\partial_\bullet \phi(x)$  is local, and depending on the values of  $\phi$  near  $x$ . Moreover  $\partial_\bullet \phi(x)$  is a closed convex subset of  $T_x^* X$  for every  $x \in \text{dom}(\phi)$ .

The Assumptions (A0)–(A3) imply  $\psi^c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  is locally semiconvex over its domain  $\text{dom}(\psi^c) \subset X$ , (c.f. Lemma 2.5.5). In otherwords, every  $x \in \text{dom}(\psi^c)$  admits an open neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  and a constant  $C \geq 0$  such that  $D^2 \psi^c \geq -C Id$  throughout  $U$ , where  $D^2 \psi^c = D_{xx}^2 \psi^c$  is the distributional Hessian in the source variable  $x$  (c.f. [Vil09, Theorem 14.1, pp.363]). So given a  $c$ -convex potential  $\psi^c$  on  $X$ , for every  $x_0 \in X$  there exists open neighborhood  $U$  and  $C \geq 0$  such that  $\psi^c|_{U_x} + C||x||^2/2$  is strictly-convex

throughout  $U$ . This implies the local subdifferential and subgradients  $\partial_{\bullet}\psi^c(x)$  coincide with the convex-analytic subdifferential of the local function  $\psi^c|_U + C||x||^2/2$ , when restricted to the sufficiently small neighborhood  $x$  in  $X$ .

Having introduced the local subdifferential, there is important comparison between  $\partial^c\psi^c(x_0) \subset Y$  and  $\partial_{\bullet}\psi^c(x_0)$ , assuming (Twist) condition Assumption (A4). This relation is the inclusion

$$\partial^c\psi^c(x_0) \subset \{y \in Y \mid -\nabla_x c(x, y) \in \partial_{\bullet}\psi^c(x_0)\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Observe  $\emptyset \neq \partial^c\psi^c(x_0)$  whenever  $x_0 \in \text{dom}(\psi^c)$ . We abuse notation and denote  $\nabla_x c(x, y)$  for the canonical covector in  $T_x^*X$ , with the tangent vector in  $T_x X$  using the ambient Riemannian structure. The inclusion (3.4) allows us to replace the global  $c$ -subdifferential  $\partial^c\psi^c$  with the local convex set of subgradients  $\partial_{\bullet}\psi^c$ . The inclusion is generally strict. However it produces basic upper bounds on the Hausdorff dimension of  $\partial^c\psi^c$ . We quote the following theorem of G. Alberti:

**Theorem 3.3.3** ([Alb94]). *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be proper lowersemicontinuous convex function. For every  $0 < k < n$ , let  $S^k(f) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be the subset defined by*

$$S^k(f) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial_{\bullet}(f)) \geq k\}.$$

*Then  $S^k(f)$  can be covered by countably many  $(n - k)$ -dimensional DC-manifolds.*

In otherwords  $S^k(f)$  is countably  $(n - k)$ -rectifiable and has Hausdorff dimension  $\leq (n - k)$ . If  $f$  is  $+\infty$ -valued on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then Alberti's method shows  $S^k(f)$  can be covered by countably many  $(n' - k)$ -dimensional manifolds where  $n' = \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{dom}(f))$ . The domain  $\text{dom}(f)$  is a closed convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  having well-defined Hausdorff dimension.

**Proposition 3.3.4.** [Dimension Estimate] *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A3). Let  $\psi : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  be  $c$ -concave potential  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  with singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ . Define  $n' := \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{dom}(\psi^c))$ . Then for every integer  $j \geq 1$ , the subvariety  $Z_j$  has Hausdorff dimension*

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(Z_j) \leq n' - j + 1.$$

*Proof.* Consider the inclusion (3.4). For given  $x_0$ , let  $U$  be the open neighborhood and  $C > 0$  such that  $\psi^c|_U + C||x||^2/2$  is strictly-convex throughout  $U$ . For  $x \in U$  the  $c$ -subdifferentials  $\partial^c\psi^c(x)$  are contained in the closed convex local subdifferentials  $\partial_{\bullet}\psi^c|_U(x)$ . Now we have equality

$$\partial_{\bullet}(\psi^c|_U(x) + C|x|^2/2) = \partial_{\bullet}\psi^c|_U(x) + C\langle -, x \rangle. \quad (3.5)$$

So the local subdifferential  $\partial_{\bullet}(\psi_U^c + C|x|^2/2)$  in  $T_x^*X$  is an affine translate of  $\partial_{\bullet}\psi^c|_U$  by the linear functional  $C\langle -, x \rangle$ .

Next we apply Alberti's theorem to the localized convex function  $\psi^c|_U + C|x|^2/2$ . Thus  $S^k(\psi^c|_U + C|x|^2/2)$  and  $S^k(\psi^c|_U)$  can be covered by countably many  $(n' - k)$ -dimensional manifolds where  $n' := \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{dom } \psi^c|_U)$ .

Finally we relate  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial_{\bullet}\psi^c|_U(x))$  to the Hausdorff dimension of  $Z'(x) = Z(\partial^c\psi^c(x)) = \cap_{y \in \partial^c\psi^c(x)} \partial^c\psi(y)$ . From the definition of subgradients, we have

$$\text{conv}(\{\nabla_x c(x, y) | y \in \partial^c\psi^c(x)\}) \subset \partial_{\bullet}\psi^c(x).$$

Moreover the closed convex hull  $\text{conv}(\{\nabla_x c(x, y) | y \in \partial^c\psi^c(x)\})$  has dimension

$$j = \dim(\text{span}\{\nabla_x c_{\Delta}(x, y, y_0) \mid y \in \partial^c\psi^c(x)\}).$$

For every  $x \in Z_j$  we conclude  $Z_j \cap U \subset S^j(\psi^c|_U + C|x|^2/2)$ , which according to Alberti's theorem 3.3.3 yields the upper bound  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(Z_j \cap U) \leq n' - j$ . To conclude, we observe that  $Z_j$  can be covered by countably many open neighborhoods  $U$  of points  $x \in Z_j$ . This follows from the fact that  $Z_j$  is topologically closed subset of  $X$ , and therefore every covering by open sets can be reduced to a countable covering.  $\square$

We conclude this section with some remarks on the literature. The term “singularity” is evidently overburdened, and having various interpretations within the literature. Our thesis imagines “singularity” as referring to a locus-of-discontinuity of certain extremal measures (the  $c$ -optimal semicouplings). The key features of our formulation of Kantorovich singularity are the following: Definition 3.1.1 is *categorical* and Definition 3.1.1 is *topological*. Indeed as we described in our introduction, the idea of “singularity” as locus-of-discontinuity is not a topological definition!

Our topological Kantorovich singularity also yields an alternative perspective on the so-called “regularity theory” of optimal transportation. Typically regularity in optimal transport focuses on the mapping  $T$  defined in (2.13) in Chapter 2. There is large volume of research concerning the  $C^{1,\alpha}$  or  $C^2$ ,  $C^\infty$  regularity of  $T$  under various hypotheses on  $c, \sigma, \tau$ . We refer the reader to [Vil09, Ch.12] for a survey. Our thesis however is interested in the continuity, and especially the discontinuities of  $T$ . Indeed we describe the topology of points  $x$  where  $c$ -convex potentials are not uniquely differentiable, where  $\partial^c\psi^c(x) \subset Y$  is not a singleton. Our thesis thus passes silently over questions of the type “how continuous is the map  $T$  away from the singularities we have identified?”.

Several results concerning singularities of optimal transports have been attained in

the literature. In [Fig10a] the singularities of optimal transports between two probability measures supported on bounded open domains in the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with respect to the quadratic euclidean cost  $c(x, y) = \|x - y\|^2/2$  (equivalently  $c = -\langle x, y \rangle$ ), was studied. The main result of [Fig10a, §3.2] is that the singularity ( $Z_2$  in our notation) has topological closure  $\overline{Z_2}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with zero two-dimensional Hausdorff measure,  $\mathcal{H}_X^2(\overline{Z_2}) = 0$ . The work of Figalli was extended in [FK10], where the determination  $\mathcal{H}^n(\overline{Z_2}) = 0$  was established for singularities of optimal couplings under the hypothesis that probability measures are supported on bounded open domains of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to euclidean quadratic cost. In [PF] a similar result is established with respect to costs on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying more general nondegeneracy conditions, namely: (i)  $c \in C^2(X \times Y)$  with  $\|c\|_{C^2} < +\infty$ , (ii)  $x \mapsto \nabla_y c(x, y)$  injective map for every  $y$ , (iii)  $y \mapsto \nabla_x c(x, y)$  injective map for every  $x$ , and (iv)  $\det(D_{xy}^2 c) \neq 0$  for all  $(x, y)$ . These previous works suggest that under general assumptions on the cost, the singularity  $Z_2$  has Hausdorff dimension

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(Z_2) \leq \dim(X) - \dim(Y).$$

The recent work [KM18] confirms this estimate under particular conditions, namely euclidean quadratic cost, convex source, and convexity and affine-independance of the disjoint target components.

### 3.4 Local–Global Homotopy Reductions: (UHS) Conditions

The final section 2.6 of Chapter 2 constructed a continuous deformation retract of a source space  $X$  onto an active  $A$  when a Condition (C) and Halfspace Conditions were satisfied: see Definition 2.6.4 Theorem 2.6.2.

This section generalizes the homotopy-reduction constructed in 2.6.2, and describes a retraction procedure  $Z_1 \rightsquigarrow Z_2 \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow Z_{J+1}$ , defined up to some maximal index  $J \geq 1$  for which the inclusions

$$Z_1 \hookleftarrow Z_2 \hookleftarrow \dots \hookleftarrow Z_{J+1}$$

are simultaneously homotopy isomorphisms. The retraction requires our cost  $c$  satisfy Assumptions (A0)–(A6) and a further hypothesis called “Uniform Halfspace Conditions” (see Definition 3.4.1). Briefly, our retraction integrates a vector field, denoted  $\eta_{avg}(x)$ , which under suitable Assumptions reparameterizes to a continuous deformation retract. See Theorem 3.4.2.

*Remark.* Our deformations are effectively generalizations of the well-rounded retracts of [Ash84], [Sou78] as interpreted in the optimal semicoupling category in the Kantorovich singularities. We refer the reader to [PS08], [Ste07, §A.6.4], for discussions on the lattice-theoretic and number-theory applications of the well-rounded retracts. Our retractions are often large-codimension ( $J \geq 2$ ), and should prove useful for applications and new constructions of small-dimensional classifying spaces.

Now we describe our retraction procedure, which requires some notations.

- Let  $c$  be a cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A6).
- Abbreviate  $Y'(x) := \text{dom}(c_x)$ .
- Suppose the source  $\sigma$  and target measure  $\tau$  are absolutely-continuous with respect to the Hausdorff measures  $\mathcal{H}_X$  and  $\mathcal{H}_Y$  on  $X, Y$ , respectively.
- Let  $\psi^{cc} = \psi$  be a  $c$ -concave potential maximizing Kantorovich's dual problem (§2.3) relative to a source  $\sigma$  and target  $\tau$ .
- Let  $Z = Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$  be the corresponding Kantorovich functor. Suppose  $j \geq 1$  and consider the inclusion  $Z_j \hookrightarrow Z_{j+1}$ , as defined in Definition 3.3.1.
- For  $x' \in Z_j - Z_{j+1}$ , evaluate  $\partial^c \psi^c(x') \subset Y$  and abbreviate  $Z' := Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x'))$ .
- For  $x \in Z'$ , let  $\text{pr}_{Z'} : T_x X \rightarrow T_x Z'$  denote the orthogonal-projection mapping, where  $T_x Z'$  is the space of directions of  $Z'$  at  $x$ . C.f. [Vil09, Def.10.4.6, pp.257]

Given the above notation, we proceed to our retraction which is based on the construction of an “averaged” Bochner integral  $\eta_{avg}(x)$ . See [Yos68, §V.5] for formal properties of Bochner integrals.

**Definition 3.4.1.** Let  $x \in Z' = Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x'))$  and select any  $y_0 \in \partial^c \psi^c(x')$ . For parameters  $\beta > 1$  and  $y \in Y$ , we define tangent vectors  $\eta(x, y) \in T_x X$  by the equation

$$\eta(x, y) := |\psi(y_0) - \psi(y) + c_\Delta(x; y, y_0)|^{-2-\beta} \cdot \text{pr}_{Z'}(\nabla_x c_\Delta(x; y, y_0)). \quad (3.6)$$

Relative to  $x$ , let  $\bar{\nu}$  be the Radon measure on  $Y$  defined by

$$d\bar{\nu}(y) := (1 - e^{d(y, \partial^c \psi^c(x'))^2}).1_{Y'(x)}.d\tau(y).$$

We say Uniform Halfspace (UHS) conditions are satisfied at  $x$  in  $Z'$  with respect to the parameter  $\beta$  if:

**(UHS1)** the Bochner integral  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  defined by

$$\eta_{avg}(x) := (\bar{\nu}[Y])^{-1} \int_Y \eta(x, y) d\bar{\nu}(y) \quad (3.7)$$

is nonzero finite vector in  $T_x Z' - \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ; and

**(UHS2)** there exists a constant  $C > 0$ , uniform with  $x \in Z'$ , for which the estimate

$$\|\eta_{avg}(x)\| \geq C \int_Y \|\eta(x, y)\| d\bar{\nu}(y) > 0 \quad (3.8)$$

holds.

Definition 3.4.1 is key to our thesis. We make some remarks and then proceed to our main Theorem 3.4.2. The definition of  $\eta(x, y)$  is independant of the choice of  $y_0 \in \partial^c \psi^c(x')$ . Clearly (UHS2) implies (UHS1). In practice the parameter  $\beta > 1$  is taken sufficiently large to ensure the divergence of  $\eta_{avg}(x)$  whenever  $x$  converges into  $\partial Z'$ . This is analogous to the discussion in §2.6, specifically the Case (II) in the proof of Theorem 2.6.2. If  $c$  further satisfies Assumption (A6), then  $\psi(y)$  is locally Lipschitz, and the exponent  $\beta = 2$  is sufficient.

**Theorem 3.4.2.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A6). Let  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  be the contravariant singularity functor defined by source and target measures absolutely continuous with respect to volume measures on  $X, Y$ . Let  $x' \in Z_1$  be a point supported on the activated domain of an optimal semicoupling  $\pi_{opt}$ , and abbreviate  $Z'(x') := Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x')) = \cap \{\partial^c \psi(y_0) \mid y_0 \in \partial^c \psi^c(x')\}$ .*

*If both (UHS) Conditions are satisfied for all points  $x'' \in Z'(x') \cap Z_j$ , and  $Z'(x') \cap Z_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ , then there exists continuous map*

$$\Psi : (Z' \cap Z_j) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Z' \cap Z_j$$

*such that:*

- (i) *the restriction  $\Psi(x, s) = x$  for all  $x \in Z' \cap Z_{j+1}$ ; and*
- (ii) *where  $\Psi(x, 0) = x$  for all  $x \in Z'$ ; and*
- (iii) *such that  $\Psi(x'', 1) \in Z' \cap Z_{j+1}$  for all  $x'' \in Z' \cap Z_j$ .*

*Therefore  $Z' \cap Z_{j+1}$  is strong deformation retract of  $Z' \cap Z_j$  and the inclusion*

$$Z' \cap Z_{j+1} \hookrightarrow Z' \cap Z_j$$

*is a homotopy-isomorphism.*

For  $x'$  varying over  $Z_j$ , with correspondant  $Z' = Z'(x') := Z(\partial^c \psi^c(x'))$ , the mappings

$$\{\Psi : Z' \cap Z_j \rightarrow Z' \cap Z_j\}$$

assemble to a continuous retraction  $Z_j \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Z_j$  which establishes  $Z_j \leftrightarrow Z_{j+1}$  is also homotopy-isomorphism.

**Theorem 3.4.3.** *Let  $c : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be cost satisfying Assumptions (A0)–(A6). Let  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$  be the contravariant singularity functor defined by source and target measures absolutely continuous with respect to volume measures on  $X, Y$ .*

*If  $j \geq 1$  is an integer such that both (UHS) Conditions are satisfied for all points  $x \in Z_j$ , and  $Z'(x) \cap Z_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$  for every  $x \in Z_j - Z_{j+1}$ , then the local homotopy-equivalences*

$$\{\Psi : (Z' \cap Z_j) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Z' \cap Z_{j+1}\}$$

*constructed in Theorem 3.4.2 assemble to a continuous deformation retract  $Z_j \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Z_{j+1}$ .*

*Furthermore if  $J \geq 1$  is that maximal integer where (UHS) conditions are satisfied throughout  $Z_J$ , then composing the retractions  $\{\Psi\}$  produces a codimension- $J$  homotopy-isomorphism  $Z_1 \simeq Z_{J+1}$ .*

*Sketch of proof for Theorem 3.4.2.* We follow the proof of Theorem 2.6.2, and construct a continuous vector field  $\eta_{avg}(x')$  on  $Z' \cap Z_j$  which blows-up precisely on  $Z' \cap Z_{j+1} \subset Z' \cap Z_j$ . For every initial point  $x'$ , the maximal interval of existence  $I(x') = [0, \omega(x'))$  varies continuously with respect to  $x'$  (see Lemma 2.6.8). The field  $\eta_{avg}(x')$  will generate a global forward-time continuous mapping

$$\Psi : (Z' \cap Z_j) \times I \rightarrow Z' \cap Z_j$$

satisfying the usual ordinary differential equation  $\frac{d}{ds}[\Psi(x', s')] = \eta_{avg}(\Psi(x', s'))$  for all  $s' \in I(x')$ . The flow  $\Psi$  is then reparameterized according to arclength to obtain a continuous deformation retract  $\Psi' : (Z' \cap Z_j) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Z' \cap Z_j$  as desired. □

The proof of Theorem 3.4.2 is analagous with the earlier “base case” retraction of  $X (= Z(\emptyset))$  onto the activated domain  $A (= Z_1)$ , see Theorem 2.6.2.

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.2.* The (UHS) conditions ensure the cross-differences  $c_\Delta$  have non-vanishing gradient  $\nabla_x c_\Delta \neq 0$  throughout the domain  $Z'$ , and the gradients  $\nabla_x c_\Delta$  vary continuously over  $Z_j$ . Moreover the uniform Halfspace condition (UHS2) ensures  $\|\eta_{avg}(x)\|$

is uniformly bounded away from zero in neighborhoods of the poles  $\{||\eta_{avg}(x)|| = +\infty\} = Z' \cap Z_{j+1}$  in  $Z' \cap Z_j$ .

The vector field  $\eta_{avg}(x')$  integrates to a global forward-time flow  $\Psi : Z' \cap Z_j \times I \rightarrow Z' \cap Z_j$ , where as usual we have  $d/ds[\Psi(x', s')] = \eta_{avg}(\Psi(x', s'))$  for all  $s' \in I(x')$ . According to Lemma 2.6.7, for every choice of  $x = x(0)$  initial value on  $Z'(x) \cap Z_j$ , the trajectory  $x = x(t)$  converges in finite time to  $Z' \cap Z_{j+1}$  with respect to the flow (2.16). Our Assumptions (A0)–(A6) imply continuous dependance on the choice of initial value. The arguments from Proposition 2.6.6 and Lemma 2.6.8 prove the lengths of trajectories vary continuously with respect to initial value. Therefore the flow  $\Psi$  can be reparameterized according to arclength to obtain a continuous deformation retract  $\Psi'$  of  $Z' \cap Z_j$  onto  $Z' \cap Z_{j+1}$ , as desired.

□

Finally we observe the “local” homotopy-isomorphisms  $\{\Psi : Z'(x) \cap Z_j \rightsquigarrow Z'(x) \cap Z_{j+1}\}$  assemble to a continuous deformation retract of  $Z_j \simeq Z_{j+1}$  and establish Theorem 3.4.3:

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.3.* The proof of Theorem 3.4.2 constructs homotopy deformations  $Z'(x) \cap Z_j \rightarrow Z'(x) \cap Z_{j+1}$ , where  $Z'(x) = Z(\partial\psi^c(x)) \subset Z_1$  for a given  $x$  in  $Z_j$ . When  $x$  varies over  $Z_j$ , the corresponding  $Z' = Z'(x)$  are either coincident or intersect along a subset of  $Z_{j+1}$ . So the local strong deformation retracts  $\{\Psi\}$  constructed in Theorem 3.4.3 assemble to a continuous deformation retract  $Z_j \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Z_j$ . Therefore  $Z_j \hookleftarrow Z_{j+1}$  is a homotopy-isomorphism. Composing the retractions  $Z_j \rightsquigarrow Z_{j+1}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, J$  yields the deformation retract  $Z_1 \rightsquigarrow Z_{J+1}$ , as desired. □




Figure 3.3: Horospherically truncated pair of pants, with active domain relative to a repulsion cost (See Definition 4.3.3 from Section 4.3). Halfspace Conditions fail.  $P \rightsquigarrow Z_1 \rightsquigarrow Z_2$  are homotopy equivalent, where  $P$  is pair of pants. But  $Z_2$  does not deformation retract to  $Z_3$

# Chapter 4

## Repulsion Costs

The previous Chapters have assumed  $c$  is a general cost satisfying the Assumptions (A0), ..., (A6). The present chapter introduces a new class of costs denoted  $c|\tau$ ,  $\tilde{c}$ ,  $\tilde{c}^*$ ,  $v$ , and derived from a highly simplified model of “electron–electron” interactions. We imagine the source measure  $\sigma$  as a non-self interacting electron distribution, and likewise the target measure  $\tau$  is a second non-self interacting electron distribution. The only interactions we consider are between pairs of source and target electrons. This toy model of “electron–electron” interactions is contradistinct from the analogous “electron–positron” interactions, which is modelled by the squared-distance cost  $c = d^2/2$ . The new costs are defined in the repulsion costs  $c|\tau$  (Definition 4.3.3), two-pointed repulsion costs  $\tilde{c}$  (Definition 4.4.1), and their generalizations to  $\tilde{c}^*$  (Definition 4.9.7) and visibility cost  $v$  (Definition 4.9.5). The various costs have their own peculiar features, with varying applications. In Section 4.2 we describe properties (D0)–(D4) which are most useful to the purpose of this thesis, as developed in later chapters 5, 6. We conjecture that our costs  $\tilde{c}^*, v$  satisfy these properties (D0)–(D4) in certain concrete settings, as elaborated in Conjectures 4.9.8, 4.9.6 below.

### 4.1 Chain sums and Well-Separated Gates

We begin with general definitions, and then specialize to a more symmetric setting involving an isometric group action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$ . Recall Figure 1.5 from the Introduction. Let  $\{F_i\}_{i \in I}$  be countable collection of compact convex subsets of complete Cartan–Hadamard source space  $(X, d)$ . Given such  $\{F_i\}_{i \in I}$  we let  $\underline{F}$  denote the chain sum  $\underline{F} = \underline{F}_I = SUM[\{F_i\}_{i \in I}]$ .

Now suppose  $\{F_i\}_{i \in I}$  consists of distinct compact convex sets, and  $\mathcal{E}[F_i \cap F_j] \subset \mathcal{E}[F_i] \cap \mathcal{E}[F_j]$  for all indices  $i, j \in I$ . Abbreviate  $F_{ij} := F_i \cap F_j$ . For every index  $i$ , assume

$F_{ij}$  is nonempty for only finitely many indices  $j$ . Each  $F_{ij}$  is compact convex subset. Let  $F'_{ij}$  denote the relative-interior  $F'_{ij} := F_{ij} - \partial F_{ij}$ .

**Definition 4.1.1.** In the above notation, let  $\{G^-\} = \pi_0(\cup_{i,j} F'_{ij})$  be the set of connected components of  $\cup_{i,j} F'_{ij}$ . The gates  $\{G\}$  of the chain sum  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[\{F_i\}_{i \in I}]$  is the set  $\{G\}$  of closures  $G := \overline{G^-}$  of the connected components of  $\cup_{i,j} F'_{ij}$ .

In otherwords we consider the set  $\{G^-\} := \pi_0(\cup_{i,j} F'_{ij})$ , and define the set of gates  $\{G\}$  as the topological closures  $G = \overline{G^-}$  of the connected components  $\{G^-\} = \pi_0(\cup_{i,j} F'_{ij})$ . The hypotheses of Definition 4.1.1 imply  $\cup_{i,j} F_{ij}$  is a closed subset of  $X$ .

**Definition 4.1.2.** The gates  $\{G\}$  of a chain sum  $\underline{F}$  are well-separated if the components  $G, G'$  of the setl  $\{G\}$  are pairwise isometric.

Now we specialize via group symmetries. Suppose  $\Gamma$  is countable group acting by isometries on a complete Cartan-Hadamard space  $(X, d)$ . If  $F$  is compact convex subset of  $X$ , then the set of  $\Gamma$ -translates  $F.\Gamma$  determines a chain sum  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[F.\Gamma]$ . The gates  $\{G\}$  of the chain sum  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[F.\Gamma]$  form a  $\Gamma$ -set, i.e. the set of gates  $\{G\}$  is  $\Gamma$ -invariant and therefore supports  $\Gamma$ -action. Indeed gates correspond to nontrivial intersections  $F.\gamma \cap F.\delta \neq \emptyset$  for  $\gamma, \delta \in \Gamma$ ,  $\gamma \neq \delta$ . The convex chain sums arising from isometric  $\Gamma$ -actions will feature in our applications below. There is a further useful hypothesis which ensures the gates are as  $\Gamma$ -symmetric as possible. Recall that a  $\Gamma$ -set is principal if  $\Gamma$  acts simply transitively (equivalently, there exists unique orbit and orbit map is a bijection).

**Definition 4.1.3.** We say the chain sum  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[F.\Gamma]$  has  $\Gamma$ -well-separated gates if the  $\Gamma$ -set of gates  $\{G\} = \{F.\gamma \cap F.\delta \neq \emptyset\}$  is a principal  $\Gamma$ -set. Or equivalently, the gates are well-separated with respect to  $\Gamma$  if there exists some fixed gate  $G'$  for which all other gates are uniquely  $\Gamma$ -isometric.

## 4.2 Hypotheses and Practical Applications

The topological results of our thesis address two issues. The first is abstract and very general. We identify hypotheses on a general cost  $c$  which guarantee that the activated source domains of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings admit large-codimension strong deformation retracts. See Theorems A, B, C from Introduction, 1.4, 1.4.1, 1.5.1 and Theorems 3.4.2, 3.4.3. Thus we identify subvarieties  $Z \subset X$ , of the source domain  $(X, \sigma)$ , for which the inclusions  $Z \hookrightarrow X$  are homotopy isomorphisms. The second issue addressed by this thesis is practical, and concerns the application of our general theory to particular costs.

Sections 4.4, 4.5 introduce some conjectures, e.g. 4.9.8, 4.9.6 regarding the (Twist) conditions which are necessary for applications. The reader may recall that (Twist) ensures the uniqueness of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings, c.f. Proposition 2.5.8. Observe that (Twist) condition, i.e. Assumption (A4), is weaker condition than the usual (Twist) conditions of the conventional coupling theory. Indeed in our settings the target space  $Y = \partial_* F[t]$  is presumed to have strictly smaller dimension than the source  $X = F$ , with  $\dim(Y) < \dim(X)$ . Here is an advantage of our semicoupling setting, and motivation for the conjectures 4.9.8, 4.9.6.

Next we make some remarks on the general hypotheses necessary for the practical applications of our costs to Chapters 5, 6. If  $\underline{F}$  is a chain sum with well-separated gates  $\{G\}$  (see §4.1 for definitions), then the costs  $c : \underline{F} \times \partial_*[\underline{F}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  best suited for our applications have the following properties:

- (D0) the cost  $c$  is a type of repulsion cost, with  $c'(x, y) = +\infty$  whenever  $x, y \in \partial_*[\underline{F}]$ ;
- (D1) the domain  $dom(c)$  consists of pairs  $(x, y)$  which occupy a common chain summand  $F'$  of  $\underline{F}$  (hence  $c(x, y) = +\infty$  if  $x, y$  occupy disjoint chain summands);
- (D2) if  $G$  is a gate of  $\underline{F}$  and  $x \in G$ , then  $dom(c_x) \subset G$ ;
- (D3) the cost  $c$  satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A5), c.f. §1.3;
- (D4) the restriction of  $c$  to a gate  $G$  yields a restricted cost  $c|G : G \times \mathcal{E}[G] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  which satisfies sufficient (UHS) conditions;
- (D5) if  $\mathcal{H}_G$  is the Hausdorff measure on  $G$ , with canonical measure  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{E}[G]}^{can}$  on  $\mathcal{E}[G]$ , then the homotopy-reductions of Theorems 3.4.2, 3.4.3 with respect to  $c|G$ -optimal semicouplings from source  $\mathcal{H}_G$  to target  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{E}[G]}^{can}$  yield deformation retracts of the gates  $G$  to points  $G \leadsto \{pt\}$ .

We define costs  $c = c|\tau, \tilde{c}, \tilde{c}^*, v$  in the following sections which are readily seen to satisfy properties (D0)–(D2). However the properties (D3)–(D5) are more difficult to verify, and in fact we cannot verify these properties for the costs of interest. The visible repulsion cost  $v$  is the basic tool developed for our applications in Chapters 5, 6, but the verification of (D3)–(D5) is omitted and summarized in the Conjectures 4.9.8, 4.9.6. We further expect the hypotheses of Theorem A (see 1.4 and Theorem 3.4.2) to be satisfied: when the active domain  $A \hookrightarrow X$  of  $v$ -optimal semicouplings is sufficiently large, then we expect the inclusion  $A \hookrightarrow X$  to be a homotopy-isomorphism. We formalize this expectation in:

**Conjecture 4.2.1.** *Let  $X = F[t]$  be a convex excision with excision boundary  $Y = \partial_* F[t]$  (see §4.1 for definitions). Let  $\sigma$  be source measure on  $X$  and  $\tau$  a target measure on  $Y$  with  $\int_X \sigma > \int_Y \tau$ . Let  $v$  be the visible repulsion cost constructed in Definition 4.9.5. Then the active domains  $A = Z_1$  of  $v$ -optimal semicouplings are strong deformation retracts of the source  $X$  when the target mass  $\int_Y \tau$  is sufficiently large.*

The heuristic motivating Conjecture 4.2.1 is that the necessary Halfspace conditions (recall Theorem 3.4.2) fail on a particular compact subdomain of  $X$ . As we increase the target mass  $\int_Y \tau$  sufficiently close to  $\int_X \sigma$ , the active domains  $A \subset X$  expand and eventually “fill”  $X$  in the limit. Thus the hypotheses of Theorem A weaken as the target mass increases. The Halfspace Conditions are satisfied in sufficiently small tubular neighborhoods of  $Y$  in  $X$ . However the repulsion costs  $\tilde{c}$  diverge to  $+\infty$  uniformly throughout these tubular neighborhoods and since active domains are necessarily domains where  $v$  is bounded, we find Halfspace conditions failing on compact subsets interior to  $X$  which are eventually disjoint from  $X - A$ .

Our applications of Theorem B (c.f. Theorem 3.4.3) require sufficient (UHS) conditions be satisfied by the gradients of  $\tilde{c}, v$ . In practice we expect (UHS) conditions of  $\tilde{c}, v$  are controlled by the restrictions  $\tilde{c}|G, v|G$  to the gates. Moreover we construct gates  $G$  possessing large symmetries, c.f. Definition 5.5.1 and Theorem 5.5.2, and we expect these symmetry conditions imply sufficient (UHS) conditions are satisfied. These expectations motivate Conjecture 1.5.2, which is an application of Theorems A, B, C to the construction of “Spines” for geometric  $E\Gamma$  models  $X$ . In the remaining chapters we apply these methods to  $E\Gamma$ -classifying spaces  $X$ , where  $\Gamma$  is an infinite discrete group satisfying Bieri-Eckmann homological duality, e.g. when  $\Gamma = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z})$  is a standard arithmetic group. See Sections 5.5, 6.3, 6.4 for details.

To illustrate the above hypotheses, we include Figure 4.2 which illustrates the singularity structure of the averaged two-pointed repulsion costs  $\tilde{c}^*$  on a two-simplex and a two-dimensional square. In these elementary cases the properties (D0)–(D5) are satisfied.

For brevity, we illustrate the above ideas with the “visibility cost”  $v$  in the simplest case of a two-dimensional regular simplex  $\Delta^2$ . Here we find  $X = \Delta^2$  is the source, equipped with two-dimensional Hausdorff measure  $\sigma$ . The target  $Y = \mathcal{E}[\Delta] = \{y_0, y_1, y_2\}$  is a discrete three-point set, with target measure  $\tau$  some positive scalar multiple of  $\delta_{y_0} + \delta_{y_1} + \delta_{y_2}$  satisfying  $\int_X \sigma > \int_Y \tau$ . Then we have

$$v(x, y_0) = \frac{1}{2} \|x - y_0\|^{-2} + \frac{\lambda_1}{1 - \lambda_0} \|x - y_1\|^{-2} + \frac{\lambda_2}{1 - \lambda_0} \|x - y_2\|^{-2}, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $0 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1$  are the unique scalars satisfying  $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$  and  $\text{bar}(\lambda_0 \delta_{y_0} +$




Figure 4.1: Singularity structures of  $\tilde{c}$  on regular 2-simplex and regular square satisfy properties (D0)–(D5)

$$\lambda_1 \delta_{y_1} + \lambda_2 \delta_{y_2}) = x.$$

Now suppose  $\blacktriangle_i$ ,  $i \in I$ , is a countable collection of simplices with chain sum  $\underline{F} = \sum_{i \in I} \blacktriangle_i$  having well-separated gates  $\{G\}$  isometric to a given one-dimensional simplex (i.e. interval). Then the visibility cost  $v$  defined in equation (4.1) extends to a repulsion cost  $v^*$  on  $\underline{F}$  satisfying properties (D0)–(D5) as above. In particular, the singularity structures  $Z(\sigma, \tau, v^*)$  are continuous interpolations of the singularity structures  $Z(\sigma|G, \tau|G, v^*|G)$  restricted to every gate  $G$ . Compare Figure 4.2.

### 4.3 Definition of Repulsion Costs

Let  $F$  be a compact convex subset of some Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and equipped with standard distance  $d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$ . Now suppose  $Y$  is closed subset, say the boundary of a convex set  $Y := \partial F$ . The distance  $d$  on  $F$  then restricts to a metric distance  $dist = d|_{Y \times Y}$  on  $Y$ . Recall  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(F)$  coincides with the dimension of the minimal affine subspace containing  $F$ . The boundary  $Y = \partial F$  is a well-defined topological space, and both  $F$ ,  $\partial F$  have integral Hausdorff dimensions  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(F) = \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial F) + 1$ .

**Definition 4.3.1** (Extreme points). Let  $F$  be closed convex. Then  $x \in F$  is an extreme-point if  $x$  is not the midpoint of any pair of distinct points  $x_0, x_1 \in F$ ,  $x_0 \neq x_1$ . That is  $x = [x_0, x_1]_{1/2}$  implies  $x_0 = x_1 = x$ .

The topological boundary  $\partial F$  possesses a canonical Hausdorff measure and with integral dimension. Alexandrov's spherical image construction, or Gauss curvature  $\omega$ , is another interesting Radon measure defined on  $\partial F$ . We recall the definition: let  $y \in \partial F$




Figure 4.2: The yellow line designates the one-dimensional gate  $G$ . The blue line designates the interpolated singularity structure with respect to the gated-visibility cost  $v^*$ .

be a boundary point, and consider the set of all normal hyperplanes  $N(y)$  supporting  $F$  at  $y$ . The subset  $N(y)$  is naturally found to be a closed convex subset of the linear dual space. The measure  $\omega$  on  $\partial F$  is defined to be the spherical-measure of  $N(y)$ . We refer the reader to [Ale06], [Oli07] for further details.

However the extreme point set  $E := \mathcal{E}[F]$  is a subset of  $\partial F$ , possibly not closed and with possibly irrational Hausdorff dimension. Indeed Cantor's middle-third construction and the so-called Cantor staircase function readily leads to compact convex sets with extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  homeomorphic to a Cantor set. Frequently  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  and  $\partial F$  may coincide, e.g. when  $F$  is strictly convex then  $\partial F$  contains no nontrivial affine segments.

Our constructions below are readily generalized to compact convex subsets  $F$  satisfying the following property:

**Definition 4.3.2** (Property (IDE)). A convex compact subset  $F$  has integral-dimension extreme points, called property (IDE), if there exists subsets  $E^{(0)}, E^{(1)}, E^{(2)} \dots$  of  $\partial F$  partitioning the extreme pointset  $\mathcal{E}[F] = E^{(0)} \coprod E^{(1)} \coprod \dots$ , and where  $E^{(j)}$  is either empty or has constant local Hausdorff dimension  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}^{\text{loc}} E^{(j)} = j$  for integers  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

We recall a subset  $D$  has local Hausdorff dimension  $d$  at  $x \in D$ , if the intersection  $D \cap B_r(x)$  has Hausdorff dimension  $d$  for sufficiently small  $r$ -balls  $B_r(x)$  centred at  $x$ . In otherwords, if

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(D \cap B_r(x)) = d$$

for every  $x \in D$ . We say the subset  $D$  has constant local Hausdorff dimension if the local Hausdorff dimension is constant with respect to  $x \in D$ .

Property (IDE) says the convex set  $F$  has extreme points with an “elementary” structure. The property (IDE) implies the extreme points  $E := \mathcal{E}[F]$  has a sufficiently canonical Hausdorff-type measure

$$\mathcal{H}_E^{can} := \mathcal{H}_{E^{(0)}} + \mathcal{H}_{E^{(1)}} + \cdots.$$

One finds  $F$  has property (IDE) if  $\mathcal{E}[F] = \partial F$  or  $F$  is a polyhedra. Henceforth we presume our convex bodies  $F$  have property (IDE) and typically  $\mathcal{E}[F] = \partial F$ . For simplicity, the reader may presume  $F$  is a convex compact polyhedra for the duration of the thesis, but this is not strictly necessarily.

For the following definition, let  $F$  be an  $(N+1)$ -dimensional compact convex set with property (IDE), with extreme points  $E := \mathcal{E}[F]$  and canonical measure  $\mathcal{H}_E^{can}$  on  $E$ . For  $y \in E$ , let  $\mathbf{e}(y) := j$  be the unique integer such that  $y \in E^{(j)}$ .

**Definition 4.3.3.** Let  $\tau$  be a Radon measure supported on the extreme points  $E := \mathcal{E}[F]$  and absolutely-continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}_E^{can}$ . We define the repulsion cost  $c|\tau : F \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  by the rule

$$c|\tau(x, y_0) := \left[ \int_E d(x, y)^{-2-\mathbf{e}(y)} d\tau(y) \right] - \frac{1}{2} d(x, y_0)^{-2-\mathbf{e}(y_0)}.$$

In the simplest case when  $E = \partial F$  and  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) = N$ , we directly define  $c$  with respect to the Hausdorff measure  $\tau = \mathcal{H}_{\partial F}$ , and obtain

$$c(x, y_0) := \left( \int_{\partial F} q(x, y)^{-2-N} d\mathcal{H}_{\partial F}(y) \right) - \frac{1}{2} d(x, y_0)^{-2-N}.$$

We illustrate with some examples.

**Example.** Let  $Y = \{0, 1\}$  be subset of  $X = conv[Y] = [0, 1]$  and  $\tau = \delta_0 + \delta_1$ . If  $x \in X$ , then  $c|\mathcal{H}_Y(x, 0) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^{-2} + |x - 1|^{-2}$  and  $c|\mathcal{H}_Y(x, 1) = |x|^{-2} + \frac{1}{2}|x - 1|^{-2}$ . The graph is modelled in Figure 4.3.

**Example.** Let  $Y := \{y_0, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_5\}$  be extreme points of a closed hexagon  $X := conv[y_0, \dots, y_5] = conv[Y]$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , defined by  $y_k = e^{2\pi k/6}$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, 5$ . Represent the distribution on  $Y = \mathcal{E}[X]$  by atomic measures  $\mathcal{H}_Y = \delta_{y_0} + \cdots + \delta_{y_5}$ . If  $x$  is contained in the convex hull  $X$ , then the cost of transporting a unit mass from  $x$  to  $y_0 = (1, 0)$  is

$$c|\mathcal{H}_Y(x, y_2) := \frac{1}{2} \cdot d(x, y_0)^{-2} + d(x, y_1)^{-2} + \cdots + d(x, y_5)^{-2}.$$

The graph is modelled in Figure 4.3.




Figure 4.3: Graph of repulsion cost  $x \mapsto c|\mathcal{H}_Y(x, 0)$ . The asymmetry reflects the “home-preference” of  $x$  to  $y = 0$ .

**Example.** Let  $F$  be a three-dimensional ellipsoid with extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F] = \partial F =: Y$ . Let  $\tau = \mathcal{H}_Y$  be uniform Hausdorff measure on the extreme points. Then we have

$$c(x, y_0) := \left( \int_Y d(x, y)^{-4} d\mathcal{H}_Y(y) \right) - \frac{1}{2} d(x, y_0)^{-4}.$$

The exponent  $e$  in the definition 4.3.3 of  $c|\tau$  ensures that  $c(x, y)$  diverges to  $+\infty$  whenever  $x$  converges to any point  $x \rightarrow y'$  in  $E$ . Indee our choice of  $e$  is motivated by the observation that  $\int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \|x\| < 1} \|x\|^{-p}$  diverges to  $+\infty$  whenever  $p \geq N$  in Euclidean space. The term  $\frac{-1}{2} d(x, y_0)^{-2-e}$  imparts a definite “home-preference” to  $c|\tau$  on  $\text{conv}\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ . When a source point  $x$  is close to an extreme point  $y_0$  in  $E = \mathcal{E}[\text{conv}[E]]$ , then the various pairings  $\{c|\tau(x, y_*) | y_* \neq y_0\}$  becoming definitely greater than  $c|\tau(x, y_0)$ . So when a point  $x$  is activated there is no confusion in the optimization program: the point  $x$  goes to the nearest point  $y_0$ .

Having defined the repulsion-costs, we now verify which Assumptions (A0), (A1), etc., are satisfied. We verify Assumptions (A0)–(A3) in the following

**Proposition 4.3.4.** *Let  $X = F$  be a compact geodesically-convex set with property (IDE) as above. Let  $Y = E = \mathcal{E}[F]$  be the extreme-point set with canonical measure  $\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{can}}$  and  $\tau$  a Radon measure on  $E$  absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathcal{H}_E^{\text{can}}$ . Then  $c|\tau$  defined in Definition 4.3.3 satisfies Assumptions (A0) – (A3) throughout  $\text{dom}(c) = (X - Y) \times Y$*

*Proof.* Evidently  $x \mapsto d(x, y)^{-2-e(y)}$  is smooth and strictly positive for  $x \neq y$ , and diverging to  $+\infty$  when  $x \rightarrow y$ . Now examine the integral defining  $c(x, y_0)$  in Definition 4.3.3. If  $x \in X - Y$ , then the integrand is smooth and finitely-valued with respect to  $y \in E$ . Now  $E$  is relatively-compact, and integrating over  $E$  we find  $c|\tau$  is uniformly-continuous




Figure 4.4: Graph of repulsion cost  $x \mapsto c|\mathcal{H}_Y(x, (1, 0))$ . The “home-preference” implies the pole at  $y = (1, 0)$  has smaller diameter than the other poles.

on compact subsets of  $\text{dom}(c) = (X - Y) \times Y$ . This proves (A0). By similar arguments, applied to  $\nabla_x d(x, y_0)^{-2-e}$  and  $\nabla_{xx}^2 d(x, y_0)^{-2-e}$ , we find  $c|\tau$  is twice-continuously differentiable on  $\text{dom}(c)$ . Again, since  $Y$  is relatively compact we deduce  $\nabla_{xx}^2 d(x, y_0)^{-2-e}$  varies uniformly with respect to  $y \in Y$ . Likewise we find the sublevels of  $c_y : \text{dom}(c_y) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are compact subsets of  $X$ . This proves (A1). Now we also see  $\|\nabla_x c(x, y)\|$  varies continuously with respect to  $y$ . So indeed (A2) is satisfied. Finally the reader finds that variations in  $d(x, y_0)^{-2-e}$  prove the cost is nowhere locally constant, and (A3) is satisfied. We leave the details to the reader.

□

**Proposition 4.3.5.** *Let  $F$  be a compact geodesically-convex set with extreme points  $E = \mathcal{E}[F]$ . Then the repulsion cost  $c|\mathcal{H}_E$  satisfies (Twist) condition throughout  $\text{dom}(c|\mathcal{H}_E)$ .*

*Proof.* We abbreviate  $dy := d\mathcal{H}_E(y)$ , and  $q(x, y) = d(x, y)^{2+e}$  where  $e = \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E)$ . Fix  $x \in F$ . Then (Twist) condition requires the rule

$$y_0 \mapsto \int_E \nabla_x q(x, y)^{-1} dy - \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x q(x, y_0)^{-1}$$

be an injective mapping  $E \rightarrow T_{x'}F$ . The left summand is independant of  $y_0$ . Moreover convexity of the domain  $F$  implies the injectivity of the rule  $y_0 \mapsto \nabla_x q(x, y_0)^{-1}$ . This establishes (Twist). □

Thus we have defined our repulsion costs  $c|\tau$ . Our applications require extending the

above definitions to nonpositively-curved complete finite-dimensional Riemannian spaces  $(X, d)$ , e.g. Cartan-Hadamard manifolds. The reader is referred to [BGS85] for standard definitions. We elaborate below.

## 4.4 Two-Pointed Repulsion Costs

The previous Section 4.1 introduced a type of repulsion costs  $c|\tau$  defined on closed convex bodies  $F$  where either  $\mathcal{E}[F] = \partial F$  or  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  is a closed discrete set. The definition of  $c|\tau$  is generally defined for convex sets satisfying the (IDE) condition (Definition 4.3.2). We think  $c|\tau$  – which satisfies (A0)–(A4) – is an interesting cost for study, but has a limited role in our applications. The simplest case of this cost leads to the two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}$  defined in the present section. We warn the reader that our definition of  $\tilde{c}$  is temporary, and will not recur in Chapters 5, 6. However  $\tilde{c}$  will be modified to an “averaged” two-pointed repulsion cost in Definition 4.9.7 in §4.9. The definition is inductive. If  $F$  is one-dimensional compact convex set, with  $\mathcal{E}[F] = \partial F = \{y_0, y_1\}$ , then we define

$$\tilde{c}(x, y_0) := \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, y_0)^{-2} + \text{dist}(x, y_1)^{-2}$$

as in previous Definition 4.3.3. Next suppose  $F$  is a compact convex set, with  $x \in F$  and  $y \in \partial F$ . Consider the directed geodesic ray  $\rho(y, x)$  issuing from  $y$  towards  $x$ . If we extend the ray indefinitely, we find  $\rho(y, x)$  first intersects  $\partial F$  at some unique point  $y' := \text{proj}(y, x)$  opposite  $y$  with respect to  $x$ . So for  $y \in \partial F$  we obtain a projection-type map  $\text{proj}_y : (F - \{y\}) \rightarrow \partial F$ . We use the projection map to define  $\tilde{c}$  to higher-dimensional convex compact sets  $F$ . Indeed if  $x \in F$ ,  $y \in \partial F$ , then we define

$$\tilde{c}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, y)^{-2} + \text{dist}(x, \text{proj}_y(x))^{-2}. \quad (4.2)$$

The formula (4.2) immediately extends to a convex chain sums  $\underline{F}$  with well-separated gates  $\{G\}$  as defined in Section 4.1, and this yields our definition of two-pointed costs.

**Definition 4.4.1** (Two-Pointed Repulsion Cost). Let  $\underline{F}$  be convex chain sum with well-separated gates  $\{G\}$  (Definition 4.1.2). For every  $y \in \mathcal{E}[\underline{F}]$  the projection map  $\text{proj}_y(x)$  is defined whenever  $x, y$  occupy at least one chain-summand  $F'$ , and the formula

$$\tilde{c}(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(x, y)^{-2} + \text{dist}(x, \text{proj}_y(x))^{-2}$$

defines the two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c} : \underline{F} \times \mathcal{E}[\underline{F}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .




Figure 4.5: Illustrating the projection map  $\text{proj} : F \rightarrow \partial F$  defining two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}$  for ellipse  $F$  where  $\partial F = \mathcal{E}[F]$ .

The projection  $\text{proj}$  varies continuously with  $x, y$ , and we find  $\tilde{c}$  is continuous throughout its domain, where  $\text{dom}(\tilde{c}) = \{(x, y) \mid \text{proj}_y(x) \neq x \text{ or } y \neq x\}$ . Our hypotheses on the well-separated gates  $\{G\}$  of  $\underline{F}$  implies the gates  $G$  are closed subsets of the boundaries  $\partial F$  of chain summands  $F$  with  $G \subset F$ . If  $y \notin G$  and  $x \in G$ , then  $\text{proj}_y(x) = x$  and  $\tilde{c}(x, y) = +\infty$ . This observation implies that  $\tilde{c}$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi$  having finite total cost, will restrict to  $\tilde{c}|_G$ -optimal semicouplings  $\pi \cdot 1_G$  on the gates  $G$  of  $\underline{F}$ . Therefore  $\tilde{c}$  satisfies Hypothesis (D2) from Section 4.2.

Now we consider the Assumptions (A0), (A1), (A2), etc..

**Lemma 4.4.2.** *Let  $\underline{F} = \sum_{i \in I} F_i$  be convex chain sum with gates  $\{G\}$  satisfying Definition 4.1.3. Then the two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}$  defined in (4.2) satisfies Assumptions (A0)–(A3) throughout  $\text{dom}(\tilde{c})$ .*

*Proof.* Assumptions (A0)–(A3) are readily verified but we leave formal details to the reader. □

The key property necessary for applications is the Assumption (A4) known as (Twist) condition. However discussions with Professor R.J. McCann indicate the existence of convex sets  $F$  for which  $\tilde{c}$  – as defined above – fails to satisfy (Twist). Indeed “general” convex sets are difficult to control, and it may happen that distinct points  $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{E}[F]$  have coincident critical points at some  $x \in F$ , with  $\nabla_x \tilde{c}(x, y_1) = 0 = \nabla_x \tilde{c}(x, y_2)$ . But such equality violates (Twist).

The applications we consider in Chapters 5, 6 below, are mainly concerned with  $F$  semiregular convex polyhedra. Specifically we will find a finite collection of regular polytope “panels”  $G, G', \dots$  and define  $F = \text{conv}(G, G', \dots)$  such that  $\mathcal{E}[F] = \mathcal{E}[G] \cup \mathcal{E}[G'] \cup \dots$ . We don’t expect semiregularity is sufficient to ensure  $\tilde{c}$  satisfies (Twist). However the following sections will introduce an application of Krein-Milman theorem, and will replace  $\tilde{c}$  with an “averaged two-pointed repulsion cost”  $\tilde{c}^*$  (see Definition 4.9.7). We then expect semiregularity is sufficient to ensure  $\tilde{c}^*$  satisfies the necessary (Twist) conditions, c.f. Conjecture 4.9.8.

## 4.5 Convex-Excisions

Henceforth we assume  $F$  is a totally geodesic subset of a Cartan-Hadamard space  $(X, d)$ . Therefore we presume there exists unique geodesics between any pair of points  $x, y$  in  $X$ , and antipodal points are nonexistent. The present section formalizes our idea of “scooping out” convex subsets. Recall the idea of excision, which is familiar from Eilenberg-Steenrod axioms of singular homology, [GJ81]. Let  $X$  be complete riemannian manifold and  $F$  a closed convex body.

**Definition 4.5.1** (Convex-Excision Parameter  $t$ ). Let  $F$  be compact geodesically-convex subset of a finite-dimensional Cartan-Hadamard space  $X$ . Let  $\{\lambda_i\}$  be a countable subset of  $\mathcal{E}[F]$ . An excision-parameter  $t$  is a function  $t : \mathcal{E}[F] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , and defines a countable collection of open subsets  $\{W_\lambda^t\}$  for every  $\lambda \in \{\lambda_i\}$  of  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  having the following properties:

- (i) the boundaries  $\partial W_\lambda^t$  are smooth manifolds for every  $\lambda \in \{\lambda_i\}$ ;
- (ii) the boundaries  $\partial W_\lambda^t$  pairwise intersect transversally;
- (iii) for every compact subset  $K$  of  $X$ , only finitely many convex subsets  $W_\lambda^t$  have nontrivial intersection.

The excision is called strictly-convex if the subsets  $W_\lambda^t$  are strictly-convex.

The basic example we pursue involves a complete Cartan-Hadamard space  $(X, d)$ . See [BGS85, §I.3] for formal definitions and Sections 5.3, 5.5. For every point-at-infinity  $\lambda$  and basepoint  $x_0 \in X$ , the horofunction  $h_{\lambda, x_0} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a geodesically-convex function on  $X$ . For every choice of  $t_\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$ , the sublevels

$$W_\lambda^t := \{x \in X \mid h_\lambda(x) < t_\lambda\}$$

are convex subsets of  $X$ , namely “horoballs centred at  $\lambda$  with radius  $t_\lambda$ .

**Definition 4.5.2** (Convex-Excision). Given an excision parameter  $t$ , Definition 4.5.1, we designate the relative complement  $F[t] := F - \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{E}[F]} W_\lambda^t$  a convex-excised model.




Figure 4.6: Excision of convex ellipsoid

Observe  $F[t]$  is a closed subset of  $F$ , generally nonconvex, with a well-defined topological boundary  $\partial F[t] \subset F$ . Our applications are especially concerned with the “excision-boundary”  $\partial_* F[t]$  defined as follows:

**Definition 4.5.3** (Excision Boundary). Let  $t$  be an excision parameter with excision  $F[t]$ . The excision-boundary  $\partial_* F[t]$  is defined by  $\partial_* F[t] := \cup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{E}[F]} (\partial F[t] \cap \overline{W_\lambda^t})$ .

In otherwords  $\partial_* F[t]$  is that subset of  $F[t]$  which intersects some boundary component  $\partial W_\lambda^t$ . Thus we obtain  $F[t]$  by excising the  $t$ -family of open convex subsets  $W_\lambda^t$  from  $F$ .

## 4.6 Visibility

The convex-excisions  $F[t]$  are not geodesically-convex subsets of  $F$ , and this is important observation. But this nonconvexity is no obstruction and is managed by introducing the definition of a visibility relation  $V$  (Definition 4.6.1). For costs, we use the visibility relation to define a visibility factor  $k(x, y)$  which rescales every term of the type  $q(x, y)^{-1}$  in the repulsion costs introduced above. The formal definitions require some preparatory lemmas.

**Definition 4.6.1** (Visibility Relation  $V$ ). Let  $F[t] \subset F$  be a convex excision (Definition 4.5.1). Then a pair of points  $(x, x') \in F[t] \times F[t]$  are *visible*, and in relation  $xVx'$ , if the unique geodesic segment  $\gamma$  joining  $x$  to  $x'$  in  $F$  is contained in  $F[t]$ .

**Lemma 4.6.2.** *[[McC01, Proposition 6]] Let  $(X, d)$  be Cartan-Hadamard space and  $F \hookrightarrow X$  a compact geodesically convex subset. let  $x, y$  be arbitrary points in  $F$  and  $\gamma$  the unique unit-parametrized geodesic  $\gamma : [0, T] \rightarrow F$  having  $T = \text{dist}(x, y)$ , and  $x = \gamma(0)$ ,  $y = \gamma(T)$ . Then  $\nabla_y d(x, y) = \gamma'(T) \in T_y F$ , and  $\nabla_x d(x, y) = -\gamma'(0)$ .*

If  $x \in F[t]$  and  $y \in \partial_* F[t]$  are geodesically visible in  $F[t]$ , then Lemma 4.6.2 implies  $\nabla_y d(x, y)$  is equal to the direction of impact of the geodesic ray from  $x$  to  $y$ . Therefore the cosine of the angle-of-impact at  $y$  (relative to an outward unit normal) is represented by the dot-product  $\langle \nabla_y d(x, y), \mathbf{n}_y \rangle$  in  $T_y F[t]$ .

**Lemma 4.6.3.** *Let  $X := F[t]$  be a convex excision of  $F$ , with excision-boundary  $Y := \partial_* F[t]$ . If  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$  are geodesically visible in  $F[t]$ , then  $\langle \nabla_y d(x, y), \mathbf{n}_y \rangle \geq 0$  where  $\mathbf{n}_y$  is any outward unit normal vector at  $y \in Y$  in  $F[t] \subset X$ .*

*Proof.* By hypothesis the initial domain  $F$  is convex, so  $x, y$  are visible along some geodesic  $\gamma$  in  $F$ . Consider the possible intersections of  $\gamma$  with  $X$  and  $Y$ . The convexity of the excised horoballs  $W_\lambda^t$  defining  $X$  implies the following: we have  $\langle \nabla_y d(x, y), \mathbf{n} \rangle < 0$  only if the geodesic  $\gamma$  from  $x$  impacts  $y$  from within the locally convex subdomain  $F - F[t]$  containing  $y$ . Or equivalently, we find  $(x, y)$  are not visible in  $X$  only if the geodesic  $\alpha$  exits  $F[t]$  at some secondary point  $y' \in \partial_* F[t]$ .  $\square$

Informally, one imagines the cost of transmission from a source point  $x \in F[t]$  to a visible target point  $y \in \partial F[t]$  is measured by the angle-of-impact (and the quadratic distance) at  $\partial F[t]$ . We posit that a directed geodesic ray enters the target point most efficiently at  $y_0 \in \partial F[t]$  when the angle-of-impact is orthogonal to the tangent space of the boundary, i.e., when the incoming ray arrives from  $x$  at a right angle to  $T_{y_0} \partial F[t] \hookrightarrow T_{y_0} F[t]$ . Conversely, if the boundary  $\partial F[t]$  has outward pointing unit normal vector  $\mathbf{n}$ , then we say the cost of transmitting rays which impact  $\partial F[t]$  orthogonally to  $\mathbf{n}$  are infinitely prohibitive. Thus we augment the data “directed ray from  $x$  to  $y$ ”, measured by magnitude and direction, with the “angle-of-impact” visibility factor  $k(x, y)$ .

**Definition 4.6.4** (Visibility factor). Let  $X := F[t]$  be convex excision, and for  $\epsilon > 0$  let  $Y_\epsilon$  be the  $\epsilon$ -regularization of the boundary  $Y := \partial F[t]$  defined in 4.7.1. The visibility factor is the function  $k : X \times Y_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\}$  defined by the formula

$$k(x, y) := \begin{cases} \langle \nabla_y d(x, y), \mathbf{n}_y \rangle^{-1}, & \text{if } x, y \text{ are visible ,} \\ +\infty, & \text{if } x, y \text{ not visible .} \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

The definition 4.6.4 represents a numerical function valued in  $[1, +\infty]$ , and diverging to  $+\infty$  when  $y$  fails to be visible from  $x$  within  $F[t]$ , according to Lemma 4.6.3.




Figure 4.7: Excision domain  $X = F[t]$ , where  $(x, y)$  are visible in  $X$  and  $(x, w)$  is not visible in  $X$

## 4.7 $\epsilon$ -Regularizations

The definition 4.5.1 produces a manifold-with-corners  $F[t]$ , having an excision-boundary  $Y := \partial_*F[t]$  which is generally not everywhere smooth and not having unique outward normals. The present section introduces a basic regularization  $Y_\epsilon$  of  $Y$  manifold-with-corners which will have smoothly varying outward normal vectors. This implies the corresponding visibility factor  $k : X \times Y_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{+\infty\}$  will be continuous throughout its domain.

The boundary of  $\partial_*F[t]$  is cellulated (“divided into cells”) by the convex excision parameter  $t$  and  $\{W[t_y] \mid y \in Y\}$ . The individual convex halfspaces  $W' := W[t]$  have well-defined inward normal vectors  $n_y \in T_y W'$  for every  $y \in W'$ . However a given point  $y' \in \partial_*F[t]$  can occupy multiple subsets of  $\{W[t_y] \mid y \in Y\}$ , and therefore the outward unit normal vector at  $T_{y'}F[t]$  is not uniquely defined. We restore uniqueness by replacing  $Y$  with  $Y_\epsilon$  as defined in Proposition 4.7.1 below.

Remark that the boundary  $\partial((F[t]))_{\leq \epsilon}$  of the closed  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\partial F[t]$  defines a  $C^{1,1}$ -regularization. With more effort one may obtain a  $C^\infty$ -regularization, c.f. [Gro91, §3, pp.53], [Gro14b, §3.4, 5.7], and Douady-Héault’s “Arrondissement des variétés à coins”, [BS73, Appendix, §6].

**Proposition 4.7.1** ( $C^\infty$  Regularization of manifold-with-corners). *Let  $X$  be complete riemannian manifold,  $F$  a closed geodesically-convex subset of  $X$ , and  $t$  an excision parameter (see Definition 4.5.1) and  $F[t]$  a convex excision. Define  $Y = \partial_* F[t]$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can replace  $Y$  with a smooth manifold  $Y_\epsilon$  such that:*

- (1)  $Y_\epsilon$  is contained within the open  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\partial_* F[t]$ ; and
- (2) as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ , we see  $Y_\epsilon$  converges in Gromov-Hausdorff topology to  $Y$ ; and
- (3) there exists a degree-one continuous map  $p : Y_\epsilon \rightarrow Y$ .

*Sketch of Proof 4.7.1.* The following approach was suggested by Professor R.J. McCann. Recall the Definition 4.5.1 includes three hypotheses: boundaries  $\partial W_i$  are smooth, boundaries are pairwise transverse, and intersect local-finitely on compacta. This implies the excision boundaries  $Y, Y_\epsilon$  are locally modelled on “standard orthogonal sectors” in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $((\partial F[t]))_\epsilon$  be the open  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\partial_* F[t]$  in  $X$ . Next let  $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a harmonic function satisfying  $u|_{F[t]} \equiv 0$  and  $u|_{X - ((\partial F[t]))_\epsilon} \equiv 1$ . Now defining  $Y_\epsilon := u^{-1}(1/2)$ , we see  $Y_\epsilon$  is indeed smooth manifold satisfying conditions (1), (2), (3). For instance, the harmonic function  $u$  will have nonvanishing gradient  $\nabla_x u \neq 0$  on the open  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood  $((F[t]))_{<\epsilon}$ , and therefore the standard “gradient-flow” argument constructs a deformation retract from the sublevels  $\{u \leq 1/2\}$  onto  $u = 0$ .  $\square$

For example, consider the unit square  $X = [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Then  $X$  is a manifold-with-corners, and having “sharp” corners at the four extreme points. For every  $\epsilon > 0$ , the closed  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood  $((X))_\epsilon$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is a  $C^{1,1}$ -manifold-with-boundary. Constructing the harmonic function  $u$  as in the proof of Proposition 4.7.1, we find  $u^{-1}(1/2)$  is smooth regularization of the boundary  $\partial((X))_\epsilon$ . The gradient flow produces a degree-one continuous covering map  $Y_\epsilon \rightarrow Y$ . The regularization from Proposition 4.7.1 replaces a manifold-with-corners  $(X, \partial X)$  with a pair  $(X, Y_\epsilon)$  where  $Y_\epsilon$  is the smooth regularization of the closed  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood  $Y = \partial((X))_{\leq\epsilon}$ . We remark that the visibility between pairs  $(x, y)$  in  $X \times \partial X$  and pairs  $(x, y') \in X \times Y_\epsilon$  are basically equivalent via the degree-one continuous map  $p$  constructed in Proposition 4.7.1. Indeed if  $V_\epsilon$  denotes the visibility relation on  $X, Y_\epsilon$  per Definition 4.6.1, then we find  $xV_\epsilon y'$  if and only if  $xVp(y')$ , where  $p$  is the degree-one map from Proposition 4.7.1.

Thus  $Y_\epsilon$  is a smooth manifold having uniquely-defined outward unit normal vector  $\mathbf{n}_y \in T_y X$  varying with  $y \in Y_\epsilon$ . Therefore  $k(x, y)$  is smooth with respect to visible pairs  $(x, y)$  for all sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ . For given  $x \in F[t]$ , the function  $y \mapsto k(x, y)$  will possibly have nontrivial domain in  $Y_\epsilon$ .




Figure 4.8: The outer boundary is the boundary of the closed outward  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood  $\partial((X[t]))_{\leq \epsilon}$  of the excision boundary  $Y = \partial_* X[t]$ . The inner hypersurface is the smooth  $\epsilon$ -regularization  $Y_\epsilon$

## 4.8 Barycentres and Krein-Milman

The previous Section 4.3 introduced the definition of “extreme points” in anticipation of the present section, which describes a useful probabilistic “coordinate system” on the convex hull of a collection  $E$  of extreme points. The references [Phe89, Ch.I] and [Bar02b, pp. II.3-4] provide useful background on Krein-Milman’s theorem from convex geometry: if  $F$  is a convex compact body, then every point mass  $\delta_x$  at a point  $x \in F$  can be represented as the centre-of-mass of some mass-distribution supported  $\lambda$  at the extreme-points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  of  $F$ . Thus points on  $F$  can be coordinatized by probability measures on  $\mathcal{E}[F]$ .

**Definition 4.8.1** (Linear barycentre). Suppose  $\lambda$  is a probability measure supported on a nonempty compact subset  $Y$  of some topological vector space  $X$ . A point  $x$  in  $X$  is the barycentre of  $\lambda$ , and denoted  $bar(\lambda)$  if  $f(x) = \int_X f(w)d\delta_x(w)dw = \int_X f(w)d\lambda(w)$  for every continuous linear functional  $f$  on  $X$ .

The linear barycentre can be generalized to Riemannian geometry with the following alternative definition, see [Jös97].

**Definition 4.8.2** (Riemannian barycentre). Let  $(X, d, \sigma)$  be a complete finite-dimensional metric-measure space. Let  $\lambda$  be Radon measure on  $(X, d)$  and absolutely-continuous with respect to  $\sigma$ . Then  $x_0 \in X$  is the barycentre of  $\lambda$  with respect to  $\sigma$  if

$$\int d^2(x_0, x)d\lambda(x) = \inf_{p \in X} \int d^2(p, x)d\lambda(x).$$

We abbreviate  $x_0 = bar(\lambda|\sigma)$ . Using the Riemannian geodesic exponential function  $exp_x : T_x X \rightarrow X$ , we find  $q \in X$  is a barycentre of  $\lambda$  if the following critical point condition holds:

$$\int_X exp_q^{-1}(x)d\lambda(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } T_x X. \quad (4.4)$$

The following standard result asserts the unique existence of barycentres for complete nonpositively curved spaces, c.f. [Jös97, Theorem 3.2.1].

**Proposition 4.8.3.** *Let  $(X, d, \sigma)$  be a complete finite-dimensional metric-measure length space with nonpositive sectional curvature  $\kappa \leq 0$ . Let  $\lambda$  be a Radon measure on  $X$  and absolutely continuous with respect to  $\sigma$ , bounded support and  $\lambda[X] < +\infty$ . Then there exists unique barycentre for  $\lambda$  and unique  $x_0 \in X$  with*

$$\int_X d^2(x_0, x)d\lambda(x) = \inf_{p \in X} \int_X d^2(p, x)d\lambda(x).$$

If the background measure  $\sigma = \mathcal{H}$  is Hausdorff-type, e.g.  $\mathcal{H}_Y = \mathcal{H}$ , then we abbreviate  $bar(-) = bar(-|\sigma)$ . Now let  $E \subset X$  be a closed subset of a finite-dimensional complete space  $X$ , and let  $\Delta(E) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\geq 0}(E)$  denote the weak-\* compact subset of Radon probability measures supported on  $E$ . The barycentre map defines a weak-\* continuous mapping  $bar : \Delta(E) \rightarrow conv[E]$ , and this mapping surjects onto the convex compact hull  $conv[E]$  of  $E$  in  $X$  according to Krein-Milman theorem.

**Definition 4.8.4.** Let  $F$  be closed convex subset. For  $x \in F$ , let  $S_x$  consist of those probability measures  $\lambda$  in  $\Delta(\mathcal{E}[F])$  with barycentre  $bar(\lambda)$  equal to  $x$ .

For every  $x \in F$  the subset  $S_x$  is nonempty compact convex subset of  $\Delta(\mathcal{E})$ . For general  $F$  and  $x \in F$  the subset  $S_x$  is not typically a singleton. Indeed Choquet's Theorem [Phe89] says  $F$  is a simplex if and only if the barycentre mapping  $bar : \Delta(\mathcal{E}[F]) \rightarrow F$  is injective, i.e. if and only if the barycentre mapping is a weak-\* isomorphism and  $S_x$  is a singleton for every  $x \in F$ . Thus we face the problem of selecting a canonical choice of  $\lambda_x^0 \in S_x$  varying continuously with the point  $x \in F$ . In our applications below, the convex set  $F$  is typically not a simplex.

Now suppose  $F$  is a compact and geodesically convex space satisfying (IDE) conditions of Definition 4.3.2. Then  $Y := \mathcal{E}[F]$  has canonical Radon measure  $\mathcal{H}_Y^{can}$ . Following the recent work of Y.-H.Kim and B. Pass [KP18] we define:

**Definition 4.8.5** ([KP18]). In the above notation, for every  $x \in F$  we define the following probability measure  $\lambda_x^*$  to be the canonical element of  $S_x$ :

$$\{\lambda_x^*\} = \{\lambda \mapsto W_2^2(\lambda, \mathcal{H}_Y^{can}) \mid \lambda \in S_x\},$$

where  $W_2^2$  denotes Wasserstein 2-distance with respect to the quadratic transport costs  $c = d^2/2$ .

With respect to the quadratic cost  $c = d^2/2$ , it is well-known that minimizers of  $W_2^2$  are unique, and especially for subsets of a convex set  $F$ . We refer the reader to [KP18] for further details. We call  $\lambda_x^*$  the “canonical probability measure” with barycentre  $x$ .

## 4.9 Visible Repulsion Costs

Throughout this section we presume  $F$  is a compact convex polyhedra such that the set of extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$  is discrete and finite subset. We continue with our convex excisions of  $F$ , but insist that the excised convex horoballs  $W_\lambda^t$ ,  $\{\lambda\} \subset \mathcal{E}[F]$ , defining

the excision  $F[t] := \cap_{\{t\}}(F - W_\lambda^t)$  are horoballs centred at the extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$ . Recall  $\Delta(\partial_* F[t])$  consists of all probability measures supported on  $\partial_* F[t]$ . The following definition is convenient:

**Definition 4.9.1.** Let  $\Delta^v(\partial_* F[t])$  be the collection of probability measures  $\lambda$  on  $\partial_* F[t]$  which satisfy the following two conditions:

- (I) the barycentre  $bar(\lambda)$  belongs to  $F[t]$ ; and
- (II) the support of  $\lambda$  is a subset of  $\partial_* F[t]$  which is visible from  $bar(\lambda)$  along geodesics contained in  $F[t]$ .

Now the excision  $F[t]$  is generally a nonconvex subset of  $F$ . Our first step in this section is to identify a convenient geodesically convex subset  $\Omega$  of  $F[t]$ . We define  $\Omega$  via the visibility relation  $V \subset F[t] \times F[t]$  (Definition 4.6.1).

**Lemma 4.9.2.** *Under the above hypotheses, let  $F$  be a convex compact polyhedra and  $F[t]$  a strictly convex excision centred on the extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$ . Then the restricted barycentre map*

$$bar : \Delta^v(\partial_* F[t]) \rightarrow F[t]$$

*is a continuous surjection.*

*Proof.* Krein-Milman theorem implies  $\Delta(\mathcal{E}[F]) \rightarrow F$  is a continuous surjection. If  $F[t]$  is a convex excision of  $F$  centred at the extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$ , suppose  $\lambda \in \Delta(\mathcal{E}[F])$  is such that  $bar(\lambda) \in F[t]$ . Then we find there exists a measure  $\lambda' \in \Delta^v(\partial_* F[t])$  with  $bar(\lambda) = bar(\lambda')$ . Indeed the geodesics joining the support of  $\lambda$  to  $x$  will intersect the excision horoballs  $W_t$  defining  $F[t]$  at points  $\{y'\}$ . And a suitable convex combination of the  $\{y\}$  will define a measure  $\lambda'$  having barycentre coincident with  $bar(\lambda)$ . We observe here that convexity of the excised  $W_t$ 's is necessary hypothesis.  $\square$

For  $z \in \partial_* F[t]$ , we define  $V_z := \{x \in F[t] \mid xVz\}$ . Then we define

$$\Omega := (\cap_{z \in \partial_* F[t]} V_z). \quad (4.5)$$

See Figure 4.9. The subset  $\Omega$  consists of all  $x \in F[t]$  which are simultaneously visible to the excision boundary  $\partial_* F[t]$  by geodesics contained in  $F[t]$ .

**Lemma 4.9.3.** *Under the above hypotheses, the subset  $\Omega$  is a geodesically convex subset of  $F[t]$ .*




Figure 4.9: The subdomain  $\Omega$  is geodesically convex

*Proof.* Consider the inclusion  $F[t] \hookrightarrow F$ . If  $y \in \partial_* F[t]$ , then the subset  $V'_z := \{x \in F[t] \mid xV'_z\}$  is a geodesically convex subset of  $F$  for every  $z \in \partial_* F[t]$ . But observe  $\cap_{z' \in \partial_* F[t]} V'_z$  is a subset of  $F[t]$  and coincident with  $\cap_{z' \in \partial_* F[t]} V_z =: \Omega$ . Thus  $\Omega$  is geodesically convex subset of  $F[t]$ .  $\square$

The next second step concerns the restriction  $\text{proj}_z|_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \partial F[t]$  of the projection  $\text{proj}_z$ . Recall  $\text{proj}_y(x)$  is the projection defined in Section 4.4, and we restrict to  $z \in \partial_* F[t]$ .

**Lemma 4.9.4.** *Under the above hypotheses, the restriction  $\text{proj}_z|_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \partial F[t]$  is a continuous map for every  $z \in \partial_* F[t]$ .*

*Proof.* We find  $\text{proj}_z$  is discontinuous at points  $x$  for which the geodesic segment  $\alpha(s)$ ,  $s > 0$  with  $\alpha(0) = z$ ,  $\alpha(\text{dist}(z, x)) = x$ , intersects  $\partial_* F[t]$  and makes angle-of-impact exactly  $\pi/2$  with respect to the normal vector  $\mathbf{n}$  at the point of intersection. But such points  $x$  are then nonvisible to a nontrivial portion of  $\partial_* F[t]$ , and therefore  $x \notin \Omega$ .  $\square$

The restricted projection  $\text{proj}_z|_\Omega$  will not surject onto  $\partial F[t]$ , and the image of  $\text{proj}_z|_\Omega$  is some closed connected subset of  $\partial F[t]$ . Moreover according to Lemma 4.9.2 every  $y \in (\text{proj}_z|_\Omega)$  is the barycentre of some probability measure  $\lambda_y \in \Delta^v$ ,  $\text{bar}(\lambda_y) = y$ . Adapting the Definition 4.8.5, we let  $\lambda_y^*$  denote the canonical probability measure. This unique canonical measure varies continuously with respect to  $y \in \partial F[t]$ .




Figure 4.10: Evaluating visibility cost  $v(x, z)$  for pair  $(x, z) \in \Omega \times \partial_*F$

In the third step, we define our visibility cost  $v$  with the explicit formula (4.6). Let  $\Omega \subset F[t]$  be the subset defined in (4.5). If  $Y = \partial_*F[t]$  is the excision boundary (Definition 4.5.3), then let  $Y_\epsilon$  be the  $\epsilon$ -regularization from Proposition 4.7.1 for some small  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**Definition 4.9.5** (Visibility Cost). Under the above hypotheses, let

$$v(x, y_0) := \frac{1}{2}k(x, y_0).q(x, y_0)^{-1} + \int k(x, y).q(x, y)^{-1} d\lambda_{\text{proj}(y_0, x)}^*(y). \quad (4.6)$$

be the visibility cost  $v : \Omega \times Y_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .

Here  $k$  denotes the visibility factor defined in 4.6.4, and  $q(x, y) := \text{dist}(x, y)^{2+e}$  for a suitable integer  $e \geq 0$  (recall Definition 4.3.3 from Section 4.3).

Under the above hypotheses, one finds the visibility cost  $v = v(x, y)$  defined by equation (4.6) varies continuously with  $(x, y) \in \Omega \times Y_\epsilon$ . In fact we propose  $v$  has many further properties throughout  $\Omega \times Y_\epsilon$ , namely the hypotheses (D0)–(D4) from Section 4.2 which are expedient for our topological applications. We summarize our expectations in the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 4.9.6.** *Under the above hypotheses, the visibility cost  $v : \Omega \times Y_\epsilon \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  defined in Formula (4.6) satisfies the hypotheses (D0)–(D5) from Section 4.2.*

The reader will find applications of the above constructions in Chapters 5, 6 below. The definition 4.9.5 has useful limit case when the “radii”  $t_\lambda$  at  $\lambda \in Y$  vanish  $t_\lambda \rightarrow 0^+$ . This limit produces the generalization of  $\tilde{c}$  to  $\tilde{c}^*$ :

**Definition 4.9.7** (Averaged Two-Pointed Repulsion  $\tilde{c}^*$ ). Let  $F$  be a compact convex set. Then the formula

$$\tilde{c}^*(x, y_0) := \frac{1}{2}q(x, y_0)^{-1} + \int_Y q(x, y)^{-1} d\lambda_{proj(y_0, x)(y)}^*$$

defines the generalized two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}^* : \underline{F} \times \mathcal{E}[F] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .

We consider the above definition of  $\tilde{c}^*$  as an “averaged two-pointed” repulsion type cost, and defer the detailed study of this generalized cost to future investigations. However we expect that the hypotheses of semiregularity of  $F$  are sufficient to ensure  $\tilde{c}^*$  satisfies (Twist) condition. We formalize this expectation in the following

**Conjecture 4.9.8.** *Let  $F = conv[G, G', \dots]$  be the compact convex hull of a finite collection of pairwise-isometric regular polyhedral gates  $G, G', \dots$ . Then the averaged two-pointed repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}^* : F \times \mathcal{E}[F] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$  satisfies Assumptions (D0)–(D5) throughout its domain.*

*Remark.* If  $F$  is compact and strictly convex with  $\partial F = \mathcal{E}[F]$ , then the formula 4.6 defining  $v(x, y)$  reduces to a modified “visual two-pointed” repulsion cost, namely

$$v(x, z) := \frac{1}{2}k(x, z).q(x, z)^{-1} + \int k(x, proj(z, x)).q(x, proj(z, x))^{-1} d\lambda_{proj(z, x)}^*.$$

Omitting the visibility factor  $k$  obviously yields  $\tilde{c}$  (Definition 4.4.1). This visual two-pointed cost  $v$  is a topic for future investigations, e.g. it would be useful to establish Conjecture 4.9.6.

# Chapter 5

## Symmetry and Dimension

This chapter begins the second phase of our thesis with the goal of establishing Theorem C from Section 1.5. Our Theorem C is a reduction program drawing together the semi-coupling and singularity methods of Chapters 2, 3, 4. We apply these methods to source spaces  $X[t]$  obtained by convex excision, with target  $Y = \partial_* X[t]$  the excision boundary, as defined in §4.5. In practice we imagine a user has an infinite discrete group  $\Gamma$  with some standard geometric  $E\Gamma$  model  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$ . Given this initial data, the user will follow the excision construction of §5.3 to obtain manifold-with-corners  $X[t] \times \partial X[t]$ . If the user can successfully Close the Steinberg symbol (c.f. §1.5, Chapter 6), then we replace the excision  $X[t]$  with a more convenient chain sum  $\underline{F}$ . The summands of chain sum  $\underline{F}$  are excised convex sets  $F[t]$ , and  $\underline{F}$  inherits a proper  $\Gamma$ -action where  $\Gamma$  acts like shift-operator on the summands. Next we install the repulsion cost  $\tilde{c}$  and visibility cost  $v$  on  $\underline{F}$ . The homotopy-reductions from Theorems 2.6.2 and 3.4.2 deformation-retract  $\underline{F}$  onto closed singularities  $\underline{Z}$ . Everything is  $\Gamma$ -equivariant and the retracts  $\underline{Z}$  are small-dimensional  $E\Gamma$  classifying spaces, where “small” depends on sufficient (UHS) conditions being satisfied.

### 5.1 Proper Classifying Spaces $E\Gamma$

The purpose of this section is to introduce the so-called geometric  $E\Gamma$  models.

Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely-generated infinite group. It is difficult to speak further in the abstract category of groups, but Poincaré’s fundamental group functor  $X \mapsto \pi_1(X, pt)$ , originally defined in [Poi95, §12], is a bridge to topology. To display  $\Gamma$  as the fundamental group of a connected topological space means constructing the so-called proper classifying space  $E\Gamma$ . Recall the topological definition:

**Definition 5.1.1.** Let  $\Gamma$  be abstract group with discrete topology. An  $E\Gamma$  model is a topological space  $X$  equipped with a continuous map  $\alpha : X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  satisfying the following properties:

- the topological space  $X$  is homologically-trivial, so all reduced homology groups vanish  $\tilde{H}_i(X; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$  for  $i \geq 0$ ;
- the continuous map  $\alpha$  is group action satisfying  $\alpha(x, \gamma\delta) = \alpha(\alpha(x, \gamma), \delta)$  for all  $x \in X$ ,  $\gamma, \delta \in \Gamma$ , and  $\alpha(x, 1_\Gamma) = x$ . We abbreviate  $\alpha(x, \gamma) = x.\gamma$ ;
- the action is proper-discontinuous, so for every  $x \in X$  and bounded open neighbourhood  $U$  of  $x$ , there exists only finitely many  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  such that  $U \cap U.\gamma$  is nonempty;
- the action is free, so for all  $x \in X$ ,  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , we have  $x.\gamma = x$  if and only if  $\gamma = Id$ .

The  $E\Gamma$  models can be characterized as universal covering spaces of the Eilenberg-Maclane space  $K(\Gamma, 1)$ . One finds every pair  $X, X'$  of  $E\Gamma$ -models are homotopic. Useful references include [Bro82], [Bre93]. Examples of  $E\Gamma$  spaces abound:

1. The universal covering space  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \approx S^1$  is  $E\mathbb{Z}$  model, where  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by additive translation  $(x, n) \mapsto x + n$ .
2. The  $n$ -dimensional torus  $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow T^n = (S^1)^n$  defines  $E\mathbb{Z}^n$  model.
3. If  $K \subset \mathbb{S}^3$  is a 1-dimensional knot, then excising the open  $\epsilon$ -neighborhoods  $N_\epsilon(K)$  from  $\mathbb{S}^3$  produces a three-dimensional manifold-with-boundary  $X = \mathbb{S}^3 - N_\epsilon(K)$ . The universal covering  $\tilde{X}$  is known to be an  $E\Gamma$  model for  $\Gamma = \pi_1(X, pt)$ .
4. The Poincaré disk  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is an  $E\Gamma$ -model for every torsion-free finite-index subgroup  $\Gamma$  of  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ .
5. The quotient  $X = K \backslash Sp(\mathbb{R}^4)$  of the group of linear symplectomorphisms of the standard four-dimensional symplectic space  $(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega)$  by a maximal compact subgroup  $K \approx U(2) = SO(4) \cap Sp(\mathbb{R}^4)$  admits a proper discontinuous right-action by the arithmetic group  $Sp(\mathbb{Z}^4)$ . One knows that  $X$  is a  $E\Gamma$ -model for every finite-index torsion-free subgroup  $\Gamma$  of  $Sp(\mathbb{Z}^4)$ .
6. Teichmueller's space  $\mathcal{T}_g$  is an  $E\Gamma$  model for the mapping class group  $\Gamma = MCG(\Sigma_g)$  of a closed orientable genus  $g$  surface  $\Sigma_g$ .

Further examples include braid groups, right-angled Artin groups, etc., and almost all the groups that arise from geometric group theory and three-dimensional topology.

Our applications are especially concerned with so-called “geometric”  $E\Gamma$  models, per the following definition:

**Definition 5.1.2.** An  $E\Gamma$  model  $X$  is geometric if  $X$  has a complete Cartan-Hadamard Riemannian metric  $g$  for which the action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  is isometric, and if the volume measure  $\text{vol}_X$  has finite covolume with respect to  $X$  (i.e. the quotient  $X/\Gamma$  has finite volume with respect to  $\text{vol}_X$ ).

The previous  $E\Gamma$  models are all geometric. We conclude this section with some remarks.

Constructing  $E\Gamma$  models is basic to practical computations. For instance, effective  $E\Gamma$  models solve the word problem on the abstract group  $\Gamma$  insofar as a group element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  can act by translations on  $X$ . The hypotheses of Definition 5.1.1 means we can distinguish  $\gamma$  from the identity element  $Id$  by finding some (any) point  $x \in X$  which is displaced some positive ( $> 0$ ) distance, and then  $x.\gamma \neq x$  implies  $\gamma \neq Id$  in  $\Gamma$ . This observation is basic to Fricke-Klein’s ping-pong argument (see [Tit72]).

The  $E\Gamma$  models are connected spaces  $X$  with action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$ . Viewing  $\Gamma$  as discrete topological space, the group action  $\Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$  defined by  $(\delta, \gamma) \mapsto \delta \cdot \gamma$  almost satisfies properties of Definition 5.1.1 with the exception of (i), namely the connectivity hypothesis that the reduced homology groups  $\tilde{H}_*$  simultaneously vanish. But of course a discrete group  $\Gamma$  is generally disconnected with respect to the discrete topology, especially when the group is infinite. So  $E\Gamma$  models  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  are maximally-connected interpolations of the principal action  $\Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ .

The proper-discontinuity hypothesis has important measure-theoretic consequences regarding so-called Radon measures. Recall that a Radon measure is a Borel measure which gives finite measure to compact subsets. A given point orbit  $x.\Gamma$  is discrete in  $X$ , and fixed point free. Naturally we interpret the orbit  $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \delta_x.\gamma$  of the Dirac atomic mass  $\delta_x$  at  $x$  as representing a unit Dirac measure on the quotient. The proper discontinuity hypothesis ensures the correspondance between Radon measures on the topological quotient  $X/\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma$ -equivariant Radon measures on  $X$  defines a weak-\* homeomorphism  $\mathcal{M}_{\geq 0}(X)_\Gamma \approx \mathcal{M}_{\geq 0}(X/\Gamma)$ .

## 5.2 Group Cohomology: Algebraic Background

The following section is primarily notation and review of the basic facts of group-cohomology, i.e. the study of projective and free resolutions of  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules. The formalities are necessary for the definition of Closing the Steinberg symbol (Chapter 6) and Bieri-Eckmann duality (Section 5.4).

Effectively computing the topological invariants of a group  $\Gamma$  is practically impossible without explicit  $E\Gamma$  models. Recall  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$  denotes the integral group-ring, consisting of finitely-supported  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued distributions on the discrete group  $\Gamma$ . If  $X$  is  $E\Gamma$  model, then the topologists' standard projective resolution of  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules over  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  is obtained via the singular chain complex  $\{C_n(X)^{sing}, \partial_n\}_n$  on  $X$ . Here  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  denotes the additive abelian group  $\mathbb{Z}$  equipped with trivial  $\Gamma$  action,  $n.\gamma = n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}, \gamma \in \Gamma$ .

More formally, let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete group. The category of linear representations of  $\Gamma$  is equivalent to the category of  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules. When  $M, N$  are  $\Gamma$ -modules, then  $M \otimes N$  inherits  $\Gamma$ -module action via the diagonal action  $m \otimes n.\gamma = m.\gamma \otimes n.\gamma$ , and we set  $M \otimes_{\Gamma} N := (M \otimes N)_{\Gamma}$  the coinvariant module, or quotient of  $M \otimes N$  (tensor product as  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules) by the  $\Gamma$ -action. If  $M, N$  are  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules, then  $Hom(M, N)$  (which is  $\simeq N \otimes M^*$ ) inherits  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module structure via  $(f.\gamma) : m \mapsto f(m.\gamma^{-1}).\gamma$ . Thus we identify  $Hom(M, N)^{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}$  with  $Hom_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}(M, N)$ , i.e. the  $\Gamma$ -invariant homomorphisms correspond exactly to the  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module morphisms  $M \rightarrow N$ . If  $F, C$  are two chain-complexes, then we declare their tensor product  $F \otimes C$  to be a chain complex with dimension  $n$  part equal to

$$(F \otimes C)_n = \bigoplus_{p+q=n} F_p \otimes C_q,$$

and having a differential  $D(f \otimes c) = df \otimes c + (-1)^{deg(f)} f \otimes d'c$ . When we reduce our coefficients to  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ , then we forget signs and have  $D(F \otimes c) = df \otimes c + f \otimes d'c$ .

For a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $M$ , the homology groups  $\{H_n(\Gamma; M)\}_{n \geq 0}$  with coefficients in  $M$  are defined as homology of the chain complex  $H_n(F \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma} M)$ , where  $F = \{F_n, \partial\}_n$  is a projective resolution of the  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ . Here we see  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  as the additive integer group with trivial  $\Gamma$ -action,  $\gamma.n = n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}, \gamma \in \Gamma$ . The topologists favourite coefficient group  $\mathbb{Z}$  or  $\mathbb{Z}/2$  are formally defined as trivial  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules, and denoted  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  or  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}/2$  when we wish emphasize the trivial  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -structure.

To define cohomology-with-coefficients, let  $\{F_n, \partial_n\}$  be a projective resolution of  $\mathbb{Z}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ , and  $M$  the coefficient  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module. There is a cochain-complex  $\{Hom_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}(F_n, M)\}_n$ , with coboundary  $\delta = \{\delta_n\}$  defined adjointly by  $\delta_n : Hom(F_n, M) \rightarrow Hom(F_{n+1}, M)$ ,  $f \mapsto \delta z$ , where  $\delta z(f) = z(\partial_n f)$  for all homomorphisms  $z : F_n \rightarrow M$  and  $f \in F_n$ . The cohomology of this cochain complex defines  $H^*(\mathbb{Z}\Gamma; M)$ . The cohomology modules

$H^m(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$  have the following definition. Let  $\{P_n, \partial_n\}_n$  be a projective resolution of  $\mathbb{Z}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ . The cochain complex  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}(P_n, \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$  with coboundary defined adjointly has cohomology describing  $H^*(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$ .

Now we define homology groups with coefficients in a chain-complex. If  $\{C_n, \partial_n\}_n$  is a chain complex, then we set  $H_n(\Gamma; C) = H_n(F \otimes_{\Gamma} C)$ , where  $F \otimes_{\Gamma} C$  is the tensor product of the chain complexes  $F, C$ , graded appropriately. The homology groups with coefficients in the chain complex  $C$  is a chain-homotopy invariant, and hence determined by the homology groups of the chain complex  $C$ . If the homology of  $C$  concentrates to a single dimension  $H_*(C) \simeq H_q(C) =: D$  for some integer  $q \geq 0$ , then the homology groups  $H_n(\Gamma; C)$  reduce to  $H_n(\Gamma; D)$ .

When  $X$  is aspherical topological space supporting a continuous free properly discontinuous action  $X \times G \rightarrow X$ , then the singular chain groups  $\{C_n^{sing}(X; \mathbb{Z})\}_n$  are abelian groups possessing a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module structure  $C_n^{sing}(X; \mathbb{Z}) \times \Gamma \rightarrow C_n^{sing}(X; \mathbb{Z})$  arising from the geometric action. When  $\Gamma$  acts proper discontinuously on  $X$  with quotient  $X/\Gamma$  supporting a finite-equivariant measure, then the action of  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$  on  $C_n^{sing}$  turns the chain groups into finitely-generated  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules.

If we augment the complex by the augmentation mapping  $\epsilon : C_0(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  (defined by  $\epsilon(v) = +1$  for every 0-cell on  $X$ ) then we obtain a projective resolution (free) of  $\mathbb{Z}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ . That is, the sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow C_q^{sing}(X) \rightarrow C_{q-1}^{sing}(X) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow C_0^{sing}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Forgetting the  $\Gamma$ -action, the resolution is homologically-trivial. But  $\Gamma$  acts on everything, and the  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -modules become essential topological invariants of  $\Gamma$ . The comparison to the singular homology with coefficients in  $\underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  arises from the augmentation mapping  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma \rightarrow \underline{\mathbb{Z}}$  defined by

$$\epsilon : \sum_{\gamma} n_{\gamma} \gamma \mapsto \sum_{\gamma} n_{\gamma}.$$

Now we require basic lemma (c.f. [Bro82, VIII.7.4, pp.208]):

**Lemma 5.2.1.** *Let  $M$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module. There is natural  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module isomorphism between  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}(M, \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$  and  $\text{Hom}_c(M, \mathbb{Z})$ , where  $\text{Hom}_c(M, \mathbb{Z}) \subset \text{Hom}(M, \mathbb{Z})$  consists of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear homomorphisms  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  satisfying: for every  $m \in M$ , there exist only finitely many  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  for which  $f(m.\gamma) \neq 0$ . We call  $\text{Hom}_c(M, \mathbb{Z})$  the module of  $\Gamma$ -compactly-supported homomorphisms.*

*Proof.* Let  $F : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -linear morphism. Then  $F$  has the form  $F(m) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} f_{\gamma}(m).\gamma$ , where  $f_{\gamma} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear morphism for every  $\gamma$ . For fixed  $m$ , we

see that only finitely many terms  $f_\gamma(m)$  are nonzero, since the group ring  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$  consists of finitely supported  $\mathbb{Z}$ -distributions over  $\Gamma$ .

As  $F$  is  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -linear, we have  $F(m.\delta) = \delta^{-1}F(m)$ , and so  $\Sigma f_\gamma(m.\delta).\gamma = \Sigma f_{\delta\gamma}(m)\gamma$  for all  $m$ . Thus  $f_\gamma(m) = f_{id}(m.\gamma^{-1})$  for all  $m, \gamma$ , and we conclude that the coefficients  $f_\gamma$  determining  $F = \sum_\gamma f_\gamma$  are uniquely determined by a particular  $\gamma$ , say,  $\gamma = id \in \Gamma$ . The assignment  $F \mapsto f_{id}$  yields the correspondance  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}(M, \mathbb{Z}\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_c(M, \mathbb{Z})$ , which can immediately seen to be natural equivariant isomorphism with inverse  $f_{id} \mapsto \sum_\gamma f_{id}(-\gamma^{-1})$ .  $\square$

The lemma gives natural equivalence between the cohomology of cochain complexes

$$\{\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma}(C_n^{sing}(X), \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)\}_n \text{ and } \{\text{Hom}_c(C_n^{sing}(X), \mathbb{Z})\}_n.$$

The latter cochain complex is familiar as the compactly-supported cohomology on  $X$  consisting of cochains  $z : C^{sing}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  for which  $z(\sigma) = 0$  for almost all cells  $\sigma$  in  $X$ , and only finitely many nonzero.

When  $\Gamma$  acts cocompactly on the contractible space  $X$ , then compactly-supported cohomology on  $X$  can be identified by a Poincaré-Lefschetz duality

$$H_c^m(X) \simeq H_{d-m}(X, \partial X; \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \Omega \simeq H_{d-m-1}(\partial X; \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \Omega,$$

where  $\Omega$  is the orientation module on  $X$ , i.e. the  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module supported on the abelian group  $\{-1, +1\}$  and which measures whether a given element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  preserves the orientation of  $X$  or not. This duality is generalized to finite-volume quotients (usually noncompact) in Bieri-Eckmann's duality. See Section 5.4 below.

### 5.3 Excision versus Compactification

This section emphasizes the distinction between excisions and compactifications. This is key to our studying the semicoupling programs associated to various  $E\Gamma$ -models. In the previous Chapter 4, we emphasized excisions  $F[t]$  of convex bodies  $F$  where the excision parameters were supported on the extreme points  $\mathcal{E}[F]$ . We generalize this idea further to excisions supported on  $\Gamma$ -rational points at-infinity in the present section. Thus the convex excisions and visibility costs defined earlier have applications to the geometric  $E\Gamma$  models.

In applications we find  $E\Gamma$  models  $X$  arising from nonpositive curvature, namely from Cartan-Hadamard spaces, i.e. finite-dimensional complete nonpositively-curved

spaces satisfying the triangle comparison inequalities of Alexandrov, Toponogov, and Cartan. See [BGS85] for basic definitions and compare Definition 5.1.2 from Section 5.1. For general complete metric spaces Gromov defined a universal compactification, c.f. [BJ06], [BGS85]. In the nonpositive curvature, the compactification has direct geometric interpretation. For every point  $x \in X$  in a  $d$ -dimensional space, the exponential map  $\exp_x : T_x X \rightarrow X$  determines a homeomorphism from the unit tangent sphere  $S^{d-1} \subset T_x X$  to the visual boundary at-infinity  $X(\infty)$  of  $X$ . Adjoining the visual boundary provides a topological compactification  $\overline{X} = X \cup X(\infty)$ . The compactification  $\overline{X}$  is a large-dimensional closed topological disk. The isometric action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  extends to a continuous action by homeomorphisms  $\overline{X} \times \Gamma \rightarrow \overline{X}$ . The visual boundary  $X(\infty)$  inherits a natural metric (so-called spherical Tits metric) and supports a uniform Lebesgue measure. However there is serious difficulty: the  $\Gamma$ -action on  $X(\infty)$  is neither free nor properly discontinuous. Brouwer's fixed point theorem implies every such continuous homeomorphism has at least one fixed point in  $\overline{X}$ . Therefore Radon measures on  $X(\infty)$  will not descend to Radon measures on the topological quotient  $X(\infty)/\Gamma$ . In fact it appears to be general principle that compactifications  $\overline{X}$  of geometric  $E\Gamma$  models  $X$  cannot support nontrivial  $\Gamma$ -equivariant Radon measures, c.f. Ahlfors's theorem, [Thu02, §8.4.2, pp.180]. For example, the standard action of  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  on the Poincaré disk  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is proper-discontinuous and virtually free. The boundary-at-infinity of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is a topological circle  $\mathbb{H}^2(\infty) = S^1$ , and it's well-known that  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  acts ergodically on this circle at-infinity with respect to the one-dimensional uniform measure  $d\theta$ . Therefore every  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ -equivariant  $d\theta$  measurable function on  $\mathbb{H}^2(\infty)$  is constant. This says all equivariant Radon measures on the boundary circle are trivial.

So conventional compactifications are not suitable for our semicoupling method, which studies transport between Radon measures. Thus we pursue a general excision procedure, implicit in the literature, and defined for a discrete groups  $\Gamma$  and Cartan-Hadamard spaces  $(X, d, \sigma)$  augmented with a free and properly discontinuous isometric action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$ . The basic idea: in a Cartan-Hadamard space  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$ , there are “deep dark zones” which a given orbit  $x.\Gamma$  will strongly avoid. These dark zones are  $\Gamma$ -equivariant collections  $\{W_\lambda \mid \lambda \in I\}$  of convex horoballs at-infinity. The dark zones  $W_\lambda$  are disjoint from all  $\Gamma$ -accumulation points at visual infinity. We excise these halfspaces, and obtain a manifold-with-corners

$$X_0 := X - \cup_\lambda W_\lambda.$$

The excision  $X_0$  has topological boundary  $\partial X_0 \subset X$ . Observe the boundary  $\partial X_0$  is naturally cellulated by the boundaries  $\partial W_\lambda$  for  $\lambda \in I$ . If  $\Gamma$  furthermore translates the halfspaces  $\{W_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in I}$  such that  $W_\lambda.\gamma \subset W_\lambda$  only if  $W_\lambda.\gamma = W_\lambda$ , then the excision boundary  $\partial X_0$

is set-theoretically  $\Gamma$ -invariant. In these cases we obtain free and proper-discontinuous actions

$$\partial X_0 \times \Gamma \rightarrow \partial X_0, \quad X_0 \times \partial X_0 \times \Gamma \rightarrow X_0 \times \partial X_0,$$

where the action is diagonal  $(x, y) \cdot \gamma = (x \cdot \gamma, y \cdot \gamma)$ . Proper-discontinuity ensures  $\partial X_0$  supports nontrivial  $\Gamma$ -equivariant Radon measures. Moreover the fact that  $\Gamma$ -orbits avoided the dark zones  $W_\lambda$  implies closed geodesic loops on the quotient  $X_0/\Gamma$  are everyone contained in a compact-core of  $X_0/\Gamma$ .

Here is formal description of the excision procedure, to be applied to arithmetic groups in Section 5.5. The construction is summarized in the Figure 5.3, where the formal definitions are described below.

Recall that a point  $\lambda$  on the visual sphere  $X(\infty)$  can be characterized as the “asymptotic class” of a geodesic ray  $s : [0, \infty] \rightarrow X$  diverging to some “point”  $s(\infty)$  at visual-infinity. Let  $\lambda \in X(\infty)$  be point at-infinity. For every choice of  $x_0 \in X$ , we define the horofunction  $h_{\lambda, x_0} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by the following formula (see [BGS85, §3]).

**Definition 5.3.1** (Horofunctions). Let  $s : [0, +\infty] \rightarrow X$  be geodesic ray diverging to  $s(+\infty) = \lambda$  with  $s(0) = x_0$ . Then the horofunction centred at  $\lambda$  is defined

$$h_{\lambda, x_0}(x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} d(x, s(t)) - t.$$

There are several equivalent characterizations of horofunctions on complete Cartan-Hadamard spaces. A continuous function  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a horofunction if and only if  $h$  is geodesically convex,  $h$  is 1-Lipschitz  $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq |x - y|$ , and for every  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$ , there exists two points  $x_1, x_2$  with  $d(x, x_1) = d(x, x_2) = 2r$ . Equivalently,  $h$  is a horofunction on a complete Cartan-Hadamard space  $(X, d)$  if and only if  $h$  is a geodesically convex  $C^1$  function with  $|\nabla_x h| = 1$ , c.f. [BGS85, Lemma 3.4].

For any  $\lambda \in X(\infty)$ , let

$$\Gamma_\lambda := \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \lambda \cdot \gamma = \lambda\}$$

be the isotropy-group (i.e. stabilizer group) of the point at infinity. The hypothesis that  $\Gamma$  acts proper discontinuously on  $X$  implies every fixed point is necessarily a point at-infinity  $\lambda \in X(\infty)$ . Notice when  $\gamma$  acts isometrically, then any accumulation point in  $X(\infty)$  of the orbit  $\{x \cdot \gamma^n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a fixed point of  $\gamma$ . If  $\gamma$  is isometry fixing  $\lambda \in X(\infty)$ , then  $\gamma$  maps horoballs centred at  $\lambda$  to horoballs centred at  $\lambda$ . And since  $\gamma$  is distance-preserving between pairs of points,  $\gamma$  also preserves signed-distance between any two horospheres. This observation suggests the following definition.

**Definition 5.3.2.** For every  $\lambda \in X(\infty)$ , let  $T_\lambda : \Gamma_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the group homomorphism




Figure 5.1: (a) Deep Zones are disjoint from  $\Gamma$ -orbit. (b) Excise the Deep Zones from  $X$ . (c) Optimal Semicoupling, with respect to repulsion cost, between target excision boundary (in blue) and activated source measure (in red). (d) Singularity structure (in yellow) of an optimal semicoupling between source and target with respect to repulsion cost.

defined by the signed-distance between successive  $\gamma$ -translates of the horospheres centred at  $\lambda$ .

So  $T_\lambda$  is defined by the identity  $\{h_{\lambda,x} \leq t\}.\gamma = \{h_{\lambda,x} \leq t + T_\lambda(\gamma)\}$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and where  $x$  is an arbitrary basepoint in  $X$ . We find  $T_\lambda = 0$  is trivial if and only if  $\Gamma_\lambda$  preserves the horospheres centred at  $\lambda$  setwise, i.e.

$$\{h_{\lambda,x} = t\}.\gamma \subset \{h_{\lambda,x} = t\}.\gamma$$

for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x \in X$ . Equivalently  $\Gamma_\lambda$  preserves the level sets of every horofunction  $h_{\lambda,x}$  centred at  $\lambda$  with respect to any  $x \in X$ .

**Definition 5.3.3** ( $\Gamma$ -rationality). A  $\Gamma$ -invariant subset  $J \subset X(\infty)$  is  $\Gamma$ -rational if the group homomorphisms  $\{T_\lambda : \Gamma_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \lambda \in J\}$  are simultaneously trivial.

**Example.** If  $\lambda \in X(\infty)$  is an accumulation point of an orbit  $x.\Gamma$  in  $X$ , then  $\gamma$  (and its powers  $\gamma^2, \gamma^3$  etc) will not preserve horoballs centred at  $\lambda$ , i.e. the group homomorphism  $T_\lambda : \Gamma_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  will be nontrivial.

The hypothesis that the homomorphisms  $T_\lambda : \Gamma_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are trivial for the collection  $\{\lambda\}$  of  $X(\infty)$  is necessary to ensure the excision boundary is  $\Gamma$ -invariant. In our applications below, this hypothesis is satisfied for every  $\mathbb{Q}$ -reductive group  $G$  whose derived group  ${}^0G$  admits no nontrivial  $\mathbb{Q}$ -rational multiplicative homomorphisms  $\text{Hom}_{/\mathbb{Q}}({}^0G, \mathbb{G}_m) = \{1\}$ . This implies that horospheres centred at the ends of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split tori in the symmetric-space model will be invariant under  $G(\mathbb{Z})$  translates.

There is another hypothesis in addition to the triviality of the homomorphisms  $\{T_\lambda \mid \lambda \in J\}$  necessary for the topological applications to small-dimensional  $E\Gamma$ -models. Namely, the reduced singular homology of the excision boundary  $\partial X_0$  must be concentrated in a unique dimension and be torsion-free. However because we are excising convex horoballs  $W$  – which are contractible connected subsets of  $X$  – the homotopy-type and homology of  $\partial X_0$  is homotopic to  $\cup_{\lambda \in J} W_\lambda$ , which is a union of contractible convex sets. According to Weil’s nerve covering theorem the homotopy-type of this union is equal to the nerve of the aspherical covering  $\{W_\lambda \mid \lambda \in J\}$ . See [BS73, Theorem 8.2.1] for details.

For arithmetic groups  $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z})$ , the excision is defined by convex horoballs corresponding to  $\mathbb{Q}$ -rational parabolic subgroups of  $G$ , and the nerve of the covering is well-known to be identical to the rational Tits complex, so  $\cup_{\lambda \in J} W_\lambda$  will be homotopic to simplicial complex  $\mathcal{B}(G, T)$  constructed in Section 5.5. The Solomon-Tits theorem identifies the simplicial complex  $\mathcal{B}(G, T)$  as homotopic to a countable wedge of spheres

$\vee_{i \in I} \mathbb{S}_i^q$  of some dimension  $q$ . Evidently the reduced singular homology of  $\partial X_0$  is concentrated in a single dimension and torsion-free, as desired. We elaborate these hypotheses in the §5.4 with Bieri-Eckmann homological duality.

## 5.4 Bieri-Eckmann Duality

Let the user produce a discrete matrix group  $\Gamma$ . Then by standard constructions we find  $E\Gamma$  models  $X$  often having an isometric action  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$ , where  $X$  is equipped with a complete proper nonpositively curved distance  $d$ . But there is further problem obstructing the user's computation of homological invariants of  $\Gamma$ . Namely the apparent space dimension  $\dim(X)$  may fail to coincide with the virtual cohomological dimension  $\nu := vcd(\Gamma)$  of  $\Gamma$ . Informally, the “vcd” is the essential dimension at which nontrivial topological invariants of  $\Gamma$  are supported. For instance, a three-dimensional ball appears to have three-space dimensions, but the cohomology of the ball is zero-dimensional since the ball is homotopic to a point. We recommend [Bro82] or [Ser, Proposition 3] for background. By formal arguments, several equivalent characterizations are possible, e.g.

$$vcd(\Gamma) = \max\{ n \mid H^n(\Gamma'; M) \neq 0 \},$$

for a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma'$ -module  $M$ , and where  $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma$  is a finite index torsion free subgroup, which exist abundantly according to Selberg's lemma [Alp87].

One optimistically expects  $vcd(\Gamma)$  to coincide with the minimal geometric dimension of an  $E\Gamma'$  model  $X$ . From the definitions, it is clear  $vcd(\Gamma)$  is no greater than any  $\dim(X)$ . There is famous theorem of Eilenberg-Ganea which proves: if  $3 \leq vcd(\Gamma) \leq n$ , then there exists an  $n$ -dimensional  $E\Gamma'$  model with the structure of a simplicial complex. Numerous references are available, e.g. [Bro82, p. VIII.7], [Ser, Proposition 10]. However the proofs of Eilenberg-Ganea's theorem are non-constructive, and abstract cellular inductive processes. Firstly, the proof requires the precise presentation of the group  $\Gamma'$  from which one builds the 2-complex of generators (1-cells) and relations (2-cells attached for every relator). This produces an abstract two-dimensional complex  $Y^2$ . Taking the universal cover  $X^2 = \tilde{Y}^2$ , one finds a simplicial complex whose homology groups vanish in dimensions  $\leq 2$ . If one can identify the nontrivial  $H_3(X^2)$  groups, then one may attach 3-cells (using Hurewicz theorem) to systematically annul all the nontrivial three-dimenionsal homology. Thus one obtains a 3-complex  $Y^3$  obtained from  $X^2$  by attaching 3-cells. Taking the universal cover  $X^3 := \tilde{Y}^3$ , the induction process continues where possibly some four-dimensional homology has arised from the attached 3-cells, which must be annulled by

attaching 4-cells, etc.

The construction – as sketched above – is impossible to implement in reality. Our thesis provides new general method for displaying the small-dimensional models according to the Reduction-to-Singularity principles of the previous chapters. The “external” construction above is replaced by the reduction of an initial  $E\Gamma$  model  $X$  to a closed subvariety  $Z \subset X$ .

Indeed, there are numerous large-dimensional  $E\Gamma$  models available. These standard  $E\Gamma$ -models will have space dimension much greater than the cohomological dimension. A precise determination of the dimension-gap is achieved in Borel-Serre’s formula  $vcd(G(\mathbb{Z})) = \dim(K^0 G(\mathbb{R})) - \text{rank}_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)$ , c.f. [BS73, §8.6], whenever  $G$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -reductive linear algebraic group. Their method is very general, c.f. Theorem 5.4.4 below. The argument of Borel-Serre is based on the construction of rational bordification models  $\overline{X}^{BS/\mathbb{Q}}$ , and the fact that  $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z})$  satisfies a homological duality generalizing Poincaré duality as discovered by Bieri-Eckmann [BE73].

**Definition 5.4.1.** A finitely generated group  $\Gamma$  is a duality group of dimension  $\nu \geq 0$  with respect to a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $\mathbf{D}$ , if there exists an element  $e \in H_\nu(\Gamma; \mathbf{D})$  with the following property: for every  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $A$ , the “cap-product with  $e$ ” defines  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module isomorphisms  $H^d(\Gamma; A) \approx H_{\nu-d}(\Gamma; A \otimes \mathbf{D})$ ,  $f \mapsto f \cap [e]$ .

The basic properties of duality groups are summarized in the following

**Proposition 5.4.2** (Bieri-Eckmann duality, [BE73]). *Let  $\Gamma$  be duality group of dimension  $\nu$ , with dualizing module  $\mathbf{D}$ . Then*

- (i) *we have  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -isomorphism  $\mathbf{D} \approx H^\nu(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma) \neq 0$ , so  $\mathbf{D}$  is a torsion-free additive abelian group;*
- (ii) *the homology group  $H_\nu(\Gamma; \mathbf{D})$  is infinite cyclic generated by  $[e]$  as additive abelian group;*
- (iii) *the group  $\Gamma$  has cohomological dimension  $cd(\Gamma)$  equal to  $\nu$ .*

*Proof.* The statements are direct consequences of duality. (i) We see  $H^\nu(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma) \approx H_0(\Gamma; \mathbf{D}) \approx \mathbf{D}$ . (ii) Duality implies  $H^0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z})$  is isomorphic to  $H_\nu(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma} \mathbf{D})$ , which in turn is canonically isomorphic to  $H_\nu(\Gamma; \mathbf{D})$  since  $\mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma} \mathbb{Z}\Gamma \approx \mathbf{D}$ . But  $H^0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z})$  is canonically isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . (iii) The duality isomorphism implies for every  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $A$  that  $H^*(\Gamma; A)$  is isomorphic to  $H_{\nu-*}(\Gamma; A \otimes \mathbf{D})$  which reduces to 0 whenever  $\nu - * < 0$ .  $\square$

Dualizing modules  $\mathbf{D}$ , which are unique up to  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -isomorphism, can be constructed for various groups  $\Gamma$  arising in practice. Whereas the Bieri-Eckmann duality produces canonical  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -isomorphism between  $\mathbf{D}$  and the cohomology group  $H^\nu(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$  supported at the

cohomological dimension  $\nu$ , this cohomological presentation of  $\mathbf{D}$  is generally insufficient. We emphasize excisions  $X_0$  whose topological boundary  $\partial X_0$  produces homological (i.e. projective) resolutions of the dualizing module  $\mathbf{D}$ . This is better suited for constructing homology with coefficients in the dualizing module  $\mathbf{D}$ , as arising in the statement of Bieri-Eckmann duality above. In our chapter on Closing the Steinberg symbol, we effectively construct nontrivial cycles  $\xi \in H_0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma \otimes \mathbf{D})$  using the homological resolution above.

**Theorem 5.4.3** ([BE73], [BS73]). *Let  $(X[t], \partial X[t])$  be a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant rational excision model, where  $X[t], \partial X[t]$  support invariant Radon measures  $\sigma, \tau$  having finite  $\Gamma$ -covolume. Suppose there exists an integer  $q \geq 0$  such that the reduced homology  $\tilde{H}_*(\partial X; \mathbb{Z})$  of the topological boundary is concentrated at dimension  $* = q$ ,*

$$\tilde{H}_*(\partial \overline{X}^{BS/\mathbb{Q}}; \mathbb{Z}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } * \neq q, \\ \mathbf{D}, & \text{if } * = q. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\mathbf{D}$  is a nonzero torsion-free additive abelian group. Then for every finite-index torsion-free subgroup  $\Gamma' < \Gamma$ , the associated  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma'$ -module  $\mathbf{D}' := \mathbf{D} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\Gamma'$  is a dualizing-module for  $\Gamma'$  of dimension  $\nu := \dim(X[t]) - q + 1$ . So

$$H^\nu(\Gamma'; \mathbb{Z}\Gamma') \simeq H_0(\Gamma'; \mathbf{D}') \approx \mathbf{D}'$$

is nonzero and  $vcd[\Gamma] = cd[\Gamma'] = \nu$ .

*Proof.* We refer the reader to [BE73, §6.2] and [BS73, §8.4, §11] for details.  $\square$

Consequently Borel-Serre's formula can be restated as follows:

**Theorem 5.4.4** (Borel-Serre). *Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete infinite group with finite virtual cohomological dimension  $vcd(\Gamma) < +\infty$  and satisfying Bieri-Eckmann homological duality. Suppose  $X$  is a Cartan-Hadamard manifold and  $E\Gamma$  model such that  $X$  has finite covolume modulo  $\Gamma$ . Let  $q$  equal the spherical-dimension of Bieri-Eckmann's dualizing module. Then we have*

$$vcd(\Gamma) = \dim(X) - (q + 1).$$

## 5.5 Arithmetic Groups: Excision

The subject of linear algebraic matrix groups and their arithmetic groups is extensive topic. In this section we describe the basic excision construction which enables the

applications of our semicoupling methods to small-dimensional  $E\Gamma$  classifying spaces, for  $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z})$  an arithmetic group. The basic examples are the arithmetic subgroups  $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z})$  of the “standard” higher-rank  $\mathbb{Q}$ -reductive groups  $G = GL(V)$ , e.g. the symplectic groups  $Sp(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega)$ ,  $Sp(\mathbb{R}^6, \omega)$ , …, and the split-orthogonal groups  $O(V^{p,q})$  for  $p, q \geq 2$ .

The problem of constructing small-dimensional classifying spaces is old topic originating in Minkowski’s “geometry of numbers”. The classic example is the reduction of the hyperbolic disk onto the so-called Farey tree, c.f. [Bro82, VIII.9, pp.215]. The discrepancy between space- and algebraic-dimensions was made precise in Borel-Serre’s investigations [BS73], wherein the relation to Bieri-Eckmann duality was first discovered (c.f. Theorem 5.4.4 from §5.4). But no general principle for constructing large codimension ( $\geq 2$ ) deformation retracts for the standard geometric models was available, with the exception of  $GL(\mathbb{Z}^N)$ . A general method for reducing the general linear group  $GL(\mathbb{Z}^N)$  was discovered by the so-called “systolic well-rounded retract” introduced in [Sou78] and extended in [Ash84]. For instance, Soulé’s method produces an interesting three-dimensional cube model for the two-dimensional deformation retract of the five-dimensional symmetric space  $\approx SO(3) \backslash SL(\mathbb{R}^3)$  predicted by Borel-Serre’s formula. The well-rounded retraction is an elementary and remarkable construction, but the apparent generalizations for different symmetry groups, e.g. the lagrangian systoles or null systoles arising from  $Sp$  or  $O_{p,q}$  geometries, do not enable large codimension retractions. The reader is referred to [Gro] for further references concerning systoles. Our program proposes new homotopy-reductions which appear to be genuine generalizations of Ash-Soulé ’s well-rounded retract.

So let the user choose an arithmetic group  $\Gamma = G(\mathbb{Z})$ . With respect to our Reduction Program, as described in Theorem C (Section 1.5.1), we begin with construction excision models from a standard given  $E\Gamma$  geometric model. This key first step originates with [BS73]. The excision is obtained from the initial  $E\Gamma$  model  $X = K \setminus {}^0G(\mathbb{R})^0$ , and defined with respect to a choice of basepoint  $[K]$  on  $X$  and equivariant excision parameters  $t : \Phi_{co}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined below. The equivariant excision model  $X[t] \times \partial X[t]$  has  $\Gamma$ -finite invariant Radon measure  $\sigma \otimes \tau = dvol_X \otimes dvol_Y$ , where  $\Gamma$  acts diagonally

$$X[t] \times \partial X[t] \times \Gamma \rightarrow X[t] \times \partial X[t], \quad (x, y). \gamma = (x\gamma, y.\gamma).$$

The main topological properties of the excision are summarized in Theorem 5.5.2, and surely well-known to the experts.

Our presentation of the excision models is generally described for discrete subgroups  $\Gamma$

of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -reductive linear algebraic matrix groups  $G$ . The generality of the construction forces us to speak in terms of the Bruhat-Tits structure theory of  $G$ . We assume  $G$  is totally split over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and so maximal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebraic tori  $T$  in  $G$  are totally  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split and admit  $\mathbb{Q}$ -rational isomorphisms  $T \approx \prod_{rank_{\mathbb{Q}}(G)} \mathbb{G}_m$  onto a product of multiplicative groups. The excision construction involves the  $\Gamma$ -orbit of the set of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -coroots  $\Phi^{co}$ , where  $\Phi = \Phi(G, T) \subset Hom_{/\mathbb{Q}}(T, \mathbb{G}_m)$  is the root system of  $G$  with respect to a maximally  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split algebraic torus. (C.f. [BJ06] or [BT65] for terminology). The root system  $\Phi$  is the conventional Bruhat-Tits-type Lie algebraic root system, and consists of the “eigenvalues” of the linear representation  $T \rightarrow GL(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{R}})$  where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the Lie algebra of  $G$ .

We follow the notation of [BJ06]. Here  $P(k^\gamma)$  corresponds to the maximal parabolic subgroup defined by the cocharacter  $k^\gamma$ , and  $q.\gamma$  corresponds to the conjugate  $K^\gamma$  of the maximal compact, and  $A_{P(k^\gamma), q.\gamma}$  corresponds to the split-central torus in  $(P(k^\gamma), K^\gamma)$  Levi-Langlands coordinates.

**Definition 5.5.1.** Fix a basepoint  $q = K$  in  $K \backslash {}^0 G(\mathbb{R})^0$ , and let  $\Phi^{co} \subset Hom_{/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{G}_m, T)$  be the coroots with respect to a maximal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split selfadjoint torus  $T$ .

- (i) An excision parameter is a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant function  $t : \Phi_{co}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .
- (ii) For  $k^\gamma \in \Phi_{co}^\Gamma$ , let  $V[k^\gamma, t]$  be the convex horosphere consisting of all matrix elements  $g \in G(\mathbb{R})^0$  for which the  $A_{P(k^\gamma), q.\gamma}$ -coordinate is less than or equal to  $\exp(t(k^\gamma))$ .

The excision model with respect to the basepoint  $o$  and excision parameter  $t : \Phi_{co}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is then defined to be  $X[t] := X - \cup_{\Phi_{co}^\Gamma} V[k^\gamma, t]$ .

**Theorem 5.5.2.** Let  $G$  be the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -split form of a semisimple  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear algebraic group for which  $Hom_{/\mathbb{Q}}(G, \mathbb{G}_m)$  is trivial. Let  $\Gamma := G(\mathbb{Z})$  be arithmetic group. Suppose  $t : \Phi_{co}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is  $\Gamma$ -equivariant excision parameter. Then

- (i) the excision boundary  $\partial X[t]$  is  $\Gamma$ -equivariant;
- (ii) the uniform homogeneous measures  $\sigma, \tau$  defined on  $X[t], \partial X[t]$  have finite volume  $\Gamma$ -quotients (actually the quotients are compact).
- (iii) the excision  $(X[t], \partial X[t])$  is diffeomorphic as manifold-with-corners to Borel-Serre’s bordification

$$X[t] \times \partial X[t] \approx \overline{X}^{BS/\mathbb{Q}} \times \partial \overline{X}^{BS/\mathbb{Q}}.$$

- (iv) the boundary  $\partial X[t]$  has concentrated reduced homology nontrivial at dimension  $q := rank_{\mathbb{Q}}(G) - 1$ , and  $\tilde{H}_q(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$  considered as a  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module is the Bieri-Eckmann dualizing module for  $\Gamma$ .

*Proof.* The hypothesis that  $Hom_{/\mathbb{Q}}(G, \mathbb{G}_m)$  is trivial descends by induction to all the semisimple parts  ${}^0 L$  of the various Levi factors  $L = L_{P,o,\gamma}$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -parabolic subgroups  $P$

with respect to the  $\Gamma$ -orbits of the basepoint  $o$ . Together with the principle of “no accidental parabolics”, we find the excision boundary is necessarily  $\Gamma$ -invariant subset of  $X$ . This proves (i). Item (ii) follows from standard argument of Borel-Harish-Chandra, see [BS73]. Rescaling the excision parameter  $t$  to  $0^+$  produces desired diffeomorphism  $X[t] \approx X[0^+] = \overline{X}^{BS/\mathbb{Q}}$ . This proves (iii). The collection of convex horospheres  $\{V[k, t]\}$  produces a covering of  $\partial X[t]$  by contractible open sets whose nerve is isotopic to the spherical Tits building  $\mathcal{B}(G, \mathbb{Q})$ . By Weil’s nerve theorem, there is natural homotopy-isomorphism between  $\partial X[t]$  and  $\mathcal{B}(G, \mathbb{Q})$ . But the well-known Solomon-Tits theorem proves  $\mathcal{B}(G, \mathbb{Q})$  has the homotopy-type of a countable wedge of  $(\text{rank}_{\mathbb{Q}}(G) - 1)$ -dimensional spheres. This proves (iv).  $\square$

*Remark.* The equivariant excision parameter  $t : \Phi_{co}^\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is determined by its restriction to the initial coroot set  $\Psi_{co}$ . In practice we look to define  $t$  as symmetrically as possible, especially with respect to the natural action of the Weyl group  ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}W$ . However the roots of  $\Psi$  are not pairwise symmetric, since indeed  ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}W$  does not act transitively on  $\Psi$ . E.g., the root system  $C_2$  corresponding to the real split symplectic group  $Sp(\mathbb{R}^4, \omega)$  is not totally regular, having roots of different lengths. We can either appeal to Minkowski’s theorem [Ale06] to prescribe an excision parameter (unique modulo homothety) for which the codimension-one faces of  $B \cap X[t]$  have given measures, or we can be satisfied with  ${}_{\mathbb{Q}}W$ -symmetry of the restricted excision parameter  $t| : \Phi_{co} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .

# Chapter 6

## Closing the Steinberg symbol

### 6.1 Stitching Footballs from Regular Panels : Motivation

This chapter introduces a subprogram we call ‘Closing the Steinberg symbol’. But before developing the formal definitions in Section 6.2 below, we offer some informal motivations. In low dimensions, our ideas relate to the problem of stitching footballs from uniform hexagonal panels, or uniform pentagonal panels, or combinations of both as in the Figures below.

To stitch a football from panels  $\{P_i \mid i \in I\}$  means finding a finite subset  $I' \subset I$  for which the singular chain sum  $\sum_{i \in I'} P_i$  has singular chain boundary which vanishes mod 2, so

$$\partial(\sum_{i \in I'} P_i) = \sum_{i \in I'} \partial P_i = 0$$

over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -coefficients. When  $P$  is two-dimensional hexagon or pentagon, the panels have



Figure 6.1: Stitching a football  $F$  from identical regular hexagons or pentagons  $P_i$



Figure 6.2: Adidas’ “Telstar” design is football stitched from white hexagon and black pentagon panels. A football can also be stitched from black triangular and white pentagonal panels.

singular boundary

$$\partial P = \sum_{e \text{ edge of } P} e.$$

We denote the closed convex hull of the football  $F := \text{conv}\{P \mid \text{panels}\}$ . The panels then become closed subsets of the boundary  $\partial F$ .

For instance, since the 1960’s the standard football is stitched after Adidas’ “Telstar” design, having twenty white hexagon panels and twelve black pentagon panels. But in our applications we assume the patches  $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$  are pairwise isometric to some regular geodesically-flat polygon  $P$ .

We furthermore assume there is an isometric action by a discrete symmetry group  $\Gamma$  translating the polygon patches  $P.\gamma$  for  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . The  $\Gamma$ -symmetries lead to convex chain sums  $\underline{F} := \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} F.\gamma$  of “footballs through space”. We say the chain sum has “well-separated gates” if a pair of footballs  $F.\gamma, F.\gamma'$  are either disjoint, identical, or intersect along a single panel  $P'$ . The support of a convex chain sum can have nontrivial topology, i.e. depending on the homotopy-type of the chain sum “combinatorics”. Indeed panels are contractible, and Mayer-Vietoris covering argument identifies the homotopy-type of the support of  $\underline{F}$  with the nerve of the covering defined by the chain summands. We detail these ideas further in the sections below.

## 6.2 Closing Steinberg : Definition and Consequence

Let  $X \times \Gamma \rightarrow X$  be a geometric  $E\Gamma$  model (Definition 5.1.2). Suppose we define a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant family of convex horospheres  $\{V[\lambda, t]\}$ , producing an excision model  $X[t] := X - \cup_\lambda V[\lambda, t]$  whose topological boundary  $\partial X[t]$  is  $\Gamma$ -invariant and has reduced singular

homology concentrated at a dimension. So there exists some integer  $q$  such that

$$\tilde{H}_q(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbf{D} \neq 0, \quad \text{and } \tilde{H}_*(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z}) = 0 \text{ when } * \neq q.$$

In applications the nonzero  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbf{D}$  will be torsion-free. The symmetry action of  $\Gamma$  on  $X$  induces a natural  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module structure on  $\mathbf{D}$ .

Imagine a relative cycle  $[B] \in H_{q+1}(X[t], \partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$ , with  $[B] \neq 0$ . The long exact sequence of relative homology produces isomorphism

$$\partial : H_{q+1}(X[t], \partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z}) \simeq H_q(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z}),$$

so the boundary  $\partial[B]$  represents nontrivial cycle in  $H_q(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$ . The group  $\Gamma$  of symmetries “flips” and “translates” the base cycle  $[B]$  throughout the space, and every finite subset  $I$  of  $\Gamma$  produces a finite chain sum

$$SUM[[B].I] = [B] + [B].\gamma + \cdots,$$

with total chain boundary

$$SUM[\partial[B].I] = \partial[B] + \partial[B].\gamma + \cdots.$$

The basic problem of Closing Steinberg is to produce a finite subset  $I \subset \Gamma$  for which the total chain boundary vanishes mod 2. I.e., for which the total chain sum of relative cycles  $[B] + [B].\gamma + \cdots$  assembles to a closed chain with respect to  $\mathbb{Z}/2$  coefficients. In its most elementary form, Closing the Steinberg symbol is the problem of assembling isometric translates of a fixed two-dimensional equilateral triangle into some two-dimensional sphere. Or, assembling isometric copies of some right-angled cube into a three-dimensional sphere.

In algebraic terms, Closing Steinberg involves constructing a nonzero chain element  $\xi \in C_0(X[t]) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/2\Gamma \otimes \mathbf{D}$  representing a nonzero element  $0 \neq [\xi] \in H_0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2\Gamma \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{D})$ . To represent  $\xi$  in the chain group (with coefficients over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ ) requires determining a finite subset  $I \subset \Gamma$  for which the flat-filled relative chain  $[B] \in C_q(X, \partial X; \mathbb{Z}/2)$  has translates  $\xi = SUM[B.I]$  in  $C_0(X) \otimes \mathbb{Z}/2 \otimes \mathbf{D}$  representing a nontrivial 0-cycle over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -coefficients.

The complete definition of Closing Steinberg includes further geometric conditions on the  $\Gamma$ -translates  $F.\Gamma$  of the the closed convex hull  $F = conv[B.I]$  of the translates  $B.I$ . Let  $X[t], \partial X[t]$  be a  $\Gamma$ -invariant excision model. Let  $[B]$  be a flat-filled relative cycle representing a nonzero generator of  $H_{q+1}(X[t], \partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z})$ .

**Definition: Closing Steinberg 6.2.1.** *A finite subset  $I$  of  $\Gamma$  successfully Closes Steinberg if:*

- (i) (**nontrivial mod 2**) *the chain  $\xi = \text{SUM}[B.I]$  is nonvanishing over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$  coefficients in the chain group  $C_{q+1}(X[t], \partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ ;*
- (ii) (**vanishing boundary mod 2**) *the restricted chain  $\partial\xi = \text{SUM}[\partial[B].I]$  on  $\partial X[t]$  vanishes over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -coefficients;*
- (iii) (**well-defined convex hull**) *the boundary-chain representing  $\partial\xi$  is simultaneously visible from an interior point  $x$  in  $X[t]$ ;*
- (iv) (**well-separated gates**) *the chain sum  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[F.\Gamma]$  has nonempty well-separated gates structure precisely equal to the principal orbit  $\{B.\gamma | \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ .*

In the above setting  $\partial B$  is coincident to  $B \cap \partial X$ , and hypothesis (ii) says  $\text{SUM}[\partial[B].I]$  is identically zero in  $C_q(\partial X[t]; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ . The hypothesis (iv) on well-separated gates structure means a pair of translates  $F, F.\gamma$  are either disjoint or the gate  $F \cap F.\gamma$  coincides with some translate  $B.\gamma'$ .

The next proposition establishes existence of nontrivial kernel vectors  $\ker \partial_0 \cap B.\Gamma$ , and proves the existence of finite subsets  $I$  which satisfy the first two conditions of Definition 6.2.1. In otherwords there exists no formal homological obstructions to successfully Closing Steinberg.

**Proposition 6.2.2.** *There exists finite subsets  $I$  in  $\Gamma$  for which  $\text{SUM}[B.I]$  lies in the kernel of  $\partial_0$  over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ .*

*Proof.* The argument is homological. We interpret  $\xi = \text{SUM}[B.I]$  as a chain sum representing a 0-cycle in  $H_0(\Gamma; \mathbb{Z}/2\Gamma \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}\Gamma} \mathbf{D})$ . The hypotheses of Closing Steinberg imply  $\xi$  is homologically nontrivial cycle. As consequence of Bieri-Eckmann duality (Proposition 5.4.2), the kernel  $\ker \partial_0$  is canonically isomorphic to the induced  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}/2 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{D}$ , which is nonzero.  $\square$

Our definition of Closing Steinberg was inspired by the author's study of [Cre84]. Indeed Cremona successfully Closes Steinberg in several cases for  $\Gamma = GL(\mathcal{O}_{\sqrt{-d}})$ , where  $\mathcal{O}_{\sqrt{-d}}$  is the ring of integers of some euclidean complex quadratic fields. In Cremona's terminology, the problem is related to determining a suitable “relation ideal  $\mathcal{R}$ ” and constructing a “basic polyhedron  $B$  whose transforms fill the space”. The interested reader should compare [Cre84, pp.290], where Cremona successfully Closes Steinberg with certain finite subgroups  $I'$  of  $\Gamma$ . We present some further examples in §§6.3–6.4 below.

Now suppose we find a finite subset  $I$  in  $\Gamma$  with  $\partial_0[\text{SUM}[B.I]] = 0$ , which after Proposition 6.2.2 is always possible. Then we have partially Closed Steinberg, except

the orbit  $B.I$  may not admit a simultaneously visible interior point and the gates of the chain sum  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[F.\Gamma]$  may not be well-separated. That a formal solution can always be made visible is the subject of the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 6.2.3.** *Let  $I$  be finite subset of  $\Gamma$  realizing Proposition 6.2.2. Then there exists subset  $I'$  of  $I$  which satisfies Proposition 6.2.2 and has well-defined convex hull in  $X[t]$ . So there exists interior point  $x' \in X[t]$  which is simultaneously visible from the translates  $B.I$ .*

Our hypotheses regarding Closing Steinberg have useful consequences, which we summarize in the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.2.4.** *Suppose  $I \subset \Gamma$  successfully Closes Steinberg (Definition 6.2.1). Define  $F := \text{conv}[B.I]$  and  $\underline{F} = \text{SUM}[F.\Gamma]$ . Then:*

- (i) *the  $\Gamma$ -translates  $F.\gamma$ ,  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , form a chain sum*

$$\underline{F} := \cdots [F]\gamma + [F]\gamma' + [F]\gamma'' + \cdots ,$$

*and there exists finite-index subgroup  $\Gamma' < \Gamma$  which acts as additive shift-operator on the summands of  $\underline{F}$ ; and*

- (ii) *the support of the chain sum  $\underline{F}$  is a simply-connected subset of  $X$ , and  $\underline{F}$  is a cubical  $E\Gamma'$  model.*

*Proof.* We can replace  $\Gamma$  with a finite-index torsion-free subgroup  $\Gamma'$  to ensure  $\Gamma'$  acts freely on  $X$ , and therefore  $X[t], \partial X[t]$ . Moreover we can ensure  $\Gamma'$  translates the flat-filled relative cycle  $[B].\gamma$ , for  $\gamma \in \Gamma'$  freely. Then  $[B].\gamma \neq [B]$  when  $\gamma \neq id$ . The definition of Closing Steinberg implies distinct translates  $F, F'$  are disjoint unless they intersect in a gate  $G' = B.\gamma'$  for some  $\gamma' \in \Gamma'$ . So  $F.\gamma$  equals  $F$  only if  $\gamma = id$  is trivial. This proves the summands  $\{F.\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma'\}$  of  $\underline{F}$  form a principal  $\Gamma'$ -set, and establishes (i). The existence of an interior point  $x \in F$  which is simultaneously visible to the translates  $B.I$  in  $X[t]$  proves  $F = \text{conv}[B.I]$  is a compact convex set, and homeomorphic to some cube. Thus  $\underline{F}$  is a chain sum of cubes, hence a “cubical chain sum” and therefore (ii).  $\square$

### 6.3 Closing Steinberg on $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ : First Example

Here we provide basic “proof-of-concept” by successfully Closing Steinberg with the finite subset  $I_0$  defined below.

(Step 1: Construct Excision Model) Consider the Voronoi state model of 2-dimensional real states  $Q \times PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2) \rightarrow Q$ . The standard self-adjoint torus

$$A(s) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{-s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^s \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

produces an orbit  $q.A$  in  $q.PGL(\mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow Q$ . The orbit  $q.A$  has projective ends at

$$A(-\infty) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$A(+\infty) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

on  $Proj[\mathbb{R}^2]$ . Within the excision model  $Q[t]$  these orbits are truncated at

$$A(t) := A \cap Q[t] = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e^{-s} & 0 \\ 0 & e^s \end{pmatrix} \mid -t \leq s \leq t \right\}.$$

Then

$$\partial A(t) = A \cap \partial Q[t] = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-t} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ e^{+t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In the projectivization limits we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} e^{-s} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ e^{+s} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Compare with Figures 6.3, 6.3.

(Step 2: Close Steinberg. Obtain Cubical Model) Next we view  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$  as formal tensor element. And define a  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -boundary operator

$$\partial_0([u] \otimes [v]) := [u] + [v],$$

which we view as valued in a boundary chain group  $C_0(\partial Q[t]; \mathbb{Z}/2)$ . The following subset

$I_0$  successfully closes the  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  Steinberg symbol  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ :

$$I_0 = \{Id, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}\}.$$

Observe that  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \in U_{\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}}$ .

Thus the chain sum

$$\xi := (\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}) + (\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}) + (\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix})$$

represents a nontrivial 0-cycle  $\xi \in H_0(PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2), \mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbf{D})$ , where  $\mathbf{D}$  is the dualizing  $\mathbb{Z}PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ -module  $\approx H_1(Proj[\partial Q[t]]; \mathbb{Z})$ . Then  $\partial_0 \xi = 0$ . Compare Figure 6.3.

Observe that  $\xi$  corresponds to the image of  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  under the boundary mapping

$$\partial_1(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here  $\partial_1$  is the right-most differential  $\partial$  in the resolution of [LS76, Theorem 3.1, pp.21].

Notice the symbol  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  has all nonvanishing  $2 \times 2$ -minors, and thus represents nonzero element in the standard resolutions of the Steinberg module, e.g. [LS76, §4]. Thus

$$\partial_0 \xi = \partial_0 \circ \partial_1(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}) = 0.$$

C.f. [Ste07, §A.5.2, pp.233], [AR79, §§2-5]. The convex hull in  $Q$

$$\{\alpha\langle -, e \rangle^2 + \beta\langle -, f \rangle^2 + \gamma\langle -, e+f \rangle^2 | \alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0, \alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1\}$$

of the rank-one states associated to  $e, f, e+f$  has barycentre at the hexagonal lattice  $x^2 + xy + y^2$ . Every quadratic state  $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  admits a  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ -translate  $p.\gamma$  which occupies  $\underline{F}_0$ . Taking the convex hull  $F(I_0)$ , and the global chain sum  $\underline{F}_0 = SUM[F(I_0).PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)]$ , we recover the cubical model  $\underline{F}_0 \times PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2) \rightarrow \underline{F}_0$ .

(Step 3: Install repulsion costs. Construct Kantorovich Singularity) So we replace  $Q$




Figure 6.3: Convex excision  $X[t]$  relative a  $\Gamma$ -equivariant excision parameter  $t : \mathbb{Q}P^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

with an excision model  $Q[t]$ , and then a cubical chain sum  $\underline{F}_0$ . The boundary  $\partial[F]$  of the chain summands  $F$  of  $\underline{F}_0$  now coincide with the topological boundary  $\partial[\underline{F}_0]$ . Having constructed this chain sum, we are now ready to install  $v : \underline{F}_0 \times \partial[\underline{F}_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ , and can proceed to studying the  $v$ -optimal semicoupling program between source  $\sigma$  on  $X = \underline{F}_0$  and target  $\tau$  on  $Y = \partial\underline{F}_0$ . Compare Figure 6.3

Suppose we compute the dual  $v$ -concave potential  $\psi : \partial[\underline{F}_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ . Then we need verify Halfspace conditions to ensure the activated source is deformation retract of the initial excision  $X[t]$ , and finally we need ensure Halfspace conditions satisfied throughout the activated source to deformation retract  $X[t] \rightsquigarrow Z_1 \rightsquigarrow Z_2$ . These are the remaining Steps of Theorem C from Section 1.5. See Figure 6.3, 6.3

## 6.4 Closing Steinberg on $GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ : Example

Recall [LS76] and [AGM]: to Close Steinberg means constructing a syzygy of the  $\mathbb{Z}GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ -module resolution:

$$\cdots \rightarrow C_1 \rightarrow C_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{D} \rightarrow 0,$$

of the Steinberg module  $\mathbf{D} \approx St_3(\mathbb{Q})$  in (any) of the available resolutions in [LS76, §3], or [AGM, §§2-5]. In otherwords the Steinberg symbol  $[B]$  is an element of  $C_0$  which maps to a generator of  $\mathbf{D}$ . To Close Steinberg means finding  $\Gamma$ -translates  $[B'] = [B].\gamma$




Figure 6.4: Steinberg symbol in  $X[t] \times \partial X[t]$  is represented as relative 1-cycle  $P$  with boundary  $\partial P$  equal to 0-sphere.




Figure 6.5: The translates by  $I_0 = \{Id, \gamma, \gamma'\}$  successfully Close the Steinberg symbol.




Figure 6.6: Evaluating the repulsion cost relative to the repulsion-cost  $\tilde{c}$  at various source points  $x, x', x'', \dots$  etc. in  $X[t]$



Figure 6.7: Active Domain for optimal semicoupling with respect to repulsion cost is homotopy-equivalent to the source, c.f. Theorem A.




Figure 6.8: Singularity Structure of optimal semicoupling. The active domain is homotopy-equivalent to one-dimensional tree, c.f. Theorem B.

for which the chain sum  $SUM[\{B'\}']$  occupies the submodule

$$\ker(\varphi : C_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{D}) = \text{image}(\partial_1 : C_1 \rightarrow C_0)$$

in  $C_0$ . Strictly speaking we work over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$  with trivial  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ -module structure, and replace  $\mathbb{Z}\Gamma$  with the induced module  $\mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma = \underline{\mathbb{Z}/2} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\Gamma$ .

Now Closing Steinberg in  $GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$  means printing a nonzero element of  $C_1$ , e.g. something like

$$\xi := [a, b, c, d] + [c, d, e, f] + [e, f, a, b],$$

where  $a, b, \dots, f$  are all primitive integral vectors in  $\text{Proj}[\mathbb{Q}^3]$ . More concretely, consider

$$\xi' := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

**Lemma 6.4.1.** Define  $\partial_0[a, b, c] = [a] + [b] + [c]$ . Then the image  $\partial_0[\partial_1(\xi')]$  vanishes in  $\mathbf{D}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -coefficients.

*Proof.* Compute according to the formulas. The columns of  $\xi'$  occur in  $\partial_0[\partial_1(\xi')]$  with even multiplicity, and therefore vanish over  $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -coefficients.  $\square$

We observe that the set of  $3 \times 3$  minors of the summands of  $\xi'$  defines the finite subset

$I'$  of  $PGL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$  which Closes Steinberg.

As consequence of Theorem 6.2.4 we find

**Proposition 6.4.2.** *The convex hull of the rank-one states spanned by the columns of  $\xi'$ , i.e.*

$$F := \text{conv}[\{x^2, y^2, z^2, (x+z)^2, (y+z)^2, (x+y+z)^2\}] \subset Q$$

*forms a convex set  $F$ , whose translates  $F.GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$  tessalate Voronoi's cone  $Q$  of three-dimensional positive-semidefinite real states.*

N.B. The above proposition is at least consistent with respect to dimensions, since  $\dim[F] = 5$  coincides with  $\dim \text{Proj}[Q] = \dim K \setminus {}^0 GL(\mathbb{R}^3)$ , where of course  ${}^0 GL(\mathbb{R}^3)$  is more commonly known as  $SL(\mathbb{R}^3)$ . Moreover it is not necessary that the orbit of  $F$  "fill"  $Q$ ; in general the translates of  $F$  will tessalate a proper simply-connected subset of  $Q$ . There are further hypotheses in Closing Steinberg, namely the boundary summands

$$\partial_1[a, b, c, d] = [b, c, d] + [a, c, d] + [a, b, c]$$

must be  $\Gamma$ -translates of  $[a, b, c]$ . I.e.,  $\partial_1[a, b, c]$  is supported on the orbit  $[a, b, c].\mathbb{Z}_2\Gamma$  in  $C_0$ . Next the translates  $F.GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$  assemble to chain sum  $\underline{F} := \text{SUM}[F.GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)]$ . Assembling all the constructions of our previous Chapters, we consider the visible repulsion cost  $v : \underline{F} \times \partial[\underline{F}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and the  $v$ -optimal semicouplings from volume source measure  $\sigma$  on  $\underline{F}$  to volume target measure  $\tau$  on the excision boundary. We propose Kantorovich's functor  $Z = Z(\tilde{c}, \sigma, \tau) : 2^{\partial[\underline{F}]} \rightarrow 2^{\underline{F}}$  realizes a spine for  $GL(\mathbb{Z}^3)$ .

**Conjecture 6.4.3.** *In the above notation with visibility cost  $c = v$ , the Kantorovich singularities produce codimension two deformation retracts  $Q \approx \underline{F} \rightarrow Z_3$  onto those points  $x' \in \underline{F}$  where  $\partial^c \psi^c(x')$  has dimension  $\geq 3$ .*

To practically construct the spine  $Z_3$  requires the  $v$ -concave potentials  $(\psi^v)^v = \psi$  arising from Kantorovich duality. The hypotheses of Closing Steinberg and the definition of  $v$  implies the (UHS) conditions are controlled by the gates. In this case, restricting the cost to a gate  $v|G$ , symmetry implies the two-dimensional gates deformation retract to a point. Thus we find  $Q \approx \underline{F}$  retracts onto the codimension two subvariety  $Z_3 \hookrightarrow Q$ . It would be interesting to compare the above spine  $Z_3$  with Soulé's cube [Sou78], [Ste07, Appendix], and the construction of [Gjo12]. We leave that to future investigations.

# Chapter 7

## Conclusion

So our thesis is concluded. Have we achieved our aims? Firstly we have developed a general method of Reduction-to-Singularity by which we construct continuous homotopy-reductions via the singularity structures of  $c$ -optimal semicouplings. Secondly we investigate concrete costs and settings which we propose as effective for applications. Our general results are mainly the Theorems A,B, from the Introduction, namely Theorem 3.4.2, 3.4.3. For applications, our main result is Theorem C, 1.5.1. But admittedly our initial ambitions, namely Conjecture 1.5.2 remains partially unresolved and especially items (C1)–(C3). Moreover the problem of verifying that our visibility costs  $v$  satisfy (Twist) and sufficient (UHS) conditions still stands, c.f. Conjecture 4.9.6.

The present thesis has elaborated the keystone fact that "the disk  $X = D$  admits no continuous retraction onto its boundary  $Y = \partial D$ " (recall Section 1.2) and revealed a new path forward. The algebraic-topology of Kantorovich's contravariant singularity functor  $Z : 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$ , for  $Z = Z(c, \sigma, \tau)$ , has been developed §3.1.1. We use the functor  $Z$  to contravariantly parameterize closed subsets  $Z(Y_I) \hookrightarrow X$  according to closed subsets  $Y_I \hookrightarrow Y$ . Assembling these inclusions, we find a new polyhedral decomposition of a source space  $X$ , and contravariantly parameterized by the target space  $Y$ . Given uniform Halfspace (UHS) conditions (Definition 3.4.1), our main Theorems A, B identify an index  $J \geq 1$  for which the source space  $X$  can be continuously reduced via strong deformation retracts onto a codimension- $J$  subvariety  $Z_{J+1} \hookrightarrow X$ . Our Theorem C expresses a general homotopy-reduction procedure based mainly on our Closing Steinberg symbol construction (Definition 6.2.1) and Theorem 6.2.4). Many new applications are possible, which we shall develop in our future investigations.

# Bibliography

- [Alb94] G. Alberti. “On the structure of singular sets of convex functions”. In: *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* 2.1 (1994), pp. 17–27. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01234313>.
- [Ale06] A.D. Alexandrov. *Convex Polyhedra*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
- [Alp87] R.C. Alperin. “An elementary account of Selberg’s lemma”. In: *Enseign. Math.* 2. 33 (1987), pp. 269–273.
- [Ash84] A. Ash. “Small dimensional classifying spaces for arithmetic subgroups of general linear groups”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 51.2 (1984), pp. 459–468. URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20080207010024/http://www.808multimedia.com/winnt/kernel.htm> (visited on 09/30/2010).
- [AGM] A. Ash, P.E. Gunnells, and M. McConnell. “Resolutions of the Steinberg Module for  $GL(n)$ ”. In: (). URL: <https://www2.bc.edu/avner-ash/Papers/Steinberg-AGM-V-6-23-11-final.pdf> (visited on 05/20/2017).
- [AR79] A. Ash and L. Rudolph. “The Modular Symbol and Continued Fractions in Higher Dimensions”. In: *Inventiones math.* 55 (1979), pp. 241–250. URL: <https://eudml.org/doc/186135>.
- [BGS85] W. Ballman, M. Gromov, and V. Schroeder. *Manifolds of Nonpositive Curvature*. Progress in Mathematics, Vol. 61. Birkhauser, 1985.
- [Bar02a] Dror Bar-Natan. “On Khovanov’s categorification of the Jones polynomial.” In: *Algebraic Geometric Topology* 2 (2002), pp. 337–370. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/122177>.
- [Bar02b] A. Barvinok. *A Course in Convexity*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 54. Springer-Verlag, 2002.

- [BE73] R. Bieri and B. Eckmann. “Groups with homological duality generalizing poincare duality”. In: *Inventiones. Math.* 20 (1973), pp. 103–124. URL: <https://eudml.org/doc/142208> (visited on 04/05/2017).
- [BJ06] A. Borel and L. Ji. *Compactifications of symmetric and locally symmetric spaces*. Mathematical Theory and Applications. Birkhauser, 2006.
- [BS73] A. Borel and J.-P. Serre. “Corners and arithmetic groups”. In: *Comm. Math. Helv* 48 (1973), pp. 436–491. URL: <https://eudml.org/doc/139559> (visited on 04/05/2017).
- [BT65] A. Borel and J. Tits. “Groupes reductifs”. In: *Publications Mathematiques de l'IHES* 27 (1965), pp. 55–151. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/103858>.
- [Bre93] G. Bredon. *Topology and Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics no. 139. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [Bro82] K.S. Brown. *Cohomology of groups*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 87. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [CM10] L. Caffarelli and R.-J. McCann. “Free boundaries in optimal transport and Monge-Ampere obstacle problems”. In: *Ann. of Math* 171.2 (2010), pp. 673–730.
- [Cre84] J.E. Cremona. “Hyperbolic tessellations, modular symbols, and elliptic curves over complex quadratic fields”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 51.3 (1984), pp. 275–324. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/89646>.
- [ET99] I. Ekeland and R. Témam. *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*. Classics in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 28. SIAM, 1999.
- [Fig10a] A. Figalli. “Regularity properties of optimal maps between nonconvex domains in the plane”. In: *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 35 (2010), no. 3 (2010), pp. 465–479.
- [FK10] A. Figalli and Y.-H. Kim. “Partial regularity of Brenier solutions of the Monge-Ampère equation”. In: *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* 28. no.2 (2010), pp. 559–565.
- [Fig10b] Alessio Figalli. “The optimal partial transport problem”. In: *Archive for rational mechanics and analysis* 195.2 (2010), pp. 533–560.
- [GM96] W. Gangbo and R.-J. McCann. “Geometry of optimal transportation”. In: *Acta Math.* 177 (1996), pp. 113–161. URL: [https://projecteuclid.org/download/pdf\\_1/euclid.acta/1485890981](https://projecteuclid.org/download/pdf_1/euclid.acta/1485890981).

- [Gjo12] Oliver Gjoneski. “Contracting The Well-Rounded Retract”. In: (2012). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.5218>.
- [Gra84] D. R. Grayson. “Reduction theory using semistability I”. In: *Comm. Math. Helv.* 59 (1984), pp. 600–634. URL: [math.u-bordeaux.fr/~fpazuki/index\\_fichiers/grayson1.pdf](http://math.u-bordeaux.fr/~fpazuki/index_fichiers/grayson1.pdf).
- [GJ81] M.J. Greenberg and J.R. Harper. *Algebraic Topology: a first course*. ABP. Perseus Publishing, 1981.
- [Gro] M. Gromov. “Systoles and intersystolic inequalities”. In: *Actes de la Table Ronde de Géométrie Différentielle (Luminy, 1992). Sémin. Congr.*, 1, *Soc. Math. France* (), pp. 291–362.
- [Gro91] M. Gromov. “Sign and geometric meaning of curvature”. In: *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano* 61.1 (1991), pp. 9–123. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02925201>.
- [Gro10] M. Gromov. “Manifolds: Where do we come from? What are we? Where are we going?” In: (2010). URL: [www.ihes.fr/~gromov/PDF/manifolds-Poincare.pdf](http://www.ihes.fr/~gromov/PDF/manifolds-Poincare.pdf).
- [Gro14a] M. Gromov. “Dirac and Plateau billiards in domains with corners”. In: *Central European Journal of Mathematics* 12.8 (Aug. 2014), pp. 1109–1156.
- [Gro14b] M. Gromov. “Plateau-Stein manifolds”. In: *Central European Journal of Mathematics* 12.7 (2014), pp. 923–951.
- [GS80] Branko Grunbaum and G. C. Shephard. “Tilings with congruent tiles”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 3.3 (Nov. 1980), pp. 951–973. URL: <https://projecteuclid.org:443/euclid.bams/1183547682>.
- [Har64] P. Hartman. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. John Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- [HL69] H. Hermes and J.P. Lasalle. *Functional Analysis and Time Optimal Control*. Mathematics in Science and Engineering, Vol. 56. Academic Press, 1969.
- [HS13] M. Huesman and K.-T. Sturm. “Optimal transport from Lebesgue to Poisson”. In: *Ann. Prob.* 41 no. 4 (2013), pp. 2426–2478. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.aop/1372859757>.
- [Jös97] J. Jöst. *Nonpositive curvature: geometric and analytic aspects*. Lecture notes in mathematics, ETH Zurich. Birkhauser, 1997.

- [KP18] Y.-H. Kim and B. Pass. “A Canonical Barycenter via Wasserstein Regularization”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 50.2 (2018), pp. 1817–1828. DOI: [10.1137/17M1123055](https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1123055). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/17M1123055>.
- [KM18] J. Kitagawa and R.-J. McCann. “Free Discontinuities in Optimal Transport”. In: (2018). URL: <http://www.math.toronto.edu/mccann/papers/KitagawaMcCann.pdf>.
- [Lan05] S. Lang. *Algebra*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics no. 211. Springer New York, 2005.
- [Lan66] R.P. Langlands. “The Volume of the Fundamental Domain for Some Arithmetical Subgroups of Chevalley Groups”. In: *in Algebraic Subgroups and Discontinuous Subgroups* (1966), pp. 143–148. URL: <http://sunsite.ubc.ca/DigitalMathArchive/Langlands/pdf/chev-ps.pdf>.
- [LS76] R. Lee and R.H. Sczearba. “On the Homology and Cohomology of Congruence Subgroups.” In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 33 (1976), pp. 15–54. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/142375>.
- [MM93] M. MacConnell and R. Macpherson. “Explicit reduction theory of Siegel modular threefolds”. In: *Invent. Math* 111 (1993), pp. 575–625. URL: <https://eudml.org/doc/144090>.
- [McC01] R.J. McCann. “Polar factorization of maps on Riemannian manifolds”. In: *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA* 11.3 (2001), pp. 589–608.
- [Nee85] A. Neeman. “Topology of quotient varieties”. In: *Ann. Math* 122.2 (1985), pp. 419–459.
- [Oli07] V. Oliker. “Embedding  $S^n$  into  $R^{n+1}$  with given integral Gauss curvature and optimal mass transport on  $S^n$ ”. In: (2007). eprint: [math/0701398](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0701398). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0701398>.
- [PS08] A. Pettet and J. Souto. “Minimality of the well-rounded retract”. In: *Geometry and topology* 12 (2008).
- [Phe89] R. R. Phelps. “Lectures on Choquet’s Theorem. Second Edition”. In: *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1757 (1989).
- [PF] G. De Philippis and A. Figalli. “Partial Regularity for optimal transport maps”. In: (). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1209.5640>.
- [Poi95] H. Poincaré. “Analysis Situs”. In: *Journal de l’École Polytechnique* 1 (1895), pp. 1–121.

- [San15] F. Santambrogio. *Optimal Transport for Applied Mathematicians*. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations, Vol. 87. Birkhauser, 2015.
- [Ser] J.-P. Serre. “Cohomologie des groupes discrets”. In: *Prospects in Mathematics, Annals of Math. Studies 70, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1970* (). URL: [https://www.college-de-france.fr/media/jean-pierre-serre/UPL1711642281342131119\\_Serre\\_Cohom\\_Groupes\\_Discrets.pdf](https://www.college-de-france.fr/media/jean-pierre-serre/UPL1711642281342131119_Serre_Cohom_Groupes_Discrets.pdf) (visited on 11/07/2018).
- [Ser71] J.-P. Serre. “Cohomologie des groupes discrets”. In: *Seminaire Bourbaki* 13 (1970-1971), pp. 337–350. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/109803>.
- [Sou78] C. Soulé. “The cohomology of  $\mathrm{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ ”. In: *Topology* 17 (1978), pp. 1–22.
- [Spi71] M. Spivak. *Calculus On Manifolds: A Modern Approach To Classical Theorems Of Advanced Calculus*. Avalon Publishing, 1971.
- [Ste07] W. Stein. *Modular Forms, a Computational Approach (with an Appendix by P.E. Gunnells)*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics no. 79. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [Thu02] W.P. Thurston. “Geometry and Topology of Three-Manifolds”. In: (2002). URL: <http://library.msri.org/books/gt3m/>.
- [Thu86] William Thurston. “A spine for Teichmüller space”. In: *preprint* (1986).
- [Tit72] J. Tits. “Free subgroups of linear groups”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 20.2 (1972), pp. 250–270. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0021869372900580>.
- [Vil03] C. Villani. *Topics in Optimal transportation*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics Vol. 58. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [Vil09] C. Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*. Grundlehren der mathematischen wissenschaften Vol. 338. Springer-Verlag, 2009.
- [Yas07] Dan Yasaki. “On the existence of spines for Q-rank 1 groups”. In: *Selecta Mathematica* 12.3-4 (2007), p. 541.
- [Yos68] K. Yosida. *Functional Analysis*. 2nd ed. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften. Band 123. Springer-Verlag, 1968.