

2. Some concepts of asymptotic geometric analysis

Objektyp: **Chapter**

Zeitschrift: **L'Enseignement Mathématique**

Band (Jahr): **48 (2002)**

Heft 3-4: **L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE**

PDF erstellt am: **21.09.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

theory, cf. papers by Gromov [Gr1], Milman [M2,M3], and some others [A-M,GI,P2,P3,G-P,GI-W]. However, it is safe to say that there is still a long way to go towards the full understanding of the picture.

Here we aim at providing a readable introduction into this circle of ideas.

2. SOME CONCEPTS OF ASYMPTOTIC GEOMETRIC ANALYSIS

DEFINITION 1. A space with metric and measure, or an *mm-space*, is a triple (X, d, μ) , where d is a metric on a set X and μ is a finite Borel measure on the metric space (X, d) . It will be convenient to assume throughout that μ is a probability measure, that is, normalized to one.

DEFINITION 2. The *concentration function* α_X of an *mm-space* $X = (X, d, \mu)$ is defined for non-negative real ε as follows:

$$\alpha_X(\varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \varepsilon = 0, \\ 1 - \inf\{\mu(A_\varepsilon) : A \subseteq X \text{ is Borel, } \mu(A) \geq \frac{1}{2}\} & \text{if } \varepsilon > 0. \end{cases}$$

Here A_ε denotes the ε -neighbourhood (ε -fattening, ε -thickening) of A .

EXERCISE 1. Prove that $\alpha(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$. (For spaces of finite diameter this is of course obvious.)

DEFINITION 3. An infinite family of *mm-spaces*, $(X_n, d_n, \mu_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, is called a *Lévy family* if the concentration functions α_n of X_n converge to zero pointwise on $(0, \infty)$:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \alpha_n(\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

EXERCISE 2. Prove that the above condition is equivalent to the following. Let $A_n \subseteq X_n$ be Borel subsets with the property that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A_n) > 0.$$

Then

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n((A_n)_\varepsilon) = 1.$$

The following are some of the most common examples of Lévy families.

EXAMPLE 1. Unit spheres S^n in the Euclidean spaces \mathbf{R}^{n+1} , equipped with the Euclidean (or geodesic) distances and the normalized Haar measures (that is, the unique rotation-invariant probability measures). This result is due to Paul Lévy [Lév], though his proof, based on the isoperimetric inequality, was only made rigorous much later by Gromov [Gr2]. (Nowadays simpler proofs, using the Brunn–Minkowski inequality, are known, cf. [Gr-M2, Sch].)

EXAMPLE 2. The special orthogonal groups $SO(n)$, equipped with the normalized Haar measure and the uniform operator metric,

$$d(T, S) := \|T - S\|,$$

induced from $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}^n) \cong M_n$. This was established by Gromov and Milman [Gr-M1]. The same argument holds for the special unitary groups.

EXAMPLE 3. The family of finite permutation groups (S_n) , equipped with the uniform (normalized counting) measure and the Hamming distance:

$$d(\sigma, \tau) = \frac{1}{n} |\{i: \sigma(i) \neq \tau(i)\}|.$$

The result is due to Maurey [Ma], see also [Ta1].

EXAMPLE 4. The Hamming cubes $\{0, 1\}^n$ equipped with the normalized counting measure and the Hamming distance $d(x, y) = \frac{1}{n} |\{i: x_i \neq y_i\}|$ form a Lévy family [Sch, M-S].

REMARK 1. All of the above are *normal* Lévy families, meaning that the concentration functions α_n admit Gaussian upper bounds:

$$\alpha_n(\varepsilon) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 n \varepsilon^2)$$

for some $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

It should be noted that this is not always the case for ‘naturally occurring’ Lévy families. For instance, the groups $SL(2, \mathbf{F}_p)$, where p are prime numbers, equipped with the normalized counting measure and the word metric given by a fixed system of generators in $SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$, form a Lévy family with $\alpha_p(\varepsilon) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 \sqrt{p} \varepsilon)$, [A-M, M4]. (Recall in this connection that the n -th prime number $p_n \sim n \log n$.)

REMARK 2. In Example 4, replace $\{0, 1\}$ with any probability measure space, $X = (X, \mu)$. Equip every finite power X^n with the product measure $\mu^{\otimes n}$ and the normalized Hamming distance $d(x, y) = \frac{1}{n} |\{i: x_i \neq y_i\}|$. Unless X is purely atomic, the measures $\mu^{\otimes n}$ are not Borel, and thus X^n aren't even *mm*-spaces in the sense of our definition. At the same time, if in the definition of the concentration function we only restrict ourselves to measurable subsets A such that A_ε are also measurable, it can be shown that $X^n, n \in \mathbf{N}$ form a Lévy family in a very reasonable sense. (See [Ta1, Ta3] for far-reaching variations.) If anything, this shows that the full formalization of the subject has not yet been achieved and nothing is cast in stone.

Notice that the *mm*-spaces from the above Examples 1–4 are at the same time (phase spaces of) topological transformation groups, with both metrics and measures being invariant under group actions. In Example 1 it is the action of the orthogonal — or the unitary — group on the sphere, while in Examples 2–4 the groups act upon themselves on the left.

3. A TRANSFORMATION GROUP FRAMEWORK

Here is the idea of what kind of interaction between concentration phenomenon and group actions one should expect. The following example is borrowed from a paper by Vitali Milman [M4].

Suppose a group G acts on an *mm*-space (X, d, μ) by measure-preserving isometries. Assume that the *mm*-space X strongly concentrates, that is, the function $\alpha_X(\varepsilon)$ drops off sharply already for small values of ε . Let us assume, for instance, that the concentration is so strong that, whenever $\mu(A) \geq \frac{1}{7}$, the measure of the $\frac{1}{10}$ -neighbourhood of A is strictly greater than 0.99. (Cf. Exercise 2.)

If now we partition X into seven pieces, and pick at random one hundred elements $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{100} \in G$, then at least one of the pieces, say A , has the property that all one hundred translates, of $\frac{1}{10}$ -neighbourhoods of A by our elements g_i have a point, x^* , in common. Equivalently, x^* is ‘close’ (closer than $\frac{1}{10}$) to each of the one hundred translates of A .

The above effect becomes more pronounced the higher the level of concentration is. Partition a concentrated (‘high-dimensional’) *mm*-space into a small number of subsets, and at least one of them is hard to move.

In order to set up a formal framework, we assume all topological spaces and topological groups appearing in this article to be metrizable, for the reasons