

## MANIFOLDS WITH NONNEGATIVE RICCI CURVATURE ALMOST EVERYWHERE

SEONG-HUN PAENG

ABSTRACT. Under the condition of  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)k$ ,  $\text{inj}_M \geq i_0$ , we prove the existence of an  $\epsilon > 0$  such that on the region of volume  $\epsilon > 0$  the curvature condition of splitting theorem can be weakened.

### 1. Introduction

It is an important problem in Riemannian geometry to classify the complete Riemannian manifolds by curvature conditions. Splitting theorems are concerned about the non-compact manifolds with nonnegative curvature. Using splitting theorem, we can prove that some finite cover of a compact Riemannian manifold with nonnegative Ricci curvature can be splitted to  $T^k \times N$ , where  $N$  is a compact simply connected manifold and  $T^k$  is a  $k$ -torus [3]. In [6, 8], we prove sphere theorems under weaker curvature conditions than the standard Ricci curvature condition  $\text{Ric}_M \geq n-1$ , i.e., Ricci curvature and injectivity radius bounded below and  $\text{Ric}_M \geq n-1$  on  $M-A$  where diameter of  $A$ ,  $\text{diam}(A)$  or volume of  $A$ ,  $\text{vol}(A)$  are sufficiently small. Similarly to sphere theorems, we will prove a splitting theorem of compact space also holds even if the Ricci curvature conditions are not satisfied on the region of small volume.

Let  $\mathcal{M}_{i_0, k}^n$  be the class of  $n$ -dimensional complete Riemannian manifolds with  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-1)k$  and the injectivity radius  $\text{inj}_M \geq i_0$ . We obtain the following theorem;

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}_{i_0, k}^n$  and  $\text{diam}(M) \leq d$ . Then there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  depending only on  $i_0, n, k, d$  such that if  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n-$*

---

Received May 9, 1998.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 53C20; Secondary 53C21.

Key words and phrases: Ricci curvature, splitting theorem.

Partially supported by KIAS and in part supported by BSRI and GARC-KOSEF.

1) $\epsilon$  on  $M - A$ ,  $\text{vol}(A) \leq \epsilon$ , then  $M$  is diffeomorphic to  $T^k \times N$  up to finite cover, where  $N$  is a simply connected space.

This theorem is a generalization of the following theorem due to Cai [2].

**THEOREM 1.2.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}(i_0, n, k)$  and  $\text{diam}(M) \leq d$ . Then there exists an  $\epsilon(i_0, n, k, d) > 0$  depending only on  $n, i_0, k, d$  such that if  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n - 1)\epsilon$ , then  $M$  is diffeomorphic to  $T^k \times N$  up to finite cover, where  $N$  is a simply connected space.*

We use the compactness theorem due to Anderson and Cheeger [1] and the rigidity result in a fixed small ball [7, 4]. The following notation will be used; if we fix  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ , then  $\tau(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n|\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\tau(\epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Hong-Jong Kim for much kind and helpful advice.

## 2. Preliminaries

In Preliminaries, we show that the conditions of  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n - 1)k$  and  $\text{inj}_M \geq i_0$  make exponential map almost isometric on a ball of fixed small radius which depends only on  $n, k, i_0$ .

By Brocks' estimate on the Laplacian of the distance function, we obtain the following Jacobi field estimate on  $i_0/2$ -ball  $B(p, i_0/2)$  [4, 7, 8]. Let  $M$  be a complete Riemannian manifold with  $\text{Ric}_M \geq -(n - 1)k$ ,  $\text{inj}_M \geq i_0$  and  $\gamma(t)$  be a minimal geodesic starting from  $p$  and  $Y(t)$  is a Jacobi field along  $\gamma$  such that  $Y(0) = 0, \langle Y'(0), \gamma'(0) \rangle = 0$ . Let  $d(\gamma)$  be the distance from  $p$  to the cut point on  $\gamma$ . Then  $i_0 \leq d(\gamma)$ . Define  $A := \nabla \nabla r = \text{Hess } r$ , so  $\text{tr}A = \Delta r$  and  $Y' = AY$ . Write  $A(t) = B(t) + I/t$ . We know

$$\int_0^r \|B\| \leq D(i_0, n, k)r^{1/2},$$

for some constant  $D(i_0, n, k)$  [4, 7]. Then we have

$$e^{-Dr^{1/2}} r \|Y'(0)\| \leq \|Y\|(r) \leq e^{Dr^{1/2}} r \|Y'\|(0)$$

for some constant  $D = D(i_0, n, k)$  if  $r < i_0/2$  [4, 7, 8]. In Euclidean space, we know that  $D = 0$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can choose a uniform

$r_0 > 0$  which is depending only on  $n, k, i_0$  such that  $Dr^{1/2} < \epsilon$  for  $r < r_0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 - \epsilon &\leq \min \left\{ \frac{\|d\exp(v)\|}{\|v\|} \mid v \in T_x M, x \in B(p, r_0) \right\} \\
 &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{\|d\exp(v)\|}{\|v\|} \mid v \in T_x M, x \in B(p, r_0) \right\} \leq 1 + \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

on  $r_0$ -ball by the above inequality. So we can find a uniform  $r_0 > 0$  such that the exponential map is almost isometric on  $r_0$ -ball.

Furthermore, we know that

$$(2.1) \quad -(n - 1)k \coth k(d(\gamma) - t) \leq \Delta r(\gamma(t)) \leq (n - 1)k \coth kt.$$

For the proof, see [1]. Then by the Riccati equation, we get the following estimate for  $r \leq d(\gamma) - \delta$ ,

$$\|A\|^2 \leq -\text{tr}A' - \text{Ric}_M.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_{i_0/2}^r \|A\|^2 \\
 &\leq -\text{tr}A(r) + \text{tr}A(i_0/2) + (n - 1)kd(\gamma) \\
 &\leq (n - 1)k \coth k(d(\gamma) - r) + C(i_0, n, k) + \frac{2(n - 1)}{i_0} + (n - 1)kd(\gamma) \\
 &\leq (n - 1)k \coth k\delta + C(i_0, n, k) + \frac{2(n - 1)}{i_0} + (n - 1)kd(\gamma) \\
 &\leq F(i_0, n, k, \delta, d(\gamma)),
 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $F$  depending only on  $i_0, n, k, \delta, d(\gamma)$  since  $\coth x$  is decreasing function. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{i_0/2}^r \|A\| &\leq (d(\gamma) \int_{i_0/2}^r \|A\|^2)^{1/2} \\
 &\leq \sqrt{d(\gamma)} F(i_0, n, k, \delta, d(\gamma))^{1/2} = F_1(i_0, n, k, \delta, d(\gamma)),
 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $F_1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^r \|B\| &= \int_0^{i_0/2} + \int_{i_0/2}^r \|B\| \\ &\leq D(i_0, n, k) \sqrt{i_0/2} + \int_{i_0/2}^r (\|A\| + \frac{1}{t}) \\ &\leq D(i_0, n, k) \sqrt{i_0/2} + F_1(i_0, n, k, \delta, d(\gamma)) + \frac{2}{i_0} \\ &\leq F_2(i_0, n, k, \delta, d(\gamma)), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $F_2$ . Then by the same method as above, we also get a uniform lower bound and upper bound of the  $\|Y\|$  depending only on  $n, k, i_0, \delta, d(\gamma)$  on  $t < d(\gamma) - \delta$ .

### 3. Estimate of the volume of the bad part

For the simplicity of argument, we only consider the sequence  $(M_j, g_j)$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{i_0, k}^n$  satisfying the conditions  $\text{diam}(M_j) \leq d, \text{Ric}_{M_j} \geq 0$  on  $M_j - A_j$  where  $\text{vol}(A_j) \leq \epsilon_j$  and  $\epsilon_j \rightarrow 0$ . Then we know that the universal covering space of  $M_j, \tilde{M}_j$  converges to a compact subset of  $C^\alpha$ -Riemannian manifold  $X$  on compact subset. Shortly we use  $A_j$  instead of the lifting of  $A_j, \tilde{A}_j$ . Fix a point  $p_j \in M_j$ . We may assume  $p_j \in \tilde{M}_j$ . Let  $\gamma_\theta(t) = \exp_{p_j} t\theta$  and  $\mu$  is the measure on  $\gamma_\theta$ . We use the following notations;

$$d^j(\theta) = \text{the distance from } p_j \text{ to the cut point in the direction } \theta, \\ \text{where } \theta \in S^{n-1} \subset T_{p_j} M_j,$$

$$\Theta_\epsilon^j = \{\theta \in S^{n-1} \subset T_{p_j} M_j \mid \mu(\gamma_\theta([0, d^j(\theta)]) \cap A_j) < \epsilon\},$$

$$S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j(\theta) = \inf\{s \mid s > \delta, \theta \in (\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c, \mu(\gamma_\theta([\delta, s]) \cap A_j) > \epsilon\}.$$

LEMMA 3.1. For any fixed  $D > 0, \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}(\{\exp_{p_j} t\theta \mid \theta \in (\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c, S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j(\theta) \leq t < \min(d^j(\theta), D)\}) = 0$ .

We can consider  $\{\exp_{p_j} t\theta \mid \theta \in (\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c, S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j(\theta) \leq t < d^j(\theta)\}$  as a bad part for applying the Bishop-Gromov theorem. We want to show that this bad part can be ignored.

*Proof.* Assume that  $M$  is an element of  $\mathcal{M}_{i_0, k}^n$ . Let  $\{u, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$  be an orthonormal basis for the tangent space at some point  $q \in M$  and let  $Y_i(t)$  be a Jacobi field along  $\gamma_\theta(t) = \exp t\theta$  such that  $Y_i(0) = 0, Y_i'(0) = e_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ .

Define

$$J(u, t) = \begin{cases} t^{-(n-1)}(\det g(Y_i, Y_j))^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } t \leq d^j(\theta) \\ 0 & \text{if } t > d^j(\theta). \end{cases}$$

Then for a region  $A$  in the unit sphere of the tangent space  $T_q M$ ,

$$\text{vol}\{\exp_q t\theta \mid t_1 < t < t_2, \theta \in A\} = \int_A \int_{t_1}^{t_2} J(u, t)t^{n-1} dt du.$$

Let  $J^j$  and  $J_{-k}$  be the  $J$  of  $M_j$  and the space form with constant curvature  $-k$ , respectively and  $b^j(u, t) = J^j(u, t)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}t, \bar{b}(u, t) = J_{-k}(u, t)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}t$ .

In the proof of the Bishop-Gromov inequality, we see that  $\frac{b(u, r)}{b(u, a)} \leq \frac{\bar{b}(u, r)}{\bar{b}(u, a)}$ , if  $r > a$ . Simply, we use  $J$  and  $b$  instead of  $J^j$  and  $b^j$ , respectively. We define

$$C_{t_1}^{t_2} := \max \left\{ \frac{\bar{b}(u, r)}{\bar{b}(u, s)} \mid r, s \in [t_1, t_2] \right\}.$$

If  $\text{vol}((\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c) \rightarrow 0$  then there are nothing to prove by the Bishop-Gromov theorem. So we assume that  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}((\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c) > 0$ . Let

$$\Phi_\epsilon^j := \{\theta \in (\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c \mid \int_{A_j \cap \gamma_\theta} b^{n-1}(\theta, r) > \epsilon_j^{1/2}\}.$$

Then  $\text{vol}(A_j) > \epsilon_j^{1/2} \text{vol}(\Phi_\epsilon^j)$ . So  $\text{vol}(\Phi_\epsilon^j) < \epsilon_j^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$  which is a contradiction.

Now we may assume that for every direction  $\theta \in (\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c$ ,

$$\int_{\gamma_\theta \cap A_j} b^{n-1}(\theta, r) < \epsilon_j^{1/2}.$$

Then we know that for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $c > \delta$  such that  $b^{n-1}(\theta, c) < \frac{\epsilon_j^{1/2}}{\epsilon}$  and  $\mu(\gamma_\theta[\delta, c] \cap A_j) < \epsilon$ . From this fact, we know that  $c \leq S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j$ . Then by the above inequality, we get

$$(3.1) \quad b^{n-1}(\theta, r) \leq (C_\delta^D)^{n-1} b^{n-1}(\theta, c) \leq (C_\delta^D)^{n-1} \frac{\epsilon_j^{1/2}}{\epsilon}$$

for  $S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j < r < D$ . So  $b^{n-1}(\theta, r) < \tau(\delta, \epsilon | \epsilon_j)$  for  $r > S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j$ .

Let

$$\tilde{A}_j(D)(\delta, \epsilon) := \{\exp t\theta \mid \theta \in (\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c, S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j < t < D\}.$$

Consequently,  $\text{vol}(\tilde{A}_j(D))(\delta, \epsilon) = \int_{(\Theta_\epsilon^j)^c} \int_{S_{\epsilon, \delta}^j}^D b^{n-1}(\theta, t) dt d\theta \rightarrow 0$  as  $j \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

REMARK 3.2. By the above proof, we know that if  $\rho_j = \epsilon_j^{1/4}$ , then  $\rho_j \rightarrow 0$  and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol}(\{\exp_{p_j} t\theta \mid \theta \in (\Theta_{\rho_j}^j)^c, S_{\rho_j, \delta}^j(\theta) \leq t < \min(D, d^j(\theta))\}) = 0.$$

This value  $\rho_j$  will be used in following sections.

#### 4. Proof of Theorem

We will prove that the limit space  $X = R^k \times N$  where  $N$  contains no line. Then we can prove Theorem 1.1 by a contradiction.

Shortly, we use  $A_i$  instead of the lifting of  $A_i$ ,  $\tilde{A}_i$ . Let  $\gamma_i$  be a line in  $\tilde{M}_i$  and  $\gamma_i(0) = p_i$ . Then  $\gamma_i$  converge to  $\gamma$  in  $X$  and we may assume that  $p_i \rightarrow p$ . We follow the proof in [9].

We know that  $\text{vol}(M_i) \geq v_1(i_0, n, k)$  and  $\text{vol}(B(\gamma_i(t_i), 2t_i)) \leq v_2(n, k, t_i)$  for some  $v_1, v_2$ . Then the number of fundamental domains in  $B(\gamma_i(t_i), 2t_i)$  is bounded by  $n_i = n_1(i_0, n, k, t_i) := v_2/v_1$ . Let

$$\rho_i := (n_i \epsilon_i)^{1/4}$$

as Remark 3.2 where  $t_i$  will be chosen below. Let  $\gamma_{\theta_x}(0) = x$ . Now we use the similar notation as previous section;

$$\Theta^i(x) = \{\theta_x \in S^{n-1} \subset T_x \tilde{M}_i \mid \mu(\gamma_{\theta_x}([0, d^i(\theta_x)]) \cap A_i) < \rho_i\},$$

$$S_\delta^i(\theta_x) = \inf\{s \mid s > \delta, \theta_x \in (\Theta^i(x))^c, \mu(\gamma_{\theta_x}([\delta, s]) \cap A_i) > \rho_i\}.$$

We use  $\Theta^i$  instead of  $\Theta^i(\gamma_i(t_i))$ .

Let  $R_i(\delta)$  be a  $\delta$ -tubular neighborhood of the cut locus of  $\gamma_i(t_i)$ . We also know that the volume form  $b_{\gamma_i(t_i)}(t)$  has a uniform lower bound  $H_0(i_0, n, k, \delta, t) > 0$  on  $R_i(\delta)^c$  as we see in Preliminaries.

Put  $D$  to be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in  $X$  and  $F_i$  be a diffeomorphism from  $D$  to a domain  $D_i$  in  $M_i$ . We consider  $D_i$  as  $D$  with a metric  $F_i^*g_i$  where  $g_i$  is the metric on  $M_i$ . Define

$$B_i^\pm(x) := d(\gamma_i(\pm t_i), x) \mp t_i,$$

and

$$B^\pm(x) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B_i^\pm(x).$$

It is an essential part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 that  $\Delta B^+ \equiv 0$ , i.e.,  $B^+$  is a harmonic function. If we assume the almost nonnegativity of Ricci curvature, we need not check that  $B^+$  is a harmonic function [2, 10]. But in our case, we must show that  $B^+$  is harmonic.

Now we choose  $t_i$  such that

$$n_1(i_0, n, k, t_i)\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0,$$

$$\rho_i e^{10(n-1)kt_i} \rightarrow 0,$$

$$\frac{\rho_i e^{10(n-1)kt_i}}{H_0(i_0, n, k, \delta, t_i)} \rightarrow 0$$

and  $t_i \rightarrow \infty$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . It is possible to find such  $t_i$  by passing to a subsequence if necessary since we know  $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ . We will show that the limit of  $B_i^+$  has properties as Busemann function. Let  $d^i(\theta)$  be the distance from  $\gamma_i(t_i)$  to the cut point in the direction  $\theta \in S^{n-1} \subset T_{\gamma_i(t_i)}M_i$ .

Then we also know that  $D_i \subset B(\gamma_i(t_i), 2t_i)$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and the volume of bad part

$$W_i = \{ \exp_{\gamma_i(t_i)} t\theta \mid \theta \in (\Theta^i)^c, S_\delta^i(\theta) \leq t < \min(d^i(\theta), 2t_i) \}$$

converges to 0 as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  by the choice of  $t_i$ , i.e.,  $\gamma_i$  meets at most  $n_1(i_0, n, k, t_i)$  fundamental domains so we may consider the volume of lifting of  $A_i$  as  $n_1(i_0, n, k, t_i)\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$ . Precisely we get that for some constant  $H_1(n, k, \delta)$

$$(4.1) \quad b_{\gamma_i(t_i)}^{n-1}(r) \leq (C_\delta^{2t_i})^{n-1} \frac{(n_i \epsilon_i)^{1/2}}{\rho_i} \leq H_1(n, k, \delta) \rho_i e^{2(n-1)kt_i},$$

as (3.1) since the exponential growth rate for  $C_\delta^r$  is less than  $(n-1)k$ . Then

$$\text{vol}(W_i) = \int_{(\Theta^i)^c} \int_0^{2t_i} b_{\gamma_i(t_i)}^{n-1} \leq \omega_{n-1} H_1(n, k, \delta) \rho_i t_i e^{2(n-1)kt_i} \rightarrow 0,$$

by the choice of  $t_i$ , where  $\omega_{n-1}$  is the volume of the standard  $(n-1)$ -sphere. If  $i$  is sufficiently large,  $\Delta B_i^+(x)$  has an upper bound  $(n-1) \coth kd(\gamma_i(t_i), x) \leq H_2(n, k)$  for some constant  $H_2(n, k)$ . Since the volume of  $W_i$  converges to 0, we may consider the integration only on  $\{ \exp_{\gamma_i(t_i)}(t\Theta^i) \}$  for computing the upper bound of  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_i} \Delta B_i^+$ .

Let  $\gamma_\theta \subset M_i$  be a geodesic from  $q$  in direction  $\theta$  and  $\Phi : [0, \infty) \times S^{n-1} \rightarrow M_i$  such that  $\Phi(r, \theta) = \exp_q(r\theta)$ . Set  $\Phi^* v_{g_i} = a(\theta, r) dr d\theta$  and  $b = a^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$ , where  $v_{g_i}$  is the volume form of  $M_i$ . Then we know that

$$b'' + \frac{\text{Ric}(\gamma', \gamma')b}{n-1} \leq 0.$$

For the proof, see [5]. In the case of the space of constant curvatures, the equality holds. So for  $R^n$ ,

$$\bar{b}'' = 0.$$

In this section, we only consider the direction  $\theta \in \Theta^i$ . If  $\gamma_\theta(r) \in A_i^c$ , then

$$(b''\bar{b} - \bar{b}''b)(r) = (b''\bar{b})(r) \leq 0,$$



and if  $\gamma_\theta(r) \in A_i$  and  $r \leq d_i(\theta)$  then

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (b''\bar{b} - \bar{b}''b)(r) &= ((b'' + b)\bar{b})(r) \leq (k + 1)b(r)\bar{b}(r) \\ &\leq C_1(i_0, n, k)e^{2(n-1)kr}, \end{aligned}$$

for some constant  $C_1$  depending only on  $i_0, n, k$ . From this, we get

$$(b'\bar{b} - \bar{b}'b)(r) = \int_0^r b''\bar{b} - \bar{b}''b \leq C_1(i_0, n, k)\rho_i e^{2(n-1)kr}.$$

Then we have

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\frac{b'}{b} - \frac{\bar{b}'}{\bar{b}}\right)(r) &= \frac{\int_0^r b''\bar{b} - \bar{b}''b}{b(r)\bar{b}(r)} \leq \frac{\rho_i C_1(i_0, n, k)e^{2(n-1)kr}}{b(r)\bar{b}(r)}, \\ \frac{b'}{b} \leq \frac{\bar{b}'}{\bar{b}} + \frac{\rho_i C_1(i_0, n, k)e^{2(n-1)kr}}{b(r)\bar{b}(r)} &\leq 2\frac{n-1}{t_i} + 2\frac{C_1 e^{4(n-1)kt_i} \rho_i}{t_i H_0} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

on  $R_i(\delta)^c$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  by the choice of  $t_i$  and we may assume  $t_i/2 < r < 2t_i$ .

Combining (4.2), (4.3) with the fact  $(n-1)\frac{b'_{\gamma_i(t_i)}}{b_{\gamma_i(t_i)}} = \Delta B_i^+$ , we get

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{U_i} \Delta B_i^+ dV &\leq \left( \int_{U_i - R_i(\delta)} + \int_{U_i \cap R_i(\delta)} \right) \Delta B_i^+ dV \\ &\leq \int_{U_i - R_i(\delta)} \Delta B_i^+ dV + H_2(n, k) \int_{U_i \cap R_i(\delta)} dV \\ &< \tau(\delta|\epsilon_i) + \tau(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

for any fixed  $U \subset D$ . We can choose  $\delta > 0$  arbitrarily small.

LEMMA 4.1.  $B^+(x) \geq \frac{1}{\omega_{n-1}R^n} \int_{B(x,R)} B^+$  for fixed small  $i_0/2 > R > 0$  and  $x \in D$ .

*Proof.* Let  $(r, \theta)$  be the normal coordinate system centered at  $x$ . The metric  $g^i$  of  $D_i$  can be expressed as  $g^i = dr^2 + r^2 g_{lk}^i d\theta_l d\theta_k$ ,  $1 \leq l, k \leq n-1$ . Let  $G^i = \det(g_{lk}^i)$ . It is known that

$$\Delta r = \frac{n-1}{r} + \frac{\partial \log \sqrt{G}}{\partial r}.$$

We know that  $H_4 \leq \sqrt{G}(r) \leq H_5$  for  $r \leq i_0/2$  from Preliminaries. Using this fact with (4.3) we obtain

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{G^i}} \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_i r - \frac{n-1}{r} \leq \frac{\rho_i C_1(i_0, n, k) e^{2(n-1)kr}}{b(r)\bar{b}(r)} \rightarrow 0,$$

on  $V_i := \{\exp t\Theta^i(x) \mid t \leq d^i(\theta_x)\}$ . Furthermore on  $V_i$ ,

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B_i^+ \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} \leq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} 2t_i \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} \leq \frac{2t_i \rho_i C_2(i_0, n, k) e^{3(n-1)kr}}{b(r)\bar{b}(r)} \rightarrow 0.$$

by the choice of  $t_i$  and  $\sqrt{G^i} \leq C_3(i_0, n, k) e^{(n-1)kr}$  for some constants  $C_2, C_3$ .

Take  $\phi_i^k \in C_0^\infty(R_i(\delta))$  such that  $\|\phi_i^k\| \leq 2$  and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_i^k = 1$  in the distribution sense and  $\phi_i^k = 0$  on the cut locus of  $\gamma_i(t_i)$ , where  $C_0^\infty(D)$  is the class of  $C^\infty$ -functions with compact support in  $D$ . Then  $B_i^+ \phi_i^k$  is a smooth function. Since  $B_i^+ \phi_i^k \rightarrow B_i^+$  in distribution sense, we also have  $\Delta(B_i^+ \phi_i^k) \rightarrow \Delta B_i^+$  in distribution sense. By (4.4) and divergence theorem,

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x,t)} \Delta_i B_i^+ = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B(x,t)} \Delta_i (B_i^+ \phi_i^k) \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial B(x,t)} \frac{\partial (B_i^+ \phi_i^k)}{\partial r} t^{n-1} \sqrt{G^i} d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 < t < R$ . We know that

$$(B_i^+ \phi_i^k) \frac{1}{\sqrt{G^i}} \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} \leq H_6(i_0, n, k, t) t_i$$

for some constant  $H_6$  since

$$\|\Delta r - \frac{n-1}{r}\| \leq C(i_0, n, k)$$

by [4]. Also we have

$$t_i \text{vol}(V_i^c \cap B(x, t)) \leq H_1 t_i \rho_i e^{2(n-1)kt_i} \rightarrow 0$$

from (4.1). So we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.7) \quad & \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^r \int_{\partial B(x,t) \cap V_i^c} B_i^+ \phi_i^k \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} d\theta dt \\
 & = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^r \int_{\partial B(x,t) \cap V_i^c} B_i^+ \phi_i^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{G^i}} \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} \sqrt{G^i} d\theta dt = 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.8) \quad & \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial B(x,t)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} d\theta \\
 & \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{B(x,t)} \Delta_i(B_i^+ \phi_i^k) \\
 & \quad + \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\partial B(x,t)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} d\theta \\
 & \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{\partial B(x,t) - V_i} + \int_{\partial B(x,t) \cap V_i} \right) \\
 & \quad \left( \frac{\partial(B_i^+ \phi_i^k)}{\partial r} \sqrt{G^i} + (B_i^+ \phi_i^k) \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} \right) d\theta \\
 & = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\partial B(x,t)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k \sqrt{G^i} d\theta.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then we get

$$\omega_{n-1} B^+ = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{n-1} B_i^+ = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{n-1} B_i^+ \phi_i^k$$

in distribution sense and from (4.7) and (4.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \omega_{n-1} B_i^+ \phi_i^k(x) \\
 & \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{\partial B(x,r)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k - \int_0^r \int_{\partial B(x,t)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k \frac{\partial \sqrt{G^i}}{\partial r} \right) d\theta dt \\
 & \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{\partial B(x,r)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k.
 \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this over  $(0, R)$ , we obtain that

$$B^+(x) \geq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{B(x,\tau)} B_i^+ \phi_i^k = \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{B(x,\tau)} B^+$$

in distribution sense. Since  $B^+$  is continuous, we get Lemma 4.1.  $\square$

We easily get that  $\Delta B^+ \leq 0$ , i.e., for any nonnegative  $C_0^\infty$ -function  $h$  and any  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D h \Delta B^+ &= \int_D \Delta h B^+ = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_i} \Delta_i h B_i^+ = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \int_{D_i} h \Delta_i B_i^+ \\ &= \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left( \int_{D_i - R_i(\delta)} + \int_{D_i \cap R_i(\delta)} \right) h \Delta_i B_i^+ \\ &\leq \tau(\delta) + \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \tau(\delta|\epsilon_i) = \tau(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

since  $g^i \rightarrow g$  in  $L^{1,p}$  or  $C^\alpha$ -norm so the coefficients of Laplacian operator for harmonic coordinates converges in  $C^\alpha$ -norm [1]. Then by the same argument as (4.4), we get the above inequality. Also we know that  $\Delta_i B_i^+ \rightarrow \Delta B^+$  in distribution sense by the above argument.

By the same argument as [3, 9], we get  $\Delta(B^+ + B^-) \equiv 0$ . From  $\Delta B^+, \Delta B^- \leq 0$ , we obtain  $\Delta B^+ \equiv 0$  so  $B^+$  is harmonic.

In [3], from  $\Delta B^+ \equiv 0$  we get that  $\text{Hess}(B^+) = 0$  and  $\nabla B^+$  is a parallel vector field. It is also an important step to show that  $\text{Hess}(B^+) = 0$  in our case. We will follow Cai's proof. Define  $b_i$  by the following Dirichlet problem;

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_i b_i &= 0 \\ b_i|_{\partial D} &= B^+. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can prove Lemma 3.1 in [2].

LEMMA 4.2.  $|\nabla_i b_i|^2$  converges, in the strong  $L^{1,q}$ -topology (for  $1 < q < p$ ), to  $|\nabla B^+|^2$ .

*Proof.* The only difference of proof occurs when we apply the Bochner-Weitzenböck formula. But we only need the integration of  $\Delta_i |\nabla_i b_i|^2$  so there are no obstruction to prove this lemma.  $\square$

From this lemma, we get  $\text{Hess}(B^+) = 0$  in  $L^q$  and can prove the remainder of the proof by the same argument as [2].

Now we obtain that there exists an  $\epsilon > 0$  depending only on  $n, k, i_0, d$  such that if  $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$  on  $M - A$  where  $\text{vol}(A) \leq \epsilon$  then  $M$  is diffeomorphic to  $T^k \times N$  up to finite cover, where  $N$  is a compact simply connected space. But the complete proof of Theorem 1.1 is the same as the above argument.

### References

- [1] M. Anderson and J. Cheeger,  *$C^\alpha$ -compactness for manifolds with Ricci curvature and injectivity radius bounded below*, J. Diff. Geom. **35** (1992), 265–281.
- [2] M. Cai, *A splitting theorem for manifolds of almost nonnegative Ricci curvature*, Ann. Global Anal. and Geom. **11** (1993), 373–385.
- [3] J. Cheeger and D. Gromoll, *The splitting theorem for manifolds of nonnegative Ricci curvature*, J. Diff. Geom. **6** (1971), 119–128.
- [4] X. Dai, Z. Shen and G. Wei, *Negative Ricci curvature and isometry group*, Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), 59–73.
- [5] S. Gallot, D. Hullin and J. Lafontaine, *Riemannian geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 1980.
- [6] S.-H. Paeng, *A sphere theorem under a curvature perturbation*, Kyushu J. Math. **50** (1996), 459–470.
- [7] ———, *Topological entropy for geodesic flows under a Ricci curvature condition*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), 1873–1879.
- [8] ———, *A sphere theorem under a curvature perturbation II*, Kyushu J. Math. **52** (1998), 439–454.
- [9] R. Schoen and S.-T. Yau, *Lectures on Differential Geometry*, International Press, 1994.
- [10] Z. Shen, G. Wei, *On Riemannian manifolds of almost nonnegative curvature*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **40** (1991), 551–565.

Korea Institute for Advanced Study (KIAS)  
 207-43 Cheongryangri-dong, Dongdaemun-gu  
 Seoul 130-012, Korea  
*E-mail*: shpaeng@kias.re.kr