

CURVATURE MEASURES AND THE SUB-RIEMANNIAN GAUSS-BONNET THEOREM

DAVIDE BARILARI, EUGENIO BELLINI, AND ANDREA PINAMONTI

ABSTRACT. We adopt a measure-theoretic perspective on the Riemannian approximation scheme proving a sub-Riemannian Gauss-Bonnet theorem for surfaces in 3D contact manifolds. We show that the zero-order term in the limit is a singular measure supported on isolated characteristic points. In particular, this provides a unified interpretation of previous results obtained in [BTV17, GHVM25].

Moreover we give natural geometric conditions under which our result holds, namely when the surface admits characteristic points of finite order of degeneracy. This notion, which we introduce, extends the concept of mildly degenerate characteristic points of [Ros23] for the Heisenberg group.

As a byproduct, we prove that the mean curvature around an isolated characteristic point of finite order of degeneracy is locally integrable. In particular, this positively answers a question by [DGD12] for analytic surfaces in every analytic 3D contact manifold.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Surfaces in 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifolds	7
3. Order of degeneracy of characteristic points. Proof of Proposition 1.7	10
4. Normal forms and coordinate characterization. Proof of Theorem 1.10	12
5. Levi-Civita connection forms and Riemannian ε -frames	14
6. Convergence of measures. Proof of Theorem 1.2	22
7. An operative formula for the invariants	25
Appendix A. Some technical lemmas	28
Appendix B. The horizontal plane in the Heisenberg group	31
References	33

1. INTRODUCTION

Embedded surfaces play a fundamental role in the theory of contact structures. Since the seminal works of Giroux [Gir91, Gir00], they have become central tools in the classification of contact structures, marking a turning point in the study of 3-dimensional contact topology. From a different perspective, works such as [Bla10, EKM12] have explored the interplay between contact and Riemannian geometry, introducing analytical techniques that have deepened our understanding of the geometry of contact manifolds.

The study of surfaces in contact 3-manifolds has also begun to attract attention from the point of view of sub-Riemannian geometry. Contributions such as [BBC22, BB23, BBCH21] have addressed

(Davide Barilari, Eugenio Bellini) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA "TULLIO LEVI-CIVITA", UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PADOVA, VIA TRIESTE 63, 35131 PADOVA (PD), ITALY, davide.barilari@unipd.it, eugenio.bellini@unipd.it

(Andrea Pinamonti) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI TRENTO, VIA SOMMARIVE, 14, 38123 POVO TN, ITALY, andrea.pinamonti@unitn.it

the existence and properties of induced metric structures and the corresponding stochastic geometric evolutions, while other works have explored the tightness of distributions in terms of sub-Riemannian curvature invariants [ABBR24].

Within the sub-Riemannian framework, one of the main challenges is the establishment of a canonical notion of Gaussian curvature and of a Gauss-Bonnet type theorem. Recent contributions which are close in spirit with our investigation were achieved in [BTV17, GHVM25, DV16, Vel23] (cf. also [ABS08] for the almost-Riemannian setting). In particular, the results in [BTV17, GHVM25] rely on the so-called *Riemannian approximation scheme*, i.e., a family of Riemannian metrics g^ε converging to the sub-Riemannian one. This is a powerful tool to transport results from classical Riemannian geometry into the sub-Riemannian context.

Our goal in this paper is to continue the above-mentioned investigation by developing a *measure-theoretic viewpoint* on the Gauss–Bonnet theorem for surfaces embedded in 3-dimensional contact sub-Riemannian manifolds, thereby providing a unified perspective on the previous results.

The main novelty of our approach is that, instead of focusing on the limit of the Gaussian curvature functions K^ε associated with the Riemannian approximation scheme g^ε , we directly look at the limit of the Gaussian *curvature measures* $K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon$, where σ^ε is the corresponding surface area form. In doing so, we are able to characterize both an absolutely continuous and a singular part of this limit, the singular part being concentrated on characteristic points. The notion of a curvature measure, as employed here, is inspired by the seminal work of Federer [Fed59].

1.1. Characteristic vector field and its singularities. In order to state our results, we review some preliminaries on contact sub-Riemannian manifolds. More details are given in Sections 2.1, 2.2.

A three-dimensional contact sub-Riemannian manifold is a triple (M, \mathcal{D}, g) , where M is a smooth three-dimensional manifold, \mathcal{D} is a *contact distribution* and g a *sub-Riemannian metric*, i.e., a smooth metric on \mathcal{D} . Given an oriented surface S embedded in M , the intersection $TS \cap \mathcal{D}$ defines a singular field of directions, whose singularities are the points $p \in S$ where $T_p S = \mathcal{D}_p$, called characteristic points. The characteristic set $\Sigma(S)$ is the set of characteristic points of S .

The sub-Riemannian metric together with the orientation of S induce a choice of a unique *characteristic vector field*, which is a field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ satisfying

$$\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{X_p\} = \begin{cases} T_p S \cap \mathcal{D}_p, & p \notin \Sigma(S), \\ 0, & p \in \Sigma(S). \end{cases}$$

We recall that given a smooth manifold S and a smooth vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ vanishing at $q \in S$, the differential of X at q is the linear map $D_q X : T_q S \rightarrow T_q S$ defined by $D_q X(Y) = [Y, X]_q$.

We say that a characteristic point is *degenerate* if $\det(D_q X) = 0$, and *non-degenerate* otherwise.

Remark 1.1. One can prove that, since \mathcal{D} a contact distribution, we have that $\text{div}(X)|_q \neq 0$. The latter condition is independent of the measure used to compute the divergence. Being $\text{trace}(D_q X) = \text{div}(X)|_q$, at degenerate characteristic points one necessarily has $\dim \ker(D_q X) = 1$.

For more details we refer to Section 2.2 (cf. in particular Remark 2.2).

1.2. The Riemannian approximation. It is well-known [ABB20] that the sub-Riemannian metric g induces a canonical choice of a vector field $f_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ called the Reeb vector field, which is globally transverse to the distribution \mathcal{D} (see Section 2.1 for a more detailed definition). We consider the family of Riemannian metrics g^ε approximating g for which

$$g^\varepsilon|_{\mathcal{D}} = g, \quad g^\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}, f_0) = 0, \quad g^\varepsilon(f_0, f_0) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}. \quad (1)$$

Given a compact orientable surface S embedded in M , we denote with K^ε and σ^ε the Gaussian curvature and area form of the Riemannian surface $(S, g^\varepsilon|_S)$, respectively. Our approach to achieve

a Gauss-Bonnet theorem consists in studying the family of signed Borel measures $K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Unfortunately, the latter sequence does not converge as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. However, the rescaled sequence

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon} K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon$$

strongly converges in $C^1(S)^*$, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, to a signed Borel measure, which we denote μ_{-1} , with vanishing total mass. This limit is regular away from the characteristic set, while near each isolated characteristic point it concentrates masses in a way dictated by the local behaviour of the characteristic foliation. Nonetheless, the existence of the limit measure μ_{-1} allows us to identify and remove the divergent term from $K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon$: in our main result we prove that the difference

$$K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \mu_{-1}$$

strongly converges in $C^1(S)^*$ to a sum of Dirac deltas supported at the characteristic points, each weighted by the *topological index* of the characteristic vector field.

Our main result can be stated under the assumption that the characteristic points are *of finite order of degeneracy*. This means that either the characteristic points are non-degenerate, or, if degenerate, their order of degeneracy is finite along a (suitably defined) curve tangent to the kernel of the differential. The notion introduced here generalizes the concept of mildly degenerate characteristic points, as defined in [Ros23] for the Heisenberg group. We refer to Section 1.3 after the statement for the formal definition

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M, \mathcal{D}, g) be a contact sub-Riemannian manifold and S be an embedded, compact and orientable surface, with characteristic vector field X . Denote K^ε and σ^ε the Gaussian curvature and area form induced on S by the metric g^ε , respectively. Assume that the characteristic set consists of points which are of finite order of degeneracy. Then the following limit of signed Borel measures exists in the strong $C^1(S)^*$ sense*

$$\mu_{-1} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon} K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon. \quad (2)$$

Furthermore the characteristic set is finite $\Sigma(S) = \{q_1, \dots, q_\ell\} \subset S$ and the following limit exists in the strong $C^1(S)^*$ sense

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{\mu_{-1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i}, \quad (3)$$

where δ_{q_i} denotes a Dirac delta centred at $q_i \in S$ and $\text{ind}(q_i)$ denotes the index of X at q_i .

Remark 1.3. We stress that characteristic points of finite order of degeneracy are automatically isolated (cf. Theorem 1.10), therefore, by compactness of S , $\Sigma(S)$ is finite. For non-compact surfaces S , characteristic points with finite order degeneracy form a discrete set, hence one can obtain the validity of the statement of Theorem 1.2 by considering the convergence in $C_c^1(S)^*$, i.e., with test functions that have compact support. We stress that in this case (3) in particular implies that for $\varphi \in C_c^1(S)$ one has

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_S \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{\mu_{-1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \varphi(q_i) \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i},$$

the sum in the right hand side being finite since φ has compact support.

Remark 1.4. The measure μ_{-1} can be computed explicitly as in Remark 6.1. Notice that the Riemannian Gauss-Bonnet theorem implies that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ one has

$$\sqrt{\varepsilon} \int_S K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon = 2\pi \sqrt{\varepsilon} \chi(S)$$

where $\chi(S)$ is the Euler characteristic of S . Hence taking the limit when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ one gets by (2) the following consequence, thus recovering the statements of [BTV17] (cf. also [Vel23] and [GHVM25])

$$\int_S \mu_{-1} = 0.$$

1.3. Characteristic points of finite order. The notion of characteristic point of finite order of degeneracy, which we discuss here, extends the concept of mildly degenerate characteristic point introduced in [Ros23] for the specific case of the Heisenberg group. This extension is not immediate, since in the Heisenberg case the definition relies in an essential way on the existence of a Lie group structure. In the general setting different techniques are required.

Our approach not only permits the extension of the notion to arbitrary spaces, but also yields finer structural results. Indeed, we show that points of finite order of degeneracy can only occur isolated, and we give sharp estimates on the norm of the characteristic vector field in their vicinity. Finally, we compute the index of the characteristic vector field at such singularity in terms of invariants.

We start by defining horizontal kernel extensions at degenerate characteristic points, i.e., characteristic points q where $\det(D_q X) = 0$.

Definition 1.5. *Let S be a surface embedded in a 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold, with characteristic vector field X . Let $q \in S$ be a degenerate characteristic point. A horizontal kernel extension at q is an arc-length parametrized horizontal smooth curve $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ satisfying*

$$\gamma(0) = q, \quad \dot{\gamma}(0) \in \ker(D_q X).$$

Recall by Remark 1.1 that the characteristic vector field X at degenerate characteristic points satisfies $\det(D_q X) = 0$ and $\dim \ker(D_q X) = 1$. Hence by a direct application of the center manifold theorem one can prove the following result (a more detailed proof is given in Section 3.1).

Lemma 1.6. *Let $q \in S$ be a degenerate characteristic point, i.e., $\det(D_q X) = 0$. Then a horizontal kernel extension $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ always exists.*

In general, a horizontal kernel extension is not unique. The definition of order of degeneracy of a characteristic point is based on the following observation.

Proposition 1.7. *Let $q \in S$ be a degenerate characteristic point, i.e., $\det(D_q X) = 0$. Then*

(i) *the order of vanishing¹ at $t = 0$ of the following smooth function*

$$\lambda_\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \lambda_\gamma(t) = g(X, \dot{\gamma}(t)), \quad (4)$$

does not depend on the choice of the horizontal kernel extension γ ,

(ii) *if λ_γ has finite order of vanishing $k \in \mathbb{N}$ at $t = 0$, with k odd, then the following quantity*

$$\Lambda^{(k)}(q) := \left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \lambda_\gamma(t) \right|_{t=0}, \quad (5)$$

does not depend on the choice of the horizontal kernel extension.

Definition 1.8. *We define the order of degeneracy of the characteristic point q , denoted $\text{ord}(q)$, as the order of vanishing at $t = 0$ of the function λ_γ in (4) for some horizontal kernel extension γ .*

Remark 1.9. We highlight here that if the order of degeneracy of q is an odd integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the quantity $\Lambda^{(k)}(q)$ defined in (5) is well-defined, while if the order of degeneracy of q is an even integer, the quantity $\Lambda^{(k)}(q)$ is well-defined only up to a sign (cf. Section 3).

We stress that for a degenerate characteristic point q one necessarily has $\text{ord}(q) \geq 2$, cf. Lemma 3.1. By abuse of notation, we set $\text{ord}(q) = 1$ for non-degenerate characteristic points q . We say that a characteristic point has finite order of degeneracy if $\text{ord}(q) < +\infty$.

Characteristic points of finite order of degeneracy satisfy the following properties.

Theorem 1.10. *Let S be an oriented surface embedded in a 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold, with characteristic vector field X . Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point of order of degeneracy $k \geq 2$, then:*

¹Given a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(0) = 0$, the order of vanishing of f at 0 is $k := \inf \{i \in \mathbb{N} : f^{(i)}(0) \neq 0\}$.

(i) q is an isolated characteristic point,

(ii) there exist local coordinates (x, y) near q and a positive constant $C > 0$ such that

$$q = (0, 0), \quad C^{-1}\sqrt{x^2 + y^{2k}} \leq |X| \leq C\sqrt{x^2 + y^{2k}},$$

(iii) the index of q satisfies

$$\text{ind}(q) = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\text{div}_q(X)\Lambda^{(k)}(q)), & \text{if } k \text{ odd,} \\ 0, & \text{if } k \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

We stress that characteristic points with finite order of degeneracy are isolated. In the analytic case, the converse also holds: isolated characteristic points have finite order of degeneracy, cf. Proposition 7.4.

Remark 1.11. We stress that in Theorem 1.10 one has $k \geq 2$. Actually one can include the case of non-degenerate characteristic points, i.e., when $k = 1$. Indeed claims (i) and (ii) hold thanks to $\det(D_q X) \neq 0$, while in (iii) one should suitably reinterpret the quantity $\Lambda^{(k)}(q)$ for $k = 1$ as follows

$$\Lambda^{(1)}(q) = \frac{\det(D_q X)}{\text{div}_q(X)} = \frac{\det(D_q X)}{\text{trace}(D_q X)}. \quad (6)$$

All the quantities $\Lambda^{(k)}(q)$ for all $k \geq 1$ can be defined and computed in a unified way through an auxiliary affine connection as follows.

Proposition 1.12. *Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point of order $k \geq 2$. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection on TS associated with $g^1|_S$. There exists a neighbourhood $U \subset S$ of q such that the following linear endomorphism is (fibrewise) diagonalizable*

$$\nabla X : TS|_U \rightarrow TS|_U, \quad Y \mapsto \nabla_Y X.$$

In particular ∇X admits an eigenvector field $v_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$ satisfying $v_0|_q \in \ker D_q X$ and $|v_0|_q = 1$. Then

$$\Lambda^{(k)}(q) = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det(\nabla X)}{\text{trace}(\nabla X)} \right) \Big|_q. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, k is the smallest natural number such that the right-hand side of (7) is non zero.

Notice that for $k = 1$ the vector v_0 is not defined but (7) makes sense and coincides with (6).

As it will be clear from the proof (see Section 7.1), the previous result is actually independent on the choice of the affine connection ∇ used to compute (7).

1.4. Consequences: integrability. A direct consequence of item (ii) of Theorem 1.10, being the function $(x^2 + y^{2k})^{-1/2}$ integrable near the origin in \mathbb{R}^2 for $k \geq 1$, is the following.

Corollary 1.13. *Let S be a surface embedded in a 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold with a smooth measure σ . Let X be the characteristic vector field. Assume all characteristic points have finite order of degeneracy, then*

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \in L^1_{loc}(S, \sigma).$$

This theorem extends [Ros23, Theorem 4.5], whose proof exploits the isometries of the Heisenberg group. Our approach relies on the normal form of Proposition 4.1.

Corollary 1.13 is related with integrability properties of the sub-Riemannian mean curvature \mathcal{H} of S , which can be defined as the limit of mean curvatures of the Riemannian approximations, see [BB24]. The estimate $|\mathcal{H}| \leq C|X|^{-1}$ follows from a technical but standard observation, cf. [Ros23, Section 2.1] and [DGN12, Prop. 3.5]. In the analytic case, we prove the following.

Corollary 1.14. *Let S be an analytic surface embedded in an analytic 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold with a smooth measure σ . Let \mathcal{H} be the sub-Riemannian mean curvature. If every characteristic point is isolated then*

$$\mathcal{H} \in L^1_{loc}(S, \sigma).$$

The previous result extends [Ros23, Theorem 4.7] concerning a conjecture in [DGN12].

1.5. Consequences: Euler characteristic. Combining Poincaré-Hopf theorem with (iii) of Theorem 1.10 we can compute the Euler characteristic of a surface in terms of the invariants $\Lambda^{(k)}(q)$.

Corollary 1.15. *Let S be a compact oriented surface embedded in a 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold. Assume that every characteristic point has finite order of degeneracy. Then the characteristic set is finite $\Sigma(S) = \{q_1, \dots, q_\ell\}$, and*

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{k_i \text{ odd}} \text{sign} \left(\text{div}_{q_i}(X) \Lambda^{(k_i)}(q_i) \right), \quad (8)$$

where $k_i = \text{ord}(q_i)$, and $\Lambda^{(k_i)}(q_i)$ are the invariants defined in (5).

Remark 1.16. We stress that if all characteristic points are non-degenerate, i.e., $k_i = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, then, thanks to (6), formula (8) reduces to the classical identity

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{sign}(\det(D_{q_i}X)). \quad (9)$$

Going back to our main Theorem 1.2, the atomic measure appearing in (3) is obtained as limit of the Gaussian curvature measures $K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon$ of the Riemannian surfaces $(S, g^\varepsilon|_S)$. It is therefore natural to compare their masses with the pointwise limit of the Gaussian curvature K^ε at characteristic points.

However, it is known that for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the Gaussian curvature K^ε at characteristic points diverges, and it converges only after an appropriate rescaling. More precisely, let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point, it was shown in [BBC22] that

$$\widehat{K}(q) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^2 K^\varepsilon(q) = -1 + \frac{\det(D_q X)}{\text{trace}(D_q X)^2}.$$

One can compare such a limit with our results by extending the function \widehat{K} near characteristic points through the following definition

$$\widehat{K}(q) = -1 + \frac{\det(\nabla X|_q)}{\text{trace}^2(\nabla X|_q)}, \quad (10)$$

where ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of the metric $g^1|_S$. In particular, restating Corollary 1.15, one can compute the Euler characteristic in terms of this curvature invariant \widehat{K} and its derivatives.

Proposition 1.17. *Let S be an oriented surface embedded in a 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold with characteristic vector field X . Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point of finite odd order of degeneracy $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let v_0 is the eigenvector field defined in Proposition 1.12. Then*

$$\text{div}_q(X) \Lambda^{(k)}(q) = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\widehat{K} + 1 \right) \Big|_q,$$

where \widehat{K} is the function defined in (10). If S is compact and all characteristic points are of finite order of degeneracy, then

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{k_i \text{ odd}} \text{sign} \left(v_0^{(k_i-1)} \left(\widehat{K} + 1 \right) \Big|_{q_i} \right), \quad (11)$$

where $\{k_1, \dots, k_\ell\}$ are the orders of the characteristic points $\{q_1, \dots, q_\ell\}$.

Again, we stress that if all characteristic points are non-degenerate $k_i = 1$ for all i and the formula (11) reduces to (9) since $\text{sign}(\widehat{K} + 1) = \text{sign}(\det D_q X)$.

1.6. An example: the horizontal plane in the Heisenberg group. It is interesting to illustrate the discrete contribution to the limiting measure in Theorem 1.2 for the explicit example of the plane $\{z = 0\}$ in the three-dimensional Heisenberg group.

Let $(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{D}, g)$ be the Heisenberg group: the contact distribution \mathcal{D} is expressed as the kernel of a differential form ω which, in cylindrical coordinates $x = r \cos \theta, y = r \sin \theta, z$, reads

$$\omega = dz + \frac{r^2}{2} d\theta.$$

The extended metrics (1), whose restrictions to \mathcal{D} coincide with the sub-Riemannian metric g , have the expression

$$g^\varepsilon = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \omega \otimes \omega.$$

Let $S = \{(x, y, z) \mid z = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Substituting the expression of ω into the one of g^ε and imposing $dz = 0$ we obtain

$$g^\varepsilon|_S = dr^2 + f_\varepsilon(r)^2 d\theta^2, \quad \text{where} \quad f_\varepsilon(r) = r \sqrt{1 + \frac{r^2}{4\varepsilon}}.$$

A standard computation shows that

$$K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon = -f_\varepsilon''(r) dr d\theta = -\frac{r(r^2 + 6\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}(r^2 + 4\varepsilon)^{3/2}} dr d\theta. \quad (12)$$

One can then explicitly compute the limit

$$\mu_{-1} := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon} K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon = -dr d\theta. \quad (13)$$

In this specific example, the statement of Theorem 1.2 can be proved by a direct computation and shows that the discrete part of the measure is a delta in the origin, which is characteristic.

Lemma 1.18. *For every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the following equality holds*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{\mu_{-1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = 2\pi \varphi(0),$$

where the measures $K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon$ and μ_{-1} are defined as in (12) and (13)

The proof is an explicit computation and is contained in Appendix B.

1.7. Structure of the paper. In Section 2 we review some preliminaries on contact sub-Riemannian manifolds and basic facts concerning surfaces embedded in contact manifolds. In Section 3 we introduce characteristic points of finite order of degeneracy and in Section 4 we derive their properties. In Section 5 we introduce the main objects and lemmas needed in the proof of Theorem 1.2, which is presented in Section 6.

Acknowledgements. Davide Barilari acknowledge the support granted by the MUR-PRIN 2022 project ‘‘Optimal Transport: new challenges across analysis and geometry’’ (Project code: 2022K53E57). Andrea Pinamonti was partially supported by the GNAMPA project *Structures of sub-Riemannian hypersurfaces in Heisenberg groups*. Further support was provided by MUR and the University of Trento (Italy) through the MUR-PRIN 2022 project *Regularity problems in Sub-Riemannian structures* (Project code: 2022F4F2LH). Andrea Pinamonti is member of the *Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilita e le loro Applicazioni* (GNAMPA), which is part of the *Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica* (INdAM).

2. SURFACES IN 3D CONTACT SUB-RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

We recall some preliminaries on contact sub-Riemannian manifolds and fix our notation. We refer to [Gei08] and [ABB20] for introductions to contact and sub-Riemannian geometry, respectively.

2.1. Contact sub-Riemannian manifolds. A three-dimensional contact sub-Riemannian manifold is a triple (M, \mathcal{D}, g) , where M is a smooth three-dimensional manifold, \mathcal{D} is a *contact distribution* and g a *sub-Riemannian metric*, i.e., a smooth metric on \mathcal{D} . We recall that a plane field \mathcal{D} is a contact distribution if locally $\mathcal{D} = \ker \omega$ for some one-form ω satisfying $d\omega|_{\mathcal{D}}$ is non-degenerate. In dimension three this is equivalent to requiring $\mathcal{D} + [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] = TM$.

A sub-Riemannian contact manifold is called co-orientable if the one-form satisfying $\mathcal{D} = \ker \omega$ can be chosen globally. In this case the three-form $\omega \wedge d\omega$ is a global volume form and M is also orientable. For simplicity in what follows we always assume the contact structure to be co-oriented.

The Reeb vector field associated with a contact form ω is the vector field $f_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ uniquely determined by the following two equations

$$\omega(f_0) = 1, \quad d\omega(f_0, \cdot) = 0. \quad (14)$$

The contact form ω is called normalized with respect to the sub-Riemannian metric if it satisfies

$$d\omega(f_1, f_2) = 1, \quad (15)$$

for every positively oriented orthonormal frame for \mathcal{D} (i.e., $d\omega|_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the area form defined by the metric g). Without further notice, in the rest of the paper we always assume ω to be normalized.

Given a contact sub-Riemannian manifold one can define the length of an absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ which is *horizontal* (i.e., almost everywhere tangent to \mathcal{D}) as

$$\text{length}(\gamma) = \int_0^1 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_g dt,$$

and the sub-Riemannian distance $d_{SR} : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows

$$d_{SR}(q_0, q_1) = \inf\{\text{length}(\gamma) \mid \omega(\dot{\gamma}) = 0, \gamma(0) = q_0, \gamma(1) = q_1\}, \quad \forall q_0, q_1 \in M.$$

where the infimum is over all horizontal absolutely continuous curve joining the two points. It is well-known that d_{SR} is actually a distance function since \mathcal{D} is bracket-generating, see [ABB20, Ch. 3].

Any sub-Riemannian space can be seen as a Gromov-Hausdorff limit of Riemannian spaces. In the contact sub-Riemannian case there exists a special family of approximating Riemannian metrics.

Definition 2.1. *Let (M, \mathcal{D}, g) be a contact sub-Riemannian manifold and let f_0 be the associated Reeb vector field. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we define the Riemannian metric g^ε as the unique one satisfying*

$$g^\varepsilon|_{\mathcal{D}} = g, \quad g^\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}, f_0) = 0, \quad g^\varepsilon(f_0, f_0) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}. \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, if $S \subset M$ is an embedded oriented surface, we denote by σ^ε the area form of the oriented Riemannian surface $(S, g^\varepsilon|_S)$, i.e., the differential two-form satisfying

$$\sigma^\varepsilon(v_1^\varepsilon, v_2^\varepsilon) = 1. \quad (17)$$

for every positively oriented orthonormal frame $v_1^\varepsilon, v_2^\varepsilon$ of S .

2.2. Surfaces in three-dimensional contact sub-Riemannian manifolds. Let S be a surface embedded in a co-oriented three-dimensional contact manifold (M, \mathcal{D}) . The intersection $TS \cap \mathcal{D}$ defines a field of directions, whose singularities are the points $p \in S$ where $T_p S = \mathcal{D}_p$, and are called characteristic points. The characteristic set $\Sigma(S)$ is the set of characteristic points. We recall that $\Sigma(S)$ is contained in a one-dimensional submanifold of S , hence has measure zero [BBC22].

Let $\omega \in \Omega^1(M)$ be a contact form. If the surface is oriented by some area form $\sigma \in \Omega^2(S)$, then we can define the characteristic vector field as the unique vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ satisfying

$$\iota_X \sigma = \omega|_S. \quad (18)$$

The characteristic vector field vanishes at characteristic points:

$$\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{X_p\} = \begin{cases} T_p S \cap \mathcal{D}_p, & p \notin \Sigma(S), \\ 0, & p \in \Sigma(S). \end{cases}$$

For a given surface, there exist several different characteristic vector fields. In fact, they constitute a conformal class: rescaling the area form σ by a positive function results in a rescaling of X by the reciprocal of the same function.

Remark 2.2. Any characteristic vector field has non zero divergence at characteristic points. Recall that, the divergence of X with respect to the area form σ is defined by (L_X denoting the Lie derivative)

$$\operatorname{div}(X)\sigma = L_X\sigma = d\iota_X\sigma. \quad (19)$$

Therefore, taking the differential of both sides of (18) and using $L_X = d \circ \iota_X + \iota_X \circ d$ we obtain

$$\operatorname{div}(X)\sigma = d\omega|_S. \quad (20)$$

Now, if $q \in S$ is a characteristic point, then $T_q S = \mathcal{D}_q$. By the contact condition, the restriction of $d\omega$ to \mathcal{D} is non degenerate, therefore (20) implies that $\operatorname{div}(X)$ does not vanish at q .

In the case of a surface embedded in a contact sub-Riemannian manifold we can fix a canonical representative characteristic vector fields by fixing the area form.

Definition 2.3. Let (M, \mathcal{D}, g) be a contact sub-Riemannian manifold and let $S \subset M$ be an embedded oriented surface. Let σ^1 be the area form defined in (17) for $\varepsilon = 1$. We define the sub-Riemannian characteristic vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ as

$$\iota_X\sigma^1 = \omega|_S, \quad (21)$$

where ω denotes the contact form normalized as in (15).

The divergence of the sub-Riemannian characteristic vector field and its norm are related.

Proposition 2.4. Let (M, \mathcal{D}, g) be a contact sub-Riemannian manifold and S an embedded oriented surface. Let σ^1 be the area form defined in (17) for $\varepsilon = 1$. Then the divergence of the sub-Riemannian characteristic vector field X , computed with respect to σ^1 , satisfies on S

$$\operatorname{div}(X)^2 + |X|^2 = 1. \quad (22)$$

We stress that in (22) the norm $|\cdot|$ is the sub-Riemannian norm on \mathcal{D} .

Proof. Let us first work on $S \setminus \Sigma(S)$ and set $f_1 = X/|X|$ the normalized characteristic vector field, let f_2 be the oriented horizontal normal and let f_0 be the Reeb field associated with the normalized contact form ω . Notice that, being $g^1|_{\mathcal{D}}$ equal to g , then f_1 has norm 1 for $(S, g^1|_S)$. Let $J : TS \rightarrow TS$ be the orthogonal map defined by

$$\sigma^1(v, Jw) = g^1(v, w), \quad v, w \in TS. \quad (23)$$

We define an orthonormal frame for $g^1|_{S \setminus \Sigma(S)}$ as

$$e_1 = f_1, \quad e_2 = Jf_1.$$

Then there exists a function $a : S \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ such that,

$$e_1 = f_1, \quad e_2 = af_2 + \sqrt{1 - a^2}f_0. \quad (24)$$

Taking the differential of the 1-forms in both sides of (21) and evaluating the result at e_1, e_2 we get

$$\operatorname{div}(X) = d\omega(e_1, e_2) = d\omega(f_1, af_2 + \sqrt{1 - a^2}f_0) = ad\omega(f_1, f_2) = a, \quad (25)$$

where, in the third equality we have used that $d\omega(f_0, \cdot) = 0$ from (14), and in the last one the normalization condition (15). Moreover, using again (23), we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} |X|^2 &= g^1(X, X) = \sigma^1(X, JX) = \iota_X\sigma^1(JX) = \omega(JX) \\ &= |X|\omega(af_2 + \sqrt{1 - a^2}f_0) = |X|\sqrt{1 - a^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows from (21), and the fifth from (24) recalling that $e_1 = f_1 = X/|X|$. This implies $|X| = \sqrt{1 - a^2}$ and, being $a = \operatorname{div}(X)$ thanks to (25), identity (22) is proved on $S \setminus \Sigma(S)$. By continuity, the equality is proved on S . \square

We recall the definition of differential of a vector field at a singular point.

Definition 2.5. *Let S be a smooth manifold and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ a smooth vector field vanishing at $q \in S$. The differential of X at q is the map*

$$D_q X : T_q S \rightarrow T_q S, \quad D_q X(Y) = [Y, X]_q.$$

Notice that the definition of $D_q X(Y)$ requires a choice of a vector field extension of Y , near q . However, since $X_q = 0$, the vector $[Y, X]_q$ only depends on Y_q .

Remark 2.6. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection on TS for $g^1|_S$, and q a characteristic point, then

$$\nabla_Y X|_q = \nabla_X Y|_q + [Y, X]|_q = (D_q X)Y, \quad \forall Y \in T_q M,$$

where we used that $\nabla_X Y|_q = 0$ since $X|_q = 0$. At a characteristic point q we have the equality

$$\operatorname{div}_q(X) = \operatorname{trace}(D_q X) = \operatorname{trace}(\nabla X|_q).$$

By Remark 2.2 we deduce that $\operatorname{trace}(D_q X) \neq 0$ and that $\operatorname{rank} D_q X \geq 1$ at characteristic points.

3. ORDER OF DEGENERACY OF CHARACTERISTIC POINTS. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.7

Throughout this subsection S denote an oriented surface embedded in a contact sub-Riemannian manifold (M, \mathcal{D}, g) with sub-Riemannian characteristic vector field X .

We start by proving the existence of a horizontal kernel extension $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$.

Proof of Lemma 1.6. According to Remark 2.2, it holds $\operatorname{div}_q(X) = \operatorname{trace}(D_q X) \neq 0$. Therefore, the characteristic polynomial of the endomorphism $D_q X : T_q S \rightarrow T_q S$ reads

$$P(\lambda) = \lambda(\lambda - \operatorname{div}_q(X)).$$

Applying the classical center manifold theorem (one see for example [Per01, Thm. 1, Sec. 2.12]) we deduce the existence of a smooth embedded submanifold \mathcal{C} which is invariant under the flow of X and such that $T_q \mathcal{C} = \ker D_q X$. Let $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ be a smooth regular parametrization of \mathcal{C} . Since \mathcal{C} is invariant under the flow of X , we deduce that γ is horizontal. Reparametrizing γ by arc-length we find a horizontal kernel extension. \square

Lemma 3.1. *Given a horizontal kernel extension $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$, the following smooth function*

$$\lambda_\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \lambda_\gamma(t) = g(X, \dot{\gamma}(t))|_{\gamma(t)},$$

satisfies $\lambda_\gamma(0) = \dot{\lambda}_\gamma(0) = 0$, i.e., has order of vanishing at zero ≥ 2 .

Proof. Since at characteristic points X vanishes, then $\lambda_\gamma(0) = 0$. Denoting ∇ the Levi-Civita connection of $g^1|_S$, we compute

$$\frac{d}{dt} g(X, \dot{\gamma})|_{\gamma(t)} = g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} X, \dot{\gamma}(t)) + g(X, \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} \dot{\gamma}(t))$$

The second term at $t = 0$ is zero since X vanishes at characteristic points. The first one vanishes as well: consider any vector field Y extension of $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ and compute (at $t = 0$)

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} X|_q = \nabla_Y X|_q = (D_q X)Y = 0,$$

where we have used Remark 2.6 and the fact that $Y|_q \in \ker D_q X$ by construction. \square

3.1. Well-posedness of the order. Proof of Proposition 1.7. We now move to the proof of the fact that the order of degeneracy is well-defined.

Proof of Proposition 1.7. Let $q \in S$ be a degenerate characteristic point, i.e., such that $\det(D_q X) = 0$. Recall that a horizontal kernel extension at q is an arc-length parametrized horizontal smooth curve $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ satisfying $\gamma(0) = q$ and $\dot{\gamma}(0) \in \ker(D_q X)$.

(ii). We now prove that the order of vanishing of the following smooth function

$$\lambda_\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \lambda_\gamma(t) = g(X, \dot{\gamma}(t))|_{\gamma(t)},$$

at $t = 0$ does not depend on the choice of the horizontal kernel extension γ . Notice that, once proved this statement, then Lemma 3.1 implies that $\text{ord}(g) \geq 2$.

Let g^1 be the Riemannian metric described in Definition 2.1. For the sake of simplicity in this proof we denote $g^1|_S$ by g and the corresponding area form σ^1 by σ . Let $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ be a kernel extension, and let $T \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ be a vector field which extends $\dot{\gamma}$. Let N denote the oriented orthonormal complement in S with respect to g . Then, from (21) we deduce that the restriction of the sub-Riemannian contact form ω to the surface S can be computed as

$$\omega|_S(\cdot) = \sigma(X, \cdot) = \det \begin{pmatrix} g(T, X) & g(T, \cdot) \\ g(N, X) & g(N, \cdot) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Let $\mathcal{C} = \gamma(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. We claim that

$$\mathcal{C} = \{p \in S \mid \omega(T)|_p = 0\} = \{p \in S \mid g(N, X)|_p = 0\}. \quad (27)$$

We observe that the function $g(N, X)$ is a submersion near q . First observe that being $X|_q = 0$ and $[T, X]|_q = D_q X(\dot{\gamma}(0)) = 0$ one has $\nabla_T X|_q = 0$. For the divergence at the point q , one has

$$\text{div}_q(X) = \text{trace}(\nabla X|_q) = g(\nabla_T X, T)|_q + g(\nabla_N X, N)|_q = g(\nabla_N X, N)|_q,$$

where we used Remark 2.6. Thus, differentiating $g(N, X)$ in the direction of N and evaluating the result at q we find

$$N(g(N, X))|_q = g(\nabla_N N, X)|_q + g(N, \nabla_N X)|_q = \text{div}_q(X),$$

where $g(\nabla_N N, X)|_q = 0$ since $X|_q = 0$. According to Remark 2.2, $\text{div}_q(X) \neq 0$. Therefore, the regular value theorem implies that the vanishing set of $\omega(T)$ is a smooth curve near q . On the other hand, since $T|_{\mathcal{C}} = \dot{\gamma}$ and $\dot{\gamma}$ is horizontal, the vanishing set of $\omega(T)$ contains \mathcal{C} ; proving (27).

Let now $\gamma' : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ be another horizontal kernel extension and let $T' \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ be a vector field extension of its velocity field $\dot{\gamma}'$. Since $\ker D_q X$ is one-dimensional we have

$$\dot{\gamma}' = T'_q = \pm T_q = \pm \dot{\gamma}(0).$$

Let us define the functions $\lambda_\gamma, \lambda'_\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ as follows

$$\lambda_\gamma(t) = g(\dot{\gamma}(t), X)|_{\gamma(t)}, \quad \lambda'_\gamma(t) = g(\dot{\gamma}'(t), X)|_{\gamma'(t)}.$$

Denoting with $\mathcal{C}' = \gamma'(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, the assertion that the two functions have the same order at $t = 0$ is equivalent to prove the following

$$\text{order}(g(T', X)|_{\mathcal{C}'}, q) = \text{order}(g(T, X)|_{\mathcal{C}}, q). \quad (28)$$

where we denote by $\text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}}, q)$ the order of vanishing of f at q along a curve \mathcal{C} (cf. Appendix A).

We prove now equality (28). By (27) applied to \mathcal{C}' one has

$$\mathcal{C}' = \{p \in S \mid \omega(T')|_p = 0\}. \quad (29)$$

Denote $\text{order}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}', q)$ the order of contact between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' at q (see Definition A.1 for a formal definition). By (29), applying Lemma A.4 we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{order}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}', q) + 1 &= \text{order}(\omega(T')|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \text{order}(g(T, X)g(N, T')|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) \\ &> \text{order}(g(T, X)|_{\mathcal{C}}, q), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where in the second equality we have used the expression (26) of $\omega|_S$ and $g(N, X)|_C \equiv 0$, thanks to (27). The third inequality follows from $g(N, T')|_q = 0$.

By construction $\omega(T')|_{C'} \equiv 0$, hence by (26)

$$g(N, X)g(T, T')|_{C'} = g(T, X)g(N, T')|_{C'}. \quad (31)$$

Decomposing $X = g(T, X)T + g(N, X)N$ and using that $g(T, T') \neq 0$ around q we get

$$\begin{aligned} g(T', X)|_{C'} &= (g(T, X)g(T', T) + g(N, X)g(T', N))|_{C'} \\ &= g(T, X)g(T', T) \left(1 + \frac{g(T', N)^2}{g(T, T')^2} \right) \Big|_{C'} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where in the last equality we used (31). Notice that on the right hand side of (32) the quantity $g(T, X)$ is multiplied by two functions that are non vanishing at q (notice $g(T', N)|_q = 0$). Hence one has

$$\text{order}(g(T', X)|_{C'}, q) = \text{order}(g(T, X)|_{C'}, q) = \text{order}(g(T, X)|_C, q),$$

where the last equality combines (30) and Lemma A.2.

(iii). Finally, let us show that if λ_γ has finite and odd order k at $t = 0$ then the quantity

$$\Lambda^{(k)}(q) := \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \lambda_\gamma(t) \Big|_{t=0} \quad (33)$$

is independent on the choice of the horizontal kernel extension γ .

With the following computation we prove that, if the order k of λ_γ and λ'_γ at $t = 0$ is odd, then the leading order coefficients of the two functions coincide. Let us start by observing that, by (32),

$$\frac{d^k}{dt^k} \lambda_\gamma(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T', X)|_{C'} = \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} \left[g(T, X)g(T', T) \left(1 + \frac{g(T', N)^2}{g(T, T')^2} \right) \right].$$

Using now that $\frac{d^j}{dt^j} \lambda_\gamma(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \frac{d^j}{dt^j} \Big|_{t=0} g(T', X)|_{C'} = 0$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T', X)|_{C'} &= \left[\frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T, X)|_{C'} \right] g(T', T) \left(1 + \frac{g(T', N)^2}{g(T, T')^2} \right) \\ &= (\pm 1) \left[\frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T, X)|_{C'} \right] \end{aligned}$$

since $g(T', T)|_q = \pm 1$ at the point q and the term $g(T', N)|_q = 0$. Using then $\dot{\gamma}(0) = (\pm 1)\dot{\gamma}'(0)$ (the sign being the same as $g(T', T)|_q$), thanks to (100) in Remark A.3 one gets

$$\frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T', X)|_{C'} = (\pm 1) \left[\frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T, X)|_{C'} \right] = (\pm 1)^{k+1} \left[\frac{d^k}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=0} g(T, X)|_C \right]$$

and the conclusion follows since k is odd. \square

4. NORMAL FORMS AND COORDINATE CHARACTERIZATION. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.10

We provide a local coordinates characterization of the finite order condition.

Proposition 4.1. *Let S be a surface embedded in a 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold with characteristic vector field X . Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point with order of degeneracy $\text{ord}(q) = k \geq 2$. Then there exists coordinates (x, y) on S near q such that*

$$q = (0, 0), \quad X = x(\nu + a_1(x, y))\partial_x + \left(\frac{\mu}{k!} y^k + xa_0(x, y) + b_0(y) \right) \partial_y,$$

where $\nu = \text{div}(X)|_q$, $\mu = \Lambda^{(k)}(q)$ is defined in (33), and a_0, a_1, b_0 are smooth functions satisfying

$$b_0(y) = O(y^{k+1}), \quad a_i(x, y) = O\left(\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}\right), \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (34)$$

Moreover, in these coordinates, the curve $y \mapsto (0, y)$ is an horizontal kernel extension.

Proof. Let q be a characteristic point such that $\det(D_q X) = 0$. By Remark 2.6, $\nu := \operatorname{div}(X)|_q = \operatorname{trace}(D_q X) \neq 0$. Thus, the characteristic polynomial of $D_q X : T_q S \rightarrow T_q S$ reads

$$P(\lambda) = \lambda(\lambda - \nu), \quad (35)$$

and $D_q X$ is diagonalizable at q . In particular, there exists a smooth regular curve $\sigma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow S$ such that

$$\sigma(0) = q, \quad D_q X(\dot{\sigma}(0)) = \nu \dot{\sigma}(0). \quad (36)$$

Let γ be a horizontal kernel extension at q and $T \in \mathfrak{X}(S)$ be a vector field extending $\dot{\gamma}$. Since $\dot{\gamma}(0)$ and $\dot{\sigma}(0)$ are linearly independent, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the following map defines coordinates near q :

$$\varphi : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)^2 \rightarrow S, \quad \varphi(x, y) = e^{yT} \circ \sigma(x).$$

In such coordinates $q = (0, 0)$ and moreover

$$\dot{\sigma}(0) = \partial_x, \quad \gamma(t) = (0, t) \quad \forall t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon). \quad (37)$$

Hence there exists $a, b : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ smooth functions such that

$$X = (\nu x + a(x, y))\partial_x + b(x, y)\partial_y.$$

which, thanks to the assumptions on $D_q X$ in (35), (36), (37), also satisfy

$$a(0, 0) = b(0, 0) = 0, \quad \nabla a(0, 0) = \nabla b(0, 0) = 0. \quad (38)$$

Moreover, for any $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ the curve $\gamma(t) = (0, t)$ should be an integral curve of X , hence $a(0, y) = 0$. Writing

$$a(x, y) = a(0, y) + x \int_0^1 \partial_x a(tx, y) dt,$$

it follows that there exists a smooth function $a_1(x, y)$ such that $a(x, y) = x a_1(x, y)$. Since $a(0, 0) = 0$ and $\nabla a(0, 0) = 0$, we deduce that $a_1(0, 0) = 0$, thus, by differentiability of a_1 the function a_1 satisfies (34). Moreover, since $a(0, y) = 0$ the function λ_γ can be computed as

$$\lambda_\gamma(t) = g(X|_{(0,t)}, \dot{\gamma}(t)) = b(0, t).$$

Combining (38) and the fact that we assume $\operatorname{ord}(q) = k$, then the function b satisfies

$$b(0, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_x b(0, 0) = 0, \quad \partial_y^j b(0, 0) = \begin{cases} 0, & 0 \leq j < k, \\ \mu, & j = k. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

Repeating the argument above, we can write for the function b

$$b(x, y) = b(0, y) + x \int_0^1 \partial_x b(tx, y) dt = \frac{\mu}{k!} y^k + x \int_0^1 \partial_x b(tx, y) dt + \left(b(0, y) - \frac{\mu}{k!} y^k \right).$$

Now we define

$$a_0(x, y) := \int_0^1 \partial_x b(tx, y) dt, \quad b_0(y) := b(0, y) - \frac{\mu}{k!} y^k.$$

By (39), we have $a_0(0, 0) = 0$, thus, by differentiability of a_0 , we obtain $a_0(x, y) = O(\sqrt{x^2 + y^2})$. Furthermore, (39) implies that $b_0(y) = O(y^{k+1})$. \square

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.10. We first prove (i) and (iii). According to Proposition 4.1 there exist coordinates (x, y) near q such that

$$X = x(\nu + a_1(x, y))\partial_x + \left(\frac{\mu}{k!} y^k + x a_0(x, y) + b_0(y) \right) \partial_y.$$

with a_0, a_1, b_0 satisfying (34). For $s \in [0, 1]$, we define X_s as follows (notice that $X_1 = X$)

$$X_s = x(\nu + s a_1(x, y))\partial_x + \left(\frac{\mu}{k!} y^k + s x a_0(x, y) + s b_0(y) \right) \partial_y.$$

We claim that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for all $s \in [0, 1]$ the origin is the only critical point of X_s .

Indeed, in a neighborhood of q , the singular points of X_s are in bijection with the solutions of the system of equations

$$x(\nu + sa_1(x, y)) = 0, \quad \frac{\mu}{k!}y^k + sxa_0(x, y) + sb_0(y) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Since $\nu \neq 0$ and $a_1(0, 0) = 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for $(x, y) \in B_\delta := \{x^2 + y^2 \leq \delta^2\}$ and $s \in [0, 1]$ the equation $x(\nu + sa_1(x, y)) = 0$ has a solution if and only if $x = 0$. Substituting $x = 0$ in the second equation of (40), since $b_0(y) = O(y^{k+1})$, we find $y = 0$. Therefore, the claim is proved.

It follows that the map

$$F : [0, 1] \times \partial B_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1, \quad F(s, p) = \frac{X_s}{|X_s|} \Big|_p,$$

is a well defined smooth homotopy. Moreover $X_1 = X$, therefore

$$\text{ind}(q) = \deg \left(\frac{X_0}{|X_0|} \Big|_{\partial B_\delta} \right) = \deg \left(\frac{X}{|X|} \Big|_{\partial B_\delta} \right).$$

For $s = 0$, one has $X_0 = \nu x \partial_x + \frac{\mu}{k!} y^k \partial_y$. According to Proposition 4.1, $\nu = \text{div}_q(X)$ and $\mu = \Lambda^{(k)}(q)$. Applying Lemma A.6 one gets $\text{ind}(q) = \text{sign}(\nu\mu)$ for k odd and $\text{ind}(q) = 0$ for k even, which concludes the proof of (iii).

We now focus on item (ii). Without loss of generality, we can assume that ∂_x, ∂_y form an orthonormal basis for the metric on S . To simplify the notation, we assume here $\nu = \mu/k! = 1$. Therefore

$$|X|^2 = (x + xa_1(x, y))^2 + (y^k + xa_0(x, y) + b_0(y))^2.$$

Notice that, according to (34), the function $f(y) := 1 + b_0(y)/y^k$ is smooth and satisfies

$$f(y) = 1 + O(y). \quad (41)$$

Hence, we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} |X|^2 - (x^2 + y^{2k}) &= (x + xa_1(x, y))^2 + (y^k f(y) + xa_0(x, y))^2 - (x^2 + y^{2k}) \\ &= x^2(a_1^2(x, y) + 2a_1(x, y) + a_0^2(x, y)) + y^{2k}(f^2(y) - 1) + 2xy^k f(y)a_0(x, y) \\ &= x^2\psi_1(x, y) + y^{2k}\phi(y) + 2xy^k\psi_2(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

Then we can write

$$\left| \left(\frac{|X|^2}{x^2 + y^{2k}} \right) - 1 \right| \leq \left| \frac{x^2\psi_1(x, y)}{x^2 + y^{2k}} \right| + \left| \frac{y^{2k}\phi(y)}{x^2 + y^{2k}} \right| + \left| \frac{2xy^k\psi_2(x, y)}{x^2 + y^{2k}} \right| \leq |\psi_1(x, y)| + |\phi(y)| + |\psi_2(x, y)|.$$

Since $\psi_i(x, y) = O(\sqrt{x^2 + y^2})$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\phi(y) = O(y)$, thanks to (34) and (41), we deduce that

$$\lim_{(x, y) \rightarrow (0, 0)} \left(\frac{|X|^2}{x^2 + y^{2k}} \right) = 1$$

concluding the proof of (ii).

5. LEVI-CIVITA CONNECTION FORMS AND RIEMANNIAN ε -FRAMES

In this section, we review the definition and fundamental properties of the Levi-Civita connection 1-forms, recalling their relation to the indices of isolated zeroes of vector fields.

5.1. Levi-Civita connection forms. We recall that given a smooth map $F : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ written as follows $F(e^{i\theta}) = e^{if(\theta)}$, where $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth, then the degree of F , denoted $\deg(F)$, is the following integer

$$\deg(F) = \frac{1}{2\pi}(f(2\pi) - f(0)) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f'(\tau) d\tau. \quad (42)$$

In what follows, a smooth ball B in S denotes an open set whose closure is diffeomorphic to a closed Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Definition 5.1. Let (S, g) be a smooth Riemannian surface, let $X \in \text{Vec}(S)$ a smooth vector field and let $q \in S$ be an isolated zero of X . Let B be smooth ball such that q is the unique zero of $X|_B$. Consider the following map

$$F : \partial B \simeq \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1, \quad \varphi(p) = \frac{X}{|X|} \Big|_p.$$

The index of the critical point q is defined as the degree of the map F

$$\text{ind}(q) = \deg(F).$$

We now define Levi-Civita connection form associated with a smooth vector field (playing the role of the characteristic vector field) and list some of its classical properties.

Proposition 5.2. Let (S, g) be an oriented Riemannian surface and let X be a smooth vector field vanishing on a set $Z \subset S$. On $S \setminus Z$ we define the orthonormal frame

$$e_1 := \frac{X}{|X|}, \quad e_2 := \frac{JX}{|X|}, \quad (43)$$

where $J : TS \rightarrow TS$ is the complex structure of the Riemannian surface (S, g) . The Levi-Civita connection form associated with the the frame e_1, e_2 is the following differential 1-form $\eta \in \Omega^1(S \setminus Z)$

$$\eta(v) = g(\nabla_v e_1, e_2) = \frac{1}{|X|^2} g(\nabla_v X, JX), \quad \forall v \in T(S \setminus Z).$$

The Levi-Civita connection form satisfies the following properties:

(i) Let θ_1, θ_2 be the coframe dual to e_1, e_2 , i.e. $\theta_i(e_j) = \delta_{ij}$. Then

$$\eta = -c_1\theta_1 - c_2\theta_2, \quad (44)$$

where c_1, c_2 are the structural functions satisfying $d\theta_i = c_i\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$, for $i = 1, 2$.

(ii) Let K denote the Gaussian curvature and σ the area form of (S, g) , then on $S \setminus Z$

$$d\eta = K\sigma. \quad (45)$$

(iii) Assume q is an isolated zero of X and let $\{C_\delta\}_{\delta>0}$ be a family of smooth embedded circles in S enclosing q and converging uniformly to it. Then

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{C_\delta} \eta = 2\pi \text{ind}(q). \quad (46)$$

Proof. (i), (ii). These are standard properties of the Levi-Civita form. See for instance [Pet16, Ex. 3.4.28] or [ABB20, Sec. 4.4.1] for details. For completeness we prove (i).

The forms θ_1, θ_2 form a basis of 1-forms on $S \setminus Z$, therefore $\eta = \eta(e_1)\theta_1 + \eta(e_2)\theta_2$. We can then compute the coefficient

$$\eta(e_1) = g(\nabla_{e_1} e_1, e_2) = -g(e_1, \nabla_{e_1} e_2) = -g(e_1, \nabla_{e_2} e_1 + [e_1, e_2]) = -c_1.$$

Where we used the fact that ∇ is metric and torsion free, and $g(e_i, e_j)$ is constant. Repeating analogous computations one obtains $\eta(e_2) = -c_2$.

(iii). If $\delta > 0$ is small enough we may assume that q is the only zero of $X|_{B_\delta}$, where B_δ is the connected component of $S \setminus C_\delta$ containing q , so that $C_\delta = \partial B_\delta$. We would like to express in coordinates

$$F : \partial B_\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1, \quad F(p) = \frac{X}{|X|} \Big|_p = e_1|_p. \quad (47)$$

Fix a regular parametrization $\gamma : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow C_\delta$ of $\partial B_\delta = C_\delta$. Choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough, consider an oriented smooth orthonormal frame e'_1, e'_2 on B_δ and a function $\phi : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$F(\gamma(t)) = \cos \phi(t) e'_1 + \sin \phi(t) e'_2, \quad \forall t \in [0, 2\pi].$$

Moreover, by (42), one has

$$\phi(2\pi) - \phi(0) = 2\pi \deg(F) = 2\pi \operatorname{ind}(q).$$

Consider the Levi-Civita connection form η' associated with the frame e'_1, e'_2 , namely

$$\eta'(v) = g(\nabla_v e'_1, e'_2), \quad \forall v \in TB_\delta.$$

Note that due to (47) and (43), along $\gamma(t)$, one has

$$e'_1 = \cos \phi(t) e_1 - \sin \phi(t) e_2, \quad e'_2 = \sin \phi(t) e_1 + \cos \phi(t) e_2$$

We stress that e'_1, e'_2 is smooth on S while e_1, e_2 is singular on Z . For any $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \eta'(\dot{\gamma}(t)) &= g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} e'_1, e'_2) = g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)} (\cos \phi(t) e_1 - \sin \phi(t) e_2), \sin \phi(t) e_1 + \cos \phi(t) e_2) \\ &= -\dot{\phi}(t) + g(\nabla_v e_1, e_2) = -\dot{\phi}(t) + \eta(\dot{\gamma}(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Notice that, since η' is smooth on B_δ , applying Stokes theorem we find by absolute continuity of the integral

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta} \eta' = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_\delta} d\eta' = 0. \quad (49)$$

We next combine (49) together with (48) to compute the limit

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta} \eta &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta} \eta - \eta' = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{2\pi} (\eta(\dot{\gamma}(t)) - \eta'(\dot{\gamma}(t))) dt \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{2\pi} \dot{\phi}(t) dt = \phi(2\pi) - \phi(0) = 2\pi \operatorname{ind}(q). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5.2. Riemannian ε -frames. We apply the construction of Section 5.1 to the case when X is the characteristic vector field, hence $Z = \Sigma(S)$ the characteristic set, and the metrics are given by the Riemannian approximations g^ε inducing Riemannian structures $(S, g^\varepsilon|_S)$. We denote by $|\cdot|_\varepsilon$ the norm induced by g^ε and $J^\varepsilon : TS \rightarrow TS$ is the corresponding complex structure.

Definition 5.3. *Let (M, \mathcal{D}, g) be a contact sub-Riemannian manifold and S an embedded oriented surface with characteristic vector field X . We define the Riemannian ε -frame on $S \setminus \Sigma(S)$*

$$e_1^\varepsilon = \frac{X}{|X|_\varepsilon}, \quad e_2^\varepsilon = \frac{J^\varepsilon X}{|X|_\varepsilon},$$

We also denote the associated dual basis of 1-forms $\theta_1^\varepsilon, \theta_2^\varepsilon$ on $S \setminus \Sigma(S)$ satisfying

$$\theta_i^\varepsilon(e_j^\varepsilon) = \delta_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, 2.$$

For simplicity of notation, when $\varepsilon = 1$ we will omit superscripts

$$e_i := e_i^1, \quad \theta_i := \theta_i^1, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (50)$$

Remark 5.4. By definition (21) of characteristic vector field X , outside the characteristic set $\ker \theta_2 = \ker \omega|_S$, where ω is the normalized contact form. Therefore there exists a function f smooth outside of the characteristic set, such that

$$\omega = f\theta_2.$$

Let σ be the area form of $g^1|_S$. Using $\theta_2(e_2) = 1$ and $\sigma(e_1, e_2) = 1$, we may compute the function f

$$f = \omega(e_2) = \sigma(X, e_2) = \sigma(|X|e_1, e_2) = |X|.$$

Lemma 5.5. *Let (M, \mathcal{D}, g) be a contact sub-Riemannian manifold and S an embedded oriented surface with characteristic vector field X . For any $\varepsilon > 0$ let $b_\varepsilon : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the following function*

$$b_\varepsilon = \sqrt{1 - \operatorname{div}(X)^2(1 - \varepsilon)} = \sqrt{1 - (1 - |X|^2)(1 - \varepsilon)}. \quad (51)$$

The Riemannian ε -coframe of Definition 5.3 satisfies

$$\theta_1^\varepsilon = \theta_1, \quad \theta_2^\varepsilon = \frac{b_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \theta_2. \quad (52)$$

Proof. We denote with $f_1 = X/|X|$ the normalized characteristic vector field of S , with f_2 the oriented horizontal orthonormal, and with f_0 the Reeb vector field. Denoting with ν_1, ν_2, ν_0 the corresponding dual coframe, i.e. $\nu_i(f_j) = \delta_{ij}$, according to (16) the Riemannian metric g^ε reads

$$g_\varepsilon = \nu_1 \otimes \nu_1 + \nu_2 \otimes \nu_2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \nu_0 \otimes \nu_0. \quad (53)$$

Let e_1, e_2 be the Riemannian frame of equation (50), i.e., $e_1 = f_1$ and e_2 is the oriented orthonormal complement obtained with respect to the metric $g^1|_S$. Substituting $\varepsilon = 1$ in the expression (53) we deduce the existence of a smooth function $a : S \setminus \Sigma(S) \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ such that

$$e_1 = f_1 = \frac{X}{|X|}, \quad e_2 = af_2 + \sqrt{1 - a^2}f_0.$$

Denoting with σ the area form induced by g^1 on S , since $\sigma(e_1, e_2) = 1$ we can compute

$$|X|^2 = |X|^2 \sigma(e_1, e_2) = |X| \sigma(X, e_2) = |X| \iota_X \sigma(e_2) = |X| \omega(e_2) = |X| \sqrt{1 - a^2},$$

where in the fourth equality we have used the definition of the characteristic vector field (21), and in the last one the fact that $\omega(f_2) = 0$ and $\omega(f_0) = 1$. We deduce that

$$a^2 = 1 - |X|^2 = \operatorname{div}(X)^2,$$

where the last equality is obtained from equation (22). Note that

$$g^\varepsilon(e_1, e_1) = 1, \quad g^\varepsilon(e_2, e_1) = 0, \quad g^\varepsilon(e_2, e_2) = a^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(1 - a^2) = \frac{b_\varepsilon^2}{\varepsilon},$$

therefore, the Riemannian ε -frame of Definition 5.3 can be computed as

$$e_1^\varepsilon = e_1, \quad e_2^\varepsilon = \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon} e_2,$$

and, consequently, the associate coframe has the expression (52). \square

5.3. Estimates on Levi-Civita forms. Given an oriented Riemannian surface (S, g) and a differential form $\eta \in \Omega^1(S)$ we define the norm of η at the point $q \in S$ as

$$\|\eta\|(q) = \sup_{v \in T_q S, v \neq 0} \frac{|\eta_q(v)|}{|v|},$$

where $|v| = \sqrt{g(v, v)}$. In particular, the norm of a differential 1-form is a function $\|\eta\| : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Observe that for $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega^1(S)$, and σ is the area form of (S, g) , the following inequality holds

$$\left| \int_S \alpha \wedge \beta \right| \leq \int_S \|\alpha\| \|\beta\| \sigma. \quad (54)$$

We now compute the Levi-Civita connection form η^ε associated with a Riemannian ε -frame of Definition 5.3, and analyse some of its properties.

Lemma 5.6. *Let η^ε be the Levi-Civita connection 1-form associated with the Riemannian ε -frame. Then*

$$\eta^\varepsilon = -\frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon} c_1 \theta_1 - c_2 \frac{b_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \theta_2 - \frac{e_1(b_\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \theta_2, \quad (55)$$

where $c_1, c_2 \in C^\infty(S \setminus \Sigma(S))$ satisfies $d\theta_i = c_i \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$, $i = 1, 2$, and b_ε is defined in (51).

Proof. We compute the differentials of the coframe $\theta_1^\varepsilon, \theta_2^\varepsilon$ in (52):

$$d\theta_1^\varepsilon = c_1\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 = \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon}c_1\theta_1^\varepsilon \wedge \theta_2^\varepsilon,$$

Analogously for $\theta_2^\varepsilon = (b_\varepsilon/\sqrt{\varepsilon})\theta_2$ we get:

$$d\theta_2^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}e_1(b_\varepsilon)\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 + \frac{b_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}c_2\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 = \left(\frac{e_1(b_\varepsilon)}{b_\varepsilon} + c_2\right)\theta_1^\varepsilon \wedge \theta_2^\varepsilon.$$

According to (44), the Levi-Civita connection form associated with the frame $e_1^\varepsilon, e_2^\varepsilon$ reads

$$\eta_\varepsilon = -c_1^\varepsilon\theta_1^\varepsilon - c_2^\varepsilon\theta_2^\varepsilon, \quad c_1^\varepsilon = \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon}c_1, \quad c_2^\varepsilon = \left(\frac{e_1(b_\varepsilon)}{b_\varepsilon} + c_2\right).$$

Substituting the expression for $\theta_1^\varepsilon, \theta_2^\varepsilon$ computed in equation (52), we get (55). \square

We are now ready to prove the following crucial estimates.

Proposition 5.7. *Let η^ε be the Levi-Civita connection 1-form associated with the Riemannian ε -frame. The following assertions hold:*

(i) *the form $\alpha \in \Omega^1(S \setminus \Sigma(S))$ defined by*

$$\alpha := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \eta^\varepsilon = -\frac{\operatorname{div}(X)}{|X|}\omega|_S, \quad (56)$$

is smooth on $S \setminus \Sigma(S)$ and uniformly bounded in norm. Furthermore

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \Big|_q = 0, \quad \forall q \in S \setminus \Sigma(S). \quad (57)$$

(ii) *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$, independent of ε , such that*

$$\|d\alpha\| \leq \frac{C}{|X|}, \quad \left\| \eta_\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| \leq \frac{C}{|X|}, \quad (58)$$

where the norms are computed with respect to the metric $g^1|_S$ of Definition 2.1.

Proof. (i). Notice that the function $(q, \varepsilon) \mapsto b_\varepsilon(q)$, defined in equation (51), is strictly positive outside of the characteristic set, and smooth in both variables $(q, \varepsilon) \in (S \setminus \Sigma(S)) \times [0, 1]$. Therefore, for any non characteristic point $q \in S$ we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \eta_q^\varepsilon = -\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{b_\varepsilon}c_1\theta_1 + c_2b_\varepsilon\theta_2 + e_1(b_\varepsilon)\theta_2 \right) \Big|_q = -(c_2b_0\theta_2 + e_1(b_0)\theta_2)|_q = \alpha_q. \quad (59)$$

Let us compute the coefficient c_2 satisfying $d\theta_2 = c_2\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$. Writing $\theta_2 = \iota_{e_1}\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$ and recalling the definition the divergence (19) one has

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= d\theta_2(e_1, e_2) = d(\iota_{e_1}\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2)(e_1, e_2) = \operatorname{div}(e_1) = \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{X}{|X|}\right) \\ &= X(|X|^{-1}) + |X|^{-1}\operatorname{div}(X) = -|X|^{-3}g(\nabla_X X, X) + |X|^{-1}\operatorname{div}(X) \\ &= -|X|^{-1}g(\nabla_{e_1} X, e_1) + |X|^{-1}\operatorname{div}(X), \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where we used the formula $\operatorname{div}(fY) = Y(f) + f\operatorname{div}(Y)$, which holds for every smooth function f and vector field Y . By definition of b_ε in (51) we have $b_0 = |X|$, therefore

$$b_0c_2 = |X|c_2 = -g(\nabla_{e_1} X, e_1) + \operatorname{div}(X). \quad (61)$$

Next we compute the term $e_1(b_0)$:

$$e_1(b_0) = |X|^{-1}X(|X|) = |X|^{-2}g(\nabla_X X, X) = g(\nabla_{e_1} X, e_1). \quad (62)$$

Combining equations (59), (61) and (62) and $\theta_2 = \omega/|X|$ (cf. Remark 5.4), we deduce

$$\alpha_q = -(c_2 b_0 + e_1(b_0))\theta_2|_q = -\operatorname{div}(X)\theta_2|_q = -\frac{\operatorname{div}(X)}{|X|}\omega|_q.$$

Since $\|\theta_2\| = 1$ and $\operatorname{div}(X)$ is smooth and well defined on the whole S , we deduce that α is uniformly bounded in norm. To prove (57), we fix a non characteristic point $q \in S \setminus \Sigma(S)$ and consider the map (51) as a function of ε :

$$[0, 1] \ni \varepsilon \mapsto b_\varepsilon(q) = \sqrt{1 - (1 - |X_q|)^2(1 - \varepsilon)}. \quad (63)$$

Since $q \in S \setminus \Sigma(S)$, then $|X_q| > 0$. According to Proposition 2.4, $|X_q| \leq 1$. Therefore the map (63) is smooth and strictly positive. Therefore, the map

$$[0, 1] \ni \varepsilon \mapsto r_\varepsilon(q) := \frac{b_\varepsilon(q) - b_0(q)}{\varepsilon},$$

is also smooth. Consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon(q)} c_1 \theta_1 + \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} (b_\varepsilon(q) - b_0(q)) \theta_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} e_1(b_\varepsilon(q) - b_0(q)) \theta_2 \right\| \\ &= \left\| \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon(q)} c_1 \theta_1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon} c_2 r_\varepsilon(q) \theta_2 + \sqrt{\varepsilon} e_1(r_\varepsilon(q)) \theta_2 \right\| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that θ_1, θ_2 have constant norm 1 with respect to the metric $g^1|_S$, and the fact that $b_\varepsilon(q)$ is strictly positive and that $r_\varepsilon(q), e_1(r_\varepsilon(q))$ are smooth.

(ii). Let us compute $d\alpha$. Applying Leibnitz rule and $d\theta_2 = c_2\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d\alpha &= -d(\operatorname{div}(X)) \wedge \theta_2 - \operatorname{div}(X) d\theta_2 = -(e_1(\operatorname{div}(X)) + c_2)\theta_1 \wedge \theta_2 \\ &= -\left(e_1(\operatorname{div}(X)) + \frac{\operatorname{div}(X) - g(\nabla_{e_1} X, e_1)}{|X|} \right) \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2, \end{aligned}$$

where, in the third equality, we used the expression of c_2 given in (60). Since $\operatorname{div}(X)$ is smooth, $|\operatorname{div}(X)|$ is bounded. Moreover, denoting $a = \operatorname{div}(X)$ and ∇a the gradient of a , we find

$$|e_1(a)| = |g(\nabla a, e_1)| \leq |\nabla a|. \quad (64)$$

Hence the term $|e_1(\operatorname{div}(X))|$ is uniformly bounded. Furthermore, using that the map $v \mapsto \nabla_v X$ is a smooth endomorphism of TS and S is compact, we deduce the existence of a constant C such that

$$|g(\nabla_v X, w)| \leq |\nabla_v X| |w| \leq C |v| |w|, \quad \forall v, w \in TS. \quad (65)$$

We deduce that $|g(\nabla_{e_1} X, e_1)| \leq C$. Therefore the first estimate in (58) is proved.

Moving to the second estimate, to lighten the notation we denote $a^2 = \operatorname{div}(X)^2 = 1 - |X|^2$, recalling (22). Then, according to (51)

$$b_\varepsilon = \sqrt{1 - a^2(1 - \varepsilon)}.$$

Observe that $a^2 \in [0, 1]$, hence $\sqrt{1 - a^2(1 - \varepsilon)} - \sqrt{1 - a^2} = |b_\varepsilon - b_0|$ is an increasing function of a for $a, \varepsilon \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, $b_\varepsilon \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Thus one gets

$$|b_\varepsilon - b_0| \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq b_\varepsilon. \quad (66)$$

Combining (66) with $\|\theta_i\| = 1$ we deduce the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| &= \left\| \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon} c_1 \theta_1 + \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} (b_\varepsilon - b_0) \theta_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} e_1(b_\varepsilon - b_0) \theta_2 \right\| \\ &\leq |c_1| + |c_2| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} |e_1(b_\varepsilon - b_0)|. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

The derivative $e_1(b_\varepsilon)$ can be computed as follows

$$e_1(b_\varepsilon) = e_1 \left(\sqrt{1 - a^2(1 - \varepsilon)} \right) = \frac{-ae_1(a)(1 - \varepsilon)}{\sqrt{1 - a^2(1 - \varepsilon)}} = \frac{-ae_1(a)}{b_\varepsilon} (1 - \varepsilon).$$

The function $e_1(b_0)$ is obtained substituting $\varepsilon = 0$ in the above expression, thus $e_1(b_0) = -ae_1(a)/b_0$. Thus we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}|e_1(b_\varepsilon - b_0)| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left| ae_1(a) \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{b_0} \right) \right| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left| b_0 e_1(b_0) \left(\frac{1-\varepsilon}{b_\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{b_0} \right) \right| \quad (68)$$

Manipulating (68), we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}|e_1(b_\varepsilon - b_0)| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \left| b_0 e_1(b_0) \left(\frac{b_0 - b_\varepsilon}{b_\varepsilon b_0} - \frac{\varepsilon}{b_\varepsilon} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{e_1(b_0)}{b_\varepsilon} \frac{b_0 - b_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right| + \left| \frac{b_0 e_1(b_0) \sqrt{\varepsilon}}{b_\varepsilon} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{e_1(b_0)}{b_0} \right| + |b_0 e_1(b_0)|, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

and in the last inequality we have used the estimates (66) and $b_\varepsilon \geq b_0$. Substituting (69) into (67)

$$\left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| \leq |c_1| + |c_2| + |b_0 e_1(b_0)| + \frac{|e_1(b_0)|}{|X|}. \quad (70)$$

The function $a = \operatorname{div}(X)$ is smooth, by (64) the term $|b_0 e_1(b_0)| = |ae_1(a)|$ is bounded. The term $e_1(b_0)$ is computed in (62) and, by (65), it is bounded. Furthermore, from (61), by smoothness of $\operatorname{div}(X)$ and (65), we deduce that

$$|c_2| = \frac{|-g(\nabla_{e_1} X, e_1) + \operatorname{div}(X)|}{|X|} \leq \frac{C}{|X|}, \quad (71)$$

for some constant $C > 0$. A computation analogous to that of equation (60) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= d\theta_1(e_1, e_2) = -d(\iota_{e_2} \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2)(e_1, e_2) = -\operatorname{div}(e_2) = -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{JX}{|X|} \right) \\ &= -JX(|X|^{-1}) - |X|^{-1} \operatorname{div}(JX) = |X|^{-3} g(\nabla_{JX} X, X) - |X|^{-1} \operatorname{div}(X) \\ &= |X|^{-1} g(\nabla_{e_2} X, e_1) - |X|^{-1} \operatorname{div}(JX). \end{aligned}$$

By smoothness of $\operatorname{div}(JX)$ and (65), we deduce that

$$|c_1| = \frac{|g(\nabla_{e_2} X, e_1) - \operatorname{div}(JX)|}{|X|} \leq \frac{C}{|X|}. \quad (72)$$

Substituting estimates (71) and (72) in (70) we deduce that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| \leq \frac{C}{|X|}.$$

which concludes the proof. \square

We conclude the section with a technical lemma which is crucial in the proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point of finite order $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$. Then there exists a family of smooth curves $\{C_\delta\}_{\delta>0}$, enclosing the point q and converging uniformly to it, such that*

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \operatorname{length}(C_\delta) = 0, \quad \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{C_\delta} |\eta^\varepsilon| < +\infty,$$

where η^ε is the Levi-Civita connection form described Proposition 5.7.

Proof. According to Proposition 4.1, there exist coordinates (x, y) near q and $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$q = (0, 0), \quad X = x(\nu + a_1(x, y))\partial_x + \left(\mu \frac{y^k}{k!} + xa_0(x, y) + b_0(y) \right) \partial_y,$$

We set $C_\delta = \{(x, y) \in S \mid x^2 + y^2 = \delta^2\}$. Let $B_\delta = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x^2 + y^2 < \delta^2\}$. We may assume that the coordinates (x, y) are defined on an open set containing the closure of B_1 . Let e'_1, e'_2 be a smooth

oriented orthonormal frame for the metric $g^\varepsilon|_S$ (in this proof $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ is fixed hence we omit it in the notation) defined on the whole B_1 , and write

$$X = |X|(\cos \phi e'_1 + \sin \phi e'_2) =: V'_1 e'_1 + V'_2 e'_2$$

for some smooth function $\phi : B_\delta \setminus \{q\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We parametrize C_δ by $\gamma : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow S$ as follows

$$\gamma(t) = (\delta \cos(t), \delta \sin(t)), \quad \forall t \in [0, 2\pi]. \quad (73)$$

For any function $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we denote the derivative along γ with \dot{f} , in particular

$$\dot{f} = \frac{d}{dt} f(\gamma(t)) = (x\partial_y f - y\partial_x f)|_{\gamma(t)}. \quad (74)$$

Repeating verbatim the computations (48), which was needed in the proof of Proposition 5.2, we find

$$\eta^\varepsilon(\dot{\gamma}) - g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} e'_1, e'_2) = \dot{\phi}. \quad (75)$$

Since $V'_1 = |X| \cos \phi$, $V'_2 = |X| \sin \phi$, we have $(V'_1)^2 + (V'_2)^2 = |X|^2$ and we can compute

$$\dot{\phi} = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\arctan \left(\frac{V'_2}{V'_1} \right) \Big|_{\gamma(t)} \right) = \frac{V'_1 \dot{V}'_2 - V'_2 \dot{V}'_1}{(V'_1)^2 + (V'_2)^2} = \frac{1}{|X|^2} V' \wedge \dot{V}' \quad (76)$$

where we identify $\dot{V}' = (\dot{V}'_1, \dot{V}'_2)$ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^2 and, given $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we set $v \wedge w := \det(v, w)$. Combining (76) with (75) yields

$$\eta^\varepsilon(\dot{\gamma}) - g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} e'_1, e'_2) = \frac{1}{|X|^2} V' \wedge \dot{V}' \quad (77)$$

We now introduce the following notation

$$V_1 = \nu x + x a_1(x, y), \quad V_2 = \mu \frac{y^k}{k!} + x a_0(x, y) + b_0(y), \quad V = (V_1, V_2),$$

so that $X = V_1 \partial_x + V_2 \partial_y$. Since both e'_1, e'_2 and ∂_x, ∂_y are smooth basis for TB_1 , there exists a smooth map $A : B_1 \rightarrow GL_2(\mathbb{R})$, and a constant $C > 0$ such that on B_1

$$V' = AV, \quad |\det A| \leq C, \quad \|\dot{A}\| \leq C.$$

where we stress by (74) that $\dot{A} = x\partial_y A - y\partial_x A$, hence is a smooth matrix-valued map on B_1 .

Since e'_1, e'_2 are smooth near q , we can also assume $|g(\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} e'_1, e'_2)| \leq C$, by adapting the constant C . Therefore, substituting the expression of V' in terms of V in (77) we find

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta^\varepsilon(\dot{\gamma})| &\leq C + \frac{1}{|X|^2} \left| AV \wedge \frac{d}{dt} (AV) \right| \\ &\leq C + \frac{1}{|X|^2} |AV \wedge (\dot{A}V + A\dot{V})| \\ &\leq C + C^2 + \frac{C}{|X|^2} |V \wedge \dot{V}|. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

By definition of γ (73), $\dot{x} = -y$ and $\dot{y} = x$. Therefore

$$\dot{V}_1 = -\nu y - y a_1(x, y) + x h_1(x, y), \quad \dot{V}_2 = -y a_0(x, y) + x h_0(x, y),$$

where h_1, h_0 are smooth functions. Collecting terms and recalling $b_0(y) = O(y^{k+1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |V \wedge \dot{V}| &= \left(x \begin{pmatrix} \nu + a_1 \\ a_0 \end{pmatrix} + y^k \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{\mu}{k!} + \frac{b_0}{y^k} \end{pmatrix} \right) \wedge \left(-y \begin{pmatrix} \nu + a_1 \\ a_0 \end{pmatrix} + x \begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &= \ell_1(x, y)x^2 + \ell_2(x, y)xy^k + \ell_3(x, y)y^{k+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

where ℓ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, are smooth functions, hence they are bounded on B_1 , say $|\ell_i| \leq C$ (from this point C denotes a constant suitably chosen). Combining the estimate described in item (ii) of Theorem 1.10, namely $|X|^2 \geq C(x^2 + y^{2k})$, with (79), one has

$$\frac{1}{|X|^2} |V \wedge \dot{V}| \leq |\ell_1| + \frac{1}{2}|\ell_2| + |\ell_3| \frac{|y|^{k+1}}{x^2 + y^{2k}} \leq 2C + C \frac{|y|^{k+1}}{x^2 + y^{2k}}.$$

Substituting the latter inequality in (78) we are left with

$$|\eta^\varepsilon(\dot{\gamma})| \leq C + C \frac{|y|^{k+1}}{x^2 + y^{2k}}.$$

Therefore, we have the following estimate

$$\int_{C_\delta} |\eta^\varepsilon| = \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta^\varepsilon(\dot{\gamma})| dt \leq 2\pi C + C \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\delta^{k+1} |\sin(t)|^{k+1}}{\delta^2 \cos(t)^2 + \delta^{2k} \sin(t)^{2k}} dt.$$

To conclude the proof of the lemma is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\delta^{k+1} |\sin(t)|^{k+1}}{\delta^2 \cos(t)^2 + \delta^{2k} \sin(t)^{2k}} dt = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} 4 \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{\delta^{k+1} \sin(t)^{k+1}}{\delta^2 \cos(t)^2 + \delta^{2k} \sin(t)^{2k}} dt < +\infty.$$

The latter can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{\delta^{k+1} \sin(t)^{k+1}}{\delta^2 \cos(t)^2 + \delta^{2k} \sin(t)^{2k}} dt &\leq \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{\delta^{k+1} (\sin(t)^{k+1} + k \cos(t)^2 \sin(t)^{k-1})}{\delta^2 \cos(t)^2 + \delta^{2k} \sin(t)^{2k}} dt \\ &= \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\arctan \left(\frac{\delta^k \sin(t)^k}{\delta \cos(t)} \right) \right) dt = \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.9. There exists a smooth vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with an isolated singularity at the origin such that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta(0)} |\eta| = +\infty.$$

Indeed, consider the following smooth vector field on \mathbb{R}^2 (extended by continuity at the origin)

$$X = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{x^2 + y^2}\right) \left(\cos\left(\frac{y}{(x^2 + y^2)^2}\right) \partial_x + \sin\left(\frac{y}{(x^2 + y^2)^2}\right) \partial_y \right).$$

Such vector field has an isolated singularity at the origin. We compute η with respect to the Euclidean metric. Let us define a function ϕ by imposing $X = |X| \cos \phi \partial_x + |X| \sin \phi \partial_y$. Introducing polar coordinates, $(x, y) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$, we note that $|X| = \exp(r^{-2})$ and $\phi = r^{-3} \sin \theta$. We compute

$$\eta(\partial_\theta) = \frac{1}{|X|^2} g(\nabla_{\partial_\theta} X, JX) = g(\partial_\theta \cos \phi \partial_x + \partial_\theta \sin \phi \partial_y, \cos \phi \partial_y - \sin \phi \partial_x) = \partial_\theta \phi = r^{-3} \cos \theta.$$

Denoting with $B_\delta(0)$ the Euclidean ball of radius δ centred at the origin, we find

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta(0)} |\eta| = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta(\partial_\theta)| d\theta = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_0^{2\pi} \delta^{-3} |\cos \theta| = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} 4\delta^{-3} = +\infty.$$

6. CONVERGENCE OF MEASURES. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Let (S, g) be a smooth, compact and orientable Riemannian surface. Recall that $C^1(S)$ is a Banach space, endowed with the norm

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^1(S)} = \|\varphi\|_\infty + \|d\varphi\|_\infty.$$

Its dual space, $C^1(S)^*$, is also a Banach space endowed with the norm

$$\|\mu\|_{C^1(S)^*} = \sup_{\varphi \neq 0} \frac{|\mu(\varphi)|}{\|\varphi\|_{C^1(S)}}.$$

We recall that a sequence $\{\mu_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0} \subset C^1(S)^*$ strongly converges to $\mu_0 \in C^1(S)^*$ if

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mu_\varepsilon - \mu_0\|_{C^1(S)^*} = 0.$$

6.1. Proof of Theorem 1.2. Our goal is to prove the following limit in $C^1(S)^*$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{\mu_{-1}}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i}, \quad (80)$$

where, denoting α the 1-form in Lemma 5.7, one has

$$\mu_{-1} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon} K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon = d\alpha. \quad (81)$$

Recall that characteristic points with finite order of degeneracy are isolated. By compactness of S the characteristic set is finite $\Sigma(S) = \{q_1, \dots, q_\ell\}$. According to Lemma 5.8, for each q_i there exists a family of circles $\{C_\delta(q_i)\}_{\delta>0} \subset S$ enclosing q_i and converging uniformly to it for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \text{length}(C_\delta(q_i)) = 0, \quad \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{C_\delta(q_i)} |\eta^\varepsilon| = L_\varepsilon < +\infty, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1],$$

Let $B_\delta(q_i)$ be the connected component of $S \setminus C_\delta(q_i)$ containing q_i , so that $C_\delta(q_i) = \partial B_\delta(q_i)$ and let

$$B_\delta := B_\delta(q_1) \cup \dots \cup B_\delta(q_n), \quad S_\delta := S \setminus B_\delta. \quad (82)$$

To prove (80), we split the proof into more steps.

Step 1. We prove the following equality: for $\varphi \in C^1(S)$ and every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ one has

$$\int_S \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = - \int_S d\varphi \wedge \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(q_i) \text{ind}(q_i). \quad (83)$$

Proof of Step 1. Corollary 1.13 implies that $|X|^{-1}$ is Lebesgue integrable on S . Then, item (iii) of Proposition 5.7 implies that $\|d\alpha\|$ is Lebesgue integrable as well, therefore, for $\varphi \in C^1(S)$ we have

$$\int_S \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{S_\delta} \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right).$$

Furthermore, writing $K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon = d\eta^\varepsilon$ by (45) and using Stokes theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_S \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{S_\delta} \varphi d \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \\ &= \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(- \int_{S_\delta} d\varphi \wedge \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) + \int_{\partial B_\delta} \varphi \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

According to (58), there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of ε such that $\|\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\| \leq C/|X|$. Since $|X|^{-1}$ is integrable, we can pass to the limit in the first term in (84) and write

$$\int_S \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = - \int_S d\varphi \wedge \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) + \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta} \varphi \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right). \quad (85)$$

We claim that the following equality holds for the second term in the right hand side (recall that B_δ is a finite union of balls, cf. (82))

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \int_{\partial B_\delta} \varphi \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} 2\pi \varphi(q_i) \text{ind}(q_i), \quad \forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1]. \quad (86)$$

To prove the claim, we fix a characteristic point q_i and the corresponding ball $B_\delta(q_i)$ around it, and we fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Exploiting property (46) for the Levi-Civita connection form η^ε , we can write

$$L := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\partial B_\delta(q_i)} \varphi \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) - 2\pi \varphi(q_i) \text{ind}(q_i) \right| = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\partial B_\delta(q_i)} \varphi \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) - \int_{\partial B_\delta(q_i)} \varphi(q_i) \eta^\varepsilon \right|$$

so that we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} L &\leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\partial B_\delta(q_i)} (\varphi - \varphi(q_i)) \eta^\varepsilon \right| + \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\partial B_\delta(q_i)} \varphi \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(\max_{p \in \partial B_\delta(q_i)} |\varphi(p) - \varphi(q_i)| \right) \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \left(\int_{\partial B_\delta(q_i)} |\eta^\varepsilon| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

$$+ \left(\sup_{p \in S \setminus \Sigma(S)} \frac{|\varphi(p)| \|\alpha_p\|}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\text{length}(\partial B_\delta(q_i))). \quad (88)$$

The term in (87) is equal to zero, since φ is continuous and the limsup is finite by Lemma 5.8. Also (88) vanishes, since the length of ∂B_δ converges to zero by Lemma 5.8 and $\|\alpha\|$ is bounded by item (ii) of Proposition 5.7. This proves (86). Replacing (86) into (85) we deduce (83) and Step 1 is proved. \square

Step 2. We prove the following equality

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\| K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i} \right\|_{C^1(S)^*} = 0. \quad (89)$$

Proof of Step 2. Thanks to (83), for any $\varphi \in C^1(S)$ we have the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_S \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \varphi(q_i) \text{ind}(q_i) \right| &= \left| \int_S d\varphi \wedge \left(\eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{p \in S} \|d_p \varphi\| \int_S \left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| \sigma^1 \leq \|\varphi\|_{C^1(S)} \int_S \left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| \sigma^1, \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we have used (54). By definition of the $C^1(S)^*$ norm we have

$$\left\| K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i} \right\|_{C^1(S)^*} \leq \int_S \left\| \eta^\varepsilon - \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right\| \sigma^1.$$

On the one hand, according to (57), the difference $\eta^\varepsilon - \alpha/\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ converges to zero pointwise outside of the characteristic set (which has measure zero).

On the other hand, $\|\eta^\varepsilon - \alpha/\sqrt{\varepsilon}\|$ by (58) is dominated by $|X|^{-1}$, which is integrable. We can therefore apply Lebesgue dominated convergence and taking the limit of $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ on both sides we prove (89), concluding Step 2. \square

Step 2 proves (80). Then (81) is a direct consequence, since

$$\|\sqrt{\varepsilon} K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - d\alpha\|_{C^1(S)^*} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left\| K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i} \right\|_{C^1(S)^*} + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \left\| 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{ind}(q_i) \delta_{q_i} \right\|_{C^1(S)^*}.$$

and taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of both sides we get (81), concluding the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Remark 6.1. In the proof of Theorem 1.2 the measure μ_{-1} is explicitly computed and coincides with the exterior differential of the form α defined in (56). In particular

$$\mu_{-1} = -d \left(\frac{\text{div}(X)}{|X|} \omega|_S \right),$$

where $\omega|_S$ is the contact form normalized as in (15) and restricted to S .

7. AN OPERATIVE FORMULA FOR THE INVARIANTS

We provide an operative formula to compute the order of degeneracy of a characteristic point and its associated invariants, through the introduction of an auxiliary affine connection.

Let us first prove this preliminary lemma. Throughout the section when referring to ∇ as the Levi-Civita connection on TS , we mean with respect to $g^1|_S$.

Lemma 7.1. *Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection on TS . There exists a neighborhood $U \subset S$ of q such that the following linear endomorphism is (fibrewise) diagonalizable*

$$\nabla X : TS|_U \rightarrow TS|_U, \quad Y \mapsto \nabla_Y X.$$

In particular ∇X admits an eigenvector field $v_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$ satisfying $v_0|_q \in \ker D_q X$ and $|v_0|_q = 1$.

Proof. Since $X_q = 0$, the equality $\nabla X|_q = D_q X$ holds (see Remark 2.6). According to Remark 2.6, $\operatorname{div}_q(X) = \operatorname{trace}(D_q X) \neq 0$. Moreover $\det(D_q X) = 0$. We deduce that the characteristic polynomial of $\nabla X|_q$ has the following expression

$$P(\lambda)|_q = \lambda(\lambda - \operatorname{div}_q(X)).$$

Therefore $\nabla X|_q$ has two distinct eigenvalues at q . By continuity ∇X has two distinct eigenvalues in a neighbourhood $U \subset S$ of q . In particular these are smooth functions $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\lambda_0(q) = 0, \quad \lambda_1(q) = \operatorname{div}_q(X).$$

Then there exists an oriented couple (v_0, v_1) of normalized eigenvectors

$$\nabla_{v_i} X = \lambda_i v_i, \quad |v_i|_q = 1, \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (90)$$

Since $\lambda_0(q) = 0$, the vector field v_0 satisfies the requirements. \square

In the following proposition, whose proof is postponed to Section 7.1, we provide a formula for the invariants $\Lambda^{(k)}(q)$ defined in (5).

Proposition 7.2. *Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point with $\operatorname{ord}(q) = k \geq 2$. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection on TS . Let $v_0 \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$ be the vector field of Lemma 7.1. Then*

$$\Lambda^{(k)}(q) = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det(\nabla X)}{\operatorname{trace}(\nabla X)} \right) \Big|_q. \quad (91)$$

Furthermore, k is the smallest natural number such that the right-hand side of (91) is non zero.

Given ∇ the Levi-Civita connection on TS we define the function

$$\widehat{K} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \widehat{K}(p) = -1 + \frac{\det(\nabla X|_p)}{\operatorname{trace}^2(\nabla X|_p)}. \quad (92)$$

Proposition 7.3. *Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point with $\operatorname{ord}(q) = k$ odd, and let v_0 be the local vector field introduced in Lemma 7.1 and \widehat{K} be the function (92). Then*

$$\operatorname{div}_q(X) \Lambda^{(k)}(q) = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\widehat{K} + 1 \right) \Big|_q,$$

If S is compact and all characteristic points are of finite order of degeneracy, denoting $k_i = \operatorname{ord}(q_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ one has

$$\chi(S) = \sum_{k_i \text{ odd}} \operatorname{sign} \left(v_0^{(k_i-1)} \left(\widehat{K} + 1 \right) \Big|_{q_i} \right). \quad (93)$$

Proof. Let us start by writing

$$v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\widehat{K} + 1 \right) = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det \nabla X}{(\operatorname{trace} \nabla X)^2} \right) = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det \nabla X}{\operatorname{trace} \nabla X} \cdot \frac{1}{\operatorname{trace} \nabla X} \right)$$

Since k is the smallest natural number such that the right-hand side of (91) is non zero one has

$$v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\widehat{K} + 1 \right) \Big|_q = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det \nabla X}{\text{trace} \nabla X} \right) \Big|_q \frac{1}{\text{trace}(\nabla X|_q)} = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det \nabla X}{\text{trace} \nabla X} \right) \Big|_q \text{trace}(\nabla X|_q)$$

where, in the last equality, we used in a crucial way that $\text{div}_q(X) = \text{trace}(\nabla X|_q) = \pm 1$ at characteristic points thanks to Proposition 2.4 and Remark 2.6.

Equality (93) follows from Poincaré-Hopf theorem combined with (iii) of Theorem 1.10. \square

7.1. Proof of Proposition 7.2. Recall that there exists a couple (v_0, v_1) of normalized eigenvectors

$$\nabla_{v_i} X = \lambda_i v_i, \quad |v_i|_q = 1, \quad i = 0, 1, \quad (94)$$

whose associated eigenvalues satisfy, at characteristic points,

$$\lambda_0(q) = 0, \quad \lambda_1(q) = \text{div}_q(X).$$

Let us fix an arbitrary affine connection ∇' (possibly with torsion). Let v'_i and λ'_i , for $i = 0, 1$, be the eigenvectors and eigenvalues satisfying (94) associated with ∇' (notice that the arguments of Remark 2.6, and consequently those of Lemma 7.1, apply to arbitrary affine connections). Let \mathcal{C} (resp. \mathcal{C}') be the integral curve of v_0 (resp. v'_0) passing through q . We divide the proof into more steps.

Step 1. We have the identity: $\text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}'}, q)$.

We start by proving the existence of two smooth 1-forms β_0, β_1 defined near q , such that

$$\lambda'_0 = \lambda_0 + \beta_0(X), \quad v'_0 = v_0 + \beta_1(X)v_1. \quad (95)$$

Let A be the following tensor defined by the difference of the connections

$$A(Y, Z) = \nabla'_Y Z - \nabla_Y Z, \quad \forall Y, Z \in \mathfrak{X}(S).$$

Let us decompose A with respect to the basis v_0, v_1 , defining the smooth bilinear forms A^0, A^1

$$A = A^0 v_0 + A^1 v_1.$$

By construction $v'_0|_q$ and $v_0|_q$ have norm 1 and both belong to $\ker D_q X$, which is 1-dimensional. Hence $v'_0|_q = \pm v_0|_q$. Up to multiplying v'_0 by a smooth non vanishing function, we may assume

$$v'_0 = v_0 + f v_1.$$

for some smooth function f vanishing at q . We compute $\nabla'_{v'_0} X$ in two ways: on the one hand

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla'_{v'_0} X &= \nabla_{v'_0} X + A(v'_0, X) = \nabla_{v_0 + f v_1} X + A(v'_0, X) \\ &= \lambda_0 v_0 + f \lambda_1 v_1 + A(v'_0, X) = (\lambda_0 + A^0(v'_0, X))v_0 + (f \lambda_1 + A^1(v'_0, X))v_1. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand by definition $\nabla'_{v'_0} X = \lambda'_0 v'_0 = \lambda'_0(v_0 + f v_1)$, hence one can solve for f finding

$$\lambda'_0 = \lambda_0 + A^0(v'_0, X), \quad v'_0 = v_0 + \frac{A^1(v'_0, X)}{\lambda'_0 - \lambda_1} v_1.$$

Setting $\beta_0(\cdot) = A^0(v'_0, \cdot)$ and $\beta_1(\cdot) = A^1(v'_0, \cdot)/(\lambda'_0 - \lambda_1)$, equation (95) is proved.

Let \mathcal{C}' be the integral curve of v'_0 through q . Let $\text{order}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}', q)$ denote the order of contact between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' at q (see Definition A.1). Then Lemma A.5 together with the expression of v'_0 in (95) ensure

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}', q) \geq \text{order}(\beta_1(X)|_{\mathcal{C}}, q).$$

Moreover, due to $\nabla_{v_0} X = \lambda_0 v_0$, the following holds

$$\nabla_{v_0}^{(i)} X|_q = 0, \quad 0 \leq i \leq \text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q),$$

which, in turn, thanks to $\nabla_{v_0} \beta_i(X) = (\nabla_{v_0} \beta_i)X + \beta_i(\nabla_{v_0} X)$ implies that

$$\text{order}(\beta_i(X)|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) > \text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q), \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (96)$$

Combining (95) and (96) one gets

$$\text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}'}, q).$$

Consequently, we deduce that

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{C}', q) \geq \text{order}(\beta_1(X)|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) > \text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q). \quad (97)$$

We conclude by Lemma A.2 the desired identity

$$\text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}'}, q).$$

Step 2. The identity (91) hold for a particular connection ∇' with $k = \text{ord}(q) = \text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}'}, q) + 1$. According to Proposition 4.1 there exist coordinates (x, y) near q such that

$$q = (0, 0), \quad X = x(\nu + a_1(x, y))\partial_x + \left(\frac{\mu}{k!}y^k + xa_0(x, y) + b_0(y)\right)\partial_y,$$

Moreover, in these coordinates, the curve $y \mapsto (0, y)$ is an horizontal kernel extension and $\Lambda^{(k)}(q) = \mu$. Fix now a Riemannian metric on S which, near q , has the expression $dx^2 + dy^2$. Let ∇' be the associated Levi-Civita connection. The following equality holds

$$\left(\nabla'_{\partial_y} X\right)\Big|_{(0,y)} = \left(\frac{\mu}{(k-1)!}y^{k-1} + \partial_y b_0(y)\right)\partial_y. \quad (98)$$

Since the right hand side of (98) is propotional to ∂_y , we deduce that

$$v'_0|_{(0,y)} = f(y)\partial_y, \quad \lambda'_0|_{(0,y)} = \mu \frac{y^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} + \partial_y b_0(y),$$

where f is a smooth function satisfying $f(0) = \pm 1$. It follows that $y \mapsto (0, y)$ is a re-parametrization of the integral curve \mathcal{C}' of v'_0 passing through the origin. Therefore, by property (34) of b_0

$$\text{order}(\lambda'_0|_{\mathcal{C}'}, q) = k - 1 = \text{ord}(q) - 1.$$

Applying (99) we obtain

$$v_0'^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det \nabla' X}{\text{trace} \nabla' X} \right) \Big|_q = (\pm 1)^{k-1} \frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \left(\frac{\det \nabla' X}{\text{trace} \nabla' X} \Big|_{(0,y)} \right) \Big|_{y=0} = \frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \left(\frac{\det \nabla' X}{\text{trace} \nabla' X} \Big|_{(0,y)} \right) \Big|_{y=0},$$

since k is odd. By property (34) of b_0 , k is the smallest natural number such that $\frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \lambda'_0(0, y)|_{y=0}$ is non zero, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \left(\frac{\det \nabla' X}{\text{trace} \nabla' X} \Big|_{(0,y)} \right) \Big|_{y=0} &= \frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \left(\lambda'_0 \cdot \frac{\lambda'_1}{\lambda'_1 + \lambda'_0} \Big|_{(0,y)} \right) \Big|_{y=0} \\ &= \frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \lambda'_0(0, y) \Big|_{y=0} \frac{\lambda'_1(0, 0)}{\lambda'_1(0, 0) + \lambda'_0(0, 0)} \\ &= \frac{d^{k-1}}{dy^{k-1}} \lambda'_0(0, y) \Big|_{y=0} = \mu = \Lambda^{(k)}(q). \end{aligned}$$

Claim 3. Equation (91) holds for the Levi-Civita connection.

Combining Claim 2 and Claim 3 we see that, for any connection $k - 1 = \text{ord}(q) - 1 = \text{order}(\lambda_0|_{\mathcal{C}}, q)$. Thus, k is the smallest natural number such that $v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda_0)|_q$ is non zero and one has

$$v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\frac{\det(\nabla X)}{\text{trace}(\nabla X)} \right) \Big|_q = v_0^{(k-1)} \left(\lambda_0 \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_0} \right) \Big|_q = v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda_0) \Big|_q \frac{\lambda_1(q)}{\lambda_1(q) + \lambda_0(q)} = v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda_0) \Big|_q,$$

where we have used $\lambda_1(q) = \text{div}_q(X) \neq 0$, and $\lambda_0(q) = 0$. On the other hand, by (95) and (96)

$$v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda_0) \Big|_q = v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda'_0 - \beta_0(X)) \Big|_q = v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda'_0) \Big|_q.$$

Furthermore, (97) and the fact that $v_0|_q = \pm v'_0|_q$ allow applying Lemma A.2 and Remark A.3 to the curves \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{C}' and the function λ'_0 , finding

$$v_0^{(k-1)}(\lambda'_0)\Big|_q = (\pm 1)^{k-1} v_0'^{(k-1)}(\lambda'_0)\Big|_q = v_0'^{(k-1)}(\lambda'_0)\Big|_q = v_0'^{(k-1)}\left(\frac{\det(\nabla'X)}{\text{trace}(\nabla'X)}\right)\Big|_q.$$

Choosing ∇' as in Claim 2 and combining the latter three equations, we prove the claim.

We conclude the proof: by Claim 3 (91) holds. Combining Claim 1 and Claim 2 we see that k is the smallest natural number such that the right hand side of (91) is non zero.

7.2. An observation in the analytic case. As an application of Proposition 1.12, we prove that in the analytic setting an isolated characteristic point necessarily has finite order of degeneracy.

Proposition 7.4. *Let S be a analytic surface embedded in a analytic 3D contact sub-Riemannian manifold. Let $q \in S$ be a characteristic point with $\text{ord}(q) = +\infty$, then q is contained in an embedded analytic curve of characteristic points. In particular q is not isolated.*

Proof. Since data are analytic, the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of $g^1|_S$ is also analytic. Consequently the eigenvector field v_0 of Lemma 7.1 and the corresponding simple eigenvalue λ_0 are analytic as well. Since $\text{ord}(q) = +\infty$, Proposition 7.2 implies that

$$v_0^{(k)}\left(\frac{\det(\nabla X)}{\text{trace}(\nabla X)}\right)\Big|_q = 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Repeating the computation of the previous section we find for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (recall $\lambda_0(q) = 0$)

$$v_0^{(k)}\left(\frac{\det(\nabla X)}{\text{trace}(\nabla X)}\right)\Big|_q = v_0^{(k)}\left(\lambda_0 \cdot \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_0}\right)\Big|_q = v_0^{(k)}(\lambda_0)\Big|_q \frac{\lambda_1(q)}{\lambda_1(q) + \lambda_0(q)} = v_0^{(k)}(\lambda_0)\Big|_q.$$

Combining the two latter equations $v_0^{(k)}(\lambda_0)|_q = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow M$ be an embedded integral curve of v_0 passing through q at $t = 0$, which is analytic. One has

$$\lambda_0(\gamma(t)) = 0, \quad \forall t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon).$$

By definition of γ , it holds $\dot{\gamma}(t) = v_0|_{\gamma(t)}$. We compute

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}(t)}X = \nabla_{v_0}X|_{\gamma(t)} = \lambda_0(\gamma(t))X|_{\gamma(t)} = 0, \quad \forall t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon).$$

Therefore the characteristic field X is parallel along γ and vanishes at $\gamma(0) = q$. It follows that $X|_{\gamma(t)} = 0$ for all $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and that γ is an analytic curve of characteristic points containing q . \square

The proof of Corollary 1.14 now follows easily.

Proof of Corollary 1.14. Since S is analytic and characteristic points are assumed to be isolated, by Proposition 7.4 every characteristic point has finite order of degeneracy. Hence, according to Corollary 1.13, $|X|^{-1} \in L^1_{loc}(S, \sigma)$ for any smooth measure σ . The estimate $|\mathcal{H}| \leq C|X|^{-1}$ (cf. for instance in [Ros23, Section 2.1]) concludes the proof. \square

APPENDIX A. SOME TECHNICAL LEMMAS

A.1. Orders of contact. We recall the definition of order of vanishing of a function and order of contact of two curves, which will be needed in what follows.

Let S be a smooth surface and $\mathcal{C} \subset S$ be an embedded curve. Let $q \in \mathcal{C}$ and let $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a smooth function. Let $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be a smooth regular parametrization such that $\gamma(0) = q$, then the order of f at q , along \mathcal{C} , is defined as

$$\text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}}, q) = \inf \left\{ i \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{d^i}{dt^i} f(\gamma(t))\Big|_{t=0} \neq 0 \right\}.$$

It is elementary to see that the order of a function at a point along a curve does not depend on the parametrization since for $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a smooth function having order of vanishing $k \in \mathbb{N}$ at the origin, and $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a diffeomorphism such that $\varphi(0) = 0$, then

$$\left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} f(\varphi(t)) \right|_{t=0} = (\varphi'(0))^k f^{(k)}(0). \quad (99)$$

Let us define the order of contact of two embedded curves.

Definition A.1. Let S be a smooth surface and $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset S$ be two embedded curves. Then $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are said to have contact of order $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ at $q \in \mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2$, and we write

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, q) = k,$$

if $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the largest integer such that there exist smooth regular parametrizations $\gamma_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_i$, for $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = q, \quad \frac{d^j \gamma_1}{dt^j}(0) = \frac{d^j \gamma_2}{dt^j}(0), \quad \forall 0 \leq j \leq k.$$

If the order of contact of the intersection of two curves is large enough, one can use equivalently any of the curve to compute the order of vanishing of a function.

Lemma A.2. Let S be a smooth surface, $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset S$ be smooth embedded curves and assume that

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, q) \geq \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q).$$

Then

$$\text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q) = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_2}, q).$$

Proof. Let $m = \text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, q)$ and $k = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q)$. By definition of order of contact of curves there exist smooth regular parametrizations $\gamma_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow S$, $i = 1, 2$, such that for every smooth $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\left. \frac{d^i}{dt^i} f(\gamma_1(t)) \right|_{t=0} = \left. \frac{d^i}{dt^i} f(\gamma_2(t)) \right|_{t=0}, \quad \forall 0 \leq i \leq m.$$

Since by hypothesis $m \geq k$, we can conclude that $\text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q) = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_2}, q)$. □

Remark A.3. Notice that if $k = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q) = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_2}, q)$ and $\gamma_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are smooth parametrizations satisfying $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0) = q$ and $\dot{\gamma}_1(0) = a\dot{\gamma}_2(0)$, with $a \neq 0$, then

$$\left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} f(\gamma_1(t)) \right|_{t=0} = a^k \left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} f(\gamma_2(t)) \right|_{t=0}. \quad (100)$$

If a curve is a regular level set, we can then relate the two notions just introduced as follows.

Lemma A.4. Let S be a smooth surface, and $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2 \subset S$ be smooth embedded curves. Assume that $u_2 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a submersion such that $\mathcal{C}_2 = u_2^{-1}(0)$. Then

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, q) = \text{order}(u_2|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q) - 1.$$

Proof. There exist local coordinates (x, y) near q such that $q = (0, 0)$ and $u_2(x, y) = y$. Let $\gamma_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1$ be a regular parametrization with $\gamma_1(0) = (0, 0)$ and let us write $\gamma_1(t) = (x_1(t), y_1(t))$. Since $q \in \mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2$, we deduce that $x_1(0) = y_1(0) = 0$.

Let $n = \text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, (0, 0))$. If $n = 0$, then necessarily $\dot{y}_1(0) \neq 0$. On the other hand

$$\text{order}(y|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, (0, 0)) = \text{order}(y \circ \gamma_1, 0) = \text{order}(y_1, 0) = 1 = \text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, (0, 0)) + 1.$$

If $n \geq 1$, then necessarily $\dot{x}_1(0) \neq 0$, therefore up to reparametrization we may assume $x_1(t) = t$, or equivalently $\gamma_1(t) = (t, y_1(t))$. Since $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{(x, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ we deduce that

$$n = \text{order}(y_1, 0) - 1 = \text{order}(y \circ \gamma_1, 0) - 1 = \text{order}(y|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, (0, 0)) - 1.$$

We also list here another useful property of the order of vanishing.

Lemma A.5. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be vector fields, linearly independent at the origin. Let $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ be the orbits of the flows of X and $X + fY$ through the origin, where $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then*

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, (0, 0)) = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, (0, 0)).$$

Proof. If $f(0, 0) \neq 0$, since X, Y are linearly independent at the origin one has

$$\text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, (0, 0)) = 0 = \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, (0, 0)).$$

Assume now that $f(0, 0) = 0$. Since X, Y are linearly independent at the origin, there exist coordinates (x, y) such that

$$X = \partial_x, \quad X + fY = \partial_x + f(a\partial_x + b\partial_y),$$

where a, b are some smooth functions and $b(0, 0) \neq 0$. Notice that in these coordinates

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = 0\}.$$

From Lemma A.4 we can infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{order}(\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2, (0, 0)) &= \text{order}(y|_{\mathcal{C}_2}, (0, 0)) - 1 = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (\partial_x + fY)^{(k)}(y)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0\} - 1 \\ &= \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (\partial_x + fY)^{(k-1)}(\partial_x + fY)(y)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0\} - 1 \\ &= \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (\partial_x + fY)^{(k-1)}(fb)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0\} - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

By induction one can show that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist smooth functions a_0, \dots, a_{k-1} such that

$$(\partial_x + fY)^k(fb) = b\partial_x^k f + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_j \partial_x^j f.$$

Since $b(0, 0) \neq 0$, we see that the smallest $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\partial_x + fY)^k(fb)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0$ coincides with the smallest k for which $\partial_x^k f(0, 0) \neq 0$. In other words

$$\begin{aligned} \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (\partial_x + fY)^{(k-1)}(fb)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0\} &= \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (\partial_x)^{(k-1)}(f)|_{(0,0)} \neq 0\} \\ &= \text{order}(f|_{\mathcal{C}_1}, q) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be concluded combining the latter equality with (101). \square

A.2. The degree of a class of singularities.

Lemma A.6. *Let $\nu, \mu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the vector field in \mathbb{R}^2*

$$X = \nu x \partial_x + \frac{\mu}{k!} y^k \partial_y.$$

Then, the index of the origin can be computed as

$$\text{ind}(0, 0) = \begin{cases} 0, & k \text{ even,} \\ \text{sign}(\nu\mu), & k \text{ odd.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. The index of the origin for X coincides with the degree of the map

$$\varphi : \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1, \quad \varphi(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) = \frac{(\nu \cos \theta, \frac{\mu}{k!} \sin^k \theta)}{|(\nu \cos \theta, \frac{\mu}{k!} \sin^k \theta)|}.$$

For k even, φ is not surjective, hence its image is contractible and its degree is zero. Now assume k odd. For $s \in [0, 1]$ consider the vector field

$$X_s = \nu x \partial_x + \frac{\mu}{k!} (sy + (1-s)y^k) \partial_y,$$

and note that the only vanishing point of X_s is the origin since k odd. Therefore the map

$$F : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{S}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1, \quad F(s, (x, y)) = \frac{X_s}{|X_s|} \Big|_{(x, y)}$$

is a smooth homotopy. Moreover, $X_0 = X$, thus the degree at the origin of X equals the degree at the origin of $X_1 = \nu x \partial_x + \frac{\mu}{k!} y \partial_y$. The latter field has a non degenerate singularity at the origin, therefore

$$\text{ind}(0, 0) = \text{sign} \det(D_{(0,0)} X_1) = \text{sign} \left(\det \begin{pmatrix} \nu & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\mu}{k!} \end{pmatrix} \right) = \text{sign}(\nu\mu).$$

□

APPENDIX B. THE HORIZONTAL PLANE IN THE HEISENBERG GROUP

In this section, we explicitly compute the sequence $\{K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon\} \subset C^1(S)^*$ for the horizontal plane in the Heisenberg group. The following lemma will be used throughout the section.

Lemma B.1. *Let $\{\psi_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a sequence of non-negative functions. If, for every $\rho > 0$*

$$(i) \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx = 2\pi, \quad (ii) \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\rho(0)} \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx = 0,$$

then $\psi_\varepsilon \rightarrow 2\pi\delta_0$ weakly in $C_c^1(S)^*$, i.e., for any $\varphi \in C_c^1(S)$ it holds

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx = 2\pi\varphi(0).$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R})$. Combining (i) and (ii) one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx - 2\pi\varphi(0) \right| &= \left| \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx - 2\pi\varphi(0) \right| \\ &= \left| \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(0) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx \right| \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\varphi(x) - \varphi(0)) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $\rho > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx - 2\pi\varphi(0) \right| &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\varphi(x) - \varphi(0)) \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx \right| \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(0)| \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_\rho(0)} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(0)| \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx + \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\rho(0)} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(0)| \psi_\varepsilon(x) dx \\ &\leq 2\pi \|\varphi - \varphi(0)\|_{L^\infty(B_\rho(0))}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho > 0$ is arbitrary and φ is smooth, taking the limit of $\rho \rightarrow 0$ of both sides of the latter inequality yields the result. □

B.1. The plane $z = 0$ in the Heisenberg group. Let $(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{D}, g)$ be the Heisenberg group: the contact distribution \mathcal{D} is expressed as the kernel of the normalized contact form ω which, in cylindrical coordinates $x = r \cos \theta$, $y = r \sin \theta$, z , reads

$$\omega = dz + \frac{r^2}{2} d\theta.$$

The extended metrics (1) have the expression

$$g^\varepsilon = dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \omega \otimes \omega.$$

Let $S = \{(x, y, z) \mid z = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Substituting the expression of ω into the one of g^ε and imposing $dz = 0$ we obtain

$$g^\varepsilon|_S = dr^2 + f_\varepsilon(r)^2 d\theta^2, \quad \text{where} \quad f_\varepsilon(r) = r\sqrt{1 + \frac{r^2}{4\varepsilon}}.$$

A standard computation shows that

$$K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon = -f_\varepsilon''(r) dr d\theta = -\frac{r(r^2 + 6\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}(r^2 + 4\varepsilon)^{3/2}} dr d\theta.$$

The form $d\alpha$ in the statement of Theorem 1.2 can be computed as

$$d\alpha = -\left(\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \frac{r(r^2 + 6\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}(r^2 + 4\varepsilon)^{3/2}}\right) dr d\theta = -dr d\theta.$$

Lemma B.2. *For every $\varphi \in C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, the following equality holds*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \varphi \left(K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{\mu-1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) = 2\pi \varphi(0).$$

Proof. Based on the computations above, we can write

$$K^\varepsilon \sigma^\varepsilon - \frac{d\alpha}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - \frac{r(r^2 + 6\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}(r^2 + 4\varepsilon)^{3/2}} \right) dr d\theta = \left(\frac{1}{r\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - \frac{(r^2 + 6\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}(r^2 + 4\varepsilon)^{3/2}} \right) dx dy.$$

It is sufficient to show that the function

$$\psi_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{r\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - \frac{(r^2 + 6\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}(r^2 + 4\varepsilon)^{3/2}},$$

satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma B.1. Notice that $\psi_\varepsilon > 0$. It remains to show (i) and (ii).

(i) Let $\rho > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \psi_\varepsilon(x, y) dx dy &= 2\pi \int_0^\rho \left(-f_\varepsilon''(r) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) dr = 2\pi \left(-f_\varepsilon'(r) + \frac{r}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) \Big|_0^\rho \\ &= 2\pi \left(-\frac{2\varepsilon + \rho^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sqrt{4\varepsilon + \rho^2}} + \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) + 2\pi, \end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

where we have used the explicit expression of f_ε'

$$f_\varepsilon'(r) = \frac{2\varepsilon + r^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sqrt{4\varepsilon + r^2}}. \tag{103}$$

Taking the limit of $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ of both sides in (102) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_\rho(0)} \psi_\varepsilon(x, y) dx dy &= 2\pi + 2\pi \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho\sqrt{4\varepsilon + \rho^2} - \rho^2 - 2\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sqrt{4\varepsilon + \rho^2}} \\ &= 2\pi + 2\pi \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho^2\sqrt{1 + \frac{4\varepsilon}{\rho^2}} - \rho^2 - 2\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sqrt{4\varepsilon + \rho^2}} \\ &= 2\pi + 2\pi \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho^2 + 2\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon) - \rho^2 - 2\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sqrt{4\varepsilon + \rho^2}} = 2\pi, \end{aligned}$$

which is condition (i) of Lemma B.1.

(ii) Fix $\rho > 0$, then, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\rho(0)$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\rho(0)} |\psi_\varepsilon(x, y)| dx dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\rho(0)} \psi_\varepsilon(x, y) dx dy = 2\pi \int_\rho^{+\infty} \left(-f_\varepsilon''(r) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right) dr = \frac{2\varepsilon + \delta^2}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}\sqrt{4\varepsilon + \rho^2}} - \frac{\rho}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}.$$

Repeating the computation in the proof of point (i) and taking the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields point (ii). \square

REFERENCES

- [ABB20] A. Agrachev, D. Barilari, and U. Boscain. *A comprehensive introduction to sub-Riemannian geometry*, volume 181 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020. From the Hamiltonian viewpoint, With an appendix by Igor Zelenko.
- [ABBR24] A. A. Agrachev, S. Baranzini, E. Bellini, and L. Rizzi. Quantitative tightness for three-dimensional contact manifolds: a sub-riemannian approach, 2024.
- [ABS08] A. Agrachev, U. Boscain, and M. Sigalotti. A Gauss-Bonnet-like formula on two-dimensional almost-Riemannian manifolds. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 20(4):801–822, 2008.
- [BB23] E. Bellini and U. Boscain. Surfaces of genus $g \geq 1$ in 3d-contact sub-riemannian manifolds. *ESAIM: COCV*, 29(79), 2023.
- [BB24] D. Barilari and T. Bossio. Steiner and tube formulae in 3D contact sub-Riemannian geometry. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 26(7):Paper No. 2350034, 40, 2024.
- [BBC22] D. Barilari, U. Boscain, and D. Cannarsa. On the induced geometry on surfaces in 3d contact sub-riemannian manifolds. *Control Optim. Calc. Var.* 28, 109, 2022.
- [BBCH21] D. Barilari, U. Boscain, D. Cannarsa, and K. Habermann. Stochastic processes on surfaces in three-dimensional contact sub-Riemannian manifolds. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 57(3):1388–1410, 2021.
- [Bla10] D. Blair. *Riemannian Geometry of Contact and Symplectic Manifolds.*, volume 203 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, 2010.
- [BTV17] Z. M. Balogh, J. T. Tyson, and E. Vecchi. Intrinsic curvature of curves and surfaces and a Gauss-Bonnet theorem in the Heisenberg group. *Math. Z.*, 287(1-2):1–38, 2017.
- [DGD12] D. Danielli, N. Garofalo, and N. D.M. Integrability of the sub-Riemannian mean curvature of surfaces in the Heisenberg group. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, (140):811–821, 2012.
- [DGN12] D. Danielli, N. Garofalo, and D. M. Nhieu. Integrability of the sub-Riemannian mean curvature of surfaces in the Heisenberg group. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140(3):811–821, 2012.
- [DV16] M. M. Diniz and J. M. M. Veloso. Gauss-Bonnet Theorem in Sub-Riemannian Heisenberg Space \mathfrak{h}^1 . *Journal of Dynamical and Control Systems*, 22(4):807–820, 2016.
- [EKM12] J. Etnyre, R. Komendarczyk, and P. Massot. Tightness in contact metric 3-manifolds. *Invent. math.*, 188(2):621–657, 2012.
- [Fed59] H. Federer. Curvature measures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, (93):418–491, 1959.
- [Gei08] H. Geiges. *An introduction to contact topology*, volume 109 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [GHVM25] E. Grong, J. Hidalgo, and S. Vega-Molino. A sub-Riemannian Gauss-Bonnet theorem for surfaces in contact manifolds. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 35(8):Paper No. 243, 33, 2025.
- [Gir91] E. Giroux. Convexité en topologie de contact. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 66(4):637–677, 1991.
- [Gir00] E. Giroux. Structures de contact en dimension trois et bifurcations des feuilletages de surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 141(3):615–689, 2000.
- [Per01] L. Perko. *Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*, volume 7 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, NY, 2001.
- [Pet16] P. Petersen. *Riemannian geometry*, volume 171 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, third edition, 2016.
- [Ros23] T. Rossi. Integrability of the sub-Riemannian mean curvature at degenerate characteristic points in the Heisenberg group. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 16(1):99–110, 2023.
- [Vel23] J. M. Veloso. Gauss-Bonnet theorems for surfaces in sub-riemannian three-dimensional manifolds. *Journal of Dynamical and Control Systems*, 29(3):1055–1076, 2023.