

Riemannian distances are locally equivalent

Bart Michels*

May 18, 2019

Version of April 8, 2020

Contents

1	Equivalence of norms	2
2	The radius of compactness	3
3	Equivalence of distances	5
4	Submanifolds	6
5	Covering maps	8

*Université Sorbonne Paris Nord, LAGA, CNRS, UMR 7539, F-93430, Villetaneuse, France. Email: michels@math.univ-paris13.fr

All manifolds and submanifolds are assumed to be smooth and connected.

1 Equivalence of norms

Proposition 1.1. *Let V be an n -dimensional real vector space with norms $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_2$. Let (e_i) be a basis of V . Then*

$$\|v\|_1 \leq \frac{n \cdot \max_i \|e_i\|_1}{\min_{\|w\|_\infty=1} \|w\|_2} \cdot \|v\|_2$$

for all $v \in V$, where the sup-norm is w.r.t. the basis (e_i) .

Proof. We have

$$\left\| \sum a_i e_i \right\|_1 \leq n \cdot \max_i \|e_i\|_1 \cdot \left\| \sum a_i e_i \right\|_\infty$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_2 &= \left\| \frac{v}{\|v\|_\infty} \right\|_2 \cdot \|v\|_\infty \\ &\geq \min_{\|w\|_\infty=1} \|w\|_2 \cdot \|v\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

where $\min_{\|w\|_\infty=1} \|w\|_2 > 0$ because the unit sphere for the norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is compact (closed and bounded). \square

Proposition 1.2. *Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension n and g_1, g_2 Riemannian metrics on M . Let $K \subset M$ be compact. Then there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in K$ and $v \in T_x M$ we have*

$$c_1 \|v\|_2 \leq \|v\|_1 \leq c_2 \|v\|_2.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that every $x \in M$ has a neighborhood U for which there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that the above inequalities hold for all $y \in U$, $v \in T_y M$. Fix $x \in M$ and let U_0 be a coordinate neighborhood of x , so that there exists a chart $\phi : U_0 \rightarrow V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and the partial derivatives $(\partial/\partial\phi_i)|_y$ form a smooth basis of $T_y M$ for $y \in U_0$. Define the sup-norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ in $T_y M$ w.r.t. this basis. Let $U \subset U_0$ be relatively compact in U_0 . Then by Proposition 1.1,

$$\|v\|_1 \leq \frac{n \cdot \max_i \|(\partial/\partial\phi_i)|_y\|_1}{\min_{\|w\|_\infty=1} \|w\|_2} \|v\|_2$$

for $y \in U$, $v \in T_y M$, so we can take

$$c_2 = \frac{n \cdot \sup_{y \in U} \max_i \|(\partial/\partial\phi_i)|_y\|_1}{\inf_{y \in U} \min_{\|w\|_\infty=1} \|w\|_2}.$$

The other inequality follows by symmetry. \square

2 The radius of compactness

This section introduces the notion of *radius of compactness*. This is not strictly necessary for the sequel, but it is a neat notion with some nice properties, and gives an excuse to review some standard facts from topology that will be used without reference in the next sections. When M is a metric space and $x \in M$, denote

$$\overline{B}(x, R) = \{y \in M : d(x, y) \leq R\}$$

for the closed ball of radius R centered at x .

Definition 2.1. Let M be a metric space and $x \in M$. Define the radius of compactness of x by

$$\text{RC}(x) := \sup\{R \geq 0 : \overline{B}(x, R) \text{ is compact}\} \in [0, \infty].$$

Proposition 2.2. Let M be a metric space.

1. Either $\text{RC}(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in M$, or $|\text{RC}(y) - \text{RC}(x)| \leq d(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in M$.
2. RC is continuous for the order topology on $[0, \infty]$.

Proof. 1. We show that $\text{RC}(y) \leq \text{RC}(x) + d(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in M$, from which both statements follow. (Here $\infty + a = \infty$ for all $a \in [0, \infty]$.) Suppose $\text{RC}(y) > \text{RC}(x) + d(x, y)$. Then there exists a closed compact ball of radius strictly larger than $\text{RC}(x) + d(x, y)$ centered at y . But this ball contains a ball of radius strictly larger than $\text{RC}(x)$ centered at x . Contradiction.

2. It is either constant and equal to ∞ , or real-valued and Lipschitz, hence continuous. \square

Remark 2.3. A metric space is called *proper* or *ball-compact* when $\text{RC}(x) = \infty$ for one (hence every) $x \in M$. Equivalently, when its closed and bounded subsets are compact.

Proposition 2.4. Let M be a metric space and $K \subset M$ compact.

1. If M is locally compact, there exists $R > 0$ such that $\overline{B}(x, R)$ is compact for all $x \in K$.
2. If R is as above and $r < R$, then

$$\overline{B}(K, r) := \bigcup_{x \in K} \overline{B}(x, r)$$

is compact.

Proof. 1. Because K is compact, so is $\text{RC}(K)$. Because M is locally compact, $0 \notin \text{RC}(K)$. Because $\text{RC}(K)$ is closed, there exists $R > 0$ such that $\text{RC}(x) > R$ for all $x \in K$.

2. We show that $\overline{B}(K, r)$ is complete and totally bounded. Complete: Let (x_n) be a Cauchy sequence in $\overline{B}(K, r)$. There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d(x_n, x_m) \leq R - r$ for all $m, n \geq N$. If $x \in K$ is such that $x_N \in \overline{B}(x, r)$, then the sequence (x_n) is eventually contained in the compact set $\overline{B}(x, R)$. In particular, (x_n) converges in $\overline{B}(x, R)$. Because $\overline{B}(K, r)$ is closed in M , the limit point lies in $\overline{B}(K, r)$.

Totally bounded: We can cover the compact set K by finitely many open balls of radius $R - r$, say centered at x_1, \dots, x_N . Let $\epsilon > 0$. We can cover each of the compact balls $\overline{B}(x_i, R)$ by finitely many balls of radius ϵ . We have then covered all the balls $\overline{B}(x, r)$ for $x \in K$. Thus $\overline{B}(K, r)$ is totally bounded. \square

This leads us to define:

Definition 2.5. Let M be a metric space and $K \subset M$ compact. Define the radius of compactness

$$\text{RC}(K) := \sup\{R \geq 0 : \overline{B}(K, R) \text{ is compact}\} \in [0, \infty].$$

From Proposition 2.4 it follows that

$$\text{RC}(K) = \min_{x \in K} \text{RC}(x).$$

In general, the set $\overline{B}(K, \text{RC}(K))$ may or may not be compact:

- Example 2.6.**
1. Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval and $x \in M$. Then $\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x))$ is not compact.
 2. Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ consist of an open ball and one isolated point x . Then $\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x)) = \{x\}$ is compact.
 3. Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ consist of the points $(1/n, 0)$ and $(1/n, 1)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and the point $(0, 0)$. Let $K = M \cap \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$. Then $\text{RC}(0, 0) = 1$ and $\overline{B}(x, 1)$ is compact for all $x \in K$, so that $\text{RC}(K) = 1$. We have that $\overline{B}(K, 1)$ is totally bounded but not complete.
 4. Let $M \subset \mathbb{R} \times \ell_\infty(\mathbb{R})$ (with the sup distance) consist of the points $(1/n, 0)$ and $(1/n, e_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, and the point $(0, 0)$. Here, e_n is the sequence with a 1 at position n and 0 elsewhere. Let $K = M \cap (\mathbb{R} \times \{0\})$. Then $\text{RC}(0, 0) = 1$ and $\overline{B}(x, 1)$ is compact for all $x \in K$, so that $\text{RC}(K) = 1$. We have that $\overline{B}(K, 1)$ is complete but not totally bounded.
 5. Take the product of the previous two examples, equipped with the sup-distance. Then $\overline{B}(x, 1)$ is compact for all $x \in K$ and $\text{RC}(K) = 1$. We have that $\overline{B}(K, 1)$ is neither complete nor totally bounded.

We will not need this, but to be complete, we state a sufficient condition for $\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x))$ to be non-compact.

Proposition 2.7. *Let M be a locally compact metric space such that for all $x \in M$ and $R, r > 0$ we have*

$$\overline{B}(x, R + r) = \overline{B}(\overline{B}(x, R), r)$$

(E.g. when M is a complete Riemannian manifold with its Riemannian distance.) *Let $x \in M$ and $K \subset M$ compact.*

1. *If $\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x))$ is compact, then $\text{RC}(x) = \infty$.*
2. *If $\overline{B}(K, \text{RC}(K))$ is compact, then $\text{RC}(K) = \infty$.*

Proof. 1. Suppose $\text{RC}(x) < \infty$ and $\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x))$ is compact. By Proposition 2.4, there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\overline{B}(\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x)), r) = \overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x) + r)$$

is compact. This contradicts the maximality of $\text{RC}(x)$.

2. Because $\text{RC}(K) = \min_{x \in K} \text{RC}(x)$, there exists $x \in K$ such that $\overline{B}(x, \text{RC}(x))$ is compact. By the first part, we have $\text{RC}(K) = \infty$. \square

3 Equivalence of distances

Proposition 3.1. *Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension n and g_1, g_2 Riemannian metrics on M . Let $K \subset M$ be compact. Then there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $x_1, x_2 \in K$ we have*

$$c_1 d_2(x_1, x_2) \leq d_1(x_1, x_2) \leq c_2 d_2(x_1, x_2).$$

Proof. We show the right inequality; the left follows by symmetry. By Proposition 2.4, there exists $r > 0$ such that $K' = \overline{B}_2(K, r)$ is compact. First note that for points with $d_2(x_1, x_2) \geq r$ we can take

$$c_2 = \max_{x_1, x_2 \in K} d_1(x_1, x_2) / r.$$

We may thus assume that $d_2(x_1, x_2) \leq r$. Let $0 < \epsilon \leq r$ and $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a piecewise smooth regular curve joining x_1 and x_2 , with $\text{length}_2(\gamma) \leq d_2(x_1, x_2) + \epsilon \leq 2r$. Then the image of γ must lie in K' . Let c'_2 be the constant from Proposition 1.2, applied to the compact set K' . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length}_1(\gamma) &= \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\|_1 dt \\ &\leq c'_2 \int_0^1 \|\gamma'(t)\|_2 dt \\ &= c'_2 \cdot \text{length}_2(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

so that $d_1(x_1, x_2) \leq c'_2(d_2(x_1, x_2) + \epsilon)$. Taking $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small, it follows that $d_1(x_1, x_2) \leq c'_2 d_2(x_1, x_2)$. We can thus take

$$c_2 = \max(c'_2, \max_{x_1, x_2 \in K} d_1(x_1, x_2) / r). \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension n and g_1, g_2 Riemannian metrics on M . Let $K \subset M$ be compact and $S \subset M$ nonempty. Then there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in K$ we have*

$$c_1 d_2(x, S) \leq d_1(x, S) \leq c_2 d_2(x, S).$$

Proof. Again, we limit ourselves to the left inequality. Let $r > 0$ be such that $K' = \overline{B}_2(K, 2r)$ is compact. For points with $d_2(x, S) \geq r$, we can take $c_2 = \max_{x \in K} d_1(x, S)/r$. Take $x \in K$ with $d_2(x, S) \leq r$. Let $0 < \epsilon \leq r$ and let $s \in S$ such that $d_2(x, s) \leq d_2(x, S) + \epsilon \leq 2r$. Then $s \in K'$. Let c'_2 be the constant from Proposition 3.1 applied to the compact set K' . Then

$$d_1(x, S) \leq d_1(x, s) \leq c'_2 d_2(x, s) \leq c'_2 (d_2(x, S) + \epsilon).$$

Taking $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small, the conclusion follows with

$$c_2 = \max(c'_2, \max_{x \in K} d_1(x, S)/r). \quad \square$$

Remark 3.3. The proofs of Proposition 3.1 and 3.2 simplify when we assume that d_1 and d_2 are complete: by Hopf–Rinow, the compactness of K then implies the compactness of $\overline{B}_2(K, r)$ for all $r \geq 0$.

Example 3.4. 1. Let G be a real Lie group with a Riemannian distance and $U \subset \mathfrak{g} = T_e G$ such that $\exp : U \rightarrow G$ is a diffeomorphism on its image. Equip \mathfrak{g} with a norm. Then for $K \subset U$ compact and $X, Y \in K$,

$$d_G(e^X, e^Y) \asymp \|X - Y\|,$$

by Proposition 3.1 applied to the metric on G and the pushforward of a Euclidean metric on \mathfrak{g} by \exp .

2. Let M, N be smooth manifolds and equip M, N and $M \times N$ with Riemannian metrics $g_M, g_N, g_{M \times N}$. Let $K \subset M \times N$ be compact. Then for $(x_M, x_N), (y_M, y_N) \in K$,

$$d_{M \times N}(x, y) \asymp d_M(x_M, y_M) + d_N(x_N, y_N),$$

by Proposition 3.1 applied to the metric $g_{M \times N}$ and $g_M \times g_N$.

4 Submanifolds

Lemma 4.1. *Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a smooth submanifold, equipped with a Riemannian metric g . Consider the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^n . Let $K \subset M$ be compact. Then*

$$d_g(x, y) \asymp_K \|x - y\|$$

for $x, y \in K$.

Proof. One estimate is immediate: Consider the restriction $g_{\text{Eucl}}|_M$ of the Euclidean metric. We have

$$d_{g_{\text{Eucl}}|_M}(x, y) \geq d_{g_{\text{Eucl}}}(x, y) = \|x - y\|$$

and Proposition 3.1 implies $d_g(x, y) \asymp d_{g_{\text{Eucl}}|_M}(x, y)$. Hence

$$d_g(x, y) \gg \|x - y\|$$

We now prove the reverse estimate. Let $m = \dim M$. Every $x \in M$ has an open neighborhood U for which there exists an open set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a diffeomorphism $\phi: V \rightarrow W \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $V \cap M = U$ and $\phi(U) = W \cap (\mathbb{R}^m \times \{0\})$. We may assume that $\phi(U)$ is convex. We may choose an open neighborhood $U' \subset U$ of x , relatively compact in U and such that for $y, z \in U'$ there exists a geodesic of length $d_g(y, z)$ contained in U . We may assume that the convex closure of U' in \mathbb{R}^n is contained in V and relatively compact in V . Among those U' we may extract a finite cover of K . By the Lebesgue covering lemma, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that when $x, y \in K$ with $d_g(x, y) \leq \delta$, there exists an open set U' of the cover such that $x, y \in U'$. We restrict our attention to $x, y \in K$ with $d_g(x, y) \leq \delta$. For the other points, we may take the implicit constant

$$\max_{\substack{x, y \in K \\ d_g(x, y) \geq \delta}} \frac{d_g(x, y)}{\|x - y\|}.$$

Now take ϕ and $U' \subset U$ as above with $x, y \in U'$. Consider the pushforward $\phi_*(g|_{U'})$ and the Euclidean metric $g_{\text{Eucl}}|_{\phi(U')}$ on $\phi(U')$. By Proposition 3.1 applied to the relatively compact set $\phi(U') \subset \phi(U)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_g(x, y) &= d_{g|_{U'}}(x, y) \\ &= d_{\phi_*(g|_{U'})}(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \\ &\asymp d_{\text{Eucl}}|_{\phi(U')}(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \\ &= \|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\| \end{aligned}$$

because $\phi(U)$ is convex. By the mean value theorem, there exists $z \in [x, y]$ such that $\|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\| \leq |(\nabla\phi)(z) \cdot (x - y)|$. Let L be the convex closure of U' in \mathbb{R}^n . Then $z \in L$. By assumption, L is relatively compact in V , so that

$$\begin{aligned} d_g(x, y) &\asymp \|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\| \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{z \in L} \|(\nabla\phi)(z)\| \right) \cdot \|x - y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Because there are only finitely many choices of (ϕ, U, U') to be considered, this settles the estimate when $d_g(x, y) \leq \delta$. \square

Proposition 4.2. *Let M be a Riemannian manifold and N a submanifold, equipped with a Riemannian metric. Let $K \subset N$ be compact. Then*

$$d_N(x, y) \asymp d_M(x, y)$$

for $x, y \in K$.

Proof. We will reduce to Lemma 4.1 using charts of M . Call g_M and g_N the metrics of M and N . Then one estimate follows from Proposition 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(x, y) &\leq d_{g_M|_N}(x, y) \\ &\asymp d_N(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

We now prove the other estimate. As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, the case of points at M -distance bounded away from 0 is immediate. We may thus suppose x and y lie in one of finitely many compact sets $L \subset N$ contained in an open subset $U \subset M$ that is diffeomorphic to an open subset of \mathbb{R}^m . We may also assume that L is small enough so that the M -distance and N -distance between points of L are realized within U . Call the diffeomorphism ϕ . By Lemma 4.1 applied to the submanifold $\phi(U \cap N) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with the pushforward metric $(\phi|_{U \cap N})_*(g_N|_U)$ and the compact subset $\phi(L) \subset \phi(U \cap N)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_N(x, y) &= d_{U \cap N}(x, y) \\ &= d_{\phi(U \cap N)}(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \\ &\asymp \|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1 applied to the (codimension 0) submanifold $\phi(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the metric $g_{\text{Eucl}}|_{\phi(U)}$ and the compact subset $\phi(L)$,

$$\|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\| \asymp d_{\text{Eucl}|_{\phi(U)}}(\phi(x), \phi(y)).$$

By Proposition 3.1 applied to the manifold $\phi(U)$, the Euclidean metric and the pushforward ϕ_*g_M , and the compact set $\phi(L)$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_M(x, y) &= d_U(x, y) \\ &= d_{\phi(U)}(\phi(x), \phi(y)) \\ &\asymp d_{\text{Eucl}|_{\phi(U)}}(\phi(x), \phi(y)), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

5 Covering maps

Proposition 5.1. *Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a smooth map between Riemannian manifolds. Let $K \subset M$ be compact. Then*

$$d_N(f(x), f(y)) \ll_K d_M(x, y)$$

for $x, y \in K$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1, using Proposition 1.2 together with the fact that the differential Df increases norms of tangent vectors locally by at most a constant. \square

Proposition 5.2. *Let $p : M \rightarrow N$ be a local diffeomorphism between smooth Riemannian manifolds. Let $K \subset M$ be compact and $x, y \in p(K)$. Let $L \supset K$ be a compact neighborhood of K . Let $\sigma : p(K) \rightarrow K$ be an arbitrary section of p . Then*

$$d_N(x, y) \asymp_{K,L} \min_{i,j} d_M(p|_L^{-1}(x), p|_L^{-1}(y)) \asymp_{K,L} \min_j d_M(\sigma(x), p|_L^{-1}(y))$$

for $x, y \in p(K)$.

Proof. Denote $p|_L^{-1}(x) = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and $p|_L^{-1}(y) = \{y_0, \dots, y_m\}$, with $\sigma(x) = x_0 \in K$. The estimate

$$d_N(x, y) \ll \min_{i,j} d_M(x_i, y_j)$$

follows from Proposition 5.1, for which we don't need to assume that L is a neighborhood of K . We trivially have

$$\min_{i,j} d_M(x_i, y_j) \leq \min_j d_M(x_0, y_j).$$

It remains to show that

$$\min_j d_M(x_0, y_j) \ll_{K,L} d_N(x, y).$$

Cover L by finitely many open sets $(U_i)_{i \in I}$ on which p is injective. When $d_N(x, y) \geq r > 0$ we may take as implicit constant the maximum of the upper semi-continuous function

$$(x, y) \mapsto r^{-1} \cdot \max_{i \in I} \min_j d_M(p|_{U_i}^{-1}(x), p|_{U_j}^{-1}(y))$$

on the compact set $\{(x, y) \in p(K) \times p(K) : d_N(x, y) \geq r\}$. Here again we do not use that L is a neighborhood of K .

Because L is a neighborhood of K , we may cover K by finitely many open sets $V_i \subset L$ that are relatively compact in an open set $W_i \subset M$ on which p is injective. We may assume that each V_i is small enough so that the distances between points of $p(V_i)$ are realized in $p(W_i)$. There exists $r > 0$ such that for every $a \in K$ there exists $V_i \ni a$ with $B_N(p(a), r) \subset p(V_i)$. Indeed, if some $p(V_i)$ equals N , this is trivial. Otherwise, we may take r to be the minimum of the continuous positive function

$$a \mapsto \max_i d_N(p(a), N - p(V_i))$$

on the compact set K . As remarked earlier, we may now assume that

$$d_N(x, y) < r.$$

Let $V_i \ni x_0$ be such that $B_N(x, r) \subset p(V_i)$. Then $y \in p(V_i)$. By Proposition 5.1 applied to the smooth map $p|_{W_i}^{-1}$ and the relatively compact subset $p(V_i) \subset p(W_i)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_N(x, y) &= d_{p(W_i)}(x, y) \\ &\gg d_M(x_0, p|_{W_i}^{-1}(y)) \\ &\geq \min_j d_M(x_0, y_j) \end{aligned}$$

because $p|_{W_i}^{-1}(y) \in V_i \subset L$. \square

Proposition 5.3. *Let $p : M \rightarrow N$ be a finite degree smooth covering map between smooth Riemannian manifolds. Let $K \subset N$ be compact. Then*

$$d_N(x, y) \asymp_K d_M(p^{-1}(x), p^{-1}(y))$$

for $x, y \in K$.

Proof. By applying Proposition 5.2 to the compact set $K' = p^{-1}(K)$ and any compact neighborhood $L \supset K'$. \square

Example 5.4. 1. With the notations of Proposition 5.2, let $M = \mathbb{R}$, $N = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $K = L = [0, 1] \subset M$. The projection $p : M \rightarrow N$ is a covering map but it is not true that

$$d_N(x, y) \asymp \min_{i,j} d_M(x_i, y_j)$$

when $x, y \in p(K)$. For example when $x = p(0)$ and $y \rightarrow p(1)^-$. So we cannot omit the condition that L is a neighborhood of K .

2. Let $M = \mathbb{R}$, $N = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, $K = [0, 0.99]$ and $L = [-0.5, 1]$. Let $x = p(0)$, $x_0 = 1 \in L - K$ and $y \rightarrow p(0)^+$. Then it is not true that

$$d_N(x, y) \asymp \min_j d_M(x_0, y_j).$$

So we cannot omit the condition that $\sigma(x) \in K$.

3. With the same notations, let $M = N = \mathbb{C}$ and $p(z) = z^2$. Then p is open; it is a ramified covering map. But it is not true that

$$d_N(0, p(z)) \asymp \min(d_M(0, z), d_M(0, -z))$$

as $z \rightarrow 0$: the LHS is $\asymp |z|^2$, the RHS is $\asymp |z|$. We cannot omit the condition that p is everywhere a local diffeomorphism.

4. Equip $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ with Riemannian metrics and $M_2(\mathbb{R})$ with a matrix norm. Then for $K \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ compact and $x, y \in K$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathrm{PSL}_2}(x, y) &\asymp \min(d_{\mathrm{SL}_2}(x, y), d_{\mathrm{SL}_2}(x, -y)) \\ &\asymp \min(d_{\mathrm{GL}_2}(x, y), d_{\mathrm{GL}_2}(x, -y)) \\ &\asymp \min(\|x - y\|, \|x + y\|), \end{aligned}$$

by respectively Proposition 5.3 and two times Proposition 4.2.