# ON THE DIFFERENTIABILITY OF HOROCYCLES AND HOROCYCLE FOLIATIONS 
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Consider a surface $S$ with a complete $C^{\infty}$-metric of nonpositive curvature and let $\tilde{S}$ be the universal cover of $S$. Denote by $\gamma_{v}$ the geodesic with initial tangent vector $v$. Unit tangent vectors $v$ and $w$ of $\tilde{S}$ are asymptotic if $\operatorname{dist}\left(\gamma_{v}(t), \gamma_{w}(t)\right)$ is bounded as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Unit vectors of $S$ are asymptotic if they have asymptotic lifts to $\tilde{S}$.

For a unit vector $v \in T_{1} \tilde{S}$ define the Busemann function $b_{v}: \tilde{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
b_{v}(q)=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\left(\operatorname{dist}\left(\gamma_{v}(t), q\right)-t\right)
$$

This function is differentiable and $-\left(\operatorname{grad} b_{v}\right)(q)$ is the unique vector at $q$ asymptotic to $v$. The horocycle $h(v)$ determined by $v$ is the level set $b_{v}^{-1}(0)$. Clearly $h(v)$ is the limit as $R \rightarrow \infty$ of the geodesic circles of radius $R$ centered at $\gamma_{v}(R)$. Let $W(v)$ be the set of vectors $w$ asymptotic to $v$ with footpoints on $h(v)$, i.e.

$$
W(v)=\left\{-\operatorname{grad} b_{v}(q): q \in h(v)\right\} .
$$

The curves $W(v), v \in T_{1} \tilde{S}$, are the leaves of the horocycle foliation $W$ of $T_{1} \tilde{S}$. We project the horocycles from $\tilde{S}$ into $S$ to obtain horocycles for vectors in $T_{1} S$. Similarly we obtain the horocycle foliation of $T_{1} S$ again denoted by $W$.

An important step in E. Hopf's proof of the ergodicity of the geodesic flow on a compact surface $S$ of variable negative curvature was to show that the horocycle foliation of $T_{1} S$ is $C^{1}$. He actually proved [6] that the horocycle foliation is $C^{1}$ under the weaker assumption that the curvature of $S$ has bounded derivative and is uniformly bounded away from 0 and $-\infty$. An immediate consequence is that the horocycles and Busemann functions in $\tilde{S}$

[^0]are $C^{2}$. In fact, since the sets $W(v)$ are the stable manifolds of the geodesic flow, they and hence also the horocycles and Busemann functions are $C^{\infty}$. P. Eberlein showed that horocycles and Busemann functions are $C^{2}$ on any complete simply connected surface of nonpositive curvature (see [5]). It follows easily that $W(v)$ is a $C^{1}$-submanifold of the unit tangent bundle which depends continuously on $v$ in the $C^{1}$-topology. In this paper we construct two examples which show that the above results are in a certain sense sharp.

The first example (see §1) is an analytic rotationally invariant metric of nonpositive curvature on the cylinder $S^{1} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $\gamma=S^{1} \times\{0\}$ is the only closed geodesic. The curvature along $\gamma$ vanishes and is negative elsewhere. We show in Theorem 1.1 that any horocycle $h$ perpendicular to $\gamma$ is not three times differentiable where it crosses $\gamma$. Note that $h \cap\left(S^{1} \times(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\right)$ is completely determined by the geometry of $S^{1} \times(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)=U$. It is easy to construct a compact smooth surface of nonpositive curvature containing a closed geodesic $\gamma^{\prime}$ with a neighborhood isometric to $U_{\varepsilon}$. We see that a horocycle in this surface is not three times differentiable at a point where it intersects $\gamma^{\prime}$ orthogonally. Ya. Pesin (Lemma 2 in [8]) claimed that the horocycles in such a surface would be $C^{r-2}$ if the surface were $C^{r}$. The above example shows that this fails for $r \geqslant 5$.

The second example (see §2) provides complete surfaces of finite volume and pinched negative curvature for which the horocycle foliation is not differentiable or even Hölder continuous. More precisely, let $k(v)<0$ denote the geodesic curvature of the horocycle $h(v)$ at the footpoint of $v$. For any modulus of continuity $m(\cdot)$ (see Definition 2.1 ), we construct a smooth family of complete metrics $g_{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon \geqslant 0$, on the torus with one puncture such that the volume of $g_{\varepsilon}$ is finite, the curvature of $g_{\varepsilon}$ is pinched between $-1-\varepsilon$ and $-1+\varepsilon$, and $g_{\varepsilon}=g_{0}$ outside a fixed neighborhood $D$ of the puncture. In Theorem 2.2 we show that there is a unit vector $v_{0}$ with footpoint outside $D$ such that, for every $m(\cdot)$ and $\varepsilon>0$, the function $k$ has modulus of continuity worse than $m$ at $v_{0}$. A similar construction works on a surface with any number of cusps.

For other results related to the differentiability of horocycles and horocycle foliations see [1], [4], [7], [9].

1. Let $S=S^{1} \times \mathbb{R}$ be the cylinder with the natural coordinates $s \in S^{1}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For any $a>0$ set $Y(t)=1+a t^{4}$. Equip $S$ with the analytic metric

$$
g(s, t)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
Y^{2}(t) & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

Then $(S, g)$ is a surface of revolution with the curves $s=$ const as meridian geodesics. The curve $\gamma: s \rightarrow(s, 0)$ is a closed unit speed geodesic. The Gaussian curvature is given by

$$
K(s, t)=-\frac{Y^{\prime \prime}(t)}{Y(t)}=-\frac{12 a t^{2}}{1+a t^{4}}
$$

Note that the curvature is negative except on $\gamma$, where it vanishes. Fix an orientation for $\gamma$ and let $V$ be the field of unit vectors negatively asymptotic to $\gamma$.
1.1. Theorem. (i) The vector field $V$ has no second derivatives in the $t$ direction at any point on $\gamma$.
(ii) Let $b(\cdot)$ be a Busemann function in the universal cover of $S$ determined by the lift $\tilde{\gamma}$ of $\gamma$. Then b has no third derivative in the $t$-direction at any point of $\tilde{\gamma}$.
(iii) Any horocycle in $S$ orthogonal to the geodesic $\gamma$ has no third derivative at the point where it intersects $\gamma$.

Proof. Assertions (ii) and (iii) follow easily from (i) which we now prove.
By the rotational symmetry, the oriented angle between $(\partial / \partial s)(s, t)$ and $V(s, t)$ does not depend on $s$. We denote it by $\alpha(t)$. Since $K<0$ except on $\gamma$ we have with proper orientation that $t \cdot \alpha(t)>0$ for $t \neq 0$.

Let $\sigma(\tau)=(s(\tau), t(\tau))$ be a geodesic in $S$ negatively asymptotic to $\gamma$. The Killing field $Y(t) \cdot \partial / \partial s$ gives rise to the Clairaut integral

$$
\langle\dot{\sigma}(\tau), Y(t(\tau)) \cdot \partial / \partial s\rangle=Y(t) \cdot \cos \alpha(t) \equiv \text { const. }
$$

However,

$$
\lim _{\tau \rightarrow-\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\dot{\sigma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(\tau))=0
$$

for otherwise $\gamma$ would bound a flat strip (cf. Proposition 5.1 in [3]). Hence

$$
Y(t) \cdot \cos \alpha(t) \equiv 1
$$

Since the function $\alpha$ is odd,

$$
\alpha(t)=\operatorname{sign} t \cdot \arccos \frac{1}{1+a t^{4}}, \quad t \neq 0
$$

and $\alpha(0)=0$. A simple calculation shows that $\alpha^{\prime}(0)=0$ and

$$
\lim _{t \geqslant 0} \frac{\alpha^{\prime}(t)}{t}=\sqrt{8 a} \quad \text { and } \quad \lim _{t>0} \frac{\alpha^{\prime}(t)}{t}=-\sqrt{8 a} .
$$

In particular, $\alpha$ has no second derivative at 0 , which proves assertion (i).
2. We start with an explicit construction of a hyperbolic metric on the punctured torus. Consider the region $R$ in the hyperbolic plane $H$ shown shaded in Figure 1. It is bounded by the vertical geodesics passing through the points 0 and $1 / 2$ and by the circles of radius $\sqrt{2} / 8$ centered at the points 0 ,
$1 / 4$, and $1 / 2$. Let $R^{\prime}$ be the reflection of $R$ with respect to the imaginary axis. Identify the geodesics bounding $R \cup R^{\prime}$ as indicated in Figure 1 to obtain a hyperbolic surface with one cusp and two boundary circles. Now glue together the boundary circles. This produces a hyperbolic surface ( $S, g$ ) diffeomorphic to a punctured torus. The horizontal line passing through the point $i$ in Figure 1 gives rise to a horocycle $h$ of length 1 in $S$ which bounds the cusp $D$ (see Figure 2).
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2.1. Definition. If $X$ is a metric space and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, then the modulus of continuity of $f$ at $x \in X$ is defined by

$$
m_{f, x}(\delta)=\sup \left\{\left|f(x)-f\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right|: \operatorname{dist}\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)<\delta\right\}
$$

2.2. Theorem. Let $(S, g)$ be the hyperbolic surface constructed above and let $v_{0}$ be a unit normal to the horocycle $h$ that points into D. Suppose $m: \mathbb{R}^{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{+}$is a continuous monotone function for which $m(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

Then there is a smooth 1-parameter family of $C^{\infty}$-metrics $g_{\varepsilon}, 0 \leqslant \varepsilon<1 / 10$, on $S$ such that $g_{0}=g$ and for each $\varepsilon$ :
(i) $g_{\varepsilon}=g$ on the l-neighborhood of $S \backslash D$;
(ii) the curvature $K_{\varepsilon}$ of $g_{\varepsilon}$ satisfies

$$
-1-\varepsilon \leqslant K_{\varepsilon} \leqslant-1+\varepsilon ;
$$

(iii) there is a smooth curve of unit vectors $v_{\delta}$ starting at $v_{0}$ such that $v_{\delta} \neq v_{0}$ for $\delta>0$ and

$$
\left|k\left(v_{\delta}\right)-k\left(v_{0}\right)\right| \geqslant m\left(\operatorname{dist}\left(v_{\delta}, v_{0}\right)\right),
$$

where $k(v)$ is the geodesic curvature of the horocycle $h(v)$ defined in the introduction.

Proof. Let $\gamma$ be the geodesic ray with $\dot{\gamma}(-2)=v_{0}$ and $\sigma$ be the geodesic ray opposite to $\gamma$ in $D$ (see Figure 2). Cut the cusp $D$ along $\sigma$ to obtain the region in the hyperbolic plane shown in Figure 3. The geodesic rays $\sigma^{-}$and $\sigma^{+}$are asymptotic. Consider Fermi coordinates ( $s, t$ ) along $\gamma$ so that $(0,0)=\gamma(0), t$ is


Figure 3
the arclength along $\gamma$, and the curves $t=$ const are unit speed geodesics perpendicular to $\gamma$.

Suppose $m(\delta)$ is defined if $0 \leqslant \delta<\delta_{0}, \delta_{0}>0$. By increasing $m(\delta)$ if necessary, we can assume without loss of generality that $m(\cdot)$ is $C^{\infty}$ except at 0 and that $m(\delta) \geqslant \delta$. Let $M(\delta)=\sqrt{m(10 \delta)}$. For $\delta \in\left(0, \delta_{0}\right]$ set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(\delta)=-\frac{1}{4} \ln M(\delta) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $\varphi$ is monotone and $\varphi(\delta) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. For $t \geqslant-\frac{1}{8} \ln M\left(\delta_{0}\right)$ define

$$
f_{0}(t)=\frac{1}{3} \varphi^{-1}(2 t) e^{t / 2}
$$

Since $M(\delta) \geqslant \delta$, (2.1) implies that $f_{0}(t) \leqslant e^{-16 t} / 30, t \geqslant 0$, and hence $f_{0}$ decreases faster than the distance between $\gamma$ and $\sigma^{+}$or $\sigma^{-}$. Therefore there exists a monotone $C^{\infty}$-function $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow(0,1)$ with the following properties:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { there is } t_{0}>0 \text { such that } f(t)=\frac{1}{3} \varphi^{-1}(2 t) e^{t / 2} \text { for } t \geqslant t_{0} \text { : } \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$ the points $( \pm f(t), t), t \geqslant-1 / 2$, are in the region bounded by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{+}$and the horocycle $\tilde{h}$ shown in Figure 3.

Let $q: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow[0,1]$ be a monotone $C^{\infty}$-function such that $q(t)=0$ if $t \leqslant-1 / 2$, and $q(t)=1$ for $t \geqslant 0$. Choose an even $C^{\infty}$-function $a: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow[0,1 / 2]$ such that $a(0)=0, a^{\prime \prime}(0)=1,-1 / 2 \leqslant a^{\prime \prime}(x) \leqslant 1$ for all $x$, and $a(x)=0$ if $|x| \geqslant 1$.

In the ( $s, t$ )-coordinates, the hyperbolic metric $g$ is given by

$$
g(s, t)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
0 & \cosh ^{2} s
\end{array}\right)
$$

Consider the one-parameter family of metrics

$$
g_{\varepsilon}(s, t)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
0 & Y^{2}(s, t)
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
Y(s, t)=\cosh s+\varepsilon \cdot q(t) \cdot a\left(\frac{s}{f(t)}\right) \cdot f^{2}(t)
$$

Note that $g_{0}=g$ and the curves $s \rightarrow(s, t)$ are unit speed geodesics with variation field $Y$ for any $\varepsilon \geqslant 0$. By our choice of $a, q$, and $f$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{\varepsilon}(s, t)=g_{0}(s, t) \quad \text { for } t \leqslant-1 / 2 \text { or }|s| \geqslant f(t) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, by (2.3), $\sigma^{-}$and $\sigma^{+}$remain asymptotic geodesics and the metrics $g_{\varepsilon}$ give rise to a one-parameter family of metrics on $S$ which satisfies statement (i) of the theorem. Part (a) of the following lemma shows that (ii) holds.
2.3. Lemma. (a) $-1-\varepsilon \leqslant K_{\varepsilon}(s, t) \leqslant-1+\varepsilon$;
(b) $K_{\epsilon}(0, t)=-1-\varepsilon$ for $t \geqslant 0$.

Proof. By the Jacobi equation,

$$
-K_{\varepsilon}(s, t)=\frac{1}{Y} \frac{\partial^{2} Y}{\partial s^{2}}=\frac{\cosh s+\varepsilon \cdot q(t) \cdot a^{\prime \prime}(s / f(t))}{\cosh s+\varepsilon \cdot q(t) \cdot a(s / f(t)) \cdot f^{2}(t)} .
$$

The left inequality in (a) holds, since

$$
\begin{aligned}
-K_{\varepsilon}(s, t) & \leqslant \frac{\cosh s+\varepsilon \cdot q(t) \cdot a^{\prime \prime}(s / f(t))}{\cosh s} \\
& \leqslant 1+\varepsilon \cdot q(t) \cdot a^{\prime \prime}\left(\frac{s}{f(t)}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $f(t)<1$,

$$
-K_{\varepsilon}(s, t) \geqslant \frac{\cosh s-\varepsilon / 2}{\cosh s+\varepsilon / 2} \geqslant 1-\varepsilon .
$$

This proves (a). To prove (b) note that $a(0)=0$ and $a^{\prime \prime}(0)=1$. q.e.d.
Let $w_{\delta}$ be the unit vector with footpoint at $\gamma(0)=(0,0)$ which makes the angle $\delta>0$ with $\dot{\gamma}(0)=w_{0}$ (see Figure 4). Denote by $\gamma_{\delta}$ the geodesic with initial velocity $w_{\delta}$. Let $\gamma_{\delta}(\tau(\delta))$ and $\gamma_{\delta}(T(\delta))$ be the points where $\gamma_{\delta}$ intersects the curves $s=f(t)$ and $\sigma^{+}$respectively.
2.4. Lemma. Suppose the right triangle shown in Figure 5 lies in a simply connected surface with curvature pinched between $-1-\varepsilon$ and $-1+\varepsilon$. If d and $\delta$ are small enough and $t$ is large enough, then

$$
\frac{1}{3} e^{\sqrt{1-\varepsilon} t} \delta \leqslant d \leqslant 2 e^{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} t} \delta
$$
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Proof. By comparing with the surfaces of constant curvature $-1-\varepsilon$ and $-1+\varepsilon$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tanh \sqrt{1-\varepsilon} d \geqslant \sinh \sqrt{1-\varepsilon} t \cdot \tan \delta, \\
& \tanh \sqrt{1+\varepsilon} d \leqslant \sinh \sqrt{1+\varepsilon} t \cdot \tan \delta .
\end{aligned}
$$

2.5. Lemma. If $\delta$ is small enough, then $T(\delta) \geqslant-\frac{1}{3} \ln \delta-2$.

Proof. Parametrize $\sigma^{+}$by arclength so that $\operatorname{dist}\left(\gamma(t), \sigma^{+}(t)\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that $h$ has length 1 . By comparing with a surface of constant curvature $-1-\varepsilon$, we see that the arc of the horocycle connecting $\gamma(t)$ and $\sigma^{+}(t)$ has length at least $\frac{1}{2} e^{-\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}(2+t)}$. Let $b(t)$ be the length of the geodesic segment $s \rightarrow(s, t)$ between $\gamma$ and $\sigma^{+}$. Since the curvature is uniformly bounded, small enough pieces of horocycles are uniformly $C^{1}$-approximated by geodesic segments. Hence for $t$ large enough

$$
\begin{equation*}
b(t) \geqslant \frac{1}{4} e^{-\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}(2+t)} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote by $t(\delta)$ the $t$-coordinate of $\gamma_{\delta}(T(\delta))$ in the $(s, t)$-coordinates. By Lemma 2.4 and (2.5), we have

$$
t(\delta) \geqslant-\frac{\ln \left(8 \delta e^{2 \sqrt{1+\varepsilon}}\right)}{2 \sqrt{1+\varepsilon}} \geqslant-\frac{1}{3} \ln \delta-2 .
$$

Since the curvature is negative, $T(\delta) \geqslant t(\delta)$.
2.6. Lemma. If $\delta$ is small enough, then $\tau(\delta) \leqslant \varphi(\delta)$.

Proof. Let $\theta(\delta)$ be the $t$-coordinate of $\gamma_{\delta}(\tau(\delta))$ (see Figure 4). By Lemma 2.4,

$$
f(\theta(\delta)) \geqslant \frac{1}{3} e^{\sqrt{1-\varepsilon} \theta(\delta)} \delta,
$$

and so by (2.2),


Figure 5

Since $\varphi$ is decreasing, $\varphi(\delta) \geqslant 2 \theta(\delta)$. Note now that $\tau(\delta) \leqslant \theta(\delta)+f(\theta(\delta)) \leqslant$ $2 \theta(\delta)$ for $\delta$ small enough. q.e.d.

Now we are ready to prove (iii). Consider the Riccati equation

$$
u^{\prime}+u^{2}+K\left(\gamma_{v}(t)\right)=0
$$

Since the curvature is negative, there are solutions of this equation that are defined for all $t$. Let $u^{-}(v, \cdot)$ be the smallest and $u^{+}(v, \cdot)$ the largest such solutions. Recall that the curvature $k(v)$ of the horocycle $h(v)$ is $u^{-}(v, 0)$ (cf. [2]).

The solution of the initial value problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{\kappa}^{\prime}+u_{\kappa}^{2}-\kappa^{2}=0, \quad u_{\kappa}(0)=\lambda, \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{\kappa}(t)=\kappa \frac{\lambda \cdot \cosh (\kappa t)+\kappa \cdot \sinh (\kappa t)}{\lambda \cdot \sinh (\kappa t)+\kappa \cdot \cosh (\kappa t)} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

By assumption, $M(\delta) \geqslant \delta$. Therefore, by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6,

$$
\begin{align*}
T(\delta)-\tau(\delta) & \geqslant-\frac{1}{3} \ln \delta-2-\varphi(\delta)  \tag{2.8}\\
& \geqslant-\frac{1}{3} \ln \delta-2+\frac{1}{4} \ln M(\delta) \geqslant-\frac{1}{12} \ln \delta-2
\end{align*}
$$

Let $v=-\dot{\gamma}_{\delta}(T(\delta))$ (see Figure 4). Since $K_{\varepsilon} \geqslant-1-\varepsilon$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{+}(v, 0) \leqslant \sqrt{1+\varepsilon} . \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, if $u$ is a solution of the Riccati equation $u^{\prime}+u^{2}+K_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma_{v}(t)\right)=0$ with $u\left(t_{0}\right)>\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}$ for some $t_{0}$, then $u(t) \rightarrow \infty$ in finite times as $t$ decreases from $t_{0}$.

By construction, $K_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma_{\delta}(t)\right)=-1$ for $\tau(\delta) \leqslant t \leqslant T(\delta)$. Hence, using (2.7) with $\kappa=1$, (2.8), and (2.9) we get

$$
u^{+}(v, T(\delta)-\tau(\delta)) \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \cdot \cosh \theta+\sinh \theta}{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \cdot \sinh \theta+\cosh \theta}
$$

where $\theta=-\frac{1}{12} \ln \delta-2$. Therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
u^{+}(v, T(\delta)-\tau(\delta))-1 & \leqslant \frac{(\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}-1) e^{-\theta}}{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \cdot \sinh \theta+\cosh \theta}  \tag{2.10}\\
& \leqslant(\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}-1) e^{-\theta} \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{10}
\end{align*}
$$

if $\delta>0$ is sufficiently small.
Our estimates on the solutions of the Riccati equation will use the following lemma.
2.7. Comparison Lemma. Let $u_{i}(t), i=0,1$, be the solutions of the initial value problems

$$
u_{i}^{\prime}+u_{i}^{2}+K_{i}(t)=0, \quad u_{i}(0)=\lambda_{i}, \quad i=0,1
$$

Suppose $\lambda_{1} \geqslant \lambda_{0}, K_{1}(t) \leqslant K_{0}(t)$ for $t \in\left[0, t_{0}\right]$, and $u_{0}\left(t_{0}\right)$ is defined. Then

$$
u_{1}(t) \geqslant u_{0}(t) \quad \text { for } t \in\left[0, t_{0}\right]
$$

Proof. The difference $\Delta u(t)=u_{1}(t)-u_{0}(t)$ satisfies the linear equation

$$
\Delta u^{\prime}=-\left(u_{0}+u_{1}\right) \Delta u+K_{0}(t)-K_{1}(t) . \quad \text { q.e.d. }
$$

Now we estimate $u^{+}(v, T(\delta))=-u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right)$. Since $K_{\varepsilon} \geqslant-1-\varepsilon$ everywhere, we can use Lemma 2.7 to compare $u^{+}(v, t), T(\delta)-\tau(\delta) \leqslant t \leqslant T(\delta)$, with the solution $u_{\kappa}$ of (2.6) with $\kappa=\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}$ and $\lambda=1+\varepsilon / 10$. By Lemma (2.6), (2.7), and (2.10) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
-u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right) & =u^{+}(v, T(\delta)) \leqslant u_{\kappa}(\tau(\delta)) \leqslant u_{\kappa}(\varphi(\delta)) \\
& =\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \frac{(1+\varepsilon / 10) \cosh \eta+\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \sinh \eta}{(1+\varepsilon / 10) \sinh \eta+\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \cosh \eta},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\eta=\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \cdot \varphi(\delta)$. Note that $u^{-}\left(w_{0}, 0\right)=-\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}$, by Lemma 2.3(b). Therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right)-u^{-}\left(w_{0}, 0\right)\right| & =\left|\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}+u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right)\right| \\
& \geqslant \sqrt{1+\varepsilon} \frac{(\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}-1-\varepsilon / 10) e^{-\eta}}{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} e^{\eta}}  \tag{2.11}\\
& =\left(\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}-1-\frac{\varepsilon}{10}\right) e^{-2 \sqrt{1+\varepsilon \varphi(\delta)}} \\
& \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{5} e^{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} / 2 \cdot \ln M(\delta)} \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{5} M(\delta)
\end{align*}
$$

provided $M(\delta)<1$. This shows that $k(\cdot)=u^{-}(\cdot, 0)$ fails to have modulus of continuity $m$ at $w_{0}$. However the footpoint of $w_{0}$ lies in the region where the metric $g$ was changed to obtain $g_{\varepsilon}$.

Let $v_{\delta}=\dot{\gamma}_{\delta}(-2)$. Since $-1-\varepsilon \leqslant K_{\varepsilon}<0$, the norm of the differential of the time 2 map for the geodesic flow of $g_{\varepsilon}$ is bounded by $e^{2+\varepsilon} \leqslant 10$ (see e.g. Lemma 5.1 in [2]). Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(v_{\delta}, v_{0}\right) \leqslant 10 \operatorname{dist}\left(w_{\delta}, w_{0}\right)=10 \delta . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a unit vector $w$ of the metric $g_{\varepsilon}$ and a number $\lambda \leqslant 0$ denote by $\psi(w, \lambda)$ the value at $t=-2$ of the solution of the initial value problem

$$
u^{\prime}+u^{2}+K\left(\gamma_{w}(t)\right)=0, \quad u(0)=\lambda
$$

Consider the map $\Psi: T_{1} S \times[-2,0] \rightarrow T_{1} S \times[-2,0]$ given by

$$
\Psi(w, \lambda)=\left(\dot{\gamma}_{w}(-2), \psi(w, \lambda)\right)
$$

Equip $T_{1} S \times[-2,0]$ with the product metric. Since $\Psi$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image and all of the vectors $w_{\delta}$ are in the same compact fiber of $T_{1} S$, there is a constant $c>0$ such that for all $\lambda, \lambda_{0} \in[-2,0]$
(2.13) $\operatorname{dist}\left(\Psi\left(w_{\delta}, \lambda\right), \Psi\left(w_{0}, \lambda_{0}\right)\right) \geqslant c \cdot \operatorname{dist}\left(\left(w_{\delta}, \lambda\right),\left(w_{0}, \lambda_{0}\right)\right)$.

Now by the triangle inequality,

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(\left(w_{\delta}, \lambda\right),\left(w_{0}, \lambda_{0}\right)\right) \geqslant \operatorname{dist}\left(w_{\delta}, w_{0}\right)
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dist}\left(\Psi\left(w_{\delta}, \lambda\right), \Psi\left(w_{0}, \lambda_{0}\right)\right) & \leqslant \operatorname{dist}\left(\dot{\gamma}_{\delta}(-2), \dot{\gamma}_{0}(-2)\right)+\left|\psi\left(w_{\delta}, \lambda\right)-\psi\left(w_{0}, \lambda_{0}\right)\right| \\
& \leqslant 10 \operatorname{dist}\left(w_{\delta}, w_{0}\right)+\left|\psi\left(w_{\delta}, \lambda\right)-\psi\left(w_{0}, \lambda_{0}\right)\right|
\end{aligned}
$$

by (2.12). Since $u^{-}\left(v_{\delta}, 0\right)=\psi\left(w_{\delta}, u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right)\right)$, it follows from (2.13) and (2.11) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|u^{-}\left(v_{\delta}, 0\right)-u^{-}\left(v_{0}, 0\right)\right| \\
& \quad \geqslant c \cdot \operatorname{dist}\left(\left(w_{\delta}, u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right)\right),\left(w_{0}, u^{-}\left(w_{0}, 0\right)\right)\right)-10 \operatorname{dist}\left(w_{\delta}, w_{0}\right) \\
& \quad \geqslant c\left|u^{-}\left(w_{\delta}, 0\right)-u^{-}\left(w_{0}, 0\right)\right|-10 \operatorname{dist}\left(w_{\delta}, w_{0}\right) \geqslant c \frac{\varepsilon}{5} M(\delta)-10 \delta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall that $M(\delta)=\sqrt{m(10 \delta)} \geqslant \sqrt{10 \delta}$, and so for any small enough $\delta$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|u^{-}\left(v_{\delta}, 0\right)-u^{-}\left(v_{0}, 0\right)\right| & \geqslant c \frac{\varepsilon}{5} \sqrt{m(10 \delta)}-10 \delta \geqslant m(10 \delta) \\
& \geqslant m\left(\operatorname{dist}\left(v_{\delta}, v_{0}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

by (2.12). This completes the proof of the theorem.
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