

## Antipodal trees and mutually critical points on surfaces

Tudor Zamfirescu\*

(Communicated by K. Strambach)

**Abstract.** To any point on an Alexandrov surface homeomorphic to the sphere one can associate a minimal subtree of the cut locus containing all farthest points. It is called the antipodal tree.

Two points of a compact orientable Alexandrov surface are called mutually critical if each of them is critical with respect to the other. All points which are mutually critical with a given point form a set. In this paper we show that this set, as well as the set of endpoints of any antipodal tree, are finite.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C45, 53C22

### Introduction

Let us recall the definition of an Alexandrov space (with curvature bounded below). If  $a, b, c$  belong to the metric space  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ , let  $\angle^k abc$  denote the angle of the geodesic triangle in  $S_k$  of side-lengths  $\rho(a, b), \rho(b, c), \rho(c, a)$ , opposite to the side of length  $\rho(c, a)$ , where  $S_k$  denotes the 2-dimensional complete simply-connected Riemannian manifold of constant curvature  $k < 0$  (a Lobachevskii plane).

Here, an *Alexandrov space* is a complete metric space  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$  such that any pair of points in  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a midpoint (so, the metric is intrinsic), and every point of  $\mathcal{A}$  has a neighbourhood in which, for any four distinct points  $a, b, c, d$ , we have

$$\angle^k bac + \angle^k cad + \angle^k dab \leq 2\pi.$$

The original definition in [2] is slightly more general, not assuming completeness of  $(\mathcal{A}, \rho)$ .

Burago, Gromov and Perelman [2] also introduced and investigated the notion of dimension in Alexandrov spaces. Any 2-dimensional Alexandrov space is a topological 2-manifold. If nothing else is specified, this is the meaning of a *surface*.

---

\*Work started in 2004 during a research stay at MSRI, Berkeley, California, the generous support of which is thankfully acknowledged.

Let  $S$  be a surface (with intrinsic metric  $\rho$ ). For an arbitrary point  $x \in S$  we consider the distance function  $\rho_x(y) = \rho(x, y)$  from  $x$  to  $y \in S$  and the *cut locus*  $C(x)$ , defined as the set of all  $y \in S \setminus \{x\}$  such that no *segment*, i.e., shortest path, from  $x$  to  $y$  can be extended as a segment beyond  $y$ .

The notion of a cut locus was first considered by H. Poincaré [7] in 1905. Among other things, it is known that (on a surface) the cut locus is locally a tree. For an introduction to the cut locus see for example [5]. A detailed description of the cut locus on surfaces was given by Shiohama and Tanaka [8].

A point of a tree is called *endpoint* if its deletion does not disconnect the tree. A tree is *finite* if it has finitely many endpoints.

Several interesting sets associated to  $x$  lie in the cut locus  $C(x)$ . For example, the set  $Q(x)$  of all critical points with respect to  $x$  and  $\rho_x$ . Among these, of special importance for the global investigation of a surface  $S$  is the set  $F_x$  of all absolute maxima of  $\rho_x$ . However, other interesting sets of critical points, like the set  $M_x$  of all relative maxima of  $\rho_x$ , have also been considered.

Let  $\sigma, \tau$  be segments on  $S$  with a common endpoint  $x$ , and take  $s \in \sigma, t \in \tau$ . Then the angle of  $\sigma, \tau$  at  $x$  is denoted by  $\angle\sigma x\tau$ , or simply by  $\angle\sigma\tau$  if  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  have no other common endpoint. The same angle is also denoted by  $\angle sxt$  if it is clear from the context that the involved segments from  $x$  to  $s$  and  $t$  are along  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , respectively.

A point  $y \in S$  is called *critical* with respect to  $x$  (and  $\rho_x$ ) if for any direction  $\delta$  at  $y$  there exists a segment from  $y$  to  $x$  making with  $\delta$  an angle at  $y$  not larger than  $\pi/2$  (see, for instance, [3], p. 2).

If the surface  $S$  is homeomorphic to  $S^2$ , then every cut locus is a tree. For  $x \in S$ , the minimal subtree of  $C(x)$  containing  $F_x$  is then called the *antipodal tree* of  $x$ . Notice that this term has been defined differently in [14]; now we prefer this meaning. We may encounter uncountable sets  $F_x$  on one hand (see [12], p. 320) and, on the other,  $C(x)$  may be quite large, even residual in  $S$  [11].

We pointed out in [15] that in fact  $Q(x)$  cannot be too scattered in  $C(x)$  if  $S$  is a Riemannian surface; more precisely, if  $S$  is orientable, it must belong to a single finite tree in  $C(x)$  the number of endpoints of which depends on the positive Gauß curvature and on the genus of  $S$ .

The case of a convex surface was treated in [14] without any differentiability assumptions. It was found that  $Q(x)$  always lies in a subtree of  $C(x)$  with at most 4 endpoints. About  $F_x$ , still in the convex case, we showed in [13] that every antipodal tree is a Jordan arc or a point.

We will show here that, on any surface homeomorphic to  $S^2$ , the antipodal trees are finite. This is a contribution to the description of  $F_x$  for which H. Steinhaus has asked (see [4]).

For any compact surface  $S$ , let  $\text{diam}S$  denote the largest value of  $\rho(x, y)$  as  $x$  and  $y$  run through  $S$ . Two points realizing  $\text{diam}S$  are called *diametrically opposite* to each other. There might be no point diametrically opposite to some point  $x \in S$ , but there might also be several points diametrically opposite to  $x$ . The set of all of them is called the *diametrically opposite set* of  $x$ . When it is not empty, this set equals  $F_x$ .

In fact, the set  $F_x$  itself can be a Jordan arc: consider a doubly covered half-disc. We shall show that this is not possible on smooth orientable surfaces, if  $F_x$  is a diametrically

opposite set. More precisely,  $F_x$  must then be finite. Moreover, we shall extend this result to any set of points  $y$ , each of which is *mutually critical with  $x$* , i.e.,  $y$  is critical with respect to  $x$ , and vice-versa.

A *geodesic triangle* is a triangle with segments as sides.

If  $x \in S$ , then the space  $\Sigma_x$  of directions at  $x$  is known to have length at most  $2\pi$  (see [2], p. 23). If  $\Sigma_x$  has length  $2\pi$  for all  $x \in S$ , we call  $S$  *smooth*. Note that, for example when  $S$  is convex, smoothness excludes no singular points except the conical ones, so it admits non- $C^1$  surfaces.

### Antipodal trees

The following lemma is the 2-dimensional case of a generalized form of Toponogov's comparison theorem (see [2], p. 7). We associate here Pizzetti's name to it, too, because for (smooth) surfaces it was Pizzetti who gave it first, in a series of papers at the beginning of the last century (see [6]).

**Lemma 1** (Pizzetti–Toponogov). *For any geodesic triangle  $abc$  in  $S$ ,*

$$\angle^k abc \leq \angle abc, \quad \angle^k bca \leq \angle bca, \quad \angle^k cab \leq \angle cab.$$

The following lemma is well-known in various contexts. For surfaces of class  $C^2$ , see [9].

**Lemma 2** (Lemma 9 in [10]). *For any  $x \in S$ , we have  $M_x \subset Q_x$ .*

We use these lemmas to prove our first result.

**Theorem 1.** *Any antipodal tree on a surface homeomorphic to  $S^2$  is finite.*

*Proof.* Suppose the antipodal tree  $T_x$  of  $x$  has an infinite set  $E$  of endpoints. Select a convergent subsequence  $\{y_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  with  $y_n \in E$  and  $y_n \rightarrow y$ . Clearly,  $E \subset F_x$  and  $y \in T_x$ . Let  $Y_n$  be the union of all segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$ , and  $D_n$  the component of  $S \setminus Y_n$  containing  $T_x \setminus \{y_n\}$ . Let  $\sigma_n, \sigma'_n$  be the (possibly coinciding) segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$  lying in  $\text{bd } D_n$ , and  $\alpha_n$  the angle at  $y_n$  between  $\sigma_n$  and  $\sigma'_n$  towards  $D_n$ .

Take the points  $x', y'_n, y'_m \in S_k$  satisfying  $\rho'(x', y'_n) = \rho(x, y_n)$ ,  $\rho'(x', y'_m) = \rho(x, y_m)$  and  $\rho'(y'_n, y'_m) = \rho(y_n, y_m)$ , where  $\rho'$  is the (standard) metric of  $S_k$ . Then the triangle  $x'y'_ny'_m$  is isosceles and  $\angle x'y'_ny'_m \rightarrow \pi/2$  as  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\tau_{nm}$  be a segment from  $y_n$  to  $y_m$ . By Pizzetti–Toponogov's comparison theorem (our Lemma 1), for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\angle \sigma_n \tau_{nm} > (\pi/2) - \varepsilon$  and  $\angle \sigma'_n \tau_{nm} > (\pi/2) - \varepsilon$  if  $n, m$  are large enough. Similarly, if  $\tau_n$  is a segment from  $y_n$  to  $y$ , then  $\angle \sigma_n \tau_n > (\pi/2) - \varepsilon$  and  $\angle \sigma'_n \tau_n > (\pi/2) - \varepsilon$  for  $n$  large enough.

By Lemma 2,  $y_n$  is a critical point with respect to  $x$ , so  $\alpha_n \leq \pi$ . Now,

$$\alpha_n = \angle \sigma_n \tau_n + \angle \sigma'_n \tau_n = \angle \sigma_n \tau_{nm} + \angle \sigma'_n \tau_{nm}.$$

Also,  $\angle \sigma_n \tau_n < (\pi/2) + \varepsilon$ , otherwise  $\angle \sigma'_n \tau_n = \alpha_n - \angle \sigma_n \tau_n \leq \pi - \varepsilon$  and a contradiction is obtained. Similarly,  $\angle \sigma_n \tau_{nm} < (\pi/2) + \varepsilon$ .

It follows that  $\angle \tau_n \tau_{nm} < 2\varepsilon$ . Thus, in the triangle  $y_n y_m y_k$ , for large indices  $n, m, k$ , we have

$$\angle y_m y_n y_k \leq \angle \tau_n \tau_{nm} + \angle \tau_n \tau_{nk} < 4\varepsilon.$$

Analogously, both other angles of the triangle  $y_n y_m y_k$  are less than  $4\varepsilon$ . But the sum of the angles of the triangle on  $S_k$  with the same side-lengths as  $y_n y_m y_k$  tends to  $\pi$  as  $n, m, k \rightarrow \infty$ . By Lemma 1, the sum of the angles of  $y_n y_m y_k$  exceeds  $\pi - \varepsilon$  for indices large enough, which contradicts for small  $\varepsilon$  the previous findings.

### Mutually critical points

We start with another lemma from [2].

**Lemma 3** ([2], p. 6). *Let  $a_n \rightarrow a, b_n \rightarrow b, c_n \rightarrow c$  on the surface  $S$ . Then*

$$\liminf \angle a_n b_n c_n \geq \angle abc.$$

We have seen in the preceding section that the antipodal tree  $T_x$  of  $x \in S$  must be finite if  $S$  is homeomorphic to a sphere. But  $F_x$  does not need to be a finite set, even in the convex case. It must, however, be finite if it is a diametrically opposite set and  $S$  is smooth, as we shall see.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $S$  be a smooth orientable surface and  $x \in S$ . Then the set of all points in  $S$  mutually critical with  $x$  is finite.*

*Proof.* Suppose the point  $x$  has an infinite set  $Y$  of points mutually critical with  $x$ . Then we may choose a convergent sequence of such points,  $y_n \rightarrow y$ , where  $y \in Y$  too, because  $Y$  is closed. (This follows from Lemma 3.)

Since  $x \in Q(y_n)$ , there are three segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$  making pairwise at  $x$  angles which are less than  $\pi$  but sum up to  $2\pi$ , or there are two segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$  making at  $x$  the angle  $\pi$ . Since  $y_n \in Q(x)$ , there also exist three segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$  making pairwise at  $y_n$  angles less than  $\pi$  summing up to  $2\pi$ , or there exist two segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$  making at  $x$  the angle  $\pi$ .

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of all segments which are limits of segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$ .

First suppose that there are three distinct limit segments  $\sigma^1, \sigma^2, \sigma^3$  from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $\sigma_n^i$  be segments from  $x$  to  $y_n$  such that  $\sigma_n^i \rightarrow \sigma^i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ). There are three sectors of  $S$ , locally at  $y$ , determined by  $\sigma^1, \sigma^2, \sigma^3$ . Again for a subsequence of indices,  $y_n$  lies in one of these sectors, say determined by  $\sigma^1, \sigma^2$ . But  $\sigma_n^3 \rightarrow \sigma^3$ , whence  $\sigma_n^3$  necessarily crosses  $\sigma^1 \cup \sigma^2$  for large  $n$ , which is impossible.

Now suppose that  $\mathcal{F}$  contains precisely two limit segments  $\sigma^1, \sigma^2$ . In this case, the above angle conditions imply that  $\sigma^1, \sigma^2$  make the angle  $\pi$  at  $x$ . Let  $\sigma_n$  be an arbitrary segment from  $x$  to  $y_n$ . Take a tubular neighbourhood  $N$  of  $\sigma^1 \cup \sigma^2$ . For  $\{\sigma_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ , the only possible limit segments are  $\sigma^1$  and  $\sigma^2$ . So, for  $n$  large enough,  $\sigma_n \subset N$ . Since  $S$

is orientable,  $N \setminus (\sigma^1 \cup \sigma^2)$  is disconnected, whence, for each  $n$ ,  $\sigma_n \setminus \{x\}$  lies on only one side of  $\sigma^1 \cup \sigma^2$  locally at  $x$ . Hence this happens, for infinitely many indices, with the same side. Let  $\delta$  be the direction at  $x$  orthogonal to  $\sigma^1 \cup \sigma^2$  and pointing to the other side of  $\sigma^1 \cup \sigma^2$ . Then the angle between  $\delta$  and  $\sigma_n$  is larger than  $\pi/2$ , for infinitely many indices and any choice of  $\sigma_n$ . This contradicts  $x \in Q(y_n)$ .

**Corollary.** *Let  $S$  be a smooth orientable surface. Then the diametrically opposite set of any point in  $S$  is finite.*

This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2. In particular, if  $S$  has genus 0, each non-empty diametrically opposite set is single-valued [10], and, if  $S$  has genus 1, any diametrically opposite set has at most 5 points [1].

The corollary cannot be extended to non-orientable surfaces, as the example of the standard projective plane shows. Smoothness is equally necessary: consider the convex hull of  $\{(0, 0)\} \cup \{(\cos \varphi, \sin \varphi) : 0 \leq \varphi \leq 1\}$ , doubly covered.

### References

- [1] I. Bárány, J. Itoh, C. Vilcu, T. Zamfirescu, Every point is critical. To appear.
- [2] Y. Burago, M. Gromov, G. Perel'man, A. D. Aleksandrov spaces with curvatures bounded below. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* **47** (1992), no. 2(284), 3–51, 222. MR1185284 (93m:53035) Zbl 0802.53018
- [3] J. Cheeger, Critical points of distance functions and applications to geometry. In: *Geometric topology: Recent developments*. Volume 1504 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, 1–38, Springer, Berlin 1991. MR1168042 (94a:53075) Zbl 0771.53015
- [4] H. T. Croft, K. J. Falconer, R. K. Guy, *Unsolved problems in geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York 1991. MR1107516 (92c:52001) Zbl 0748.52001
- [5] S. Kobayashi, On conjugate and cut loci. In: *Global differential geometry*, volume 27 of *MAA Stud. Math.*, 140–169, 1989 (second ed.). MR0212737 (35 #3603) MR1013807 (90d:53003) Zbl 0683.53043
- [6] P. Pizzetti, Confronto fra gli angoli di due triangoli geodetici di eguali lati. *Palermo Rend.* **23** (1907), 255–264. Zbl 38.0638.04
- [7] H. Poincaré, Sur les lignes géodésiques des surfaces convexes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6** (1905), 237–274. MR1500710 Zbl 36.0669.01
- [8] K. Shiohama, M. Tanaka, Cut loci and distance spheres on Alexandrov surfaces. In: *Actes de la Table Ronde de Géométrie Différentielle (Luminy, 1992)*, volume 1 of *Sémin. Congr.*, 531–559, Soc. Math. France, Paris 1996. MR1427770 (98a:53062) Zbl 0874.53032
- [9] H. Steinhaus, On shortest paths on closed surfaces. *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astr. Phys.* **6** (1958), 303–308. MR0096772 (20 #3255) Zbl 0082.36903
- [10] C. Vilcu, T. Zamfirescu, Multiple farthest points on Alexandrov surfaces. *Adv. Geom.* **7** (2007), 83–100.
- [11] T. Zamfirescu, Many endpoints and few interior points of geodesics. *Invent. Math.* **69** (1982), 253–257. MR674405 (84h:53088) Zbl 0494.52004

- [12] T. Zamfirescu, On some questions about convex surfaces. *Math. Nachr.* **172** (1995), 313–324. MR1330637 (96e:52004) Zbl 0833.53004
- [13] T. Zamfirescu, Farthest points on convex surfaces. *Math. Z.* **226** (1997), 623–630. MR1484714 (98m:52003) Zbl 0896.52005
- [14] T. Zamfirescu, Extreme points of the distance function on convex surfaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **350** (1998), 1395–1406. MR1458314 (98i:52005) Zbl 0896.52006
- [15] T. Zamfirescu, On the critical points of a Riemannian surface. *Adv. Geom.* **6** (2006), 493–500.

Received 21 October, 2005; revised 24 February, 2006

T. Zamfirescu, Fachbereich Mathematik, Universität Dortmund, 44221 Dortmund, Germany

Email: tzamfirescu@yahoo.com