

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'É.N.S.

U. ABRESCH

Lower curvature bounds, Toponogov's theorem, and bounded topology. II

Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. 4^e série, tome 20, n° 3 (1987), p. 475-502

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1987_4_20_3_475_0

© Gauthier-Villars (Éditions scientifiques et médicales Elsevier), 1987, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. » (<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ansens>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
<http://www.numdam.org/>

LOWER CURVATURE BOUNDS, TOPONOGOV'S THEOREM, AND BOUNDED TOPOLOGY, II

BY U. ABRESCH

ABSTRACT. — Extending a result by Gromov, we establish an upper bound on the Betti numbers of asymptotically non-negatively curved manifolds.

Introduction

In this paper we continue studying asymptotically non-negatively curved manifolds. Our goal is to estimate their Betti numbers from above in terms of the curvature decay and the dimension. In special cases bounds of this type are due to Gromov [G]; he deals with non-negatively curved manifolds and with compact manifolds. Related is also the work of Berard and Gallot [BG] who have applied heat equation methods in order to get bounds for all topological invariants of compact manifolds.

We recall that a complete Riemannian manifold (M^n, g) with base point o is said to be *asymptotically non-negatively curved*, iff there exists a monotone function $\lambda: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$(i) \quad b_0(\lambda) := \int_0^\infty r \cdot \lambda(r) dr < \infty$$

and

$$(ii) \quad \text{the sectional curvatures at } p \geq -\lambda(d(o, p)) \text{ for all } p \in M^n.$$

A detailed exposition of the analytical impact of the convergence of the integral $b_0(\lambda)$ has been given in chapter II of [A]; for instance there exists a unique non-negative solution of the Riccati equation $u' = u^2 - \lambda$ with the property that $u(r) \rightarrow 0$ for $r \rightarrow \infty$. This gives rise to another numerical invariant

$$b_1(\lambda) := \int_0^\infty u(r) dr.$$

Both b_0 and b_1 depend on λ in a monotone way, and they can be regarded as invariants of the manifold M^n by taking the minimal monotone function λ which obeys the conditions (i) and (ii).

In principle b_0 and b_1 can be regarded as equivalent invariants: $b_1 \leq b_0 \leq \exp(b_1) - 1$. However, b_1 is better adapted to our problem. A natural family of weighted L^1 -norms on the Betti numbers of a space X is induced by the Poincaré series

$$P_t(X) := \sum_i t^i \cdot \beta_i(X).$$

MAIN THEOREM. — *For any asymptotically non-negatively curved manifold (M^n, g, o) the Betti numbers with respect to an arbitrary coefficient field can be bounded universally in terms of the dimension and the invariant b_1 :*

$$P_{t(n)^{-1}}(M^n) \leq C(n) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{15n-13}{4} \cdot b_1(M^n)\right),$$

where

$$C(n) := \exp(5n^3 + 8n^2 + 4n + 2)$$

and

$$t(n) := 5^{n^2} 8^n \exp\left(\frac{8}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{n+1}\right).$$

Moreover these manifolds have finitely many ends and the Betti numbers at infinity are bounded as follows:

$$\sum_{\text{ends } E} P_{t(n)^{-1}}(E) \leq C(n) \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1(M^n)).$$

Remarks. — (i) By the examples given in chapter IV of part one it is reasonable that the bounds in both the estimates grow exponentially in $n \cdot b_1(M^n)$.

However there is no geometric reason known so far, why the constants $C(n)$ and $t(n)^n$ should grow exponentially in n^3 .

(ii) Notice that:

$$\# \{ \text{ends of } M^n \} \leq \sum_{\text{ends}} P_1(E) \leq t(n)^{n-1} \cdot \sum_{\text{ends}} P_{t(n)^{-1}}(E).$$

Thus we have recovered a weaker version of Theorem III. 3 in [A].

(iii) Using the long exact homology sequence, one obtains an estimate on the relative Betti numbers:

$$P_{t(n)^{-1}}(M^n, \bigcup_{\text{ends}} E) \leq (1 + t(n)^{-1}) \cdot C(n) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{15n-13}{4} \cdot b_1(M^n)\right).$$

(iv) Because of Poincaré duality the inequality

$$\sum_i \beta_i(M^n) \leq \tilde{C}(n) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{15n-13}{4} \cdot b_1(M^n)\right)$$

holds with

$$\tilde{C}(n) := 3 \cdot t(n)^{n/2} \cdot C(n) \leq \exp(6n^3 + 9n^2 + 4n + 4).$$

Special Cases. – (a) M^n has non-negative sectional curvature:

$$P_{t(n)-1}(M^n) \leq C(n).$$

(b) the sectional curvatures of M^n are bounded from below by $-k^2$ and even more are non-negative outside a ball with radius d around the base point o : (e. g.: M^n compact with diametre d)

$$P_{t(n)-1}(M^n) \leq C(n) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{15n-13}{4} \cdot k \cdot d\right)$$

Method of Proof. – We use a modification of Gromov’s direct geometric proof. The basic idea is to combine Morse theory arguments on the distance function and covering arguments. In a first step we do things locally and derive an estimate for small balls (sections 1-3). In a second step we reduce the theorem to these local bounds (sections 4 and 5).

In principle the local result is already contained in Gromov’s paper (c. f. [G]); however, we shall rearrange the details in a more subtle way. Therefore our constants grow only exponentially in n^3 ; they do not depend doubly exponentially on n . The key to this improvement is a non-standard packing lemma (c. f. Appendix A).

The way in which we put together the local estimates is essentially new. We use metrical annuli as intermediate objects when extending the estimate from small balls to all of the manifold M^n .

1. A topological Lemma

In this section we are going to do the topological part of the argument. There are two reasons for avoiding the Betti numbers in the intermediate steps in the proof:

(a) Given a point $p \in M^n$ and any number $N > 0$, it is easy to put a bumpy metric on M^n such that $\dim H_1(B(p, 1)) \geq N$. The idea is to produce a sufficiently complicated intersection pattern of the distance sphere $S(p, 1) \subset M^n$ with the cut-locus of p .

(b) For arbitrary subsets $X_1, X_2 \subset M^n$ it is impossible to estimate the dimension of $H_*(X_1 \cup X_2)$ in terms of $\dim H_*(X_1)$ and $\dim H_*(X_2)$ only.

Some pieces of information about $X_1 \cap X_2$ are required in addition. These obstructions towards an “obvious proof” are related, and they both can be circumvented looking at

topological pairs (Y, X) where $X \subset Y \subset M^n$ are open subsets. We consider the numbers

$$1.1 \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} rk_i(Y, X) := \text{rank}(H_i(X) \rightarrow H_i(Y)) \\ rk_*^t(Y, X) := \sum_{i \geq 0} rk_i(Y, X) \cdot t^i. \end{array} \right.$$

It is worthwhile noticing that under the hypothesis above the numbers $rk_i(Y, X)$ vanish for $i > n$.

1.2 We consider open subsets $B_j^0 \subset B_j^1 \subset \dots \subset B_j^{n+1}$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, such that

$$X \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^0$$

and

$$Y \supset \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n+1}.$$

LEMMA. — Let $t > 0$ and suppose that any B_j^n intersects at most t distinct sets $B_{j'}^n$, $j' \neq j$; then there holds the following inequality:

$$rk_*^{t^{-1}}(Y, X) \leq rk_*^{t^{-1}}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n+1}, \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^0\right) \\ \leq (e-1) \cdot N \cdot \sup \{rk_*^{t^{-1}}(B_{j_0}^{\sigma+1} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^{\sigma+1}, B_{j_0}^\sigma \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^\sigma) \mid \\ 0 \leq \sigma \leq n, 1 \leq j_0 < \dots < j_{n-\sigma} \leq N\}.$$

Essentially this lemma is already contained in Gromov's paper (c.f. [G]). For the sake of completeness we include an elementary

Proof. — Consider open subsets $X_1 \subset X_2 \subset X_3$ and $Y_1 \subset Y_2 \subset Y_3$ in M^n . The Mayer-Vietoris sequence gives raise to a commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \rightarrow H_\mu(X_1) \oplus H_\mu(Y_1) & \rightarrow & H_\mu(X_1 \cup Y_1) & \rightarrow & H_{\mu-1}(X_1 \cap Y_1) & \rightarrow & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow^{i_\mu} & & \downarrow^{i'_{\mu-1}} \\ \rightarrow H_\mu(X_2) \oplus H_\mu(Y_2) & \rightarrow & H_\mu(X_2 \cup Y_2) & \rightarrow & H_{\mu-1}(X_2 \cap Y_2) & \rightarrow & \\ & & \downarrow^{j_{\mu, X} \oplus j_{\mu, Y}} & & \downarrow^{j_\mu} & & \downarrow \\ \rightarrow H_\mu(X_3) \oplus H_\mu(Y_3) & \rightarrow & H_\mu(X_3 \cup Y_3) & \rightarrow & H_{\mu-1}(X_3 \cap Y_3) & \rightarrow & \end{array}$$

All the vertical homomorphisms are induced by inclusions. The standard diagram chasing technique shows that:

$$1.3 \quad rk(j_\mu \circ i_\mu) \leq rk(j_{\mu, X} \oplus j_{\mu, Y}) + rk(i'_{\mu-1})$$

or in different terminology:

$$rk_\mu(X_3 \cup Y_3, X_1 \cup Y_1) \leq rk_\mu(X_3, X_2) + rk_\mu(Y_3, Y_2) + rk_{\mu-1}(X_2 \cap Y_2, X_1 \cap Y_1).$$

This estimate extends as follows to the family B_j^i when we use the Leray spectral sequence instead of the Mayer-Vietoris sequence:

$$1.4 \quad rk_i \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{i+1+v}, \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^v \right) \leq \sum_{\mu=0}^i \sum_{j_0 < \dots < j_{i-\mu}} rk_{\mu} (B_{j_0}^{\mu+v+1} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{i-\mu}}^{\mu+v+1}, B_{j_0}^{\mu+v} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{i-\mu}}^{\mu+v});$$

here v denotes some non-negative integer which does not exceed $n-i$.

We specialize to the case $v=n-i$ and compute:

$$rk_*^{i-1} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n+1}, \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^0 \right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^n t^{-i} \cdot rk_i \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n+1}, \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n-i} \right) \leq \sum_{v=0}^n \sum_{\sigma=v}^n \sum_{j_0 < \dots < j_{n-\sigma}} t^{v-n} \cdot rk_{\sigma-v} (B_{j_0}^{\sigma+1} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^{\sigma+1}, B_{j_0}^{\sigma} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^{\sigma}) = \sum_{\sigma=0}^n \sum_{j_0 < \dots < j_{n-\sigma}} t^{\sigma-n} \cdot \sum_{v=0}^{\sigma} t^{v-\sigma} \cdot rk_{\sigma-v} (\dots, \dots),$$

hence:

$$1.5 \quad rk_*^{i-1} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n+1}, \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^0 \right) \leq \sum_{\sigma=0}^n \sum_{j_0 < \dots < j_{n-\sigma}} t^{\sigma-n} \cdot rk_*^{i-1} (B_{j_0}^{\sigma+1} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^{\sigma+1}, B_{j_0}^{\sigma} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^{\sigma}).$$

To complete the proof, we point out that the number of non-empty intersections

$$B_{j_0}^{\sigma} \cap \dots \cap B_{j_{n-\sigma}}^{\sigma}$$

does not exceed

$$\frac{N}{n-\sigma+1} \cdot \binom{t}{n-\sigma}, \quad 0 \leq \sigma \leq n;$$

therefore the number of non-vanishing terms on the right-hand side of 1.5 is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{\sigma=0}^n \frac{N}{n-\sigma+1} \cdot \binom{t}{n-\sigma} \cdot t^{\sigma-n} \leq N \cdot \sum_{\sigma=0}^n \frac{1}{(n-\sigma+1)!} \leq N \cdot (e-1). \quad \square$$

In most of our applications the sets B_j^i will be open metrical balls. We shall use the notation $\rho \cdot B(p, r) = B(p, \rho \cdot r)$. It is convenient to draw the following

1.6 COROLLARY. — Let $\rho > 1$, $t \geq 1$ and suppose that:

- (i) $X \subset M^n$ is covered by open metrical balls B_j^0 , $1 \leq j \leq N$,
- (ii) $i < n$ and $B_j^i \cap B_j^{i+1} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \rho \cdot B_j^i \subset B_j^{i+1}$,
- (iii) $\rho \cdot B_j^n \subset B_j^{n+1} \subset Y$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, and
- (iv) each ball B_j^n intersects at most t other balls B_j^n .

Then the following estimate holds:

$$rk_*^{t-1}(Y, X) \leq rk_*^{t-1} \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^{n+1}, \bigcup_{j=1}^N B_j^0 \right) \\ \leq (e-1) \cdot N \cdot \sup \{ rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot B_j^i, B_j^i) \mid 0 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq N \}.$$

Remark. — Condition (ii) is obviously met, if all the balls B_j^0 have equal radii and if $B_j^i = (2 + \rho)^i \cdot B_j^0$, $0 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq N$.

2. The Morse theory of the distance function

Any point $p \in M$ gives rise to a function $d_p: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $d_p(\tilde{p}) = d(p, \tilde{p})$. $\tilde{p} \in M$ is called a *critical point of d_p* , iff for any $v \in T_{\tilde{p}}M$ there is a minimizing geodesic segment γ which joins $\tilde{p} = \gamma(0)$ to p , and which obeys $\langle v, \gamma'(0) \rangle \geq 0$. $\mathfrak{s}_p := \{\text{critical points of } d_p\}$ is said to be the *singular set of d_p* . Notice that \tilde{p} is *non-critical* for d_p , iff the initial vectors of all minimizing geodesics joining \tilde{p} to p lie in an open half-space of $T_{\tilde{p}}M$. Hence for any non-critical point \tilde{p} , there is an open neighborhood U and a continuous non-vanishing vector field v_U which is defined on U and has an acute angle with the initial vector of any minimizing geodesic joining a point in U to p . As \mathfrak{s}_p is closed, one can reason in the standard way and obtain:

2.1 LEMMA. — For any $p \in M$ there exists a smooth vector field $v_p: M \rightarrow TM$, which obeys $\langle v_p|_{\gamma(0)}, \gamma'(0) \rangle > 0$ for all minimizing geodesics γ which join some point $\gamma(0) \in M \setminus \mathfrak{s}_p$ to p .

We shall use the vector field v_p in order to construct retraction maps; we point out that d_p is monotone decreasing along the integral curves of v_p . Under some suitable hypothesis this tool even gives rise to isotopies rather than homotopy equivalences (c.f. [G], [GS].)

In order to establish a Morse theory on d_p , it is moreover necessary to determine how the topology of M changes at the critical points of d_p and to count the strata of the singular set \mathfrak{s}_p in a reasonable manner. As d_p is not differentiable at the cut-locus of p , both these problems cannot be tackled in the usual way.

2.2. However, it is possible to bound in some sense the number of critical points of d_p : let $L > 1$; we consider $p_1, \dots, p_k \in M$ such that

$$(i) \quad d_p(p_{i-1}) \geq L \cdot d_p(p_i),$$

and

$$(ii) \quad p_i \text{ is critical for } d_p, \quad 2 \leq i \leq k.$$

Such a sequence $(p_i)_{i=1}^k$ will be called a metrical $(k; L_1, L, L_k)$ -frame of p , provided L_1 and L_k are positive real numbers which satisfy $l_1 := d_p(p_1) \leq L_1$ and $l_k := d_p(p_k) \geq L_k$. We shall say that a subset $X \subset M$ is $(k; L_1, L, L_k)$ -framed, iff for each $p \in X$ there exists a metrical $(k; L_1, L, L_k)$ -frame.

2.3 LEMMA. — (i) In a manifold (M^n, g, o) which has asymptotically non-negative curvature any metrical $(k; L_1, L, L_k)$ -frame of the base point o obeys:

$$k \leq 2 \cdot \pi^{n-1} \cdot \left(\frac{L}{L-1} \right)^{2n-2} \cdot \exp((2n-2) \cdot b_1).$$

(ii) Let p be any point in an arbitrary Riemannian manifold, and suppose that the sectional curvatures in the ball $B(p, (1+L^{-1}) \cdot L_1)$ are bounded from below by $-\eta^2$, $\eta \geq 0$. If, moreover,

$$3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1} \cdot \eta \cdot L_1 \cdot \coth(\eta \cdot L_1) \leq L,$$

then $k \leq 2n$ holds for any metrical $(k; L_1, L, L_k)$ -frame of p .

Remark. — The lemma relates the parameter k to the dimension n of M^n , and thus it justifies the terminology, although the word “frame” might be a little misleading. In a similar context Gromov heuristically speaks of the “number of essential directions in M^n ”.

Proof. — We fix minimizing geodesics γ_i which join p with p_i ; their initial vectors in $T_p M$ will be denoted by v_i . We head towards a lower bound on the angle between any two of these vectors and then make use of some packing arguments: let $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and study the geodesic triangle $\Delta = (p_i, p, p_j)$ with edges γ_i, γ_j , and a minimizing geodesic γ_{ij} . We observe that p_j is critical for d_p , and thus γ_j can be replaced by another minimizing geodesic $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ such that the angle at p_j in the modified triangle $\tilde{\Delta}$ does not exceed $\pi/2$. The data on Δ and $\tilde{\Delta}$ are turned into inequalities by means of the (generalized) Toponogov theorem. We start with $\tilde{\Delta}$:

(i) Proposition III.1 (ii) applies with $\varepsilon = (L-1)/L$, and in the limit $a \rightarrow 1$ it yields:

$$d_p(p_i) \leq d(p_i, p_j) + d_p(p_j) \cdot \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{L-1}{L} \right)^2 \cdot \exp(-2 \cdot b_1)}.$$

(ii) Obviously a minimizing geodesic which joins p_i to any point on γ_j is not longer than $d_p(p_i) + d_p(p_j)$, and therefore it is contained in the ball

$$B(p, d_p(p_i) + d_p(p_j)) \subset B(p, (1+L^{-1}) \cdot L_1).$$

Hence the hyperbolic plane with curvature $-\eta^2$ is an admissible model. We deform the Alexandrov triangle such that

$$\bar{l}_i \geq d_p(p_i), \quad \bar{l}_j = d_p(p_j), \quad \bar{l} = d(p_i, p_j), \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha} \text{ at } \bar{p}_j = \frac{\pi}{2};$$

then the Law of Cosines yields:

$$\cosh \eta \cdot \bar{l} = \frac{\cosh \eta \cdot \bar{l}_i}{\cosh \eta \cdot d_p(p_j)} \geq \frac{\cosh \eta \cdot d_p(p_i)}{\cosh \eta \cdot d_p(p_j)}.$$

Using the above estimates we can treat the triangle Δ in a similar way:

(i) Reversing the implication in Proposition III.1 (i), we obtain:

$$\cos \bar{\alpha}(v_i, v_j) < \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{L-1}{L}\right)^4 \cdot \exp(-4 \cdot b_1)},$$

or :

$$|\bar{\alpha}(v_i, v_j)| \geq |\sin \bar{\alpha}(v_i, v_j)| > \left(\frac{L-1}{L}\right)^2 \cdot \exp(-2 \cdot b_1).$$

In this case the claim immediately follows from the standard packing estimate, which has been stated in Lemma III.3.1 for instance.

(ii) Here we apply the Law of Cosines directly to the Alexandrov triangle:

$$\bar{l}_i = d_p(p_i), \quad \bar{l}_j = d_p(p_j), \quad \bar{l} = d(p_i, p_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha} \text{ at } \bar{p} \leq \bar{\alpha} \text{ at } p = \bar{\alpha}(v_i, v_j);$$

we obtain the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \bar{\alpha}(v_i, v_j) &\leq \frac{\cosh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_i) \cdot \cosh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_j) - \cosh(\eta \cdot \bar{l})}{\sinh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_i) \cdot \sinh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_j)} \\ &\leq \frac{\coth(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_i)}{\sinh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_j)} \cdot \left(\cosh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_j) - \frac{1}{\cosh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_j)} \right) \\ &= \coth(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_i) \cdot \tanh(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_j) \leq \frac{\bar{l}_j}{\bar{l}_i} \cdot \eta \cdot \bar{l}_i \cdot \coth(\eta \cdot \bar{l}_i); \end{aligned}$$

hence:

$$\cos \bar{\alpha}(v_i, v_j) \leq L^{-1} \cdot \eta \cdot L_1 \cdot \coth(\eta \cdot L_1).$$

By assumption the packing argument given in appendix A applies. \square

3. Morse theory and coverings

We have no idea how to control in which way the topology of M^n changes at the critical strata of d_p ; thus the gluing arguments have to be eliminated from the Morse theory. We are going to use covering arguments along the lines of section 1 instead. The idea of deformation will be applied to reduce to special covering situations which we know quite a lot about. For this purpose we introduce some more language:

3.1 DEFINITION. — Given $\rho > 1$; a ball $B = B(p, r)$ in M^n is said to be ρ -compressible to $\tilde{B} = B(\tilde{p}, \tilde{r})$, if and only if:

- (i) $\tilde{r} \leq (1 - \rho^{-1}) \cdot r$,
- (ii) $\rho \cdot \tilde{B} \subset \rho \cdot B$,

and

(iii) \tilde{B} is a deformation retract of some subset $X \subset \rho \cdot B$, which also contains B .

B is called ρ -incompressible, iff there does not exist a ball \tilde{B} as above.

The injectivity radius is a continuous positive function on M^n , which has a positive lower bound r_0 on $\rho \cdot B$. ρ -Compressing the given ball B repeatedly, one will therefore arrive at a ρ -incompressible ball or at a topological ball within finitely many steps. Thus it is natural to try and reduce to incompressible balls, when bounding the invariant $rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot B, B)$.

3.2 LEMMA. — If $t > 0$, and if the ball B is ρ -compressible to \tilde{B} , then:

$$rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot B, B) \leq rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot \tilde{B}, \tilde{B}).$$

Proof. — The claim is an immediate consequence of the following commutative diagram, where the graded maps are induced by inclusion:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_*(\tilde{B}) & \xrightarrow[\text{deformation retract}]{\cong} & H_*(X) & \leftarrow & H_*(B) \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_*(\rho \cdot \tilde{B}) & \rightarrow & H_*(\rho \cdot B) & & \square \end{array}$$

Moreover, incompressible balls allow for some statements about the critical points of several distance functions.

3.3. LEMMA. — If $B = B(p, r)$ is ρ -incompressible, then for any $\tilde{p} \in (\rho - 1)/2 \cdot B$ there is a critical point p_c of $d_{\tilde{p}}$ such that:

$$\min \{ (1 - \rho^{-1}) \cdot r, r - \rho^{-1} \cdot d(p, \tilde{p}) \} \leq d(\tilde{p}, p_c) \leq r + d(p, \tilde{p}) \leq \frac{1 + \rho}{2} \cdot r.$$

Proof. — Conversely, let us assume that there is no critical point p_c of $d_{\tilde{p}}$ which obeys the above inequalities. We put:

$$\tilde{r} := \min \{ (1 - \rho^{-1}) \cdot r, r - \rho^{-1} \cdot d(p, \tilde{p}) \}$$

and consider the balls $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} := \mathbf{B}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{r})$ and $\mathbf{X} := \mathbf{B}(\tilde{p}, r + d(p, \tilde{p}))$. We point out that $r + 2 \cdot d(p, \tilde{p}) \leq \rho \cdot r$, hence $\mathbf{B} \cup \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \subset \mathbf{X} \subset \mathbf{B}(p, r + 2 \cdot d(p, \tilde{p})) \subset \rho \cdot \mathbf{B}$ and $\rho \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}} \subset \rho \cdot \mathbf{B}$. Lemma 2.1 gives rise to a vector field $v_{\tilde{p}}$ which does not vanish on the closed annulus $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \setminus \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. As $d_{\tilde{p}}$ is monotone decreasing along the integral curves of $v_{\tilde{p}}$, we obtain a retraction map, and, in contrast to the hypothesis, \mathbf{B} turns out to be ρ -compressible to $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. \square

We proceed and consider the covering situation in some more detail.

3.4. ASSUMPTIONS. — Let $\xi, \tilde{\xi}, L$, and L_1 be some positive real numbers; define functions ρ, q, t_0 , and N_0 by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &:= 3 + 2 \cdot L^{-1} \\ q &:= (2 + 3 \cdot L)^{-1} \\ t_0 &:= \left(\frac{2L}{\xi \cdot L_1} \cdot \sinh \frac{\tilde{\xi} \cdot L_1}{2L} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \left(1 + 8 \cdot \left(5 + \frac{2}{L} \right)^n \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$N_0 := \left(\frac{L}{\xi \cdot L_1} \cdot \sinh \frac{\tilde{\xi} \cdot L_1}{L} \right)^{n-1} \cdot \left(1 + 4 \cdot (2 + 3L) \cdot \left(5 + \frac{2}{L} \right)^n \right).$$

We suppose that:

- (i) the ball $\rho \cdot \mathbf{B}$ associated to $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}(p, r)$ is $(k; L_1, L, (1 + 2L) \cdot r)$ -framed.
- (ii) the curvatures in $\rho \cdot \mathbf{B}$ are bounded from below by $-\tilde{\xi}^2$.
- (iii) the curvatures in $\mathbf{B}(p, (1 + L^{-1}) \cdot L_1)$ are bounded from below by $-\xi^2$.

Furthermore it is useful to introduce the notation:

$$\text{cont}_k^{t-1}(L_1, L, \xi) := \sup \{ rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}) \mid \text{the ball } \mathbf{B} \text{ meets the conditions 3.4 (i) and 3.4 (ii)} \}.$$

3.5 LEMMA. — (i) Suppose that the assumptions 3.4 hold; then for any $t \geq t_0$ there is the estimate:

$$rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{B}) \leq (e-1) \cdot N_0 \cdot \sup \{ rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}) \mid \tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{B}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{r}) \text{ where } \tilde{r} \leq q \cdot r \text{ and } \tilde{p} \text{ lies in } \mathbf{B} \}.$$

(ii) If moreover \mathbf{B} is ρ -incompressible, then all the balls $\rho \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ on the right-hand side of the above estimate are $(k+1; L_1, L, (1+2L) \cdot q \cdot r)$ -framed.

(iii) If $t \geq t_0(L_1, L, \xi)$, then:

$$\text{cont}_k^{t-1}(L_1, L, \xi) \leq \max \{ 1, (e-1) \cdot N_0 \cdot \text{cont}_{k+1}^{t-1}(L_1, L, \xi) \}.$$

(iv) If condition 3.4 (iii) holds and if $L \geq \sqrt{1 + \xi^2} \cdot L_1^2 \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1}$, then:

$$\text{cont}_{2n}^{t-1}(L_1, L, \xi) = 1.$$

Proof. — (i) We put $\rho_i := (2 + \rho)^i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\rho_{n+1} := \rho \cdot \rho_n$. We pick a maximal set of pairwise disjoint metrical balls \mathbf{B}_j^{-1} , $1 \leq j \leq N$, whose centres lie in \mathbf{B} and whose

radii equal $r_{-1} := 0.5 \cdot q \cdot \rho_n^{-1} \cdot r$. Obviously for $0 \leq i \leq n$ the families $B_j^i := 2 \cdot \rho_i \cdot B_j^{-1}$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, cover B . Since $1 + q \cdot \rho = 1 + L^{-1} < \rho$, we conclude that the balls B_j^{n+1} are contained in $\rho \cdot B$. Therefore the estimate is a consequence of corollary 1.6, provided that (a) $N_0 \geq N$ and that (b) t_0 bounds from above the number of balls B_j^n which intersect any fixed B_j^n . In order to verify both the conditions, we point out that the B_j^{-1} are disjoint, and that:

$$(a) \quad B_j^{-1} \subset \left(1 + \frac{q}{2 \cdot \rho_n}\right) \cdot B \subset (1 + 4 \cdot \rho_n \cdot q^{-1}) \cdot B_j^{-1} \subset \left(\frac{3+q}{2 \cdot \rho_n}\right) \cdot B$$

$$(b) \quad B_j^n \cap B_j^n \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow B_j^{-1} \subset \left(2 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot \rho_n}\right) \cdot B_j^n \subset \left(4 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot \rho_n}\right) \cdot B_j^n$$

$$\qquad \qquad \qquad \subset \left(1 + 4 \cdot q + \frac{q}{2 \cdot \rho_n}\right) \cdot B.$$

These inclusions yield:

$$(a) \quad N \leq \sup_j \frac{\text{vol}(1 + 0.5 \cdot q \cdot \rho_n^{-1}) \cdot B}{\text{vol } B_j^{-1}} \leq \sup_j \frac{\text{vol}(1 + 4 \cdot \rho_n \cdot q^{-1}) \cdot B_j^{-1}}{\text{vol } B_j^{-1}}$$

$$(b) \quad \# \{B_j^n \mid B_j^n \cap B_j^n \neq \emptyset\} \leq \sup_j \frac{\text{vol}(1 + 8 \cdot \rho_n) \cdot B_j^{-1}}{\text{vol } B_j^{-1}}.$$

Since all the balls are contained in $\rho \cdot B$, the right-hand sides of these inequalities can be evaluated by means of the volume comparison theorem for concentric metrical balls (c. f. [BC]); we may use model spaces with constant curvature $-\xi^2$, and we compute:

$$(a) \quad N \leq \frac{\int_0^{1+4 \cdot \rho_n/q} \sinh(\xi \cdot \sigma \cdot r_{-1})^{n-1} d\sigma}{\int_0^1 \sinh(\xi \cdot \sigma \cdot r_{-1})^{n-1} d\sigma}$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{4}{q} \cdot \rho_n\right) \cdot \sup \left\{ \frac{\sinh \xi \cdot \sigma \cdot (1 + (4/q) \cdot \rho_n) \cdot r_{-1}}{\sinh \xi \cdot \sigma \cdot r_{-1}} \mid 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1 \right\}^{n-1}$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{4}{q} \cdot \rho_n\right)^n \cdot \left(\frac{\sinh \xi \cdot (1 + (4/q) \cdot \rho_n) \cdot r_{-1}}{\xi \cdot (1 + (4/q) \cdot \rho_n) \cdot r_{-1}}\right)^{n-1} \leq N_0.$$

The last step is due to the fact that:

$$\left(1 + \frac{4}{q} \cdot \rho_n\right) \cdot r_{-1} = \left(2 + \frac{q}{2 \cdot \rho_n}\right) \cdot r \leq (2 + L^{-1}) \cdot r \leq L_1/L$$

and $\rho_n \cdot q^{-1} = (2 + 3L) \cdot (5 + (2/L))^n$.

$$(b) \quad \# \{ B_j^n \mid B_j^n \cap B_j^n \neq \emptyset \} \leq \frac{\int_0^{1+8\rho_n} \sinh(\xi \cdot \sigma \cdot r_{-1})^{n-1} d\sigma}{\int_0^1 \sinh(\xi \cdot \sigma \cdot r_{-1})^{n-1} d\sigma} \\ \leq (1 + 8 \cdot \rho_n)^n \cdot \left(\frac{\sinh \xi \cdot (1 + 8 \rho_n) \cdot r_{-1}}{\xi \cdot (1 + 8 \rho_n) \cdot r_{-1}} \right)^{n-1} \leq t_0.$$

This time the last estimate is due to the fact that:

$$(1 + 8 \cdot \rho_n) \cdot r_{-1} = \left(4 + \frac{1}{2 \cdot \rho_n} \right) \cdot q \cdot r \leq \frac{9}{2} \cdot (2 + 3L)^{-1} \cdot (1 + 2L)^{-1} \cdot L_1 \leq \frac{L_1}{2 \cdot L}.$$

(ii) It follows from lemma 3.3 that for any point $\tilde{p} \in (1 + q \cdot \rho) \cdot B$ there exists a critical point p_c of $d_{\tilde{p}}$, which obeys:

$$L \cdot d(p_c, \tilde{p}) \leq L \cdot (2 + q \cdot \rho) \cdot r = (1 + 2L) \cdot r$$

and

$$d(p_c, \tilde{p}) \geq (1 - \rho^{-1} \cdot (1 + q \cdot \rho)) \cdot r = q \cdot (\rho \cdot L - L - 1) \cdot r = q \cdot (1 + 2L) \cdot r;$$

therefore the set $(1 + q \cdot \rho) \cdot B$ as well as the subballs $\rho \cdot \tilde{B}$ are $(k + 1; L_1, L, (1 + 2L) \cdot q \cdot r)$ -framed.

(iii) Obviously $rk_*^{-1}(\rho \cdot B, B) = 1$, if the metrical ball B is a topological ball as well. Therefore lemma 3.2 reduces the proof to the case where B is a ρ -incompressible ball. The estimate given in (i) holds, and the property (ii) allows to bound the right-hand side as desired.

(iv) Suppose B were a ρ -incompressible ball which obeyed the conditions 3.4 (i), (ii) and (ii) with $k = 2n$; then by means of (ii) there would exist $(2n + 1; L_1, L, 0)$ -framed balls. As by hypothesis

$$L \geq \sqrt{1 + \xi^2} \cdot L_1^2 \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1} \geq \xi \cdot L_1 \cdot \coth(\xi \cdot L_1) \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1},$$

the above conclusion contradicts to lemma 2.3 (ii). \square

3.6 PROPOSITION. — *Suppose that the ball $B = B(p, r)$ obeys the conditions 3.4 (ii) and (iii) with $L \geq \sqrt{1 + \xi^2} \cdot L_1^2 \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1}$; moreover assume that the boundary of $B(p, L_1)$ in M^n is non-empty and that $L_1 \geq 2r \cdot (L + 2 + L^{-1})$. Then for any $t \geq t_0(L_1, L, \xi)$, one has:*

$$rk_*^{-1}(\rho \cdot B, B) \leq (e - 1)^{2n-1} \cdot N_0(L_1, L, \xi)^{2n-1}.$$

Proof. — We fix a point p_1 on the boundary of $B(p, L_1)$; it is easy to verify that $\rho \cdot B = (3 + 2 \cdot L^{-1}) \cdot B$ is $(1; L_1, L, (1 + 2L) \cdot r)$ -framed. We apply lemma 3.5 (iii) inductively and use 3.5 (iv) in order to stop at $k = 2n$. \square

Heuristically speaking, the proposition bounds the topology of small metrical balls B in a Riemannian manifold M^n . All the conditions can be formulated in terms of the curvature, the diameter of M^n , and the radius of the ball B . No assumption on the injectivity radius is required.

3.7. COROLLARY (c. f. Gromov). — *If M^n is non-negatively curved, non-compact, and connected, and if $t \geq 2^{1/n} \cdot 8^n \cdot 5^{n^2}$, then for any ball $B = B(p, r)$ in M^n the following estimate holds:*

$$rk_*^{t-1}(M^n, B) \leq rk_*^{t-1}(3.3. B, B) \leq \exp(5 \cdot n^3 + 3.5 \cdot n^2).$$

Proof. — We put $\xi := \tilde{\xi} := 0$, $L := 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1}$, and $L_1 := 2r \cdot L \cdot (1 + L^{-1})^2$.

Then the proposition applies; to make things more explicit, we make use of the following computations:

$$t_0 = \left(1 + 8 \cdot 5^n \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2}{5L}\right)^n\right)^n \leq 8^n \cdot 5^{n^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n^2}{5 \cdot L} + \frac{n}{8} \cdot 5^{-n}\right) \leq 2^{1/n} \cdot 8^n \cdot 5^{n^2}$$

and

$$N_0 = \left(1 + 12 \cdot L \cdot 5^n \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2}{5L}\right)^n \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2}{3L}\right)^n\right)^n \leq (12 \cdot L)^n \cdot 5^{n^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n^2}{5L} + \frac{2n}{3L} + \frac{n \cdot 5^{-n}}{12 \cdot L}\right)$$

i. e.

$$\begin{aligned} ((e-1) \cdot N_0)^{2n-1} &\leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{n^2 \cdot (2n-1)} \cdot \left(\frac{36 \cdot \sqrt{e-1}}{1 + \sqrt{2}}\right)^{n \cdot (2n-1)} \\ &\quad \cdot \exp\left(\frac{n \cdot (2n-1)}{L} \cdot \left(\frac{2n}{5} + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{12} \cdot 5^{-n}\right)\right) \\ &\leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{(n^2+1.2 \cdot n) \cdot (2n-1)} \cdot 5 \leq 5 \cdot \exp(5 \cdot n^3 + 3.5 \cdot n^2 - 3 \cdot n). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4. Metrical annuli in asymptotically non-negatively curved manifolds

Most of the preceding results are valid for arbitrary Riemannian manifolds; especially proposition 3.6 holds in general. In this section we are going to specialize to asymptotically non-negatively curved manifolds (M^n, g, o) . Our goal is to get rid of the assumption on the diameter of M^n . Towards this purpose it is natural to consider metrical annuli

$$A(R_1, R_2) := \overline{B(o, R_2)} \setminus B(o, R_1)$$

around the base point o of M^n . We want to bound from above

$$rk_*^{t-1}(A(1-\varepsilon) \cdot R_1, (1+\varepsilon) \cdot R_2), A(R_1, R_2),$$

provided t and ε are sufficiently large. The idea is to cover the annuli by balls of a very special type: a metrical ball $B = B(p, r)$ in M^n is said to be δ -small ($\delta > 0$), iff $r = \delta \cdot d_o(p)$.

We recall that by lemma II.1.1 the curvatures at a point $p \in M^n$ are bounded from below by

$$-2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f(d_0(p)) \cdot d_0(p)^{-2};$$

here $r \mapsto f(r)$ denotes a monotone non-increasing error function which takes values in $[0, 1]$ and converges to 0 for $r \rightarrow \infty$.

4.1. ASSUMPTIONS. — Let $L_0 := 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1}$ and let $\eta < (1 + \sqrt{b_0 \cdot f(R_1/2L_0)})^{-1}$ be some positive number; we put:

$$L := L_0 \cdot \sqrt{1 + 2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_1}{2L_0}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{\eta}{1-\eta}\right)^2}$$

$$\rho := 3 + 2 \cdot L^{-1}$$

and

$$\varepsilon_n := \frac{1}{2} \cdot L^3 \cdot (1+L)^{-4} \cdot \eta.$$

4.2 LEMMA

(i) $L_0 \leq L \leq \sqrt{3} \cdot L_0 \leq 2 \cdot L_0 - 1$

$$\varepsilon_n \leq \frac{\eta}{2 \cdot (L+4)} \leq \frac{\eta}{22}$$

$$\rho \cdot \varepsilon_n \leq \frac{9}{2} \cdot \frac{\eta}{3L+10} \leq \frac{\eta}{7}.$$

(ii) If $0 < \delta \leq \varepsilon_n$ and $B = B(p, r)$ is any δ -small ball in M^n with centre p in $A(R_1, R_2)$, then the estimate

$$rk_*^{-1}((\rho \cdot B, B)) \leq (e-1)^{2n-1} \cdot \tilde{N}_0^{2n-1}$$

holds for

$$\tilde{N}_0 := (12 \cdot L)^n \cdot 5^{n^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{n}{L} \cdot \left(\frac{2n}{5} + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{12} \cdot 5^{-n}\right) + \frac{\sqrt{2} \cdot (n-1)}{L+2}\right)$$

and for all

$$t \geq \tilde{t}_0(n) := 8^n \cdot 5^{n^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n^2}{5L} + \frac{n-1}{\sqrt{2} \cdot (L+2)} + \frac{n}{8} \cdot 5^{-n}\right).$$

Proof. — (i) These estimates are obvious consequences of the definitions.

(ii) We define

$$L_1 := 2L \cdot (1+L^{-1})^2 \cdot \varepsilon_n \cdot d_0(p) = \left(\frac{L}{L+1}\right)^2 \cdot \eta \cdot d_0(p).$$

It is easy to verify that:

(a) the curvatures in $B(p, (1+L^{-1}) \cdot L_1) \subset B(p, (L \cdot \eta/(L+1)) \cdot d_0(p))$ are bounded from below by $-\xi^2$, where

$$\xi := \sqrt{2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_1}{L+1}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{L \cdot \eta}{L+1}\right)^{-1}} \cdot d_0(p)^{-1}.$$

(b)
$$\xi \cdot L_1 \leq \sqrt{2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_1}{L+1}\right) \cdot \frac{\eta}{1-\eta}},$$

i. e. :

$$L \geq \sqrt{1 + \xi^2} \cdot L_1^2 \cdot L_0.$$

(c) the curvatures in the ball $\rho \cdot B \subset B(p, \rho \cdot \varepsilon_n \cdot d_0(p)) \subset B(p, (\eta/7) \cdot d_0(p))$ are bounded from below by $-\xi^2$, where

$$\xi := \sqrt{2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_1}{L+1}\right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{7}\right)^{-1}} \cdot d_0(p)^{-1}.$$

Therefore proposition 3.6 applies; it remains to compute $N_0(L_1, L, \xi)$ and $t_0(L_1, L, \xi)$. Since

$$\frac{2 \cdot (1+L^{-1})^2 \cdot \varepsilon_n}{1 - (\eta/7)} = \frac{L}{(1+L)^2} \cdot \frac{\eta}{1 - (\eta/7)} \leq \frac{1}{L+2} \cdot \frac{\eta}{1-\eta},$$

we see that:

$$\frac{\xi \cdot L_1}{L} = \frac{1}{L+2} \cdot \frac{\eta}{1-\eta} \cdot \sqrt{2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_1}{L+1}\right)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{L+2}.$$

Because of the inequality

$$\frac{\sinh(x)}{x} \leq \cosh(x) \leq \exp(|x|)$$

we obtain that:

$$t_0 \leq \exp\left(\frac{n-1}{\sqrt{2} \cdot (L+2)}\right) \cdot \left(1 + 8 \cdot \left(5 + \frac{2}{L}\right)^n\right)^n \leq \tilde{t}_0(n),$$

and

$$N_0 \leq \exp\left(\frac{\sqrt{2} \cdot (n-1)}{L+2}\right) \cdot \left(1 + 12 \cdot L \cdot \left(1 + \frac{2}{3L}\right) \cdot \left(5 + \frac{2}{L}\right)^n\right)^n \leq \tilde{N}_0. \quad \square$$

4.3. CONSTRUCTION. — There is a sequence of numbers

$$0 < \varepsilon_{-1} < \varepsilon_0 < \dots < \varepsilon_n < \varepsilon_{n+1} < 1,$$

uniquely determined by the following conditions:

ε_n is the number given in 4.1,

$$\varepsilon_{n+1} := \rho \cdot \varepsilon_n,$$

$$\varepsilon_{i+1} = (2 + \rho \cdot (1 + \varepsilon_i)) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_i)^{-1} \cdot \varepsilon_i, \quad 0 \leq i < n,$$

and

$$\varepsilon_0 := 2 \cdot \varepsilon_{-1} \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_{-1})^{-1}.$$

(i. e.

$$\varepsilon_{-1} = \varepsilon_0 \cdot (2 + \varepsilon_0)^{-1}.)$$

We put $\rho_i := \varepsilon_i \cdot \varepsilon_0^{-1}$ for $-1 \leq i \leq n+1$.

We pick a maximal family of disjoint ε_{-1} -small balls B_j^{-1} , $1 \leq j \leq N$, whose centres p_j lie in $A(R_1, R_2)$. Moreover, we shall consider all balls

$$B_j^i := \rho_i \cdot (2 + \varepsilon_0) \cdot B_j^{-1}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq N, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n+1.$$

4.4. IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES:

- (i) $p \in B_j^i \Rightarrow (1 - \varepsilon_i) \cdot d_0(p_j) \leq d_0(p) \leq (1 + \varepsilon_i) \cdot d_0(p_j)$.
- (ii) $B_j^i \cap B_j^i \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \begin{cases} p_j \in 2 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_i)^{-1} \cdot B_j^i \text{ and} \\ \sigma \cdot B_j^i \subset (2 + \sigma \cdot (1 + \varepsilon_i)) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_i)^{-1} \cdot B_j^i \text{ for all } \sigma > 0. \end{cases}$
- (iii) the balls B_j^0 , $1 \leq j \leq N$, cover the annulus $A(R_1, R_2)$.

In order to prove (iii), let us assume that there is some point $p_{N+1} \in A(R_1, R_2) \setminus \bigcup \{B_j^0 \mid 1 \leq j \leq N\}$; it is a consequence of (ii) that the ball $B_{N+1}^{-1} := B(p_{N+1}, \varepsilon_{-1} \cdot d_0(p_{N+1}))$ is disjoint from the other B_j^{-1} . This conclusion contradicts the maximality of the family $(B_j^{-1})_{j=1}^N$.

We point out that for sufficiently large t the corollary 1.6 gives rise to an upper bound on

$$rk_*^{t-1}(A((1 - \varepsilon_{n+1}) \cdot R_1, (1 + \varepsilon_{n+1}) \cdot R_2), A(R_1, R_2))$$

in terms of the quantities $rk_*^{t-1}(\rho \cdot B_j^i, B_j^i)$, $0 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, which in turn have already been controlled in lemma 4.3.

We continue listing some inequalities which will be used in the subsequent computations.

$$(iv) \quad 5^i \leq \rho_i \leq 5^i \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2i}{5L} + \frac{1}{4 \cdot (L+4)}\right), \quad 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

$$2 \cdot 5^n \leq \varepsilon_n \cdot \varepsilon_{-1}^{-1} = \rho_n \cdot (2 + \varepsilon_0) = 2 \cdot \rho_n + \varepsilon_n \leq 2 \cdot 5^n \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n}{5L} + \frac{1 + 5^{-n}}{4 \cdot (L+4)}\right).$$

(c. f. Appendix B.)

$$(v) \quad \varepsilon_{-1}^{-1} \leq 4 \cdot 5^n \cdot \frac{L}{\eta} \cdot (1+L^{-1})^4 \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n}{5L} + \frac{1+5^{-n}}{4 \cdot (L+4)}\right) \leq 4 \cdot 5^n \cdot \frac{L}{\eta} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n}{5L} + \frac{17}{4L}\right).$$

$$(vi) \quad B_j^n \cap B_j^n \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow B_j^{-1} \subset (2 + \varepsilon_{-1} \cdot \varepsilon_n^{-1} \cdot (1 + \varepsilon_n)) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_n)^{-1} \cdot B_j^n \subset \tau_n \cdot B_j^n,$$

where

$$\tau_n := \left(\frac{2}{1 - \varepsilon_n}\right)^2 + \varepsilon_{-1} \cdot \varepsilon_n^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1 + \varepsilon_n}{1 - \varepsilon_n}\right)^2.$$

$$(vii) \quad \left(\frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_n}\right)^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{2L+7}\right)^2 = 1 + \frac{4L+15}{(2L+7)^2} \leq \frac{4L+17}{4L+13},$$

$$\left(\frac{1 + \varepsilon_n}{1 - \varepsilon_n}\right)^2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{2L+7}\right)^2 = 1 + 4 \cdot \frac{2L+8}{(2L+7)^2} \leq \frac{L+5}{L+3}.$$

$$(viii) \quad \tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n \leq \left(4 \cdot \frac{4L+17}{4L+13} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot 5^{-n} \cdot \frac{L+5}{L+3}\right) \cdot \frac{\eta}{2 \cdot (L+4)}$$

$$\leq \frac{2\eta}{L+3} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{(L+4) \cdot (4L+13)} + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 5^{-n} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{L+4}\right)\right)$$

$$\leq \frac{2\eta}{L+3} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 5^{-n}\right).$$

$$(ix) \quad \frac{\tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_{-1}} \leq 8 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{2L+7}\right)^2 \cdot 5^n \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n}{5L} + \frac{1+5^{-n}}{4 \cdot (L+4)}\right) + \left(1 + \frac{2}{2L+7}\right)^2$$

$$\leq (1+8 \cdot 5^n) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n}{5L} + \frac{5+5^{-n}}{2 \cdot (2L+7)}\right).$$

4.5. LEMMA. — *The number of balls B_j^n which intersect a given ball B_j^n is bounded from above by*

$$t_1(n) = 5^{n^2} \cdot 8^n \cdot \exp\left(\frac{8}{3 \cdot (n+1)}\right).$$

Proof. — Since by construction the balls B_j^{-1} are disjoint, we can deduce from 4.4 (vi) that:

$$(\star) \quad \#\{B_j^n \mid B_j^n \cap B_j^n \neq \emptyset\} \leq \sup_j \frac{\text{vol } \tau_n \cdot B_j^n}{\text{vol } B_j^{-1}}.$$

The curvatures in the ball $\tau_n \cdot B_j^n$ are bounded from below by $-\xi_j^2$ where

$$\xi_j := \sqrt{2 \cdot b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_1}{L+1}\right)} \cdot (1 - \tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n)^{-1} \cdot d_0(p_j)^{-1}.$$

Since

$$\frac{\tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n}{1 - \tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n} \leq \frac{2}{L+3} \cdot \frac{\eta}{1-\eta} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 5^{-n}\right)$$

and since $p_{j'} \in A(R_1, R_2)$, it follows that:

$$\xi_{j'} \cdot \tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n \cdot d_0(p_{j'}) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{L+3} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{8} \cdot 5^{-n}\right).$$

Therefore the volume comparison for concentric metrical balls yields:

$$\frac{\text{vol } \tau_n \cdot B_{j'}^n}{\text{vol } B_{j'}^{-1}} \leq \frac{\int_0^{\tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n \cdot d_0(p_{j'})} \sinh(\xi_{j'} \cdot \sigma)^{n-1} d\sigma}{\int_0^{\varepsilon_{-1} \cdot d_0(p_{j'})} \sinh(\xi_{j'} \cdot \sigma)^{n-1} d\sigma} \leq \left(\frac{\tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_{-1}}\right)^n \cdot \left(\frac{\sinh(\xi_{j'} \cdot \tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n \cdot d_0(p_{j'}))}{\xi_{j'} \cdot \tau_n \cdot \varepsilon_n \cdot d_0(p_{j'})}\right)^{n-1}.$$

We plug this estimate into (★) and obtain by means of 4.4 (ix) that:

$$\# \{B_{j'}^n \mid B_{j'}^n \cap B_j^n \neq \emptyset\} \leq 8^n \cdot 5^{n^2} \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2n^2}{5L} + n \cdot \frac{5+5^{-n}}{2 \cdot (2L+7)} + \frac{n}{8} \cdot 5^{-n} + \frac{2\sqrt{2} \cdot (n-1)}{L+3} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{5^{-n}}{8}\right)\right) \leq t_1(n). \quad \square$$

In order to bound the number N of balls B_j^0 in the covering, we look at the pulled back situation under $\exp_0 : T_0 M \rightarrow M$. We pick a family of vectors $v_j \in T_0 M$ such that

- (i) $\exp_0(v_j)$ is the centre p_j of B_j^0 ;
- (ii) $\|v_j\| = d_0(p_j)$, i. e. the curve $t \mapsto \exp_0(t \cdot v_j)$, $t \in [0, 1]$, is minimizing.

Given numbers $0 < \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3 < 1$ and a non-zero vector $w \in T_0 M$, we consider the sets

$$AC(w; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) := \{v \in T_0 M \mid \star(v, w) \leq \zeta_1 \cdot \zeta_3 \cdot \exp(-b_1) \text{ and} \\ (1-\zeta_1) \cdot (1-\zeta_2) \cdot |w| \leq |v| \leq (1-\zeta_1) \cdot (1+\zeta_2) \cdot |w|\}.$$

4.6. LEMMA. — (i) If $1 - \varepsilon_{-1} \leq (1 - \zeta_1) \cdot (\sqrt{1 - \zeta_3^2} - \zeta_2)$, then \exp_0 maps the set $AC(v_j; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$ into B_j^{-1} for all j .

(ii) The number of disjoint sets $AC(w; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$ in the annulus

$$A := \{v \in T_0 M \mid (1 - \zeta_1) \cdot (1 - \zeta_2) \cdot R_1 \leq |v| \leq (1 - \zeta_1) \cdot (1 + \zeta_2) \cdot R_2\}$$

is bounded from above by

$$\left(2 + \zeta_2^{-1} \cdot \ln \frac{R_2}{R_1}\right) \cdot \pi^{n-1} \cdot (2 \cdot \zeta_1 \cdot \zeta_3)^{1-n} \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1)$$

(iii) The number N of distinct balls B_j^{-1} in M^n is bounded from above by

$$N_1 := \left(\frac{5^{-n}}{8L+32} + \ln \frac{R_2}{R_1} \right) \cdot 16 \cdot (16 \cdot \pi)^{n-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \cdot L \cdot 5^n \right)^{(3n-1)/2} \\ \times \exp \left(\frac{3n-1}{L} \cdot \left(\frac{n}{5} + \frac{17}{8} \right) \right) \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1).$$

Proof. – (i) It is sufficient to show that \exp_o maps the sets $AC(v_j; \zeta_1, 0, \zeta_3)$ into the $(\varepsilon_{-1} - \zeta_2 \cdot (1 - \zeta_1))$ -small balls $(1 - \zeta_2 \cdot (1 - \zeta_1)) \cdot \varepsilon_{-1}^{-1} \cdot B_j^{-1}$. This amounts to studying the generalized geodesic triangle $\Delta = (p_j, p, o)$, where p is the image under \exp_o of any vector $v \in AC(v_j; \zeta_1, 0, \zeta_3)$.

Thus, in the notation of proposition III. 1, we have:

$$l_1 = d_o(p_j), \\ l_o = d_o(p) \leq (1 - \zeta_1) \cdot l_1,$$

and

$$\cos(\angle at o) \geq \sqrt{1 - \zeta_1^2 \cdot \zeta_3^2 \cdot \exp(-2 \cdot b_1)}$$

Hence, the proposition applies and yields the desired inequality:

$$d(p, p_j) \leq l_1 - l_o \cdot \sqrt{1 - \zeta_3^2} \leq (1 - (1 - \zeta_1)) \cdot \sqrt{1 - \zeta_3^2} \cdot d_o(p_j) \leq (\varepsilon_{-1} - \zeta_2 \cdot (1 - \zeta_1)) \cdot d_o(p_j).$$

(ii) We make use of the diffeomorphism

$$\Phi : T_o M \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow S^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R},$$

$v \mapsto (|v|^{-1} \cdot v, \ln |v|)$ and the canonical volume form on $S^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$, and we compute $-B^S(r)$ will denote a ball of radius r in S^{n-1} —:

disjoint sets $AC(w; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$ in A

$$\leq \sup_w \frac{\text{vol } \Phi(A)}{\text{vol } \Phi(AC(w; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3))} \\ \leq \ln \frac{(1 + \zeta_2) \cdot R_2}{(1 - \zeta_2) \cdot R_1} \cdot \left(\ln \frac{1 + \zeta_2}{1 - \zeta_2} \right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{\text{vol } S^{n-1}}{\text{vol } B^S(\zeta_1 \cdot \zeta_3 \cdot \exp(-b_1))} \\ \leq \left(1 + \left(\ln \frac{1 + \zeta_2}{1 - \zeta_2} \right)^{-1} \cdot \ln \frac{R_2}{R_1} \right) \cdot 2 \cdot \pi^{n-1} \cdot (2 \cdot \zeta_1 \cdot \zeta_3 \cdot \exp(-b_1))^{1-n}.$$

This inequality immediately yields the claimed bound, as it is known that $\ln(1 + \zeta_2) - \ln(1 - \zeta_2) \geq 2\zeta_2$ for all $\zeta_2 \geq 0$.

(iii) If $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \zeta_3^2 = \varepsilon_{-1}$, then the hypothesis of (i) are met, the sets $AC(v_j; \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$ are disjoint, and part (ii) yields the required control on N . We put

$$\zeta_1 = 2. \zeta_2 = 2. \zeta_3^2 = 0.5. \varepsilon_{-1}$$

and obtain the estimate:

$$N \leq \left(2. \varepsilon_{-1} + 4. \ln \frac{R_2}{R_1} \right) \cdot (2. \pi)^{n-1} \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon_{-1}}^{-(3n-1)} \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1).$$

Using the estimates given in 4.4, one easily verifies that the right-hand side is dominated by N_1 . \square

4.7. PROPOSITION. — Assume like in 4.1 that $0 < R_1 \leq R_2$ and that

$$\eta \leq (1 + \sqrt{b_0 \cdot f(R_1/2L_0)})^{-1}.$$

If moreover

$$t \geq t_1(n) := 5^{n^2} \cdot 8^n \cdot \exp\left(\frac{8}{3 \cdot (n+1)}\right)$$

the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i) } rk_*^{t-1} \left(A \left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot R_1, \frac{8}{7} \cdot R_2 \right), A(R_1, R_2) \right) \\ \leq C_a(n) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2000} + \ln \frac{R_2}{R_1} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\eta \cdot \sqrt{2}}^{-(3n-1)} \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_a(n) := (e-1)^{2n} \cdot (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{\tilde{c}_a(n)},$$

and

$$\tilde{c}_a(n) := 2 \cdot n^3 + \frac{19}{6} \cdot n^2 + \frac{5}{12} \cdot n + \frac{3}{4}.$$

$$\text{(ii) } \lim_{R_1 \rightarrow \infty} rk_*^{t-1} \left(A \left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot R_1, \frac{8}{7} \cdot R_1 \right), A(R_1, R_1) \right) \leq C_e(n) \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1),$$

where

$$C_e(n) := (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{\tilde{c}_e(n)},$$

and

$$\tilde{c}_e(n) := 2 \cdot n^3 + \frac{19}{6} \cdot n^2 - \frac{1}{3} \cdot n - \frac{1}{3}.$$

Remark. — We point out that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{b_0 \cdot f\left(\frac{R_2}{R_1}\right)}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (1 + \sqrt{b_0}) \leq \sqrt{1 + b_0}.$$

Since by remark II. 2. 4 the last term does not exceed $\exp((1/2) \cdot b_1)$, it is *admissible* to pick:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \cdot \eta} := \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot b_1\right).$$

Proof. — By continuity it is sufficient to treat the case $\eta < (1 + \sqrt{b_0 \cdot f(R_1/2L_0)})^{-1}$. We are going to consider the covering constructed in 4. 3. One easily verifies that $t_1(n) \geq \tilde{t}_0(n)$; hence it is possible to apply corollary 1. 6 and lemma 4. 2 (ii):

$$\begin{aligned} &rk_*^{t_1^{-1}}\left(A\left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot R_1, \frac{8}{7} \cdot R_2\right), A(R_1, R_2)\right) \\ &\leq (e-1) \cdot N_1 \cdot \sup\{rk_*^{t_1^{-1}}(\rho, B, B) \mid B \text{ is } \delta\text{-small with } \delta \leq \varepsilon_n \\ &\quad \text{and has centre in the set } A(R_1, R_2)\} \\ &\leq (e-1)^{2n} \cdot \tilde{N}_0^{2n-1} \cdot N_1 \\ &= (e-1)^{2n} \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot \left(\frac{5^{-n}}{8L+32} + \ln \frac{R_2}{R_1}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\eta}^{1-3n} \cdot \exp((n-1) \cdot b_1). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the abbreviations:

$$c_1 := ((12 \cdot L)^n \cdot 5^{n^2})^{2n-1} \cdot \sqrt{5^n \cdot L^{3n-1}} \cdot (16 \cdot \pi)^{n-1} \cdot 16$$

and

$$c_2 := \exp\left(\frac{2n^2-n}{L} \cdot \left(\frac{2n}{5} + \frac{8+5^{-n}}{12}\right) + \frac{3n-1}{L} \cdot \left(\frac{n}{5} + \frac{17}{8}\right) + \frac{(2n-1) \cdot (n-1) \cdot \sqrt{2}}{L+2}\right).$$

Since $L \geq 3 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{n-1}$, we have $c_2 \leq 36$ for all $n \geq 2$.

(i) Observing that $5^{-n}/(8L+32) \leq 1/2000$, it is sufficient to show that

$$(e-1)^{2n} \cdot 2^{(3n-1)/4} \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \leq C_a(n).$$

Obviously

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{(3n-1)/4} \cdot c_1 &\leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{n^2 \cdot (2n-1) + n \cdot (3n-1)/2} \cdot \left(\frac{36 \cdot \sqrt{3}}{1 + \sqrt{2}}\right)^{n \cdot (2n-1)} \\ &\quad \times \left(\frac{3 \cdot \sqrt{6}}{1 + \sqrt{2}}\right)^{(3n-1)/2} \cdot (16 \cdot \pi)^{n-1} \cdot 16, \end{aligned}$$

and the result is due to the inequalities:

$$\frac{36 \cdot \sqrt{3}}{1 + \sqrt{2}} \leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{4/3}, \quad \left(\frac{3 \cdot \sqrt{6}}{1 + \sqrt{2}} \right)^{3/2} \cdot 16 \cdot \pi \leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{9/4},$$

and

$$\frac{3 \cdot \sqrt{6}}{1 + \sqrt{2}} \cdot 16 \cdot c_2 \leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^3.$$

(ii) Since the error function f converges to zero for $R_1 \rightarrow \infty$, it is possible to pick a function $\eta(R_1)$ which converges to 1 for $R_1 \rightarrow \infty$.

Thus one is reduced to checking that

$$(e-1)^{2n} \cdot c_1 \cdot c_2 \cdot \frac{5^{-n}}{8 \cdot L} \leq C_e(n).$$

This can be done calculating in a similar way as above. \square

5. The global estimates

The special case of non-negative curvature has been treated in corollary 3.7, and the Betti numbers of the ends of M^n have been bounded in proposition 4.7 (ii). It remains to consider the general case and piece together the estimates on metrical annuli in an arbitrary asymptotically non-negatively curved manifold.

We look at a sequence of critical points p_1, \dots, p_k of the distance function d_0 such that:

$$d_0(p_i) \geq e \cdot d_0(p_{i+1}), \quad 1 \leq i < k,$$

and that its length k is maximal. In the terminology of 2.2 this is a metrical $(k; e, 0)$ -frame of the base point o . It is useful to consider the annuli

$$A_i := A(e^{-1} \cdot d_0(p_i), e \cdot d_0(p_i)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq k.$$

5.1. IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES. — (i) $k \leq 2 \cdot \pi^{n-1} \cdot (e/(e-1))^{2n-2} \cdot \exp((2n-2) \cdot b_1)$ [lemma 2.3].

(ii) $M^n \setminus \bigcup_i A_i$ does not contain a critical point of d_0 ; therefore lemma 2.1 gives rise to a vector field v_0 which does not vanish on this set.

There are numbers $0 < x_k < y_k < \dots < x_2 < y_2 < x_1 < y_1 < x_0 := \infty$ such that:

$$(iii) \quad \bigcup_{i=1}^k A_i \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^k A\left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot e^{-1} \cdot d_0(p_i), \frac{8}{7} \cdot e \cdot d_0(p_i)\right) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} A\left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot x_j, \frac{8}{7} \cdot y_j\right),$$

(iv) the annuli $A((6/7) \cdot x_j, (8/7) \cdot y_j)$ are disjoint.

It is convenient to also introduce the annuli \tilde{A}_j which are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_j &:= A\left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot x_j, x_{j-1}\right), \quad 1 \leq j < \tilde{k}, \\ \tilde{A}_{\tilde{k}} &:= \overline{B(0, x_{\tilde{k}-1})} \setminus \{0\} \end{aligned}$$

5.2. OBSERVATIONS

- (i) $\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} \left(\ln \frac{4}{3} + \ln \frac{y_j}{x_j} \right) \leq k \cdot \left(2 + \ln \frac{4}{3} \right).$
- (ii) $M^n \setminus \{0\} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} \tilde{A}_j.$
- (iii) $\tilde{A}_j \cap \tilde{A}_{j+1} = A\left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot x_j, x_j\right), \quad 1 \leq j < \tilde{k},$

and

$$\tilde{A}_j \cap \tilde{A}_{j'} = \emptyset \quad \text{if } |j-j'| \geq 2.$$

(iv) the Mayer-Vietoris sequence yields estimates on the values of the Poincaré series (for $0 < t \leq 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} P_t(M^n \setminus \{0\}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} P_t(\tilde{A}_j) + \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}-1} P_t\left(A\left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot x_j, x_j\right)\right) \\ P_t(M^n) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} \left(P_t(\tilde{A}_j) + P_t\left(A\left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot x_j, x_j\right)\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

(v) the inclusions

$$A(x_j, y_j) \subset A\left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot x_j, \frac{8}{7} \cdot y_j\right) \subset \tilde{A}_j$$

and

$$A\left(\frac{7}{8} \cdot x_j, \frac{7}{8} \cdot x_j\right) \subset A\left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot x_j, x_j\right)$$

allow for deformation retracts along the vector field v_0 as has been mentioned above.

- (vi) $P_{t-1}(M^n) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} \left(rk_*^{t-1} \left(A\left(\frac{6}{7} \cdot x_j, \frac{8}{7} \cdot y_j\right), A(x_j, y_j) \right) \right. \\ \left. + rk_*^{t-1} \left(A\left(\frac{3}{4} \cdot x_j, x_j\right), A\left(\frac{7}{8} \cdot x_j, \frac{7}{8} \cdot x_j\right) \right) \right).$

(vii) if $t \geq t_1(n)$ the right hand side of the previous formula can be estimated by means of proposition 4.7 :

$$P_{t^{-1}}(M^n) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{k}} \left(\frac{1}{1000} + \ln \frac{y_j}{x_j} \right) \cdot C_a(n) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{7n-5}{4} \cdot b_1 \right).$$

We use 5.1 (i) and 5.2 (i) in order to compute the bound. This gives us the following result:

5.3 PROPOSITION. — *Let M^n be an asymptotically non-negatively curved manifold, b_1 be its curvature invariant (as above), and let t be some number greater than:*

$$t_1(n) := 5^{n^2} \cdot 8^n \cdot \exp \left(\frac{8}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{n+1} \right);$$

then:

$$P_{t^{-1}}(M^n) \leq (5 \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2}))^{c(n)} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{15n-13}{4} \cdot b_1(M^n) \right),$$

where:

$$c(n) := 2 \cdot n^3 + \frac{19}{6} \cdot n^2 + \frac{7}{4} \cdot n + 1.$$

Remarks. — (i) Up to this point all the numerical estimates done in order to get a simple explicit bound have been chosen in such a way that they do not spoil the leading order terms of $c(n)$ and $t_1(n)$. The factors exponentiated by $c(n)$ are explained as follows: the Fibonacci number 5 reflects the geometry in the local covering argument (c.f. corollary 1.6), and the number $1 + \sqrt{2}$ is due to the packing argument in appendix A.

(ii) The lower order terms have not been treated that carefully; they could even be improved easily by changing the geometric details in the argument. For instance one could make use of the fact that the critical points of the distance function d_p cannot lie everywhere in an incompressible ball $B(p, r)$; they are contained in a rather small subset, and lemma 3.5 could be modified accordingly.

APPENDIX A

A packing problem in $S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

We define sequences $(a_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of real numbers in $(0, 1]$ resp. $(0, \pi/2]$ by:

$$a_1 := 1, \\ a_n = a_{n-1} \cdot (1 - a_n) \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 + a_n}} \right)^{-1}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

and

$$\alpha_n := \arcsin(a_n), \quad n \geq 1.$$

PROPOSITION. — Let A_n be the collection of all subsets $A \subset S^{n-1}$ satisfying

$$(\star) \quad p, q \in A, \quad p \neq q \Rightarrow d(p, q) > \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha_n.$$

Then:

$$\max \{ \# A \mid A \in A_n \} = 2n.$$

Remarks. — (i) We point out that $a_2 = \sin(\pi/10)$, and $(\pi/2) - \alpha_2 = 2\pi/5$, which is the centriangle of the regular 5-gon.

(ii) As explained in example 1 in appendix B, there is the estimate:

$$\frac{1}{3} \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{1-n} \leq a_n \leq (1 + \sqrt{2})^{1-n}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

(iii) We may view α_n as a lower bound on the angle $\tilde{\alpha}_n$ defined by

$$\frac{\pi}{2} - \tilde{\alpha}_n = 2 \cdot \sup \{ \rho \mid \text{there exist } 2n+1 \text{ disjoint balls of radius } \rho \text{ in } S^{n-1} \}.$$

In principal such a bound could also have been obtained computing the packing densities of n balls of radius ρ mutually touching each other with respect to the simplex spanned by their centres (c.f. [Bö]).

Proof. — The vertices of the generalized octahedron in \mathbb{R}^n define a set $A \in A_n$. This proves “ \geq ”. The opposite inequality is shown by induction:


We take some $A \in A_n$. If A contains no more than 2 elements, we are done; else we pick 2 points $p, \tilde{p} \in A$ such that their distance $d(p, \tilde{p})$ is maximal.

To finish the proof, we construct a projection of $A' := A \setminus \{p, \tilde{p}\}$ onto some set in A_{n-1} :

(i) The estimate $(\pi/2) - \alpha_n < d(p, q) < (3\pi/4) + (1/2) \cdot \alpha_n$ holds for all $q \in A'$.

Assuming the converse, one concludes that q and \tilde{p} both lie in the ball of radius $(\pi/4) - (1/2) \cdot \alpha_n$ around the antipodal point of p . This observation immediately yields a contradiction to property (\star) .

(ii) The projection $\text{pr}: A' \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-2} = \{x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \mid d(p, x) = \pi/2\}$ along the great circles through p can be controlled by means of spherical trigonometry:



Suppose that q_1, q_2 are two distinct points in A' ; put:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &:= d(\text{pr}(q_1), \text{pr}(q_2)), \\ l &:= d(q_1, q_2), \\ l_i &:= d(p, q_i), \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

The Law of Cosines may be written as follows:

$$(\star\star) \quad \cos \gamma = \frac{\cos l - \cos l_1 \cdot \cos l_2}{\sin l_1 \cdot \sin l_2}.$$

It is elementary analysis to verify that under the constraints

$$\frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha_n \leq l_2 \leq l_1 \leq \frac{3\pi}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \alpha_n, \quad \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha_n \leq l$$

the right-hand side of $(\star\star)$ has a unique maximum, which is achieved at:

$$l = l_2 = \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha_n, \quad l_1 = \frac{3\pi}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \alpha_n.$$

Therefore, if $q_1, q_2 \in A'$, we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \gamma &> \cot\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha_n\right) \cdot \frac{1 - \cos((3\pi/4) + (1/2) \cdot \alpha_n)}{\sin((3\pi/4) + (1/2) \cdot \alpha_n)} \\ &= \tan \alpha_n \cdot \frac{1 + \sqrt{1/2 \cdot (1 - \cos((\pi/2) + \alpha_n))}}{\sqrt{1/2 \cdot (1 + \cos((\pi/2) + \alpha_n))}} \\ &= \frac{a_n}{\sqrt{1 - a_n^2}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{1 + a_n}}{\sqrt{1 - a_n}} \\ &= \frac{a_n}{1 - a_n} \cdot \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{1 + a_n}}\right) = a_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

hence:

$$\cos \gamma > \cos \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha_{n-1} \right) \quad \square.$$

APPENDIX B

A Lemma on recursively defined sequences

Let $\varphi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [a, \infty)$ be a monotone function such that $\varphi(0) = a > 1$.

Then $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $x \mapsto x \cdot \varphi(x)$ is invertible. For any $x_0 \in (0, 1]$ there is a unique sequence of real numbers $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined by:

$$x_n = f(x_{n+1}), \quad x_{n+1} \in (0, 1].$$

LEMMA. — (i) $x_{n+1} \leq a^{-1} \cdot x_n \leq a^{-n} \cdot x_1$.

If moreover $\varphi(x) \leq a \cdot (1+x)/(1-x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$, there are also lower bounds for the x_n :

(ii) $x_{n+1}/x_n = \varphi(x_{n+1})^{-1} \geq \varphi(a^{-n} \cdot x_1)^{-1}$,

(iii) $x_n/x_0 \geq a^{-n} \cdot \left(\frac{1-x_1}{1+x_1} \right)^{a/(a-1)} \geq a^{-n} \cdot \left(\frac{a-x_0}{a+x_0} \right)^{a/(a-1)}$; $n \geq 1$.

Proof. — (i) and (ii) are obvious. In order to prove the last claim, notice that by induction:

$$(\star) \quad x_n/x_0 \geq \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi(a^{-j} \cdot x_1)^{-1} \geq a^{-n} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{1-a^{-j} \cdot x_1}{1+a^{-j} \cdot x_1}.$$

We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \ln \left(\frac{1-a^{-j} \cdot x_1}{1+a^{-j} \cdot x_1} \right) &= -2 \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2k+1} \cdot a^{-j \cdot (2k+1)} \cdot x_1^{2k+1} \\ &\geq -2 \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2k+1} \cdot \frac{1}{1-a^{-2k-1}} \cdot x_1^{2k+1} \geq \frac{a}{a-1} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{1-x_1}{1+x_1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this inequality with (\star) gives the required estimate.

Examples :

1. $\varphi(x) = \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2}{1+x}} \right) / (1-x)$; $x_0 = 1$:

Clearly $a = 1 + \sqrt{2}$ and $x_1 = \sin(\pi/10)$; therefore one has:

$$x_n \geq \frac{1}{3} \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{-n}, \quad \text{provided } n \geq 1.$$

$$2. \varphi(x) = (2 + \rho \cdot (1 + x)) / (1 - x),$$

where

$$2 + \rho = 5 + 2 \cdot L^{-1}, \quad L > 0; \quad x_0 \leq \frac{1}{2 \cdot (L + 4)}.$$

Clearly $a = 2 + \rho$, and one easily computes that:

$$\left(\frac{a + x_0}{a - x_0} \right)^{a/a-1} \leq \left(\frac{5 + (2/L) + (1/2 \cdot (L + 4))}{5 + (2/L) - (1/2 \cdot (L + 4))} \right)^{5/4} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{5 \cdot (L + 4)} \right)^{5/4} \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{4 \cdot (L + 4)} \right).$$

Therefore

$$5^n \leq \frac{x_0}{x_n} \leq 5^n \cdot \exp \left(\frac{2n}{5L} + \frac{1}{4 \cdot (L + 4)} \right).$$

Note added in proof. — In the meantime a nice account on the results obtained by heat equation methods has appeared in [B].

REFERENCES

- [A] U. ABRESCH, *Lower curvature bounds, Toponogov's theorem and bounded topology, I* (*Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup.*, Vol. 19, 1985, pp. 651 à 670).
- [B] P. BERARD, *Spectral geometry: direct and inverse problems* (*L.N.M.*, No. 1207, Springer, 1986).
- [BC] R. BISHOP and R. CRITTENDEN, *Geometry of manifolds*, Academic Press, N.Y., 1964.
- [BG] P. BERARD and S. GALLOT, *Inégalités Isopérimétriques pour l'équation de la chaleur et application à l'estimation de quelques invariants géométriques* (preprint).
- [BM] P. BERARD and D. MEYER, *Inégalités Isopérimétriques et Applications*, (*Ann. scient. Ec. Norm. Sup.*, Vol. 15, 1982, pp. 513-542).
- [Bö] K. BÖRÖCZKY, *Packing of spheres in spaces of constant curvature* (*Acta Math. Acad. Scient. Hungaricae*, Vol. 32, 1978, pp. 243-261).
- [CE] J. CHEEGER and D. EBIN, *Comparison theorems in Riemannian geometry*, North Holland, N.Y., 1975.
- [EN] P. EBERLEIN and B. O'NEILL, *Visibility manifolds* (*Pac. J. Math.*, Vol. 46, 1972, pp. 45-109).
- [G] M. GROMOV, *Curvature, diameter and Betti numbers* (*Comm. Math. Helv.*, Vol. 56, 1981, pp. 179-195).

(Manuscrit reçu le 4 décembre 1984,
révisé le 18 février 1985).

Uwe ABRESCH,

Mathematisches Institut der Universität
Bonn,
Berlingstr. 1,
5300 Bonn 1,
West-Germany.