

# Invitation to comparison geometry

Anton Petrunin and Sergio Zamora Barrera

# Contents

<b>I</b>	<b>Curves</b>	<b>4</b>
1	Curves	5
2	Length	9
3	Space curves	19
4	Torsion	33
5	Plane curves	40
<b>II</b>	<b>Surfaces</b>	<b>57</b>
6	Definitions	58
7	Curvatures	67
8	Saddle surfaces	75
9	Positive Gauss curvature	82
10	Geodesics	87
11	Spherical map	99
12	Parallel transport	107
<b>A</b>	<b>Review</b>	<b>116</b>
A.1	Metric spaces . . . . .	116
A.2	Continuity . . . . .	118
A.3	Regular values . . . . .	119
A.4	Multiple integral . . . . .	120

A.5	Initial value problem . . . . .	122
A.6	Lipschitz condition . . . . .	122
A.7	Uniform continuity . . . . .	123
A.8	Jordan's theorem . . . . .	124
A.9	Connectedness . . . . .	124
A.10	Convexity . . . . .	125
A.11	Elementary geometry . . . . .	125
<b>B</b>	<b>Homework assignments</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Semisolutions</b>	<b>130</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>132</b>

# Part I

## Curves

# Chapter 1

## Curves

**Paths.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a metric space. A continuous map  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is called a *path*. If  $p = f(0)$  and  $q = f(1)$ , then we say that  $f$  *connects*  $p$  to  $q$ .

If any two points in  $\mathcal{X}$  can be connected by a path then  $\mathcal{X}$  is called *path connected*. Similarly, a subset  $A \subset \mathcal{X}$  is called *path connected* if any two points  $p, q \in A$  can be connected by a path that runs in  $A$ ; equivalently, the subspace  $A$  is path connected.

**Simple curves.**

**1.1. Definition.** A path connected subset  $\gamma$  in a metric space is called a *simple curve* if it is locally homeomorphic to a real interval; that is, any point  $p \in \gamma$  has a neighborhood  $U \ni p$  such that the intersection  $U \cap \gamma$  is homeomorphic to a real interval.

It turns out that any curve  $\gamma$  admits a homeomorphism from a real interval or a circle; that is, there is a continuous bijection  $G \rightarrow \gamma$  with continuous inverse; here (and further)  $G$  denotes a circle or real interval. We omit a proof of this statement, but it is not hard.

The homeomorphism  $G \rightarrow \gamma$  as above is called *parametrization* of  $\gamma$ . The parametrization completely defines the curve. Often will use the same letter for curve and its parametrization, so we can say curve  $\gamma$  has parametrization  $\gamma: G \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . Note however that any curve admits many different parametrization.

**1.2. Exercise.** Find a continuous injective map  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  such that its image is not a simple curve.

*Hint:* The image of  $\gamma$  should have a shape of digit 9.

If  $G$  is a circle, then the curve  $\gamma: G \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is called *closed*. If  $G$  is a real interval, then we may say that  $\gamma$  is an *arc*.

**Parameterized curves.** A *parameterized curve* is defined as a continuous map  $\gamma: G \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ . For a parameterized curve we do not assume that  $\gamma$  is injective; in other words the parameterized curve might have self-intersections.

**1.3. Advanced exercise.** Let  $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a path from  $p$  to  $q$ . Assume  $p \neq q$ . Show that there is a simple path connecting from  $p$  to  $q$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ .

## Smooth curves

A curve in the Euclidean space or plane, called *space* or *plane curve* correspondingly.

A space curve can be described by its coordinate functions

$$\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t)).$$

Plane curves can be considered as a partial case of space curves with  $z(t) \equiv 0$ .

If each of the coordinate functions  $x(t), y(t), z(t)$  of the space curve  $\gamma$  is a smooth (that is, it has derivatives of all orders everywhere in its domain) then the parameterized curve is called *smooth*.

If the *velocity vector*

$$\gamma'(t) = (x'(t), y'(t), z'(t))$$

does not vanish at all points, then the parameterized curve  $\gamma$  is called *regular*.

A simple space curve is called *smooth and regular* if it admits a smooth and regular parametrization correspondingly. Regular smooth curves are among the main objects in differential geometry; the term *smooth curve* often used for *smooth regular curve*.

**1.4. Exercise.** The function

$$f(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t \leq 0, \\ \frac{t}{e^{1/t}} & \text{if } t > 0. \end{cases}$$

is smooth.<sup>1</sup>

Show that  $\gamma(t) = (f(t), f(-t))$  gives a smooth parametrization of the curve  $S$  formed by the union of two half-axis in the plane.

---

<sup>1</sup>The existence of all derivatives  $f^{(n)}(x)$  at  $x \neq 0$  is evident and direct calculations show that  $f^{(n)}(0) = 0$  for any  $n$ .

Show that any smooth parametrization of  $S$  has vanishing velocity vector at the origin. Conclude that the curve  $S$  is not regular and smooth.


**1.5. Exercise.** Describe the set of real numbers  $a$  such that the plane curve  $\gamma_a(t) = (t + a \cdot \sin t, a \cdot \cos t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  is

- (a) regular;
- (b) simple.

**Loops and periodic parametrization.** A closed simple curve can be described as an image of a parameterized curve  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  such that  $p = \gamma(0) = \gamma(1)$ ; such curves are called *loops*; the point  $p$  in this case is called *base* of the loop.

However, it is more natural to present it as a *periodic* parameterized curve  $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ ; that is, there is a constant  $\ell$  such that  $\gamma(t + \ell) = \gamma(t)$  for any  $t$ . For example the unit circle in the plane can be described by  $2\pi$ -periodic parametrization  $\gamma(t) = (\cos t, \sin t)$ .

Any smooth regular closed curve can be described by a smooth regular loop. But in general the closed curve that described by a smooth regular loop might fail to be smooth and regular — it might fail to be smooth at its base; an example shown on the diagram.



## Implicitly defined curves

Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function; that is, all its partial derivatives defined in its domain of definition. Consider the set  $S$  of solution of equation  $f(x, y) = 0$  in the plane.

Assume  $S$  is path connected. According to implicit function theorem (A.10), the set  $S$  is a smooth regular simple curve if  $0$  is a *regular value* of  $f$ . In this case it means that the gradient  $\nabla f$  does not vanish at any point  $p \in S$ . In other words, if  $f(p) = 0$ , then  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(p) \neq 0$  or  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(p) \neq 0$ .

Similarly, assume  $f, h$  is a pair of smooth functions defined in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The system of equations  $f(x, y, z) = h(x, y, z) = 0$  defines a regular smooth space curve if the set of solutions is path connected and  $0$  is a regular value of the map  $F: (x, y, z) \mapsto (f(x, y, z), h(x, y, z))$ . In this case it means that the gradients  $\nabla f$  and  $\nabla h$  are linearly independent at any point  $p \in S$ . In other words, if  $f(p) = 0$ , then at the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \\ \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \end{pmatrix}$$

for the map  $F: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  has rank 2 at  $p$ .

The described way to define a curve is called *implicit*; if a curve is defined by its parametrization, we say that it is *explicitly defined*. While implicit function theorem guarantees the existence of regular smooth parametrizations, do not expect it to be in a closed form. When it comes to calculations, usually it is easier to work directly with implicit presentation.

**1.6. Exercise.** Consider the set in the plane described by the equation

$$y^2 = x^3.$$

Is it a simple curve? and if “yes”, is it a smooth regular curve?

**1.7. Exercise.** Describe the set of real numbers  $a$  such that the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned}x^2 + y^2 + z^2 &= 1 \\ x^2 + a \cdot x + y^2 &= 0\end{aligned}$$

describes a smooth regular curve.



# Chapter 2

## Length

Recall that a sequence

$$a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k = b.$$

is called a *partition* of the interval  $[a, b]$ .

**2.1. Definition.** Let  $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  be a curve in a metric space. The length of a  $\alpha$  is defined as

$$\text{length } \alpha = \sup\{|\alpha(t_0) - \alpha(t_1)| + |\alpha(t_1) - \alpha(t_2)| + \cdots \\ \cdots + |\alpha(t_{k-1}) - \alpha(t_k)|\},$$

where the exact upper bound is taken over all partitions

$$a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k = b.$$

The length of  $\alpha$  is a nonnegative real number or infinity; the curve  $\alpha$  is called *rectifiable* if its length is finite.

The length of a closed curve is defined as the length of a corresponding loop. If a curve is defined on a open or closed-open interval then its length is defined as the exact upper bound for lengths of all its closed arcs.

If  $\alpha$  is a space curve, then the above definition says that its length is the exact upper bound of the lengths of polygonal lines  $p_0 \dots p_k$  inscribed in the curve, where  $p_i = \alpha(t_i)$  for a partition  $a = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k = b$ . If  $\alpha$  is closed then  $p_0 = p_k$  and therefore the inscribed polygonal line is also closed.

**2.2. Exercise.** Let  $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a simple curve. Suppose a parametrized curve  $\beta: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  has that same image as  $\alpha$ ; that is

$\beta([0, 1]) = \alpha([0, 1])$ . Show that

$$\text{length } \beta \geq \text{length } \alpha.$$

**2.3. Exercise.** Assume  $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth curve. Show that

(a)  $\text{length } \alpha \geq \int_a^b |\alpha'(t)| \cdot dt,$

(b)  $\text{length } \alpha \leq \int_a^b |\alpha'(t)| \cdot dt.$


Conclude that

❶ 
$$\text{length } \alpha = \int_a^b |\alpha'(t)| \cdot dt.$$

*Hints:* For (a), apply the fundamental theorem of calculus for each segment in a given partition. For (b) consider a partition such that the velocity vector  $\alpha'(t)$  is nearly constant on each of its segments.

**Nonrectifiable curves.** A classical example of a nonrectifiable curve is the so called *Koch snowflake*; it is a fractal curve that can be constructed the following way:

Start with an equilateral triangle, divide each of its side into three segments of equal length and add an equilateral triangle with base at the middle segment. Repeat this construction recursively to the obtained polygons. Few first iterations of the construction are shown



on the diagram. The Koch snowflake is the boundary of the union of all the polygons.

**2.4. Exercise.**

(a) Show that Koch snowflake is a closed simple curve; that is, it admits a homeomorphism to a circle.

(b) Show that Koch snowflake is not rectifiable.

## Arc length parametrization

We say that a parametrized curve  $\gamma$  has an *arc length parametrization*<sup>1</sup> if for any two values of parameters  $t_1 < t_2$ , the value  $t_2 - t_1$  is the length of  $\gamma|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ ; that is, the closed arc of  $\gamma$  from  $t_1$  to  $t_2$ .

Note that a smooth space curve  $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  has arc length parametrization if and only if it has unit velocity vector at all times; that is

$$|\gamma'(t)| = \sqrt{x'(t)^2 + y'(t)^2 + z'(t)^2} = 1;$$

by that reason arc length parametrization of smooth curves with also called *unit-speed curves*. Note that smooth unit-speed curves are automatically regular.

Any rectifiable curve can be parameterized by arc length. For a parametrized smooth curve  $\gamma$ , the arc length parameter  $s$  can be written as an integral

$$s(t) = \int_{t_0}^t |\gamma'(\tau)| \cdot d\tau.$$

Note that  $s(t)$  is a smooth increasing function. Further by fundamental theorem of calculus,  $s'(t) = |\gamma'(t)|$ . Therefore if  $\gamma$  is regular, then  $s'(t) \neq 0$  for any parameter value  $t$ . By inverse function theorem (A.9) the inverse function  $s^{-1}(t)$  is also smooth. Therefore  $\gamma \circ s^{-1}$  — the reparametrization of  $\gamma$  by arc length  $s$  — remains smooth and regular.

Most of the time we use  $s$  for an arc length parameter of a curve.

### 2.5. Exercise. Reparametrize the helix

$$\gamma_{a,b}(t) = (a \cdot \cos t, a \cdot \sin t, b \cdot t)$$

by arc length.

We will be interested in the properties of curves that are invariant under a reparametrization. Therefore we can always assume that the given smooth regular curve comes with a arc length parametrization. A good property of arc length parametrizations is that it is almost canonical — these parametrizations differ only by a sign and additive constant. On the other hand, often it is impossible to find an arc length parametrization in a closed form which makes it hard to use it calculations; usually it is more convenient to use the original parametrization.

---

<sup>1</sup>which is also called *natural parametrization*

## Convex curves

A simple plane curve is called *convex* if it bounds a convex region.

**2.6. Proposition.** *Assume a convex closed curve  $\alpha$  lies inside the domain bounded by a closed simple plane curve  $\beta$ . Then*

$$\text{length } \alpha \leq \text{length } \beta.$$

Note that it is sufficient to show that for any polygon  $P$  inscribed in  $\alpha$  there is a polygon  $Q$  inscribed in  $\beta$  with  $\text{perim } P \leq \text{perim } Q$ , where  $\text{perim } P$  denotes the perimeter of  $P$ .

Therefore it is sufficient to prove the following lemma.


**2.7. Lemma.** *Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be polygons. Assume  $P$  is convex and  $Q \supset P$ . Then*

$$\text{perim } P \leq \text{perim } Q.$$

*Proof.* Note that by the triangle inequality, the inequality

$$\text{perim } P \leq \text{perim } Q$$

holds if  $P$  can be obtained from  $Q$  by cutting it along a chord; that is, a line segment with ends on the boundary of  $Q$  that lies in  $Q$ .



Note that there is an increasing sequence of polygons

$$P = P_0 \subset P_1 \subset \cdots \subset P_n = Q$$

such that  $P_{i-1}$  obtained from  $P_i$  by cutting along a chord. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{perim } P = \text{perim } P_0 &\leq \text{perim } P_1 \leq \cdots \\ &\leq \text{perim } P_n = \text{perim } Q \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma follows. □

**2.8. Corollary.** *Any convex closed plane curve is rectifiable.*

*Proof.* Any closed curve is bounded; that is, it lies in a sufficiently large square. Indeed the curve can be described as an image of a loop  $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\alpha(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ . The coordinate functions  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  are continuous functions defined on  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore the absolute values of both of these functions are bounded by some constant  $C$ . That is  $\alpha$  lies in the square defined by the inequalities  $|x| \leq C$  and  $|y| \leq C$ .

By Proposition 2.6, the length of the curve cannot exceed the perimeter of the square  $8 \cdot C$ , whence the result.  $\square$

Recall that convex hull of a set  $X$  is the smallest convex set that contains  $X$ ; in other words convex hull is the intersection of all convex sets containing  $X$ .

**2.9. Exercise.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a closed simple plane curve. Denote by  $K$  the convex hull of  $\alpha$ ; let  $\beta$  be the boundary curve of  $K$ . Show that*

$$\text{length } \alpha \geq \text{length } \beta.$$

*Try to show that the statement holds for arbitrary closed plane curve  $\alpha$ , assuming that  $X$  has nonempty interior.*

## Crofton formulas\*

Consider a plane curve  $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ . Given a unit vector  $u$ , denote by  $\alpha_u$  the curve that follows orthogonal projections of  $\alpha$  to the line in the direction  $u$ ; that is

$$\alpha_u(t) = \langle u, \alpha(t) \rangle \cdot u.$$

Note that

$$|\alpha'(t)| = |\langle u, \alpha'(t) \rangle|$$

for any  $t$ . Note that for any plane vector the magnitude of its average projection is proportional to its magnitude with coefficient; that is,

$$|w| = k \cdot \overline{|w_u|},$$

where  $\overline{|w_u|}$  denotes the average value of  $|w_u|$  for all unit vectors  $u$ . (The value  $k$  is the average value of  $|\cos \varphi|$  for  $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]$ ; it can be found by integration, but soon we will show another way to find it.)

If the curve  $\alpha$  is smooth, then according to Exercise 2.3

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length } \alpha &= \int_a^b |\alpha'(t)| \cdot dt = \\ &= \int_a^b k \cdot \overline{|\alpha'_u(t)|} \cdot dt = \\ &= k \cdot \overline{\text{length } \alpha_u}. \end{aligned}$$

This formula and its relatives are called Crofton formulas. To find the coefficient  $k$  one can apply it for the unit circle: the left hand

side is  $2\pi$  — this is the length of unit circle. Note that for any unit vector  $u$ , the curve  $\alpha_u$  runs back and forth along an interval of length 2. Therefore  $\text{length } \alpha_u = 4$  and hence its average value is also 4. It follows that the coefficient  $k$  has to satisfy the equation  $2\pi = k \cdot 4$ ; whence

$$\text{length } \alpha = \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot \overline{\text{length } \alpha_u}.$$

The Crofton's formula holds for arbitrary rectifiable curves, not necessary smooth; it can be proved using Exercises 2.12.

**2.10. Exercise.** *Show that any closed plane curve  $\alpha$  has length at least  $\pi \cdot s$ , where  $s$  is the average of pojections of  $\alpha$  to lines. Moreover the equality holds if and only if  $\alpha$  is convex.*

*Use this statement to give another solution of Exercise 2.9.*

**2.11. Advanced exercise.** *Show that the length of space curve is proportional to the average length of its projections to all lines and to planes. Find the coefficients in each case.*

**2.12. Advanced exercises.**

- (a) *Show that the formula ❶ holds for any Lipschitz curve  $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ .*
- (b) *Construct a simple curve  $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  such that the velocity vector  $\alpha'(t)$  is defined and bounded for almost all  $t \in [a, b]$ , but the formula ❶ does not hold.*

*Hint:* Use theorems of Rademacher and Lusin (A.15 and A.16).

## Semicontinuity of length

Recall that the lower limit of a sequence of real numbers  $(x_n)$  is denoted by

$$\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n.$$


It is defined as the lowest partial limit; that is, the lowest possible limit of a subsequence of  $(x_n)$ . The lower limit is defined for any sequence of real numbers and it lies in the extended real line  $[-\infty, \infty]$

**2.13. Theorem.** *Length is a lower semi-continuous with respect to pointwise convergence of curves.*

*More precisely, assume that a sequence of curves  $\alpha_n: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  in a metric space  $\mathcal{X}$  converges pointwise to a curve  $\alpha_\infty: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ ; that is,  $\alpha_n(t) \rightarrow \alpha_\infty(t)$  for any fixed  $t \in [a, b]$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then*

$$\text{❷} \quad \varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{length } \alpha_n \geq \text{length } \alpha_\infty.$$

Note that the inequality ❷ might be strict. For example the diagonal  $\alpha_\infty$  of the unit square can be approximated by a sequence of stairs-like polygonal curves  $\alpha_n$  with sides parallel to the sides of the square ( $\alpha_6$  is on the picture). In this case



$$\text{length } \alpha_\infty = \sqrt{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{length } \alpha_n = 2$$

for any  $n$ .

*Proof.* Fix a partition  $a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = b$ . Set

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_n &:= |\alpha_n(t_0) - \alpha_n(t_1)| + \dots + |\alpha_n(t_{k-1}) - \alpha_n(t_k)|. \\ \Sigma_\infty &:= |\alpha_\infty(t_0) - \alpha_\infty(t_1)| + \dots + |\alpha_\infty(t_{k-1}) - \alpha_\infty(t_k)|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\Sigma_n \rightarrow \Sigma_\infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\Sigma_n \leq \text{length } \alpha_n$  for each  $n$ . Hence

$$\text{❸} \quad \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{length } \alpha_n \geq \Sigma_\infty.$$

If  $\alpha_\infty$  is rectifiable, we can assume that

$$\text{length } \alpha_\infty < \Sigma_\infty + \varepsilon.$$

for any given  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By ❹ it follows that

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{length } \alpha_n > \text{length } \alpha_\infty - \varepsilon$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; whence ❷ follows.

It remains to consider the case when  $\alpha_\infty$  is not rectifiable; that is  $\text{length } \alpha_\infty = \infty$ . In this case we can choose a partition so that  $\Sigma_\infty > L$  for any real number  $L$ . By ❸ it follows that

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{length } \alpha_n > L$$

for any  $L$ ; whence

$$\underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{length } \alpha_n = \infty$$

and ❷ follows. □

## Length metric

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a metric space. Given two points  $x, y$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , denote by  $d(x, y)$  the exact lower bound for lengths of all paths connecting  $x$  to  $y$ ; if there is no such path we assume that  $d(x, y) = \infty$ .

Note that function  $d$  satisfies all the axioms of metric except it might take infinite value. Therefore if any two points in  $\mathcal{X}$  can be connected by a rectifiable curve, then  $d$  defines a new metric on  $\mathcal{X}$ ; in this case  $d$  is called *induced length metric*.

Evidently  $d(x, y) \geq |x - y|$  for any pair of points  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ . If the equality holds for any pair, then the metric is called *length metric* and the space is called *length-metric space*.

Most of the time we consider length-metric spaces. In particular the Euclidean space is a length-metric space. A subspace  $A$  of length-metric space  $\mathcal{X}$  might be not a length-metric space; the induced length distance between points  $x$  and  $y$  in the subspace  $A$  will be denoted as  $|x - y|_A$ ; that is  $|x - y|_A$  is the exact lower bound for the length of paths in  $A$ .

**2.14. Exercise.** Let  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a closed subset. Show that  $A$  is convex if and only if

$$|x - y|_A = |x - y|_{\mathbb{R}^3}.$$

**2.15. Exercise.** Let us denote by  $\mathbb{S}^1$  the unit circle in the plane; that is,

$$\mathbb{S}^1 = \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + y^2 = 1 \}.$$

Show that

$$|u - v|_{\mathbb{S}^1} = \angle(u, v) := \arccos \langle u, v \rangle$$

for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{S}^1$ .

## Spherical curves

A space curve  $\gamma$  is called *spherical* if it runs in the unit sphere; that is,  $|\gamma(t)| = 1$  for any  $t$ .

**2.16. Exercise.** Let us denote by  $\mathbb{S}^2$  the unit sphere in the space; that is,

$$\mathbb{S}^2 = \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1 \}.$$

Show that

$$|u - v|_{\mathbb{S}^2} = \angle(u, v) := \arccos \langle u, v \rangle$$

for any  $u, v \in \mathbb{S}^2$ .

*Hint:* Use Exercise 2.15 and the following map  $f: (r, \theta, \varphi) \mapsto (r, \theta, 0)$  in spherical coordinates. Note that  $f$  is distance nonexpanding and it maps  $\mathbb{R}^3$  to a half-plane and  $\mathbb{S}^2$  to one of its meridians.



**2.17. Hemisphere lemma.** *Any closed curve of length  $< 2\pi$  in  $\mathbb{S}^2$  lies in an open hemisphere.*

This lemma is a keystone in the proof of Fenchel's theorem given below. The lemma is not as simple as you might think — try to prove it yourself. I learned the following proof from Stephanie Alexander.

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha$  be a closed curve in  $\mathbb{S}^2$  of length  $2\ell$ .

Assume  $\ell < \pi$ .

Let us divide  $\alpha$  into two arcs  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  of length  $\ell$ , with endpoints  $p$  and  $q$ . According to Exercise 2.16,  $\angle(p, q) \leq \ell < \pi$ . Denote by  $z$  be the midpoint between  $p$  and  $q$  in  $\mathbb{S}^2$ ; that is  $z$  is the midpoint of an equator arc from  $p$  to  $q$ . We claim that  $\alpha$  lies in the open north hemisphere with north pole at  $z$ . If not,  $\alpha$  intersects the equator in a point, say  $r$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $r$  lies on  $\alpha_1$ .

Rotate the arc  $\alpha_1$  by angle  $\pi$  around the line thru  $z$  and the center of the sphere. The obtained arc  $\alpha_1^*$  together with  $\alpha_1$  forms a closed curve of length  $2\ell$  that passes thru  $r$  and its antipodal point  $r^*$ . Therefore

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{length } \alpha = \ell \geq \angle(r, r^*) = \pi,$$

a contradiction. □


**2.18. Exercise.** *Describe a simple closed spherical curve that does not pass thru a pair of antipodal points and does not lie in any hemisphere.*

**2.19. Exercise.** *Suppose that a closed simple spherical curve  $\alpha$  divides  $\mathbb{S}^2$  into two regions of equal area. Show that*

$$\text{length } \alpha \geq 2\pi.$$

**2.20. Exercise.** *Consider the following problem, find a flaw in the given solution. Come up with a correct argument.*

**Problem.** Suppose that a closed plane curve  $\alpha$  has length at most 4. Show that  $\alpha$  lies in a unit disc.



The north hemisphere corresponds to the disc and the south hemisphere to the complement of the disc.

*Wrong solution.* Note that it is sufficient to show that diameter of  $\alpha$  is at most 2; that is, the distance between any two pairs of points  $p$  and  $q$  of  $\alpha$  cannot exceed 2.

The length of  $\alpha$  cannot be smaller than the closed inscribed polygonal line which goes from  $p$  to  $q$  and back to  $p$ . Therefore

$$2 \cdot |p - q| \leq \text{length } \alpha \leq 4. \quad \square$$

**2.21. Advanced exercises.** Given points  $v, w \in \mathbb{S}^2$ , denote by  $w_v$  the closest point to  $w$  on the equator with pole at  $v$ ; in other words, if  $w^\perp$  is the projection of  $w$  to the plane perpendicular to  $v$ , then  $w_v$  is the unit vector in the direction of  $w^\perp$ . The vector  $w_v$  is defined if  $w \neq \pm v$ .

1. Show that for any spherical curve  $\alpha$  we have that

$$\text{length } \alpha = \overline{\text{length } \alpha_v},$$

where  $\overline{\text{length } \alpha_v}$  denotes the average length for all  $v \in \mathbb{S}^2$ . (This is a spherical analog of Crofton's formula.)

2. Give another proof of hemisphere lemma using part (1).

# Chapter 3

## Space curves

### Acceleration of unit-speed curve

Recall that any regular smooth curve can be parametrized by its arc length. The obtained parametrized curve, say  $\gamma$ , remains to be smooth and it has unit speed; that is,  $|\gamma'(s)| = 1$  for all  $s$ .

The following proposition states that the acceleration vector is perpendicular to the velocity vector if the speed remains constant.

**3.1. Proposition.** *Assume  $\gamma$  is a smooth unit-speed space curve. Then  $\gamma'(s) \perp \gamma''(s)$  for any  $s$ .*

The scalar product (also known as dot product) of two vectors  $v$  and  $w$  will be denoted by  $\langle v, w \rangle$ . Recall that the derivative of a scalar product satisfies the product rule; that is if  $v = v(t)$  and  $w = w(t)$  are smooth vector-valued functions of a real parameter  $t$ , then

$$\langle v, w \rangle' = \langle v', w \rangle + \langle v, w' \rangle.$$

*Proof.* The identity  $|\gamma'| = 1$  can be rewritten as  $\langle \gamma', \gamma' \rangle = 1$ . Therefore

$$2 \cdot \langle \gamma'', \gamma' \rangle = \langle \gamma', \gamma' \rangle' = 0,$$

whence  $\gamma'' \perp \gamma'$ . □

### Curvature

For a unit speed smooth space curve  $\gamma$  the magnitude of its acceleration  $|\gamma''(s)|$  is called its *curvature* at the time  $s$ . If  $\gamma$  is simple, then we can say that  $|\gamma''(s)|$  is the curvature at the point  $p = \gamma(s)$  without

ambiguity. The curvature is usually denoted by  $k(s)$  or  $k(s)_\gamma$  and in the latter case it might be also denoted by  $k(p)$  or  $k(p)_\gamma$ .

The curvature measures how fast the curve turns; if you drive along a plane curve, curvature tells how much to turn the steering wheel at the given point (note that it does not depend on your speed). In general, the term *curvature* is used for different types of geometric objects, and it always measures how much it deviates from being *straight*; for curves, it measures how fast it deviates from a straight line.

**3.2. Exercise.** *Show that any regular smooth spherical curve has curvature at least 1 at each time.*

*Hint:* Differentiate the identity  $\langle \gamma(s), \gamma(s) \rangle = 1$  a couple of times.

## Tangent indicatrix

Let  $\gamma$  be a regular smooth space curve. Let us consider another curve

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \tau(t) = \frac{\gamma'(t)}{|\gamma'(t)|}$$

that is called *tangent indicatrix* of  $\gamma$ . Note that  $|\tau(t)| = 1$  for any  $t$ ; that is,  $\tau$  is a spherical curve.

The line thru  $\gamma(s)$  in the direction of  $\tau(s)$  is called *tangent line* at  $s$ .

We say that smooth regular curve  $\gamma_1$  at  $s_1$  is *tangent* to a smooth regular curve  $\gamma_2$  at  $s_2$  if  $\gamma_1(s_1) = \gamma_2(s_2)$  and the tangent line of  $\gamma_1$  at  $s_1$  coincide with the tangent line of  $\gamma_2$  at  $s_2$ ; if both of the curves are simple we can also say that they are tangent at the point  $p = \gamma_1(s_1) = \gamma_2(s_2)$  without ambiguity.

If  $\gamma$  has a unit speed parametrization, then  $\tau(t) = \gamma'(t)$ . In this case we have the following expression for curvature:  $k(t) = |\tau'(t)| = |\gamma''(t)|$ .

In general case we have

$$\textcircled{2} \quad k(t) = \frac{|\tau'(t)|}{|\gamma'(t)|}.$$

Indeed, for an arc length parametrization  $s(t)$  we have  $s'(t) = |\gamma'(t)|$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} k(t) &= \left| \frac{d\tau}{ds} \right| = \\ &= \left| \frac{d\tau}{dt} \right| / \left| \frac{ds}{dt} \right| = \\ &= \frac{|\tau'(t)|}{|\gamma'(t)|}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that indicatrix of a smooth regular curve  $\gamma$  is regular if the curvature of  $\gamma$  does not vanish.

**3.3. Exercise.** Use the formulas ❶ and ❷ to show that for any smooth regular space curve  $\gamma$  we have the following expressions for its curvature:

(a)

$$k(t) = \frac{|\gamma''(t)^\perp|}{|\gamma'(t)|^2},$$

where  $\gamma''(t)^\perp$  denotes the projection of  $\gamma''(t)$  to the normal plane of  $\gamma'(t)$ ;

(b)

$$k(t) = \frac{|\gamma''(t) \times \gamma'(t)|}{|\gamma'(t)|^3},$$

where  $\times$  denotes the vector product (also known as cross product).

*Hint:* Prove and use the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma''(t) - \gamma''(t)^\perp &= \frac{\gamma'(t)}{|\gamma'(t)|} \cdot \langle \gamma''(t), \frac{\gamma'(t)}{|\gamma'(t)|} \rangle, \\ |\gamma'(t)| &= \sqrt{\langle \gamma'(t), \gamma'(t) \rangle}.\end{aligned}$$

**3.4. Exercise.** Apply the formulas in the previous exercise to show that if  $f$  is a smooth real function, then its graph  $y = f(x)$  has curvature

$$k(p) = \frac{|f''(x)|}{(1 + f'(x)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

at the point  $p = (x, f(x))$ .

## Total curvature

Let  $\gamma: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a regular smooth curve and  $\tau$  its tangent indicatrix. Recall that without loss of generality we can assume that  $\gamma$  has a unit speed parametrization; in this case  $\tau(s) = \gamma'(s)$  and hence

$$k(s) := |\gamma''(s)| = |\tau'(s)|;$$

that is, the curvature of  $\gamma$  at time  $s$  is the speed of the tangent indicatrix  $\tau$  at the same time moment.

The integral

$$\Phi(\gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{I}} k(s) \cdot ds$$

is called *total curvature* of  $\gamma$ .

**3.5. Exercise.** Find the curvature of the helix

$$\gamma_{a,b}(t) = (a \cdot \cos t, a \cdot \sin t, b \cdot t),$$

its tangent indicatrix and the total curvature of its arc  $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ .

**3.6. Observation.** The total curvature of a smooth regular curve is the length of its tangent indicatrix.

*Proof.* It is sufficient to prove the observation for a unit-speed space curve  $\gamma: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ . Denote by  $\tau$  its tangent indicatrix. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\gamma) &:= \int_{\mathbb{I}} k(s) \cdot ds = \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{I}} |\tau'(s)| \cdot ds = \\ &= \text{length } \tau. \end{aligned}$$

□

**3.7. Fenchel's theorem.** The total curvature of any closed regular space curve is at least  $2\pi$ .

*Proof.* Fix a closed regular space curve  $\gamma$ ; we can assume that it is described by a loop  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ ; in this case  $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$  and  $\gamma'(a) = \gamma'(b)$ .

Consider its tangent indicatrix  $\tau = \gamma'$ . Recall that  $|\tau(s)| = 1$  for any  $s$ ; that is,  $\tau$  is a closed spherical curve.

Let us show that  $\tau$  cannot lie in a hemisphere. Assume the contrary; without loss of generality we can assume that  $\tau$  lies in the north hemisphere defined by the inequality  $z > 0$  in  $(x, y, z)$ -coordinates. It means that  $z'(t) > 0$  at any time, where  $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$ . Therefore

$$z(b) - z(a) = \int_a^b z'(s) \cdot ds > 0.$$

In particular,  $\gamma(a) \neq \gamma(b)$ , a contradiction.

Applying the observation (3.6) and the hemisphere lemma (2.17), we get that

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \text{length } \tau \geq 2\pi.$$

□

**3.8. Exercise.** Show that a closed space curve  $\gamma$  with curvature at most 1 cannot be shorter than the unit circle; that is,  $\text{length } \gamma \geq 2\pi$ .

**3.9. Advanced exercise.** Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular space curve that does not pass thru the origin. Consider the spherical curve defined as  $\sigma(t) = \frac{\gamma(t)}{|\gamma(t)|}$  for any  $t$ . Show that

$$\text{length } \sigma < \Phi(\gamma) + \pi.$$

Moreover, if  $\gamma$  is closed, then

$$\text{length } \sigma \leq \Phi(\gamma).$$

Hint: Assume that  $\gamma$  is unit-speed; show that  $|\sigma'| \leq k + \theta'$ , where  $\theta(s) = \angle(\gamma(s), \gamma'(s))$ .

Note that the last inequality gives an alternative proof of Fenchel's theorem. Indeed, without loss of generality we can assume that the origin lies on a chord of  $\gamma$ ; in this case the spherical curve  $\sigma$  passes thru a pair of antipodal points in  $\mathbb{S}^2$ ; whence

$$\text{length } \sigma \geq 2 \cdot \pi.$$

## Piecewise smooth curves

Assume  $\alpha: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\beta: [b, c] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  are two curves such that  $\alpha(b) = \beta(b)$ . Then one can combine these two curves into one  $\gamma: [a, c] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  by the rule

$$\gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \alpha(t) & \text{if } t \leq b, \\ \beta(t) & \text{if } t \geq b. \end{cases}$$


The obtained curve  $\gamma$  is called the *concatenation* of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . (The condition  $\alpha(b) = \beta(b)$  ensures that the map  $t \mapsto \gamma(t)$  is continuous.)

The same definition of concatenation can be applied if  $\alpha$  and/or  $\beta$  are defined on semiopen intervals  $(a, b]$  and/or  $[b, c)$ .

The concatenation can be also defined if the end point of the first curve coincides with the starting point of the second curve; if this is the case, then the time intervals of both curves can be shifted so that they fit together.

If in addition  $\beta(c) = \alpha(a)$  then we can do cyclic concatenation of these curves; this way we obtain a closed curve.

If  $\alpha'(b)$  and  $\beta'(b)$  are defined then the angle  $\theta = \angle(\alpha'(b), \beta'(b))$  is called *external angle* of  $\gamma$  at time  $b$ .



A space curve  $\gamma$  is called *piecewise smooth and regular* if it can be presented as a concatenation of finite number of smooth regular curves; if  $\gamma$  is closed, then the concatenation is assumed to be cyclic.

If  $\gamma$  is a concatenation of smooth regular arcs  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ , then the total curvature of  $\gamma$  is defined as a sum of the total curvatures of  $\gamma_i$  and the external angles; that is,

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \Phi(\gamma_1) + \dots + \Phi(\gamma_n) + \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_{n-1}$$

where  $\theta_i$  is the external angle at the joint  $\gamma_i$  and  $\gamma_{i+1}$ ; if  $\gamma$  is closed, then

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \Phi(\gamma_1) + \dots + \Phi(\gamma_n) + \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n,$$

where  $\theta_n$  is the external angle at the joint  $\gamma_n$  and  $\gamma_1$ .

**3.10. Generalized Fenchel's theorem.** *Let  $\gamma$  be a closed piecewise smooth regular space curve. Then*

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq 2\pi.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\gamma$  is a cyclic concatenation of  $n$  smooth regular arcs  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ . Denote by  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  its external angles. We need to show that

$$\textcircled{3} \quad \Phi(\gamma_1) + \dots + \Phi(\gamma_n) + \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n \geq 2\pi.$$

Consider the tangent indicatrix  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$  for each arc  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ ; these are smooth spherical arcs.

The same argument as in the proof of Fenchel's theorem, shows that the curves  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$  cannot lie in an open hemisphere.

Note that the spherical distance from the end point of  $\tau_i$  to the starting point of  $\tau_{i+1}$  is equal to the external angle  $\theta_i$  (we enumerate modulo  $n$ , so  $\gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_1$ ). Therefore if we connect the end point of  $\tau_i$  to the starting point of  $\tau_{i+1}$  by a short arc of a great circle in the sphere, then we add  $\theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n$  to the total length of  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$ .

Applying the hemispheric lemma (2.17) to the obtained closed curve, we get that

$$\text{length } \tau_1 + \dots + \text{length } \tau_n + \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n \geq 2\pi.$$

Applying the observation (3.6), we get  $\textcircled{3}$ . □

**3.11. Chord lemma.** *Let  $\ell$  be the chord to a smooth regular arc  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ . Assume  $\gamma$  meets  $\ell$  at angles  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  at its ends; that is*


$$\alpha = \angle(w, \gamma'(a)) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \angle(w, \gamma'(b)),$$



where  $w = \gamma(b) - \gamma(a)$ . Then

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq \alpha + \beta.$$

*Proof.* Let us parameterize the chord  $\ell$  from  $\gamma(b)$  to  $\gamma(a)$  and consider the cyclic concatenation  $\bar{\gamma}$  of  $\gamma$  and  $\ell$ . The closed curve  $\bar{\gamma}$  has two external angles  $\pi - \alpha$  and  $\pi - \beta$ . Since curvature of  $\ell$  vanish, we get that



$$\Phi(\bar{\gamma}) = \Phi(\gamma) + (\pi - \alpha) + (\pi - \beta).$$

According to the generalized Fenechel's theorem (3.10),

$$\Phi(\bar{\gamma}) \geq 2\pi;$$

hence the result.  $\square$

**3.12. Exercise.** Show that the estimate in the chord lemma is optimal.

That is, given two points  $p, q$  and two nonzero vectors  $u, v$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , show that there is a smooth regular curve  $\gamma$  that starts at  $p$  in the direction of  $u$  and ends at  $q$  in the direction of  $v$  such that  $\Phi(\gamma)$  is arbitrarily close to  $\angle(w, u) + \angle(w, v)$ , where  $w = q - p$ .

## Polygonal lines

Polygonal lines are partial case of piecewise smooth regular curves; each arc in its concatenation is a line segment. Since the curvature of a line segment vanish, the total curvature of polygonal line is the sum of its external angles.

**3.13. Exercise.** Let  $a, b, c, d$  and  $x$  be distinct points in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Show that the total curvature of polygonal line  $abcd$  cannot exceed the total curvature of  $abxcd$ ; that is,

$$\Phi(abcd) \leq \Phi(abxcd).$$

Use this statement to show that any closed polygonal line has curvature at least  $2\pi$ .

*Hint:* Use that exterior angle of a triangle equals to the sum of the two remote interior angles; for the second part apply the induction on number of vertexes.

**3.14. Proposition.** Assume a polygonal line  $\hat{\gamma} = p_1 \dots p_n$  is inscribed in a smooth regular curve  $\gamma$ . Then

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq \Phi(\hat{\gamma}).$$

Moreover if  $\gamma$  is closed we can assume that the inscribed polygonal line  $\hat{\gamma}$  is also closed.

*Proof.* Since the curvature of line segments vanishes, the total curvature of polygonal line is the sum of external angles  $\theta_i = \pi - \angle p_{i-1}p_i p_{i+1}$ .

Assume  $p_i = \gamma(t_i)$ . Set

$$\begin{aligned} w_i &= p_{i+1} - p_i, & v_i &= \gamma'(t_i), \\ \alpha_i &= \angle(w_i, v_i), & \beta_i &= \angle(w_{i-1}, v_i). \end{aligned}$$

In case of closed curve we use indexes modulo  $n$ , in particular  $p_{n+1} = p_1$ .

Note that  $\theta_i = \angle(w_{i-1}, w_i)$ . Therefore

$$\theta_i \leq \alpha_i + \beta_i.$$

By the chord lemma, the total curvature of the arc of  $\gamma$  from  $p_i$  to  $p_{i+1}$  is at least  $\alpha_i + \beta_{i+1}$ .

Therefore if  $\gamma$  is a closed curve, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\hat{\gamma}) &= \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n \leq \\ &\leq \beta_1 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \beta_n + \alpha_n = \\ &= (\alpha_1 + \beta_2) + \dots + (\alpha_n + \beta_1) \leq \\ &\leq \Phi(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\gamma$  is an arc, the argument is analogous:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\hat{\gamma}) &= \theta_2 + \dots + \theta_{n-1} \leq \\ &\leq \beta_2 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \beta_{n-1} + \alpha_{n-1} \leq \\ &\leq (\alpha_1 + \beta_2) + \dots + (\alpha_{n-1} + \beta_n) \leq \\ &\leq \Phi(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.15. Exercise.

- Draw a smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  which has a self-intersection, such that  $\Phi(\gamma) < 2\pi$ .
- Show that if a smooth regular curve  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  has a self-intersection, then  $\Phi(\gamma) > \pi$ .

**3.16. Proposition.** *The equality case in the Fenchel's theorem holds only for convex plane curves; that is, if the total curvature of a smooth regular space curve  $\gamma$  is equal to  $2\pi$ , then it is a convex plane curve.*

The proof is an application of Proposition 3.14.

*Proof.* Consider an inscribed quadrilateral  $abcd$  in  $\gamma$ . By the definition of total curvature, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(abcd) &= (\pi - \angle dab) + (\pi - \angle abc) + (\pi - \angle bcd) + (\pi - \angle cda) = \\ &= 4\pi - (\angle dab + \angle abc + \angle bcd + \angle cda)\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\textcircled{4} \quad \angle abc \leq \angle abd + \angle dbc \quad \text{and} \quad \angle cda \leq \angle cdb + \angle bda.$$


The sum of angles in any triangle is  $\pi$ . Therefore combining these inequalities, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(abcd) &\geq 4\pi - (\angle dab + \angle abd + \angle bda) - (\angle bcd + \angle cdb + \angle dbc) = \\ &= 2\pi.\end{aligned}$$

By 3.14,

$$\Phi(abcd) \leq \Phi(\gamma) \leq 2\pi.$$


Therefore we have equalities in  $\textcircled{4}$ . It means that the point  $d$  lies in the angle  $abc$  and the point  $b$  lies in the angle  $cda$ . That is,  $abcd$  is a convex plane quadrilateral.



It follows that any quadrilateral inscribed in  $\gamma$  is convex plane quadrilateral. Therefore all points of  $\gamma$  lie in one plane and the domain bounded by  $\gamma$  is convex; that is,  $\gamma$  is a convex plane curve.  $\square$

**3.17. Exercise.** *Suppose that a closed curve  $\gamma$  crosses a line at four points  $a, b, c$  and  $d$ . Assume that these points appear on the line in the order  $a, b, c, d$  and they appear on the curve in the order  $a, c, b, d$ . Show that*

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq 4\pi.$$



A line crossing a curve at four points as in the exercise is called *alternating quadriseccants*. It turns out that any *nontrivial knot* admits an alternating quadriseccants [1]; it implies the so called Fáry–Milnor theorem — *the total curvature any knot exceeds  $4\pi$* .


## Bow lemma

**3.18. Lemma.** *Let  $\gamma_1: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\gamma_2: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be two smooth unit-speed curves; denote by  $k_1(s)$  and  $k_2(s)$  their curvatures at  $s$ . Suppose that  $k_1(s) \geq k_2(s)$  for any  $s$  and the curve  $\gamma_1$  is a simple arc of a convex curve; that is, it runs in the boundary of a convex plane figure. Then the distance between the ends of  $\gamma_1$  cannot exceed the distance between the ends of  $\gamma_2$ ; that is,*

$$|\gamma_1(b) - \gamma_1(a)| \leq |\gamma_2(b) - \gamma_2(a)|.$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  the tangent indicatrices of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  correspondingly.

Let  $\gamma_1(s_0)$  be the point on  $\gamma_1$  that maximize the distance to the line thru  $\gamma(a)$  and  $\gamma(b)$ . Consider two unit vectors



$$u_1 = \tau_1(s_0) = \gamma_1'(s_0) \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 = \tau_2(s_0) = \gamma_2'(s_0).$$

By construction the vector  $u_1$  is parallel to  $\gamma(b) - \gamma(a)$  in particular

$$|\gamma_1(b) - \gamma_1(a)| = \langle u_1, \gamma_1(b) - \gamma_1(a) \rangle$$

Since  $\gamma_1$  is an arc of convex curve, its indicatrix  $\tau(s)$  runs in one direction along the unit circle. Suppose  $s \leq s_0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \angle(\gamma_1'(s), u_1) &= \angle(\tau_1(s), \tau_1(s_0)) = \\ &= \text{length}(\tau_1|_{[s, s_0]}) = \\ &= \int_s^{s_0} |\tau_1'(t)| \cdot dt = \\ &= \int_s^{s_0} k_1(t) \cdot dt \geq \\ &\geq \int_s^{s_0} k_2(t) \cdot dt = \\ &= \int_s^{s_0} |\tau_2'(t)| \cdot dt = \\ &= \text{length}(\tau_2|_{[s, s_0]}) \geq \\ &\geq \angle(\tau_2(s), \tau_2(s_0)) = \\ &= \angle(\gamma_2'(s), u_2), \end{aligned}$$

The same argument shows that

$$\angle(\gamma'_1(s), u_1) \geq \angle(\gamma'_2(s), u_2)$$

for  $s \geq s_0$ ; therefore the inequality holds for any  $s$ . Since the vectors  $\gamma'_1(s), u_1, \gamma'_2(s), u_2$  are unit, it follows that

$$\langle \gamma'_1(s), u_1 \rangle \leq \langle \gamma'_2(s), u_2 \rangle.$$

Integrating the last inequality, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma_1(b) - \gamma_1(a)| &= \langle u_1, \gamma_1(b) - \gamma_1(a) \rangle = \\ &= \int_a^b \langle u_1, \gamma'_1(s) \rangle \cdot ds \leq \\ &\leq \int_a^b \langle u_2, \gamma'_2(s) \rangle \cdot ds = \\ &= \langle u_2, \gamma_2(b) - \gamma_2(a) \rangle \leq \\ &\leq |\gamma_2(b) - \gamma_2(a)|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the result.  $\square$

**3.19. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth regular curve and  $0 < \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Suppose

$$\Phi(\gamma) \leq 2 \cdot \theta.$$

(a) Show that

$$|\gamma(b) - \gamma(a)| > \cos \theta \cdot \text{length } \gamma.$$

(b) Use part (a) to give another solution of 3.15b.

(c) Show that the inequality in (a) is optimal; that is, given  $\theta$  there is a smooth regular curve  $\gamma$  such that  $\frac{|\gamma(b) - \gamma(a)|}{\text{length } \gamma}$  is arbitrarily close to  $\cos \theta$ .

*Hint:* Choose a value  $s_0 \in [a, b]$  that splits the total curvature into two equal parts,  $\theta$  in each. Observe that  $\angle(\gamma'(s_0), \gamma'(s)) \leq \theta$  for any  $s$ . Use this inequality the same way as in the proof of the bow lemma.

**3.20. Exercise.** Suppose that two points  $p$  and  $q$  lie on a unit circle and dividing it in two arcs with lengths  $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ . Show that if a curve  $\gamma$  runs from  $p$  to  $q$  and has curvature at most 1, then either

$$\text{length } \gamma \leq \ell_1 \quad \text{or} \quad \text{length } \gamma \geq \ell_2.$$

**3.21. Exercise.** Suppose  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth regular loop with curvature at most 1. Show that

$$\text{length } \gamma \geq 2 \cdot \pi.$$

## DNA inequality\*

Recall that curvature of a spherical curve is at least 1 (Exercise 3.2). In particular the length of spherical curve cannot exceed its total curvature. The following theorem shows that the same inequality holds for *closed* curves in a unit ball.

**3.22. Theorem.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular closed curve that lies in a unit ball. Then

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq \text{length } \gamma.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can assume the curve is described by a loop  $\gamma: [0, \ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  parameterized by its arc length, so  $\ell = \text{length } \gamma$ . We can also assume that the origin is the center of the ball. It follows that

$$\langle \gamma'(s), \gamma'(s) \rangle = 1, \quad |\gamma(s)| \leq 1$$

and in particular

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \gamma''(s), \gamma(s) \rangle &\geq -|\gamma''(s)| \cdot |\gamma(s)| \geq \\ &\geq -k(s) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $s$ , where  $k(s) = |\gamma''(s)|$  is the curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ .

Since  $\gamma$  is closed, we have that  $\gamma'(0) = \gamma'(\ell)$  and  $\gamma(0) = \gamma(\ell)$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \gamma(\ell), \gamma'(\ell) \rangle - \langle \gamma(0), \gamma'(0) \rangle = \\ &= \int_0^\ell \langle \gamma(s), \gamma'(s) \rangle' \cdot ds = \\ &= \int_0^\ell \langle \gamma'(s), \gamma'(s) \rangle \cdot ds + \int_0^\ell \langle \gamma(s), \gamma''(s) \rangle \cdot ds \geq \\ &\geq \ell - \Phi(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

whence the result.  $\square$

This theorem was proved by Don Chakerian [2]; for plane curves it was proved earlier by István Fáry [3]. We present the proof given by Don Chakerian in [4]; few other proofs of this theorem are discussed by Serge Tabachnikov [5]. He also conjectured the following closely related statement:

**3.23. Theorem.** *Suppose a closed regular smooth curve  $\gamma$  lies in a convex figure with the perimeter  $2\cdot\pi$ . Then*

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq \text{length } \gamma.$$

It was proved by Jeffrey Lagarias and Thomas Richardson [6]; latter a simpler proof was found by Alexander Nazarov and Fedor Petrov [7]. The proof is elementary, but annoyingly difficult; we do not present it here.

## Nonsmooth curves\*

**3.24. Theorem.** *For any regular smooth space curve  $\gamma$  we have that*

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \sup\{\Phi(\beta)\},$$

where the least upper bound is taken for all polygonal lines  $\beta$  inscribed in  $\gamma$ ; if  $\gamma$  is closed we assume that so is  $\beta$ .

*Proof.* Note that the inequality

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq \Phi(\beta)$$

follows from 3.14; it remains to show

$$\textcircled{5} \quad \Phi(\gamma) \leq \sup\{\Phi(\beta)\}.$$

Let  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth curve. Fix a partition  $a = t_0 < \dots < t_n = b$  and consider the corresponding inscribed polygonal line  $\beta = p_0 \dots p_n$ . (If  $\gamma$  is closed, then  $p_0 = p_n$  and  $\beta$  is closed as well.)

Let  $\chi = \xi_1 \dots \xi_n$  be a spherical polygonal line with the vertexes  $\xi_i = \frac{p_i - p_{i-1}}{|p_i - p_{i-1}|}$ . We can assume that  $\chi$  has constant speed on each arc and  $\chi(t_i) = \xi_i$  for each  $i$ . The spherical polygonal line  $\chi$  will be called tangent indicatrix for  $\beta$ .

Consider a sequence of finer and finer partitions, denote by  $\beta_n$  and  $\chi_n$  the corresponding inscribed polygonal lines and their tangent indicatrices. Note that since  $\gamma$  is smooth, the indicatrices  $\chi_n$  converge

pointwise to  $\tau$  — the tangent indicatrix of  $\gamma$ . By semi-continuity of the length (2.13), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(\gamma) &= \text{length } \tau \leq \\ &\leq \varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{length } \chi_n = \\ &= \varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\beta_n) \leq \\ &\leq \sup\{\Phi(\beta)\},\end{aligned}$$

where the last supremum is taken over all partitions and their corresponding inscribed polygonal lines  $\beta$ ; whence **5** follows.  $\square$

The theorem above can be used to define total curvature for arbitrary curves, not necessary (piecewise) smooth and regular. We say that a parameterized curve is trivial if it is constant; that is, it stays at one point.

**3.25. Definition.** *The total curvature of a nontrivial parameterized space curve  $\gamma$  is the exact upper bound on the total curvatures of inscribed nondegenerate polygonal lines; if  $\gamma$  is closed then we assume that the inscribed polygonal lines are closed as well.*

**3.26. Exercise.** *Show that the total curvature is lower semicontinuous with respect to pointwise convergence of curves. That is, if a sequence of curves  $\gamma_n: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  converges pointwise to a nontrivial curve  $\gamma_\infty: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ , then*

$$\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\gamma_n) \geq \Phi(\gamma_\infty).$$

*Hint:* Modify the proof of semi-continuity of length (Theorem 2.13).

**3.27. Exercise.** *Show that Fenchel's theorem holds for any nontrivial closed curve  $\gamma$ ; that is,*

$$\Phi(\gamma) \geq 2\pi.$$

**3.28. Exercise.** *Assume that a curve  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  has finite total curvature. Show that  $\gamma$  is rectifiable.*

*Construct a rectifiable curve  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  that has infinite total curvature.*

A good survey on curves of finite total curvature is written by John Sullivan [8].



# Chapter 4

## Torsion

### Frenet frame

Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular space curve. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\gamma$  has arc length parametrization, so the velocity vector  $\tau(s) = \gamma'(s)$  is unit.

Assume its curvature does not vanish at some time moment  $s$ ; in other words,  $\gamma''(s) \neq 0$ . Then we can define the so called *normal vector* at  $s$  as

$$\nu(s) = \frac{\gamma''(s)}{|\gamma''(s)|}.$$

Note that

$$\tau'(s) = \gamma''(s) = k(s) \cdot \nu(s).$$

According to 3.1,  $\nu(s) \perp \tau(s)$ . Therefore the vector product

$$\beta(s) = \tau(s) \times \nu(s)$$

is a unit vector which makes the triple  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  an oriented orthonormal basis in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ; in particular, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau, \tau \rangle &= 1, & \langle \nu, \nu \rangle &= 1, & \langle \beta, \beta \rangle &= 1, \\ \langle \tau, \nu \rangle &= 0, & \langle \nu, \beta \rangle &= 0, & \langle \beta, \tau \rangle &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The orthonormal basis  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  is called *Frenet frame* at  $s$ ; the vectors in the frame are called *tangent*, *normal* and *binormal* correspondingly. Note that the frame  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  is defined only if  $k(s) \neq 0$ .

The plane  $\Pi_s$  thru  $\gamma(s)$  spanned by vectors  $\tau(s)$  and  $\nu(s)$  is called *osculating plane* at  $s$ ; equivalently it can be defined as a plane thru

$\gamma(s)$  that is perpendicular to the binormal vector  $\beta(s)$ . This is a unique plane that has *second order of contact* with  $\gamma$  at  $s$ ; that is,  $\rho(\ell) = o(\ell^2)$ , where  $\rho(\ell)$  denotes the distance from  $\gamma(s + \ell)$  to  $\Pi_s$ .

## Torsion

Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth unit-speed space curve and  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  is its Frenet frame. The value

$$\kappa(s) = \langle \nu'(s), \beta(s) \rangle$$

is called *torsion* of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ .

Note that the torsion  $\kappa(s)$  is defined at each  $s$  with nonzero curvature. Indeed, if  $k(s) \neq 0$  then Frenet frame  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  is defined at  $s$ . Moreover since the function  $s \mapsto k(s)$  is continuous, it must be positive in an open interval containing  $s$ ; therefore Frenet frame is also defined in this interval. Clearly  $\tau(s), \nu(s)$  and  $\beta(s)$  depend smoothly on  $s$  in their domains of definition. Therefore  $\nu'(s)$  is defined and so is the torsion  $\kappa(s)$ .

The torsion measures how fast the osculating plane rotated when one travels along  $\gamma$ .

**4.1. Exercise.** Given real numbers  $a$  and  $b$ , calculate curvature and torsion of the helix

$$\gamma_{a,b}(t) = (a \cdot \cos t, a \cdot \sin t, b \cdot t).$$

Conclude that for any  $k > 0$  and  $\kappa$  there is a helix with constant curvature  $k$  and torsion  $\kappa$ .

## Frenet formulas

Assume the Frenet frame  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  of curve  $\gamma$  is defined at  $s$ . Recall that

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \tau'(s) = k(s) \cdot \nu(s).$$

Let us write the remaining derivatives  $\nu'(s)$  and  $\beta'(s)$  in the frame  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$ .

First let us show that

$$\textcircled{3} \quad \nu'(s) = -k(s) \cdot \tau(s) + \kappa(s) \cdot \beta(s).$$

Since the frame  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  is orthonormal it is equivalent to the following three identities:

$$\langle \nu', \tau \rangle = -k, \quad \langle \nu', \nu \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \nu', \beta \rangle = \kappa,$$

The last identity follows from the definition of torsion. Differentiating  $\langle \nu, \nu \rangle = 1$  in **1**, we get that

$$2 \cdot \langle \nu', \nu \rangle = 0;$$

whence the second identity follows. Differentiating the identity  $\langle \tau, \nu \rangle = 0$  in **1**; we get that

$$\langle \tau', \nu \rangle + \langle \tau, \nu' \rangle = 0.$$

Applying **2**, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu', \tau \rangle &= -\langle \tau', \nu \rangle = \\ &= -k \cdot \langle \nu, \nu \rangle = \\ &= -k. \end{aligned}$$

It proves the first equality  $\langle \nu', \tau \rangle = -k$  and whence **3** follows.

Taking derivatives of the third identity in **1**, we get that  $\beta' \perp \beta$ . Further taking derivatives of the other identities with  $\beta$  in **1**, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \beta', \tau \rangle &= -\langle \beta, \tau' \rangle = -k \cdot \langle \beta, \nu \rangle = 0 \\ \langle \beta', \nu \rangle &= -\langle \beta, \nu' \rangle = \kappa \end{aligned}$$

Since the frame  $\tau(s), \nu(s), \beta(s)$  is orthonormal, it follows that

$$\textbf{4} \quad \beta'(s) = -\kappa(s) \cdot \nu(s).$$

The equations **2**, **3** and **4** are called Frenet formulas. All three can be written as one matrix identity:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau' \\ \nu' \\ \beta' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k & 0 \\ -k & 0 & \kappa \\ 0 & -\kappa & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \nu \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}.$$

**4.2. Exercise.** Deduce the formula **4** from **2** and **3** by differentiating the identity  $\beta = \tau \times \nu$ .

**4.3. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma$  be a regular space curve with nonvanishing curvature. Show that  $\gamma$  lies in a plane if and only if its torsion vanishes.

*Hint:* Show and use that the binormal vector is constant.

**4.4. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular space curve and  $\tau, \nu, \beta$  its Frenet frame. Show that

$$\beta = \frac{\gamma' \times \gamma''}{|\gamma' \times \gamma''|}.$$

Use this formula to show that its torsion is

$$\kappa = \frac{\langle \gamma' \times \gamma'', \gamma''' \rangle}{|\gamma' \times \gamma''|^2}.$$

## Curves of constant slope

We say that a smooth regular space curve  $\gamma$  has *constant slope* if its velocity vector makes a constant angle with a fixed direction. The following theorem was proved by Michel Ange Lancet [9] more than two centuries ago.

**4.5. Theorem.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular curve; denote by  $k$  and  $\kappa$  its curvature and torsion. Suppose  $k(s) > 0$  at any  $s$ . Then  $\gamma$  has constant slope if and only if the ratio  $\frac{\kappa}{k}$  is constant.

Note that the assumption in the theorem implicitly implies that  $k \neq 0$ ; otherwise  $\frac{\kappa}{k}$  is undefined.

The proof is an application of Frenet formulas. The following exercise will guide you thru the proof of the theorem.

**4.6. Exercise.** Suppose that  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular space curve with nonvanishing curvature,  $\tau, \nu, \beta$  is its Frenet frame and  $k, \kappa$  are its curvature and torsion.

- (a) Assume that  $\langle w, \tau \rangle$  is constant for a fixed nonzero vector  $w$ . Show that

$$\langle w, \nu \rangle = 0.$$

Use it to show that

$$\langle w, -k \cdot \tau + \kappa \cdot \beta \rangle = 0.$$

Use these two identities to show that  $\frac{\kappa}{k}$  is constant; it proves the “only if” part of the theorem.

- (b) Assume that  $\frac{\kappa}{k}$  is constant, show that the vector  $w = \frac{\kappa}{k} \cdot \tau + \beta$  is constant. Conclude that  $\gamma$  has constant slope; it proves the “if” part of the theorem.

Assume  $\gamma$  is a smooth unit speed curve and  $s_0$  is a fixed real number. Then the curve

$$\alpha(s) = \gamma(s) + (s_0 - s) \cdot \gamma'(s)$$

is called *evolvent* of  $\gamma$ . Note that if  $\ell(s)$  denotes the tangent line of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ , then  $\alpha(s) \in \ell(s)$  and  $\alpha'(s) \perp \ell$  for any  $s$ .

**4.7. Exercise.** Show that evolvent of a constant slope curve lies in a plane.

*Hint:* Show that  $\langle w, \alpha \rangle$  is constant if  $\gamma$  makes constant angle with a fixed vector  $w$  and  $\alpha$  is the evolvent of  $\gamma$ .

## Spherical curves

**4.8. Theorem.** A smooth regular space curve  $\gamma$  lies in a unit sphere if and only if the following identity

$$\left| \frac{k'}{\kappa} \right| = k \cdot \sqrt{k^2 - 1}.$$

holds for its curvature  $k$  and torsion  $\kappa$ .

Note that the identity implicitly implies that the torsion  $\kappa$  of the curve is nonzero; otherwise the left hand side would be undefined while right hand side is defined. The proof is another application of Frenet formulas; we present it in a form of guided exercise:

**4.9. Exercise.** Suppose  $\gamma$  is a smooth unit-speed space curve. Denote by  $\tau, \nu, \beta$  its Frenet frame and  $k, \kappa$  its curvature and torsion.

Assume that  $\gamma$  is spherical; that is,  $|\gamma(s)| = 1$  for any  $s$ . Show that

(a)  $\langle \tau, \gamma \rangle = 0$ ; conclude that  $\langle \nu, \gamma \rangle^2 + \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle^2 = 1$ .

(b)  $\langle \nu, \gamma \rangle = -\frac{1}{k}$ ;

(c)  $\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle' = \frac{\kappa}{k}$ ; conclude that if  $\gamma$  is closed, then  $\kappa(s) = 0$  for some  $s$ .

(d) Use (a)–(c) to show that

$$\left| \frac{k'}{\kappa} \right| = k \cdot \sqrt{k^2 - 1}.$$

It proves the “only if” part of the theorem.

Now assume that  $\gamma$  is a space curve that satisfies the identity in (d).

(e) Show that  $p = \gamma + \frac{1}{k} \cdot \nu + \frac{k'}{k^2 \cdot \kappa} \cdot \beta$  is constant; conclude that  $\gamma$  lies in a unit sphere the centered at  $p$ .

It proves the “if” part of the theorem.

For a unit speed curve  $\gamma$  with nonzero curvature and torsion at  $s$ , the sphere  $\Sigma_s$  with the center

$$p(s) = \gamma(s) + \frac{1}{k(s)} \cdot \nu(s) + \frac{k'(s)}{k^2(s) \cdot \kappa(s)} \cdot \beta(s)$$

that pass thru  $\gamma(s)$  is called *osculating sphere* of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ . This a unique sphere that has *third order of contact* with  $\gamma$  at  $s$ ; that is,  $\rho(\ell) = o(\ell^3)$ , where  $\rho(\ell)$  denotes the distance from  $\gamma(s + \ell)$  to  $\Sigma_s$ .

## Fundamental theorem of curves

**4.10. Theorem.** *Let  $k(s)$  and  $\kappa(s)$  be two smooth real valued functions defined on a real interval  $\mathbb{I}$ . Suppose  $k(s) > 0$  for any  $s$ . Then there is a smooth unit-speed curve  $\gamma: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  with curvature  $k(s)$  and torsion  $\kappa(s)$  for every  $s$ . Moreover  $\gamma$  is uniquely defined up to a rigid motion of the space.*

*Proof.* Fix a parameter value  $s_0$ , a point  $\gamma(s_0)$  and an oriented orthonormal frame  $\tau(s_0)$ ,  $\nu(s_0)$ ,  $\beta(s_0)$ . Consider the following initial value problem:

$$\begin{cases} \gamma' = \tau, \\ \tau' = k \cdot \nu, \\ \nu' = -k \cdot \tau + \kappa \cdot \beta, \\ \beta' = -\kappa \cdot \nu. \end{cases}$$

It has four vector equations, so it can be rewritten as a system of 12 scalar equations. By A.14, it has a solution which is defined in a maximal subinterval  $\mathbb{J}$  containing  $s_0$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau, \tau \rangle' &= 2 \cdot \langle \tau, \tau' \rangle = 2 \cdot k \cdot \langle \tau, \nu \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \nu, \nu \rangle' &= 2 \cdot \langle \nu, \nu' \rangle = -2 \cdot k \cdot \langle \nu, \tau \rangle + 2 \cdot \kappa \cdot \langle \nu, \beta \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \beta, \beta \rangle' &= 2 \cdot \langle \beta, \beta' \rangle = -2 \cdot \kappa \cdot \langle \beta, \nu \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \tau, \nu \rangle' &= \langle \tau', \nu \rangle + \langle \tau, \nu' \rangle = k \cdot \langle \nu, \nu \rangle - k \cdot \langle \tau, \tau \rangle + \kappa \cdot \langle \tau, \beta \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \nu, \beta \rangle' &= \langle \nu', \beta \rangle + \langle \nu, \beta' \rangle = 0, \\ \langle \beta, \tau \rangle' &= \langle \beta', \tau \rangle + \langle \beta, \tau' \rangle = -\kappa \cdot \langle \nu, \tau \rangle + k \cdot \langle \beta, \nu \rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is, the values  $\langle \tau, \tau \rangle$ ,  $\langle \nu, \nu \rangle$ ,  $\langle \beta, \beta \rangle$ ,  $\langle \tau, \nu \rangle$ ,  $\langle \tau, \beta \rangle$ ,  $\langle \nu, \beta \rangle$  are constant functions of  $s$ . Since we choose  $\tau(s_0)$ ,  $\nu(s_0)$ ,  $\beta(s_0)$  to be an oriented

orthonormal frame, we have that the  $\tau(s)$ ,  $\nu(s)$ ,  $\beta(s)$  is oriented orthonormal for any  $s$ .

In particular  $|\gamma'(s)| = 1$  for any  $s$ .

Assume  $\mathbb{J} \neq \mathbb{I}$ . Then an end of  $\mathbb{J}$ , say  $a$ , lies in the interior of  $\mathbb{I}$ . By Theorem A.14, at least one of the values  $\gamma(s)$ ,  $\tau(s)$ ,  $\nu(s)$ ,  $\beta(s)$  escapes to infinity as  $s \rightarrow a$ . But this is impossible since the vectors  $\tau(s)$ ,  $\nu(s)$ ,  $\beta(s)$  remain unit and  $|\gamma'(s)| = |\tau(s)| = 1$  — a contradiction. Whence  $\mathbb{J} = \mathbb{I}$ .

Assume there are two curves  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  with the given curvature and torsion functions. Applying a motion of the space we can assume that the  $\gamma_1(s_0) = \gamma_2(s_0)$  and the Frenet frames of the curves coincide at  $s_0$ . Then  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$  by uniqueness of solution of the system (A.14). That is, the curve is unique up to a rigid motion of the space.  $\square$

**4.11. Exercise.** Assume a curve  $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  has constant curvature and torsion. Show that  $\gamma$  is a helix, possibly degenerate to a circle; that is, in a suitable coordinate system we have

$$\gamma(t) = (a \cdot \cos t, a \cdot \sin t, b \cdot t)$$

for some constants  $a$  and  $b$ .

*Hint:* Use the second statement in 4.1.

**4.12. Advanced exercise.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular space curve such that the distance  $|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t + \ell)|$  depends only on  $\ell$ . Show that  $\gamma$  is a helix, possibly degenerate to a line or a circle.

*Hint:* Note that the function

$$\rho(\ell) = |\gamma(t + \ell) - \gamma(t)|^2 = \langle \gamma(t + \ell) - \gamma(t), \gamma(t + \ell) - \gamma(t) \rangle$$

is smooth and does not depend on  $t$ . Express speed, curvature and torsion of  $\gamma$  in terms of derivatives  $\rho^{(n)}(0)$  and apply 4.11.

# Chapter 5

## Plane curves

### Signed curvature

Suppose  $\gamma$  is a smooth unit-speed plane curve, so  $\tau(s) = \gamma'(s)$  is its unit tangent vector.

Let us rotate  $\tau(s)$  by angle  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  counterclockwise; denote the obtained vector by  $\nu(s)$ . The pair  $\tau(s), \nu(s)$  is an oriented orthonormal frame in the plane which is analogous to the Frenet frame for space curves; we will keep the name *Frenet frame* for it.

Recall that  $\gamma''(s) \perp \gamma'(s)$  (see 3.1). Therefore

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \tau'(s) = k(s) \cdot \nu(s).$$

for some real number  $k(s)$ ; the value  $k(s)$  is called *signed curvature* of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ . Note that up to sign it equals to the curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $s$  as it defined on page 19; the sign tells which direction  $\gamma$  turns — if it turns left, then it is positive. If we want to emphasise that we work with *nonsigned* curvature of the curve, we call it *absolute curvature* — it is absolute value of signed curvature.

Note that if we reverse the parametrization of  $\gamma$  or change the orientation of the plane, then the signed curvature changes its sign.

Since  $\tau(s), \nu(s)$  is an orthonormal frame, we have that

$$\langle \tau, \tau \rangle = 1, \quad \langle \nu, \nu \rangle = 1, \quad \langle \tau, \nu \rangle = 0,$$

Differentiating these identities we get that

$$\langle \tau', \tau \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \nu', \nu \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \tau', \nu \rangle + \langle \tau, \nu' \rangle = 0,$$

By  $\textcircled{1}$ ,  $\langle \tau', \nu \rangle = k$  and therefore  $\langle \tau, \nu' \rangle = -k$ . Whence we get

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \nu'(s) = -k(s) \cdot \tau(s).$$



The equations ❶ and ❷ are Frenet formulas for plane curves. They could be also written in a matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau' \\ \nu' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k \\ -k & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \tau \\ \nu \end{pmatrix}.$$

**5.1. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma_0: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be a smooth regular curve and  $\tau$  its tangent indicatrix. Consider another curve  $\gamma_1: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  defined by  $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_0(t) + \tau(t)$ . Show that

$$\text{length } \gamma_0 \leq \text{length } \gamma_1.$$

The curves  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_1$  in the exercise above describe tracks of idealized bicycle with the distance 1 from rear to front wheel. Thus by the exercise, the front wheel have to have the longer track. For more on geometry of bicycle tracks see [10] and the references there in.

**5.2. Theorem.** Let  $k(s)$  be a smooth real valued function defined on a real interval  $\mathbb{I}$ . Then there is a smooth unit-speed curve  $\gamma: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  with signed curvature  $k(s)$  at every  $s$ . Moreover  $\gamma$  is uniquely defined up to a rigid motion of the plane.

This is the fundamental theorem of plane curves; it is direct analog of 4.10 and it can be proved along the same lines. We give a slightly simpler proof.

*Proof.* Fix  $s_0 \in \mathbb{I}$ . Consider the function

$$\theta(s) = \int_{s_0}^s k(t) \cdot dt.$$

Note that by the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have  $\theta'(s) = k(s)$  for any  $s$ .

Set

$$\tau(s) = (\cos[\theta(s)], \sin[\theta(s)])$$

and let  $\nu(s)$  be its counterclockwise rotation by angle  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ ; so

$$\nu(s) = (-\sin[\theta(s)], \cos[\theta(s)]).$$

Consider the curve

$$\gamma(s) = \int_{s_0}^s \tau(s) \cdot ds.$$

Since  $|\gamma'| = |\tau| = 1$ , the curve  $\gamma$  is unit-speed and  $\tau, \nu$  is its Frenet frame.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma''(s) &= \tau'(s) = \\ &= (\cos[\theta(s)]', \sin[\theta(s)]') = \\ &= \theta'(s) \cdot (-\sin[\theta(s)], \cos[\theta(s)]) = \\ &= k(s) \cdot \nu(s).\end{aligned}$$

That is  $k(s)$  is the signed curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ .

We proved the existence; it remains to prove uniqueness. Assume  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are two curves that satisfy the assumptions of the theorem. Applying a rigid motion, we can assume that  $\gamma_1(s_0) = \gamma_2(s_0) = 0$  and the Frenet frame of both curves at  $s_0$  is formed by the coordinate frame  $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ . Let us denote by  $\tau_1, \nu_1$  and  $\tau_2, \nu_2$  the Frenet frames of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  correspondingly. The triples  $\gamma_i, \tau_i, \nu_i$  satisfy the same system of ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{cases} \gamma'_i = \tau_i, \\ \tau'_i = k \cdot \nu_i, \\ \nu'_i = -k \cdot \tau_i. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, they have the same the initial values at  $s_0$ . Therefore  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ .  $\square$

Note that from the proof of theorem we obtain the following corollary:

**5.3. Corollary.** *Suppose  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is a smooth unit-speed curve. Then there is a smooth function  $\theta: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\gamma'(s) = (\cos[\theta(s)], \sin[\theta(s)]) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta'(s) = k(s)$$

for any  $s$ , where  $k(s)$  denotes the signed curvature of  $\gamma$ .

## Total signed curvature

Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth unit-speed plane curve. The integral of its signed curvature is called *total signed curvature* and it denoted by  $\Psi(\gamma)$ ; so if  $\theta$  and  $\gamma$  is as in 5.3, then

$$\textcircled{3} \quad \Psi(\gamma) = \int_a^b k(s) \cdot ds = \theta(b) - \theta(a).$$

Since  $|\int k(s) \cdot ds| \leq \int |k(s)| \cdot ds$ , we have that

$$\textcircled{4} \quad |\Psi(\gamma)| \leq \Phi(\gamma)$$

for any smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$ .

**5.4. Proposition.** *The total signed curvature of any closed simple smooth plane curve  $\gamma$  is  $\pm 2\pi$ ; it is  $+2\pi$  if the region bounded by  $\gamma$  lies on the left from it and  $-2\pi$  otherwise.*

This proposition is a differential-geometric analog of the theorem about sum of the internal angles of a polygon (A.23) which we use in the proof. A more conceptual proof was given by Heinz Hopf [11], [12, p. 42].

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\gamma$  is oriented in such a way that the region bounded by  $\gamma$  lies on the left from it. We can also assume that it parametrized by arc length.

Consider a closed polygonal line  $p_1 \dots p_n$  inscribed in  $\gamma$ . We can assume that the arcs between the vertexes are sufficiently small; in this case the polygonal line is simple and each arc  $\gamma_i$  from  $p_i$  to  $p_{i+1}$  have small total absolute curvature, say  $\Phi(\gamma_i) < \pi$  for each  $i$ .

As usual we use indexes modulo  $n$ , in particular  $p_{n+1} = p_1$ . Assume  $p_i = \gamma(t_i)$ . Set

$$\begin{aligned} w_i &= p_{i+1} - p_i, & v_i &= \gamma'(t_i), \\ \alpha_i &= \angle(v_i, w_i), & \beta_i &= \angle(w_{i-1}, v_i), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in (-\pi, \pi]$  are oriented angles —  $\alpha_i$  is positive if  $w_i$  points to the left from  $v_i$ .

By ③, the value

$$\textcircled{5} \quad \Psi(\gamma_i) - \alpha_i - \beta_{i+1}$$


is a multiple of  $2\pi$ . Since  $\Phi(\gamma_i) < \pi$ , by chord lemma (3.11), we also have that  $|\alpha_i| + |\beta_i| < \pi$ . By ④, we have that  $|\Psi(\gamma_i)| \leq \Phi(\gamma_i)$ ; therefore the value in ⑤ vanishes, or equivalently

$$\Psi(\gamma_i) = \alpha_i + \beta_{i+1}$$

for each  $i$ .

Note that  $\delta_i = \pi - \alpha_i - \beta_i$  is the internal angle of  $p_1 \dots p_n$  at  $p_i$ ;  $\delta_i \in (0, 2\pi)$  for each  $i$ . Recall that the sum of internal angles of an  $n$ -gon is  $(n-2)\pi$  (see A.23); that is,

$$\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_n = (n-2)\pi.$$



Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Psi(\gamma) &= \Psi(\gamma_1) + \cdots + \Psi(\gamma_n) = \\
 &= (\alpha_1 + \beta_2) + \cdots + (\alpha_n + \beta_1) = \\
 &= (\beta_1 + \alpha_1) + \cdots + (\beta_n + \alpha_n) = \\
 &= (\pi - \delta_1) + \cdots + (\pi - \delta_n) = \\
 &= n \cdot \pi - (n - 2) \cdot \pi = \\
 &= 2 \cdot \pi.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

**5.5. Exercise.** Draw a smooth regular closed plane curve with zero total signed curvature.

**5.6. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth regular plane curve with Frenet frame  $\tau, \nu$ . Given a real parameter  $d$ , consider the curve  $\gamma_d(t) = \gamma(t) + d \cdot \nu(t)$ ; it is called a parallel curve of  $\gamma$  on the signed distance  $d$ .

- (a) Show that  $\gamma_d$  is a regular curve if  $d \cdot k(t) \neq 1$  for any  $t$ , where  $k(t)$  denotes the signed curvature of  $\gamma$ .
- (b) Set  $\ell(d) = \text{length } \gamma_d$ . Show that

$$\ell(d) = \ell(0) - d \cdot \Psi(\gamma)$$

for all  $d$  sufficiently close to 0. Show that in general, this formula does not hold for all  $d$ .

## Osculating circline

As a direct corollary of Theorem 5.2, we get the following:

**5.7. Proposition.** Given a point  $p$ , a unit vector  $\tau$  and a real number  $k$ , there is a unique smooth unit-speed curve  $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  that starts at  $p$  in the direction of  $\tau$  and has constant signed curvature  $k$ .

Moreover, if  $k = 0$ , then  $\sigma(s) = p + s \cdot \tau$  which runs along the line; if  $k \neq 0$ , then  $\sigma$  runs around the circle of radius  $\frac{1}{|k|}$  and center  $p + \frac{1}{k} \cdot \nu$ , where  $\tau, \nu$  is an oriented orthonormal frame.


Further we will use the term *circline* for a circle or a line.

**5.8. Definition.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth unit-speed plane curve; denote by  $k(s)$  the signed curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ .

The unit-speed curve  $\sigma$  of constant signed curvature  $k(s)$  that starts at  $\gamma(s)$  in the direction  $\gamma'(s)$  is called the osculating circline of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ .

The center and radius of the osculating circle at a given point are called *center of curvature* and *radius of curvature* of the curve at that point.

The osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  can be also defined as the (necessarily unique) circline that has *second order of contact* with  $\gamma$  at  $s$ ; that is,  $\rho(\ell) = o(\ell^2)$ , where  $\rho(\ell)$  denotes the distance from  $\gamma(s + \ell)$  to  $\sigma_s$ .




## Spiral lemma

The following lemma was proved by Peter Tait [13] and later rediscovered by Adolf Kneser [14].

**5.9. Lemma.** *Assume that  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular plane curve with strictly decreasing positive signed curvature. Then the osculating circles of  $\gamma$  are nested; that is, if  $\sigma_s$  denoted the osculating circle of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ , then  $\sigma_{s_0}$  lies in the open disc bounded by  $\sigma_{s_1}$  for any  $s_0 < s_1$ .*

It turns out that osculating circles of the curve  $\gamma$  give a peculiar foliation of an annulus by circles; it has the following property: if a smooth function is constant on each osculating circle it must be constant in the annulus [see 15, Lecture 10]. Also note that the curve  $\gamma$  is tangent to a circle of the foliation at each of its points. However, it does not run along a circle.




*Proof.* Let  $\tau(s), \nu(s)$  be the Frenet frame,  $z(s)$  the curvature center and  $r(s)$  the radius of curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ . By 5.7,

$$z(s) = \gamma(s) + r(s) \cdot \nu(s).$$

Since  $k > 0$ , we have that  $r(s) \cdot k(s) = 1$ . Therefore applying Frenet formula 2, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} z'(s) &= \gamma'(s) + r'(s) \cdot \nu(s) + r(s) \cdot \nu'(s) = \\ &= \tau(s) + r'(s) \cdot \nu(s) - r(s) \cdot k(s) \cdot \tau(s) = \\ &= r'(s) \cdot \nu(s). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $k(s)$  is decreasing,  $r(s)$  is increasing; therefore  $r' \geq 0$ . It follows that  $|z'(s)| = r'(s)$  and  $z'(s)$  points in the direction of  $\nu(s)$ .



Since  $\nu'(s) = -k(s) \cdot \tau(s)$ , the direction of  $z'(s)$  cannot have constant direction on a nontrivial interval; that is, the curve  $s \mapsto z(s)$  contains no line segments. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |z(s_1) - z(s_0)| &< \text{length}(z|_{[s_0, s_1]}) = \\ &= \int_{s_0}^{s_1} |z'(s)| \cdot ds = \\ &= \int_{s_0}^{s_1} r'(s) \cdot ds = \\ &= r(s_1) - r(s_0). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, the distance between the centers of  $\sigma_{s_1}$  and  $\sigma_{s_0}$  is strictly less than the difference between their radii. Therefore the osculating circle at  $s_0$  lies inside the osculating circle at  $s_1$  without touching it.  $\square$

The curve  $s \mapsto z(s)$  is called *evolute* of  $\gamma$ ; it traces the centers of curvature of the curve. The evolute of  $\gamma$  can be written as

$$z(t) = \gamma(t) + \frac{1}{k(t)} \cdot \nu(t)$$

and in the proof we showed that  $(\frac{1}{k})' \cdot \nu$  is its the velocity vector.

**5.10. Exercise.** Show that the stretched astroid

$$\alpha(t) = \left(\frac{a^2-b^2}{a} \cdot \cos^3 t, \frac{b^2-a^2}{b} \cdot \sin^3 t\right)$$

is an evolute of the ellipse  $\gamma(t) = (a \cdot \cos t, b \cdot \sin t)$ .

The following theorem states formally that *if you drive on the plane and turn the steering wheel to the right all the time, then you will not be able to come back to the same place.*

**5.11. Theorem.** Assume  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular plane curve with positive and strictly monotonic signed curvature. Then  $\gamma$  is simple.

*Proof of 5.11.* Note that  $\gamma(s)$  lies on the osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ . If  $s_1 \neq s_0$ , then by lemma  $\sigma_{s_0}$  does not intersect  $\sigma_{s_1}$ . Therefore  $\gamma(s_1) \neq \gamma(s_0)$ , hence the result.  $\square$


The same statement holds without assuming positivity of curvature; the proof requires only minor modifications.

**5.12. Exercise.** Show that a 3-dimensional analog of the theorem does not hold. That is, there are self-intersecting smooth regular space curves with strictly monotonic curvature.

**5.13. Exercise.** Assume that  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular plane curve with positive strictly monotonic signed curvature.

- (a) Show that no line can be tangent to  $\gamma$  at two distinct points.
- (b) Show that no circle can be tangent to  $\gamma$  at three distinct points.

Note that part (a) does not hold if we allow the curvature to be negative; an example is shown on the diagram.



## Supporting circlines

Suppose  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular plane curve. Recall that a circline  $\sigma$  is tangent to  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  if  $\gamma(t_0) = \sigma(t_1)$  for some  $t_1$  and they share the tangent at these time parameters; that is, the tangent lines of  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  coincides with the tangent line  $\sigma$  at  $t_1$ .

We can (and often will) assume that tangent circline is *cooriented* with the curve; that is, the tangent vectors  $\gamma'(t_0)$  and  $\sigma'(t_1)$  point in the same direction. If not we can reverse the parametrization of  $\sigma$ . If both curves are given with arc length parametrization, then coorientation means that  $\gamma'(t_0) = \sigma'(t_1)$ .


If  $\gamma$  is simple we can say that  $\sigma$  is tangent to  $\gamma$  at the point  $p = \gamma(t_0)$  without ambiguity.

A circline  $\sigma$  supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  if  $\gamma(t_0) \in \sigma$  and  $\gamma$  lies on one side of  $\sigma$ . (We assume that  $t_0$  is not an end point of the interval of parameters.) If  $p = \sigma(t_0)$  for a single value  $t_0$ , then we can also say  $\sigma$  supports  $\gamma$  at  $p$  without ambiguity.

Note that if  $\sigma$  supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$ , then  $\sigma$  is tangent to  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$ . Indeed, if it is not the case, then  $\gamma'(t_0)$  would point inside or outside of  $\sigma$ ; therefore  $\gamma$  would cross  $\sigma$  from one side to another. Therefore we can assume that  $\sigma$  is cooriented with  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$ . In this case we say that  $\sigma$  supports  $\gamma$  from the left (right) if  $\gamma$  lies on the right (correspondingly left) side from  $\sigma$ .

Note that a circle supports itself on the right and left at the same time at any point.

We say that a circle  $\sigma$  *locally supports* a curve  $\gamma$  at  $s$  if it supports its arc  $\gamma|_{(s-\varepsilon, s+\varepsilon)}$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . The same definitions for local support on the left and right are applied.



The circle  $\sigma$  on the diagram locally supports curve  $\gamma$  on the right at  $p$ , but does not support it globally — since  $\gamma$  crosses  $\sigma$  at a latter time.

We say that a smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  has a *vertex* at  $s$  if the signed curvature function is critical at  $s$ ; that is, if  $k'_\gamma(s) = 0$ . If  $\gamma$  is simple we could say that the point  $p = \gamma(s)$  is a vertex

of  $\gamma$  without ambiguity.

**5.14. Exercise.** Assume that osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  of a smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  supports  $\gamma$  at  $s$ . Show that  $\gamma$  has a vertex at  $s$ .

*Hint:* Apply the spiral lemma (5.9).

## Supporting test

The following proposition resembles the second derivative test.

**5.15. Proposition.** Assume  $\sigma$  is a circline that locally supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the right (correspondingly left). Suppose  $\sigma$  is cooriented to  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$ . Then

$$k(t_0)_\gamma \geq k_\sigma \quad (\text{correspondingly } k(t_0)_\gamma \leq k_\sigma).$$

where  $k_\sigma$  is the signed curvature of  $\sigma$  and  $k(t_0)_\gamma$  is the signed curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$ .

A partial converse also holds. Namely, suppose a unit-speed circline  $\sigma$  with signed curvature  $k_\sigma$  starts at  $\gamma(t_0)$  in the direction  $\gamma'(t_0)$ . Then  $\sigma$  locally supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the right (correspondingly left) if

$$k(t_0)_\gamma > k_\sigma \quad (\text{correspondingly } k(t_0)_\gamma < k_\sigma).$$

*Proof.* We prove only the case  $k_\sigma > 0$ . The 2 remaining cases  $k_\sigma = 0$  and  $k_\sigma < 0$  can be done essentially the same way.

Since  $k_\sigma \neq 0$ , the curve  $\sigma$  is a circle. According to Proposition 5.7,  $\sigma$  has radius  $r_\sigma = \frac{1}{k_\sigma}$  and it is centered at

$$z = \gamma(t_0) + r \cdot \nu(t_0).$$

Consider the function

$$f(t) = |z - \gamma(t)|^2 - \frac{1}{k_\sigma^2}.$$



Note that  $f(t) \leq 0$  (correspondingly  $f(t) \geq 0$ ) if and only if  $\gamma(t)$  lies on the closed left (correspondingly right) side from  $\sigma$ . It follows that

◇ if  $\sigma$  locally supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the right, then

$$f'(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f''(t_0) \leq 0;$$

◇ if  $\sigma$  locally supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the left, then

$$f'(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f''(t_0) \geq 0;$$

◇ if

$$f'(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f''(t_0) < 0,$$

then  $\sigma$  locally supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the right;

◇ if

$$f'(t_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f''(t_0) > 0,$$

then  $\sigma$  locally supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the left;


Direct calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} f(t_0) &= 0; \\ f'(t_0) &= \langle z - \gamma(t), z - \gamma(t) \rangle' |_{t=t_0} = \\ &= -2 \cdot \langle \gamma'(t_0), z - \gamma(t_0) \rangle = \\ &= -2 \cdot r \cdot \langle \gamma'(t_0), \nu(t_0) \rangle = \\ &= 0; \\ f''(t_0) &= \langle z - \gamma(t), z - \gamma(t) \rangle'' |_{t=t_0} = \\ &= 2 \cdot (\langle \gamma'(t_0), \gamma'(t_0) \rangle - \langle \gamma''(t_0), z - \gamma(t_0) \rangle) = \\ &= 2 \cdot (\langle \tau(t_0), \tau(t_0) \rangle - r \cdot k(t_0)_\gamma \cdot \langle \nu(t_0), \nu(t_0) \rangle) = \\ &= 2 \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{k(t_0)_\gamma}{k_\sigma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the result. □

**5.16. Exercise.** Assume a closed smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  runs between parallel lines on distance 2 from each other. Show that there is a point on  $\gamma$  with absolute curvature at least 1.

*Hint:* Note that the curve lies in a figure  $F$  as on the diagram. More precisely,  $F$  is formed by a rectangle with pair of bases on the lines and two half discs attached to the sides of length 2. Look at the right most position of  $F$  that still contains the curve.



**5.17. Exercise.** Assume a closed smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  runs inside of a triangle  $\Delta$  with inradius 1; that is, the inscribed circle of  $\Delta$  has radius 1. Show that there is a point on  $\gamma$  with absolute curvature at least 1.


## Convex curves

Recall that a plane curve is convex if it bounds a convex region.

**5.18. Proposition.** Suppose that a closed simple curve  $\gamma$  bounds a figure  $F$ . Then  $F$  is convex if and only if the signed curvature of  $\gamma$  does not change the sign.

**5.19. Lens lemma.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular simple curve that runs from  $x$  to  $y$  and distinct from the line segment from  $x$  to  $y$ . Assume that  $\gamma$  runs on the closed right side (correspondingly left side) of the oriented line  $xy$  and only its end points  $x$  and  $y$  lie on the line. Then  $\gamma$  has a point with positive (correspondingly negative) signed curvature.

Note that the lemma fails for curves with self-intersections; the curve  $\gamma$  on the diagram always turns right, so it has negative curvature everywhere, but it lies on the right side of the line  $xy$ .




*Proof.* Choose points  $p$  and  $q$  on  $\ell$  so that the points  $p, x, y, q$  appear in the same order on  $\ell$ . We can assume that  $p$  and  $q$  lie sufficiently far from  $x$  and  $y$ , so the half-disc with diameter  $pq$  contains  $\gamma$ .

Consider the smallest disc segment with chord  $[pq]$  that contains  $\gamma$ . Note that its arc  $\sigma$  supports  $\gamma$  at a point  $s = \gamma(t_0)$ .

Note that the  $\gamma'(t_0)$  is tangent to  $\sigma$  at  $s$ . Let us parameterise  $\sigma$  from  $p$  to  $q$ . Then  $\gamma$  and  $\sigma$  are cooriented as  $s$ . If not, then the arc of  $\gamma$  from  $s$  to  $y$  would be trapped in the curvilinear triangle  $xsp$  bounded by arcs of  $\sigma$ ,  $\gamma$  and the line segment  $[px]$ . But this is impossible since  $y$  does not belong to this triangle.

It follows that  $\sigma$  supports  $\gamma$  at  $t_0$  from the right. By 5.15,


$$k(t_0)_\gamma \geq k_\sigma,$$



Evidently  $k_\sigma > 0$ , hence the result.  $\square$

*Remark.* Instead of taking minimal disc segment, one can take a point  $s$  on  $\gamma$  that maximize the distance to the line  $xy$ . The same argument shows that curvature at  $s$  is nonnegative, which is slightly weaker than the required positive curvature.

*Proof of 5.18.* If  $F$  is convex, then every tangent line of  $\gamma$  supports  $\gamma$ . If a point moves along  $\gamma$ , the figure  $F$  has to stay on one side from its tangent line; that is, we can assume that each tangent line supports  $\gamma$  on one side, say on the right. Applying the supporting test (5.15), we get that  $k \geq 0$  at each point.



Now assume  $F$  is not convex. Then there is a line that supports  $\gamma$  at two points, say  $x$  and  $y$  that divide  $\gamma$  in two arcs  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ , both distinct from the line segment  $xy$ . Note the one of the arcs is parametrized from  $x$  to  $y$  and the other from  $y$  to  $x$ . Applying the lens lemma, we get that the arcs  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  contain points with curvatures of opposite signs.

That is, if  $F$  is not convex, then curvature of  $\gamma$  changes sign. Equivalently: if curvature of  $\gamma$  does not change sign then  $F$  is convex.  $\square$

**5.20. Exercise.** Suppose  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular simple closed convex plane curve of diameter bigger than 2. Show that  $\gamma$  has a point with absolute curvature less than 1.


*Hint:* Note that we can assume that  $\gamma$  bounds a convex figure  $F$ , otherwise by 5.18 its curvature changes the sign and therefore it has zero curvature at some point. Choose two points  $x$  and  $y$  surrounded by  $\gamma$  such that  $|x - y| > 2$ , look at the maximal lens bounded by two arcs with common chord  $xy$  that lies in  $F$  and apply supporting test (5.15).

**5.21. Exercise.** Suppose  $\gamma$  is a simple smooth regular curve in the plane with positive curvature. Assume  $\gamma$  crosses a line  $\ell$  at the points  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n$  and these points appear on  $\gamma$  in that same order.


- Show that  $p_2$  cannot lie between  $p_1$  and  $p_3$  on  $\ell$ .
- Show that if  $p_3$  lies between  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  on  $\ell$  then the points appear on  $\ell$  in the following order:

$$p_1, p_3, \dots, p_4, p_2.$$

- Try to describe all possible orders when  $p_1$  lies between  $p_2$  and  $p_3$  (see the diagram).



**5.22. Exercise.** Let  $F$  be a plane figure bounded by two circle arcs  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  of signed curvature 1 that run from  $x$  to  $y$ . Suppose  $\sigma_1$  is a shorter than  $\sigma_2$ . Assume a simple arc  $\gamma$  runs in  $F$  and has the end points on  $\sigma_1$ . Show that the absolute curvature of  $\gamma$  is at least 1 at some parameter value.




## Moon in a puddle

**5.23. Theorem.** Assume  $\gamma$  is a simple closed smooth regular plane curve. Then at least two of its osculating circles support  $\gamma$  from the left and at least two from the right.

The diagram shows for supporting osculating circles, two from inside and two outside the curve for the given curve.

The above theorem is a slight generalization of the following theorem proved by Vladimir Ionin and German Pestov in [16]:


**5.24. Theorem.** Assume  $\gamma$  is a simple closed smooth regular plane curve of absolute curvature bounded by 1. Then it surrounds a unit disc.



This theorem is a direct corollary of 5.23; indeed, since absolute curvature is bounded by 1, every osculating circle has radius at least 1 and by 5.23 two of these circles are surrounded by  $\gamma$ .

This theorem gives a simple but nontrivial example of the so called *local to global theorems* — based on some local data (in this case the curvature of a curve) we conclude a global property (in this case existence of a large disc surrounded by the curve). For convex curves, this result was known earlier [17, §24].

A straightforward approach to the latter theorem would be to start with some disc in the region bounded by the curve and blow it up to maximize its radius. However, as one may see from the diagram it does not always lead to a solution a closed plane curve of absolute curvature bounded by 1 may surround a disc of radius smaller than 1 that cannot be enlarged continuously.




Recall that a vertex of a smooth regular curve is defined as a critical point of its signed curvature; in particular, any local minimum (or maximum) of the signed curvature is a vertex.

According to 5.14, if an osculating circle supports the curve at the same point  $p$ , then  $p$  is a vertex. Therefore 5.23 implies existence of 4 vertexes of  $\gamma$ . That is, we proved the following theorem:

**5.25. Four-vertex theorem.** *Any smooth regular simple plane curve has at least four vertexes.*

Evidently any closed curve has at least two vertexes — where the minimum and the maximum of the curvature are attained. On the diagram the vertexes are marked; the first curve has one self-intersection and exactly two vertexes; the second curve has exactly four vertexes and no self-intersections.




The four-vertex theorem was first proved by Syamadas Mukhopadhyaya [18] for convex curves. By now it has a large number of different proofs and generalizations. One of my favorite proofs was given by Robert Osserman [19]; the proof of Vladimir Ionin and German Pestov given below is even better.

*Proof of 5.23.* Denote by  $F$  the closed region surrounded by  $\gamma$ ; as usual we parametrize  $\gamma$  so that  $F$  lies on the left from it.

First let us show that one osculating circle is supporting  $\gamma$  from the left; that is, it lies completely in  $F$  — this is the main part of the proof.

Assume contrary; that is, the osculating circle at each point  $p \in \gamma$  does not lie in  $F$ . For each point  $p \in \gamma$  let us consider the maximal circle  $\sigma$  that lies completely in  $F$  and tangent to  $\gamma$  at  $p$ ; in other words,  $\sigma$  has minimal signed curvature among these circles. Note that  $\sigma$  has to touch  $\gamma$  at another point; otherwise we could increase its radius slightly while keeping the circle in  $F$ .


Fix a point  $p_1$  and let  $\sigma_1$  be the corresponding circle. Denote by  $\gamma_1$  an arc of  $\gamma$  from  $p_1$  to a first point  $q_1$  on  $\sigma_1$ . Denote by  $\hat{\sigma}_1$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_1$



two arcs of  $\sigma_1$  from  $p_1$  to  $q_1$  such that the cyclic concatenation of  $\hat{\sigma}_1$  and  $\gamma_1$  surrounds  $\hat{\sigma}_1$ .

Let  $p_2$  be the midpoint of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  be the corresponding circle.

Note that  $\sigma_2$  cannot intersect  $\hat{\sigma}_1$ . Otherwise, if  $\sigma_2$  intersects  $\hat{\sigma}_1$  at some point  $s$ , then  $\sigma_2$  has two more common points with  $\hat{\sigma}_1$  —  $x$  and  $y$ , one for each arc of  $\sigma_2$  from  $p_2$  to  $s$ . That is  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  have common point  $s$ ,  $x$  and  $y$ . Therefore  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  as two circles with three common points. On the other hand, by construction  $p_2 \in \sigma_2$  and  $p_2 \notin \sigma_1$  — a contradiction.



Recall that  $\sigma_2$  has to touch  $\gamma$  at another point. From above it follows that it can only touch  $\gamma_1$  and therefore we can choose an arc  $\gamma_2 \subset \gamma_1$  that runs from  $p_2$  to a first point  $q_2 \in \sigma_2$ . Note that by construction we have that

$$\textcircled{6} \quad \text{length } \gamma_2 < \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{length } \gamma_1.$$

Two ovals on the diagram pretend to be circles.

Let us repeat this construction recessively. We get an infinite sequence of arcs  $\gamma_1 \supset \gamma_2 \supset \dots$ . By  $\textcircled{6}$ , we also get that

$$\text{length } \gamma_n \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore the intersection

$$\bigcap_n \gamma_n$$

contains a single point; denote it by  $p_\infty$ .

Let  $\sigma_\infty$  be the corresponding circle at  $p_\infty$ ; it has to touch  $\gamma$  at another point  $q_\infty$ . The same argument as above shows that  $q_\infty \in \gamma_n$  for any  $n$ . It follows that  $q_\infty = p_\infty$  — a contradiction.

Now suppose that there is only one point  $q \in \gamma$  at which osculating circle supports  $\gamma$  from the left. In this case for any point  $p \neq q$  on  $\gamma$  the corresponding circle touches  $\gamma$  at another point.

Chose a point  $p_1 \neq q$  on  $\gamma$ , take its corresponding circle  $\sigma_1$  and note that there are two choices for arc  $\gamma_1$  one of which does not contain  $q$ . Repeating the same construction starting from  $\gamma_1$  we also arrive to a contradiction.

It remains to show that existence of a pair of osculating circlines that support  $\gamma$  form the right. This is done the same way, one only has to change the definition of corresponding circline — given  $p \in \gamma$ , it has to be the circline of maximal signed curvature that supports  $\gamma$  from the right at  $p$ . We leave it as an exercise:

**5.26. Exercise.** List the necessary changes in the proof above for the existence of circlines that support  $\gamma$  form the right.  $\square$

Theorem 5.24 admits the following generalization:

**5.27. Theorem.** Let  $\gamma$  be a smooth regular simple plane loop. Suppose that absolute curvature of  $\gamma$  does not exceed 1. Then  $\gamma$  surrounds a unit circle.



**5.28. Exercise.** Describe the modifications in the proof of 5.23 which are necessary to prove 5.27.

**5.29. Exercise.** Assume that a closed smooth regular curve  $\gamma$  lies in a figure  $F$  bounded by a closed simple plane curve. Suppose that  $R$  is the maximal radius of discs that lies in  $F$ . Show that absolute curvature of  $\gamma$  is at least  $\frac{1}{R}$  at some parameter value.


*Hint:* Note that  $\gamma$  contains a simple loop; apply to it 5.27.

**5.30. Advanced exercise.** Suppose  $\gamma$  is a closed simple smooth regular plane curve and  $\sigma$  is a circle. Assume  $\gamma$  crosses  $\sigma$  at the points  $p_1, \dots, p_{2 \cdot n}$  and these points appear in the same cycle order on  $\gamma$  and on  $\sigma$ . Show that osculating circles at  $n$  distinct points of  $\gamma$  lie inside  $\gamma$  and that osculating circles at other  $n$  distinct points of  $\gamma$  lie outside of  $\gamma$ . In particular the curve  $\gamma$  has at least  $2 \cdot n$  vertexes.

Construct an example of a closed simple smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  with only 4 vertexes that crosses a given circle at arbitrary many points.

*Hint:* Repeat the proof of theorem for each cyclic concatenation of an arc of  $\gamma$  from  $p_i$  to  $p_{i+1}$  with large arc of the circle.

Recall that the *inverse* of a point  $x$  with respect to the unit circle centered at the origin is the point  $\hat{x} = \frac{x}{|x|^2}$ .



**5.31. Advanced exercise.** Suppose  $\gamma$  is a smooth regular plane curve that does not pass thru the origin. Let  $\hat{\gamma}$  be the inversion of  $\gamma$  in the unit circle centered at the origin. Show that osculating circline of  $\hat{\gamma}$  at  $s$  is the inversion of osculating circline of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ . Conclude that every vertex of  $\hat{\gamma}$  is the inversion of a vertex of  $\gamma$ .

*Hint:* Use the definition of osculating circle via order of contact and that inversion maps circles to circlines.

Note that the exercise provides an alternative way to finish the proof of 5.23 — once we proved the existence of two osculating circles that support  $\gamma$  from the left, we can apply to  $\gamma$  inversion with the center surrounded by  $\gamma$ . In this case the curve  $\gamma$  is mapped to a curve  $\hat{\gamma}$ , the domain inside  $\gamma$  is mapped to the domain outside  $\hat{\gamma}$  and the other way around. It follows that if an osculating circle supports the obtained curve  $\hat{\gamma}$  on the right then its inversion supports  $\gamma$  from the left and the other way around. That is from the existence of two supporting circles on the left we also get the existence of two supporting circles on the right.



# Part II

## Surfaces

# Chapter 6

## Definitions

### General definition

Few times we will need the following general definition.

A path connected subset  $\Sigma$  in a metric space is called *surface* (more precisely *embedded surface without boundary*) if any point of  $p \in \Sigma$  admits a neighborhood  $W$  in  $\Sigma$  which is *homeomorphic* to an open subset in the Euclidean plane; that is, if there is an injective continuous map  $U \rightarrow W$  from an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  such that its invese  $W \rightarrow U$  is also continuous.

However, as well as in the case of curves we will be mostly interested in smooth surfaces in the Euclidean space describe in the following section.

### Smooth surfaces

Recall that a function  $f$  of two variables  $x$  and  $y$  is called *smooth* if all its partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial^{m+n}}{\partial x^m \partial y^n} f$  are defined and are continuous in the domain of definition of  $f$ .

A path connected set  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is called a *smooth surface* (or more precisely *smooth regular embedded surface*) if it can be described locally as a graph of a smooth function in an appropriate coordinate system.

More precisely, for any point  $p \in \Sigma$  one can choose a coordinate system  $(x, y, z)$  and a neighborhood  $U \ni p$  such that the intersection  $W = U \cap \Sigma$  is formed by a graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a smooth function  $f$  defined in an open domain of the  $(x, y)$ -plane.

**Examples.** The simplest example of a surface is the  $(x, y)$ -plane

$$\Pi = \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z = 0 \}.$$

The plane  $\Pi$  is a surface since it can be described as the graph of the function  $f(x, y) = 0$ .

All other planes are surfaces as well since one can choose a coordinate system so that it becomes the  $(x, y)$ -plane. We can also present a plane as a graph of a linear function  $f(x, y) = a \cdot x + b \cdot y + c$  for some constants  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  (assuming the plane is not perpendicular to the  $(x, y)$ -plane).

A more interesting example is the unit sphere

$$\mathbb{S}^2 = \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1 \}.$$

This set is not the graph of any function, but  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is locally a graph; in fact it can be covered by 6 graphs:

$$\begin{aligned} z &= f_{\pm}(x, y) = \pm \sqrt{1 - x^2 - y^2}, \\ y &= g_{\pm}(x, z) = \pm \sqrt{1 - x^2 - z^2}, \\ x &= h_{\pm}(y, z) = \pm \sqrt{1 - y^2 - z^2}; \end{aligned}$$

each function  $f_{\pm}, g_{\pm}, h_{\pm}$  is defined in an open unit disc. That is,  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is a smooth surface.

**More conventions.** If the surface  $\Sigma$  is formed by a closed set, then it is called *complete*. For example, paraboloids

$$z = x^2 + y^2, \quad z = x^2 - y^2$$

or sphere

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1$$

are complete surfaces, while the open disc in a plane

$$\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 < 1, z = 0 \}$$

is a surface which is not complete.

If moreover  $\Sigma$  is a compact set, then it is called *closed surface* (the term is closely related to *closed curve* but has nothing to do with *closed set*).

If a complete surface  $\Sigma$  is noncompact, then it is called *open surface* (again the term *open set* is not relevant).

For example, paraboloids are open surfaces, and sphere is closed.

A closed subset in a surface that is bounded by one or more curves is called *surface with boundary*; in this case the collection of curves is called the *boundary line* of the surface. When we say *surface* we usually mean a surface without boundary; we may use the term *surface with possibly nonempty boundary* if we need to talk about surfaces with and without boundary.

## Local parametrizations

Let  $U$  be an open domain in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $s: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth map. We say that  $s$  is regular if its Jacobian has maximal rank; in this case it means that the vectors  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial u}$  and  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial v}$  are linearly independent at any  $(u, v) \in U$  or equivalently  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial u} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial v} \neq 0$ , where  $\times$  denotes the vector product.

**6.1. Proposition.** *If  $s: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth regular embedding of an open connected set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , then its image  $\Sigma = s(U)$  is a smooth surface.*

*Proof.* Let  $s(u, v) = (s_1(u, v), s_2(u, v), s_3(u, v))$ . Since  $s$  is regular the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial v} \\ \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial v} \\ \frac{\partial s_3}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial s_3}{\partial v} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank two.

Fix a point  $p \in \Sigma$ ; by shifting the coordinate system we may assume that  $p$  is the origin. Permuting the coordinates  $x, y, z$  if necessary, we may assume that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial v} \\ \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial u} & \frac{\partial s_2}{\partial v} \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible. Let  $\bar{s}: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  be the projection of  $s$  to the  $(x, y)$ -coordinate plane; that is,  $\bar{s}(u, v) = (s_1(u, v), s_2(u, v))$ . Note that the  $2 \times 2$ -matrix above is the Jacobian matrix of  $\bar{s}$ .

The inverse function theorem implies that there is a smooth regular function  $h$  defined on an open set  $W \ni 0$  in the  $(x, y)$ -plane such that  $h(0, 0) = (0, 0)$  and  $\bar{s} \circ h$  is the identity map.

Note that the graph  $z = s_3 \circ h(x, y)$  for  $(x, y) \in W$  is a subset in  $\Sigma$ . Indeed, if  $(u, v) = h(x, y)$ , then  $x = s_1(u, v)$  and  $y = s_2(u, v)$ . Therefore the identity  $z = s_3 \circ h(x, y)$  can be rewritten as  $(x, y, z) = s(u, v)$ .

Clearly the graph  $z = s_3 \circ h(x, y)$  for  $(x, y) \in W$  is open in  $\Sigma$ ; that is,  $\Gamma$  a neighborhood of  $p$  in  $\Sigma$  that can be described as a graph of a smooth function  $f_3 \circ h: W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $p$  is arbitrary, we get that  $\Sigma$  is a surface.  $\square$

If  $s$  and  $\Sigma$  as in the proposition, then we say that  $s$  is a *parametrization* of the surface  $\Sigma$ .

Not all the smooth surfaces can be described by such a parametrization; for example the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$  cannot. But any smooth surface  $\Sigma$  admits a local parametrization; that is, any point  $p \in \Sigma$  admits an open neighborhood  $W \subset \Sigma$  with a smooth regular parametrization  $s$ . In this case any point in  $W$  can be described by two parameters, usually denoted by  $u$  and  $v$ , which are called *local coordinates* at  $p$ . The map  $s$  is called a *chart* of  $\Sigma$ .

If  $W$  is a graph  $z = h(x, y)$  then the map  $s: (u, v) \mapsto (u, v, h(u, v))$  is a chart. Indeed,  $s$  has an inverse  $(u, v, h(u, v)) \mapsto (u, v)$  which is continuous; that is,  $s$  is an embedding. Further,  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial u} = (1, 0, \frac{\partial h}{\partial u})$  and  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial v} = (0, 1, \frac{\partial h}{\partial v})$ , whence  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial u}$  and  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial v}$  are linearly independent.

Note that from 6.1, we obtain the following corollary.

**6.2. Corollary.** *A path connected set  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth regular surface if at any point  $p \in \Sigma$  it has a local parametrization by a smooth regular map.*

**6.3. Exercise.** *Consider the following map*

$$s(u, v) = \left( \frac{2 \cdot u}{1+u^2+v^2}, \frac{2 \cdot v}{1+u^2+v^2}, \frac{2}{1+u^2+v^2} \right).$$

*Show that  $s$  is a chart of the unit sphere centered at  $(0, 0, 1)$ ; describe the image of  $s$ .*

The map


$$(u, v, 1) \mapsto \left( \frac{2 \cdot u}{1+u^2+v^2}, \frac{2 \cdot v}{1+u^2+v^2}, \frac{2}{1+u^2+v^2} \right)$$

is called *stereographic projection*. Note that the point  $(u, v, 1)$  and its image  $\left( \frac{2 \cdot u}{1+u^2+v^2}, \frac{2 \cdot v}{1+u^2+v^2}, \frac{2}{1+u^2+v^2} \right)$  lie on one half-line starting at the origin.

Let  $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  be a plane curve. Recall that the image of the map

$$(t, \theta) \mapsto (x(t), y(t) \cdot \cos \theta, y(t) \cdot \sin \theta)$$

is called *surface of revolution* of the curve  $\gamma$  around  $x$ -axis. For fixed  $t$  or  $\theta$  the obtained curves are called meridian or correspondingly parallel of the surface of revolution; note that parallels are formed by circles in the plane perpendicular to the axis of rotation.



**6.4. Exercise.** *Assume  $\gamma$  is a closed simple smooth regular plane curve that does not intersect  $x$ -axis. Show that surface of revolution of  $\gamma$  around  $x$ -axis is a smooth regular surface.*

## Golbal parametrizations

A surface can be described by an embedding from a known surface to the space. For example the ellipsoid

$$\Sigma_{a,b,c} = \left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \frac{x^2}{a^2} + \frac{y^2}{b^2} + \frac{z^2}{c^2} = 1 \right\}$$

for some positive numbers  $a, b, c$  can be defined as the image of the map  $s: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ , defined as the restriction of the map  $(x, y, z) \mapsto (a \cdot x, b \cdot y, c \cdot z)$  to the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$ .

For a surface  $\Sigma$ , a map  $s: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is called a *smooth parametrized surface* if for any chart  $f: U \rightarrow \Sigma$  the composition  $s \circ f$  is smooth and regular; that is, all partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial^{m+n}}{\partial u^m \partial v^n}(s \circ f)$  exist and are continuous in the domain of definition and the following two vectors  $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}(s \circ f)$  and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial v}(s \circ f)$  are linearly independent.

Evidently the parametric definition includes the embedded surfaces defined previously — as the domain of parameters we can take the surface itself and the identity map as  $s$ . But parametrized surfaces are more general, in particular they might have self-intersections.

If  $\Sigma$  is a known surface for example a sphere or a plane, the parametrized surface  $s: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  might be called by the same name. For example, any embedding  $s: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  might be called topological sphere and if  $s$  is smooth and regular, then it might be called smooth sphere. (A smooth regular map  $s: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  which is not necessary an embedding is called *smooth regular immersion*, so we can say that  $s$  describes a smooth immersed sphere.) Similarly an embedding  $s: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  might be called topological plane and if  $s$  is smooth it might be called smooth plane.

## Implicitly defined surfaces

**6.5. Proposition.** *Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function. Suppose that 0 is a regular value of  $f$ ; that is,  $\nabla_p f \neq 0$  if  $f(p) = 0$ . Then any path connected component  $\Sigma$  of the set of solutions of the equation  $f(x, y, z) = 0$  is a surface.*

*Proof.* Fix  $p \in \Sigma$ . Since  $\nabla_p f \neq 0$  we have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(p) \neq 0, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(p) \neq 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(p) \neq 0.$$

We may assume  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(p) \neq 0$ ; otherwise permute the coordinates  $x, y, z$ .

The implicit function theorem (A.10) implies that a neighborhood of  $p$  in  $\Sigma$  is the graph  $z = h(x, y)$  of a smooth function  $h$  defined on

an open domain in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . It remains to apply the definition of smooth surface (page 58).  $\square$

**6.6. Exercise.** Describe the set of real numbers  $a$  such that the equation

$$x^2 + y^2 - z^2 = a$$

describes a smooth regular surface.

## Tangent plane

Let  $z = f(x, y)$  be a local graph realization of a surface. Assume that a point  $p = (x_p, y_p, z_p)$  lies on this graph, so  $z_p = f(x_p, y_p)$ . The plane spanned by the vectors  $(1, 0, (\frac{\partial}{\partial x}f)(x_p, y_p))$  and  $(0, 1, (\frac{\partial}{\partial y}f)(x_p, y_p))$  is called the *tangent plane* of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ . The tangent plane to  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  is usually denoted by  $T_p$  or  $T_p\Sigma$ . Vectors in  $T_p$  are called *tangent vectors* of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ .

Tangent plane  $T_p$  might be considered as a linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  or as a parallel plane passing thru  $p$ . In the latter case it can be interpreted as the best approximation of the surface  $\Sigma$  by a plane at  $p$ ; it has *first order of contact* with  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ ; that is,  $\rho(q) = o(|p - q|)$ , where  $q \in \Sigma$  and  $\rho(q)$  denotes the distance from  $q$  to  $T_p$ .

**6.7. Proposition.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth surface. A vector  $w$  is a tangent vector of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  if and only if there is a curve  $\gamma$  that runs in  $\Sigma$  and has  $w$  as a velocity vector at  $p$ .

Note that according to the proposition the tangent plane  $T_p\Sigma$  can be defined as the set of all velocity vectors at  $p$  of smooth parameterized curves that run in  $\Sigma$ . In particular the tangent plane to a surface at a given point does not depend on the choice of its local graph representation.

*Proof.* We can assume that  $\Sigma$  is a graph  $z = f(x, y)$ ; otherwise pass to a local presentation of  $\Sigma$  around  $p$ .

*“Only if” part.* Suppose that  $(x(t), y(t))$  denotes the projection of  $\gamma(t)$  to the  $(x, y)$ -plane. Since  $\gamma$  runs in  $\Sigma$ , we have that

$$\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), f(x(t), y(t))).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma' &= (x', y', \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, y) \cdot x' + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(x, y) \cdot y') = \\ &= x' \cdot (1, 0, (\frac{\partial}{\partial x}f)(x, y)) + y' \cdot (0, 1, (\frac{\partial}{\partial y}f)(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $\gamma'(t) \in T_{\gamma(t)}$  for any  $t$ .

*“If” part.* Without loss of generality we can assume that  $p$  is the origin. Fix a tangent vector

$$w = a \cdot (1, 0, (\frac{\partial}{\partial x} f)(0, 0)) + b \cdot (0, 1, (\frac{\partial}{\partial y} f)(0, 0))$$

and consider the curve  $\gamma(t) = (a \cdot t, b \cdot t, f(a \cdot t, b \cdot t))$ . By construction  $\gamma$  runs in  $\Sigma$  and the direct calculations show that  $\gamma'(0) = w$ .  $\square$

**6.8. Exercise.** Assume  $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is a smooth regular chart of a surface  $\Sigma$  and  $p = f(u_0, v_0)$ . Show that the tangent plane  $T_p \Sigma$  is spanned by vectors  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(u_0, v_0)$  and  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial v}(u_0, v_0)$ .

**6.9. Exercise.** Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function with a regular value 0 and  $\Sigma$  is a surface described as a connected component of the set of solutions  $f(x, y, z) = 0$ . Show that the tangent plane  $T_p \Sigma$  is perpendicular to the gradient  $\nabla_p f$  at any point  $p \in \Sigma$ .

**6.10. Exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth surface and  $p \in \Sigma$ . Fix an  $(x, y, z)$ -coordinates. Show that a neighborhood of  $p$  in  $\Sigma$  is a graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a smooth function  $f$  defined on an open subset in  $(x, y)$ -plane if and only if the tangent plane  $T_p$  is not a vertical plane; that is if the projection of  $T_p$  to  $(x, y)$ -plane does not degenerates to a line.


## Normal vector and orientation

A unit vector that is normal to  $T_p$  is usually denoted by  $\nu_p$ ; it is uniquely defined up to sign.

A surface  $\Sigma$  is called *oriented* if it is equipped with a unit normal vector field  $\nu$ ; that is, a continuous map  $p \mapsto \nu_p$  such that  $\nu_p \perp T_p$  and  $|\nu_p| = 1$  for any  $p$ . The choice of the field  $\nu$  is called *orientation* on  $\Sigma$ . A surface  $\Sigma$  is called *orientable* if it can be oriented. Note that each orientable surface admits two orientations  $\nu$  and  $-\nu$ .

Möbius strip shown on the diagram gives an example of nonorientable surface — there is no choice of normal vector field that is continuous along the middle of the strip, when you go around it changes the sign.

Note that each surface is locally orientable. In fact each chart  $f(u, v)$  admits





an orientation

$$\nu = \frac{\frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \times \frac{\partial f}{\partial v}}{\left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \times \frac{\partial f}{\partial v} \right|}.$$

Indeed the vectors  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial u}$  and  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial v}$  are tangent vectors at  $p$ ; since they are linearly independent, their vector product does not vanish and it is perpendicular to the tangent plane. Therefore  $\nu(u, v)$  is a unit normal vector at  $f(u, v)$ ; evidently  $(u, v) \mapsto \nu(u, v)$  is a continuous map.

**6.11. Exercise.** Let  $h : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function with a regular value 0 and  $\Sigma$  is a surface described as a connected component of the set of solutions  $h(x, y, z) = 0$ . Show that  $\Sigma$  is orientable.

*Hint.* Show that  $\nu = \frac{\nabla h}{|\nabla h|}$  defines a unit normal field on  $\Sigma$ .

The following claim should be intuitively obvious. Its proof is not at all trivial; a standard proof use the so called *Alexander's duality* which is a classical technique in algebraic topology.

**6.12. Claim.** The complement of any complete surface in the Euclidean space has exactly two connected components.

Note that if a complete surface is smooth, we can choose the unit normal field on it that points into one of the components of the complement. Therefore we obtain the following observation.

**6.13. Observation.** Any smooth complete surface in Euclidean space is oriented.

In particular it follows that the Möbius strip cannot be extended to a complete smooth surface.

## Plane sections

**6.14. Advanced exercise.** Show that any closed set in the plane can appear as an intersection of this plane with a complete smooth regular surface.

As a consequence of the exercise above, the section of a smooth regular surface by a plane might look complicated. The following lemma makes possible to perturb the plane so that the section becomes nice.

**6.15. Lemma.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth regular surface. Then for any plane  $\Pi$  there is arbitrarily close parallel plane  $\Pi'$  such that each connected component of the intersection  $\Sigma \cap \Pi'$  is a smooth regular curve.

*Proof.* Assume  $\Pi$  is described by equation  $f(x, y, z) = r_0$ , where

$$f(x, y, z) = a \cdot x + b \cdot y + c \cdot z.$$

The surface  $\Sigma$  can be covered by a countable set of charts  $s_i: U_i \rightarrow \Sigma$ . Note that the composition  $f \circ s_i$  is a smooth function. By Sard's lemma (A.11), almost all real numbers  $r$  are regular values of each  $f \circ s_i$ .

Fix such value  $r$  sufficiently close to  $r_0$  and consider the plane  $\Pi'$  described by the equation  $f(x, y, z) = r$ . Note that  $\Pi' \parallel \Pi$  and arbitrary close to it. Any point in the intersection  $\Sigma \cap \Pi'$  lies in the image of one of the charts. From above it admits a neighborhood which is a regular smooth curve; hence the result.  $\square$

# Chapter 7

## Curvatures

### Tangent-normal coordinates

Fix a point  $p$  in a smooth surface  $\Sigma$ . Consider a coordinate system  $(x, y, z)$  with origin at  $p$  such that the  $(x, y)$ -plane coincides with  $T_p$ . By 6.10, we can present  $\Sigma$  locally around  $p$  as a graph of a function  $f$ . Note that  $f$  satisfies the following additional properties:

$$f(0, 0) = 0, \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}f\right)(0, 0) = 0, \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}f\right)(0, 0) = 0.$$

The first equality holds since  $p = (0, 0, 0)$  lies on the graph and the last two equalities mean that the tangent plane at  $p$  is horizontal.

Consider the Hessian matrix

$$\textcircled{1} \quad M_p = \begin{pmatrix} \ell & m \\ m & n \end{pmatrix},$$


where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &= \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}f\right)(0, 0), \\ m &= \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y}f\right)(0, 0) = \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y \partial x}f\right)(0, 0), \\ n &= \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}f\right)(0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

The components of the matrix describe the surface at up to the second order at  $p$ . In fact the so called *osculating paraboloid*

$$z = \frac{1}{2}(\ell \cdot x^2 + 2 \cdot m \cdot x \cdot y + n \cdot y^2)$$

gives the best approximation of the surface at  $p$ ; it has *second order of contact* with  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ .



Given two vectors  $v, w$  in the  $(x, y)$ -plane, consider the value

$$\Pi_p(v, w) := (D_w D_v f)(0, 0),$$

where  $D$  denotes the directional derivative. The function  $(v, w) \mapsto \Pi_p(v, w)$  is called *second fundamental form* at  $p$ ; it takes two tangent vector  $v$  and  $w$  at  $p$  and spits the real number  $\Pi_p(v, w)$ .

The second fundamental form can be written in terms of the Hessian matrix. Indeed if  $w = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$  and  $v = \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix}$ , then

$$D_w = a \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + b \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \quad \text{and} \quad D_v = c \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + d \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_p(w, v) &:= (D_w D_v f)(0, 0) = \\ \textcircled{2} \quad &= a \cdot c \cdot \ell + (a \cdot d + b \cdot c) \cdot m + b \cdot d \cdot n = \\ &= \langle M_p \cdot w, v \rangle = \\ &= \langle M_p \cdot v, w \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that from  $\textcircled{2}$  it follows that  $\Pi_p$  is symmetric; that is,

$$\textcircled{3} \quad \Pi_p(v, w) = \Pi_p(w, v)$$

for any two tangent vectors  $v, w \in T_p$ .

## Principle curvatures

Note that tangent-normal coordinates give an almost canonical coordinate system in a neighborhood of  $p$ ; it is unique up to a rotation of the  $(x, y)$ -plane and switching the sign of the  $z$ -coordinate. Rotating the  $(x, y)$ -plane is equivalent to changing its orthonormal basis, which results in the rewriting the Hessian matrix in this new basis.

Since Hessian matrix is symmetric, it is diagonalizable by orthogonal matrices. That is, by rotating  $(x, y)$ -plane we can assume that  $m = 0$  in  $\textcircled{1}$ . In this case the diagonal components of  $M_p$  are called *principle curvatures* of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ ; they are uniquely defined up to sign; they are denoted as  $k_1(p)$  and  $k_2(p)$  or  $k_1(p)_\Sigma$  and  $k_2(p)_\Sigma$  if we need to emphasize that these are the curvatures of the surface  $\Sigma$ . We will always assume that  $k_1 \leq k_2$ .

The principle curvatures can be also defined as the eigenvalues of  $M_p$ ; the eigendirections of  $M_p$  are called *principle directions* of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ . Note that if  $k_1(p) \neq k_2(p)$  then  $p$  has exactly two principle directions, which are perpendicular to each other.

Note that if we revert the orientation of  $\Sigma$ , then the principle curvatures at each point switch their signs and indexes.

## Normal curvature

Assume we choose the coordinates in the  $(x, y)$ -plane so that the Hessian matrix is diagonalized, we can assume that

$$M_p = \begin{pmatrix} k_1(p) & 0 \\ 0 & k_2(p) \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to ❷, the second directional derivative for a vector  $w = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$  in the  $(x, y)$ -plane can be written as

$$(D_w^2 f)(0, 0) = a^2 \cdot k_1(p) + b^2 \cdot k_2(p).$$

If  $w$  is unit, then the second directional derivative  $D_w^2 f(0, 0)$  can be interpreted as the signed curvature of the curve formed by the intersection of  $\Sigma$  with the plane thru  $p$  spanned by  $\nu_p$  and  $w$ . In this case  $\Pi_p(w, w) = D_w^2 f(0, 0)$  is called *normal curvature* in the direction  $w$ ; it is denoted by  $k_w(p)$  or  $k_w(p)_\Sigma$ .

Since  $|w| = 1$ , we have  $a^2 + b^2 = 1$  which implies the following:

**7.1. Observation.** *For any point  $p$  on an oriented smooth surface  $\Sigma$ , the principle curvatures  $k_1(p)$  and  $k_2(p)$  are correspondingly minimum and maximum of the normal curvatures at  $p$ . Moreover, if  $\theta$  is the angle between a unit vector  $w \in T_p$  and the first principle direction at  $p$ , then*

$$k_w(p) = k_1(p) \cdot \cos^2 \theta + k_2(p) \cdot \sin^2 \theta.$$

The last identity is the so called *Euler's formula*.

A smooth regular curve on a surface  $\Sigma$  that always runs in the principle directions is called *line of curvature* of  $\Sigma$ .

**7.2. Exercise.** *Assume that a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  is mirror symmetric with respect to a plane  $\Pi$ . Suppose that  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$  intersect along a curve  $\gamma$ . Show that  $\gamma$  is a line of curvature of  $\Sigma$ .*

**7.3. Exercise.** *Assume  $V$  is a body of revolution in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and its boundary is a smooth surface with principle curvatures at most 1 in absolute value. Show that  $V$  contains a unit ball.*

*Hint:* Use 7.2 and 5.24.

## More curvatures

Fix an oriented smooth surface  $\Sigma$  and a point  $p \in \Sigma$ .

The product

$$K(p) = k_1(p) \cdot k_2(p)$$

is called Gauss curvature at  $p$ . We may denote it by  $K(p)_\Sigma$  if we need to emphasize that this is curvature of  $\Sigma$ . The Gauss curvature can be also interpreted as determinant of the Hessian matrix  $M_p$ .

The sum

$$H(p) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (k_1(p) + k_2(p))$$

is called mean curvature at  $p$ . We may denote it by  $H(p)_\Sigma$  if we need to emphasize that this is curvature of  $\Sigma$ . The mean curvature can be also interpreted as half of the trace of the Hessian matrix  $M_p$ .

Note that the Gauss curvature depends only on  $\Sigma$  and  $p$ , and not on the choice of the coordinate system. The same is true up to sign for the mean curvature — it changes the sign if we revert the orientation of the surface.

**7.4. Exercise.** *Show that any surface with positive Gauss curvature is orientable.*

## Supporting surfaces

Assume two oriented surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  have a common point  $p$ . If there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $p$  such that  $\Sigma_1 \cap U$  lies on one side from  $\Sigma_2$  in  $U$ , then we say that  $\Sigma_2$  *locally supports*  $\Sigma_1$  at  $p$ .

**7.5. Exercise.** *Let  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  be two smooth surfaces. Assume  $\Sigma_2$  locally supports  $\Sigma_1$  at a point  $p$ . Show that  $T_p \Sigma_1 = T_p \Sigma_2$ ; that is, the tangent planes of  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  at  $p$  coincide.*

By the exercise, we can assume that  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are cooriented at  $p$ ; that is, they have common unit normal vector at  $p$ . If not we can revert the orientation of one of the surfaces.

If  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are cooriented at  $p$ , then we can say that  $\Sigma_1$  locally supports  $\Sigma_2$  from *inside* or from *outside*, assuming that the normal vector points *inside* the domain bounded by surface  $\Sigma_2$  in  $U$ .

More precisely, we can use for  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  one tangent-normal coordinate system at  $p$ , assuming that the axis  $z$  points in the direction of the unit normal vector  $\nu_p$  to both surfaces. This way we write  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  locally as graphs:  $z = f_1(x, y)$  and  $z = f_2(x, y)$  correspondingly. Then  $\Sigma_1$  locally supports  $\Sigma_2$  from inside (from outside) if  $f_1(x, y) \geq f_2(x, y)$  (correspondingly  $f_1(x, y) \leq f_2(x, y)$ ) for  $(x, y)$  in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin.

Note that  $\Sigma_1$  locally supports  $\Sigma_2$  from inside at the point  $p$  is equivalent to  $\Sigma_2$  locally supports  $\Sigma_1$  from outside. Further if we revert


the orientation of both surfaces then supporting from inside becomes supporting from outside and the other way around.

**7.6. Proposition.** *Let  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  be oriented surfaces. Assume  $\Sigma_1$  locally supports  $\Sigma_2$  from inside at the point  $p$  (equivalently  $\Sigma_2$  locally supports  $\Sigma_1$  from outside). Then  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2}$  and  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ .*

**7.7. Exercise.** *Give an example of two surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  that have common point  $p$  with common unit normal vector  $\nu_p$  such that  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} > k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2}$  and  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1} > k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ , but  $\Sigma_1$  does not support  $\Sigma_2$  locally at  $p$ .*

*Proof.* We can assume that  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  are graphs  $z = f_1(x, y)$  and  $z = f_2(x, y)$  in a common tangent-normal coordinates at  $p$ , so we have  $f_1 \geq f_2$ .

Fix a unit vector  $w \in T_p \Sigma_1 = T_p \Sigma_2$ . Consider the plane  $\Pi$  passing thru  $p$  and spanned by the normal vector  $\nu_p$  and  $w$ . Let  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  be the curves of intersection of  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  with  $\Pi$ .



Let us orient  $\Pi$  so that  $\nu_p$  points to the left from  $w$ . Further, let us parametrize both curves so that they are running in the direction of  $w$  at  $p$  and therefore cooriented. In this case the curve  $\gamma_1$  supports the curve  $\gamma_2$  from the right.

Therefore we have the following inequality for the normal curvatures of  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  at  $p$  in the direction of  $w$ :

$$\textcircled{4} \quad k_w(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq k_w(p)_{\Sigma_2}.$$

According to 7.1,

$$k_1(p)_{\Sigma_i} = \min \{ k_w(p)_{\Sigma_i} : w \in T_p, |w| = 1 \}$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . Choose  $w$  so that  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} = k_w(p)_{\Sigma_1}$ . Then by  $\textcircled{4}$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} &= k_w(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq \\ &\geq k_w(p)_{\Sigma_2} \geq \\ &\geq \min \{ k_w(p)_{\Sigma_2} \} = \\ &= k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2}; \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ .

Similarly, by 7.1, we have that

$$k_2(p)_{\Sigma_i} = \max \{ k_w(p)_{\Sigma_i} \}.$$

Let us fix  $w$  so that  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2} = k_w(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2} &= k_w(p)_{\Sigma_2} \leq \\ &\leq k_w(p)_{\Sigma_1} \leq \\ &\leq \max \{ k_w(p)_{\Sigma_1} \} = \\ &= k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1}; \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ . □

**7.8. Corollary.** *Let  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  be oriented surfaces. Assume  $\Sigma_1$  locally supports  $\Sigma_2$  from inside at the point  $p$ . Then*

- (a)  $H(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq H(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ ;
- (b) If  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2} \geq 0$ , then  $K(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq K(p)_{\Sigma_2}$ .

*Proof.* By (7.6), we get that  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2}$  and  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2} \geq k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1}$ . Therefore part (a) follows since

$$H(p)_{\Sigma_i} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (k_1(p)_{\Sigma_i} + k_2(p)_{\Sigma_i}).$$

(b). Since  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_i} \geq k_1(p)_{\Sigma_i}$  and  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2} \geq 0$ , we get that all the principle curvatures  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1}$ ,  $k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1}$  and  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1}$  and  $k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2}$  are nonnegative. Whence

$$\begin{aligned} K(p)_{\Sigma_1} &= k_1(p)_{\Sigma_1} \cdot k_2(p)_{\Sigma_1} \geq \\ &\geq k_1(p)_{\Sigma_2} \cdot k_2(p)_{\Sigma_2} = \\ &= K(p)_{\Sigma_2}. \end{aligned}$$
□

**7.9. Exercise.** *Show that any closed surface has a point with positive Gauss curvature.*

*Hint.* Consider the minimal sphere that encloses the surface.

**7.10. Exercise.** *Assume that a closed surface  $\Sigma$  surrounds a unit disc. Show that Gauss curvature of  $\Sigma$  is at most 1 at some point.*

*Try to prove the same assuming that  $\Sigma$  surrounds a unit circle only.*

*Hint.* Look for a supporting spherical dome with the unit circle as the boundary.



## Curve in a surface

Recall that the second fundamental form  $\Pi_p$  is defined on page 68.

**7.11. Proposition.** *Suppose  $\gamma$  is a smooth curve in a smooth oriented surface  $\Sigma$  with a unit normal field  $\nu$ . Then, the following identity holds for any time parameter  $t$ :*

$$\langle \gamma''(t), \nu_{\gamma(t)} \rangle = \Pi_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t)).$$

*Proof.* Fix a parameter value  $t_0$ ; set  $p = \gamma(t_0)$ ,  $v = \gamma'(t_0)$  and  $a = \gamma''(t_0)$ ; so we need to show that

$$\textcircled{5} \quad \langle a, \nu_p \rangle = \Pi_p(v, v).$$

Let  $z = f(x, y)$  be the local representation of  $\Sigma$  in the tangent-normal coordinates at  $p$ ; we assume that  $\nu$  points in the direction of  $\nu_p$ .

Without loss of generality may assume that  $\gamma$  runs in the graph  $z = f(x, y)$ ; so

$$\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), f(x(t), y(t))).$$

Then

$$\gamma' = (x', y', \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \cdot x' + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \cdot y');$$

$$\gamma'' = (x'', y'', \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} \cdot (x')^2 + 2 \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} \cdot x' \cdot y' + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} \cdot (y')^2 + \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \cdot x'' + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \cdot y'').$$

Recall that  $p = \gamma(t_0) = (0, 0, 0)$  and

$$f(0, 0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0, 0) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}(0, 0) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$v = (x', y', 0)(t_0);$$

$$a = \left( x'', y'', \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} \cdot (x')^2 + 2 \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} \cdot x' \cdot y' + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} \cdot (y')^2 \right)(t_0).$$

Note that

$$\Pi_p(v, v) = \left( \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} \cdot (x')^2 + 2 \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} \cdot x' \cdot y' + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} \cdot (y')^2 \right)(t_0);$$

that is, the  $z$ -coordinate of the acceleration  $a$  equals to  $\Pi_p(v, v)$  which is equivalent to  $\textcircled{5}$ .  $\square$

**7.12. Corollary.** *Let  $\gamma$  be a regular smooth curve that runs in a smooth surface  $\Sigma$ . Suppose  $p = \gamma(t_0)$  and  $w = \gamma'(t_0)$ . Denote by  $\alpha$  the*

angle between the unit normal to  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  and the unit normal vector in the Frenet frame of  $\gamma$ . Then the following identity holds for the curvature  $k(t_0)_\gamma$  of  $\gamma$  at  $p$  and the normal curvature  $k_w(p)$  of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  in the direction of  $w$ :

$$k(t_0)_\gamma \cdot \cos \alpha = k_w(p).$$

*Proof.* Denote by  $\nu_\Sigma$  the unit normal vector to  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  and by  $\nu_\gamma$  the unit normal vector in the Frenet frame of  $\gamma$ . Note that  $\cos \alpha = \langle \nu_\Sigma, \nu_\gamma \rangle$ .

Applying 7.11, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} k_w(p) &= \Pi_p(w, w) = \\ &= \langle \gamma'', \nu_\Sigma \rangle = \\ &= k(t_0)_\gamma \cdot \langle \nu_\gamma, \nu_\Sigma \rangle = \\ &= k(t_0)_\gamma \cdot \cos \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

□

The corollary above, as well as the statement in the following exercise are proved by Jean Baptiste Meusnier [20].

**7.13. Exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth surface,  $p \in \Sigma$  and  $w \in T_p\Sigma$  is a unit vector. Assume that  $k_w(p) \neq 0$ ; that is the normal curvature of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  in the direction of  $w$  does not vanish.

Show that the osculating circles at  $p$  of smooth regular curves in  $\Sigma$  that run in the direction  $w$  sweep out a sphere.

**7.14. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t))$  be a smooth unit-speed simple plane curve in the upper half-plane. Suppose that  $\Sigma$  is the surface of revolution of  $\gamma$  with respect to the  $x$ -axis.

Express the principle curvatures of  $\Sigma$  at  $(x(t), y(t), 0)$  in terms of  $y(t)$ ,  $y'(t)$  and  $y''(t)$ . Conclude that  $-\frac{y''(t)}{y(t)}$  is the Gauss curvature of  $\Sigma$  at  $(x(t), y(t), 0)$ .

*Hint:* Use 7.2 and 7.12.

**7.15. Exercise.** Assume that a regular smooth curve  $\gamma$  lies in a surface of positive Gauss curvature. Show that curvature of  $\gamma$  does not vanish at any value.


# Chapter 8

## Saddle surfaces

### Definitions

A surface is called *saddle* if its Gauss curvature at each point is nonpositive; in other words principle curvatures at each point have opposite signs or one of them is zero.

If the Gauss curvature is negative at each point, then the surface is called *strictly saddle*; equivalently it means that the principle curvatures have opposite signs at each point. Note that in this case tangent plane is does not support the surface even locally — moving along the surface in the principle directions at a given point, one gets above and below the tangent plane at this point.



**8.1. Exercise.** Let  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth positive function. Show that the surface of revolution of the graph  $y = f(x)$  around the  $x$ -axis is saddle if and only if  $f$  is convex; that is if  $f''(x) \geq 0$  for any  $x$ .

*Hint:* Use 7.14.

A surface  $\Sigma$  is called *ruled* if for every point  $p \in \Sigma$  there is a line segment  $\ell_p \subset \Sigma_p$  thru  $p$  that is infinite or has its endpoint(s) on the boundary line of  $\Sigma$ .

**8.2. Exercise.** Show that any ruled surface  $\Sigma$  is saddle.

*Hint:* Prove and use that each point  $p \in \Sigma$  has a direction with vanishing normal curvature.

**8.3. Exercise.** Assume  $\Sigma$  is complete saddle surface. Show that for any point  $p \in \Sigma$  there is a curve  $\gamma: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \Sigma$  that starts at  $p$  such that  $t \mapsto |\gamma(t)|$  is an increasing function and  $|\gamma(t)| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .


A tangent direction on a smooth surface with vanishing normal curvature is called *asymptotic*. A smooth regular curve that always run in an asymptotic direction is called *asymptotic line*.

**8.4. Advanced exercise.** Let  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be the graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a smooth function  $f$  and  $\gamma$  be a closed smooth asymptotic line in  $\Sigma$ . Assume  $\Sigma$  is strictly saddle in a neighborhood of  $\gamma$ . Show that the projection of  $\gamma$  to the  $(x, y)$ -plane cannot be star-shaped.

## Hats

Note that a closed surface cannot be saddle. Indeed consider a smallest sphere that contains a closed surface  $\Sigma$  inside; it supports  $\Sigma$  at some point  $p$  and at this point the principle curvature must have the same sign. The following more general statement is proved using the same idea.

**8.5. Lemma.** Assume  $\Sigma$  is a compact saddle surface and its boundary line lies in a convex closed region  $R$ . Then  $\Sigma \subset R$ .



*Proof.* Assume contrary; that is, there is point  $p \in \Sigma$  that does not lie in  $R$ . Let  $\Pi$  be a plane that separates  $p$  from  $R$ ; it exists by A.22. Denote by  $\Sigma'$  the part of  $\Sigma$  that lies with  $p$  on the same side from  $\Pi$ .

Since  $\Sigma$  is compact, it is surrounded by a sphere  $S$ ; let  $\sigma$  be the circle of intersection of  $S$  and  $\Pi$ . Consider the smallest spherical dome  $\Sigma_0$  with boundary  $\sigma$  that includes  $\Sigma'$ .

Note that  $\Sigma_0$  supports  $\Sigma$  at some point  $q$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\Sigma_0$  and  $\Sigma$  are cooriented at  $q$  and  $\Sigma_0$  has positive principle curvatures. In this case  $\Sigma_0$  supports  $\Delta$  from outside. By 7.8,  $K(q)_\Sigma \geq K(q)_{\Sigma_0} > 0$  — a contradiction.  $\square$

Note that if we assume that  $\Sigma$  is strictly saddle, then we could arrive to a contradiction by taking a point  $q$  on the same side with  $p$  and on the maximal distance from  $\Pi$ .

**8.6. Exercise.** Let  $\Delta$  be a smooth regular saddle disc and  $p \in \Delta$ . Assume that the boundary line  $\partial\Delta$  lies in the unit sphere centered at  $p$ . Show that  $\text{length}(\partial\Delta) \geq 2\pi$ .

*Hint:* Use the lemma above and the hemisphere lemma (2.17).

**8.7. Exercise.** Show that an open saddle surface cannot lie inside of an infinite circular cone.

A disc  $\Delta$  in a surface  $\Sigma$  is called a *hat* of  $\Sigma$  if its boundary line  $\partial\Delta$  lies in a plane  $\Pi$  and the remaining points of  $\Delta$  lie on one side of  $\Pi$ .

**8.8. Proposition.** A smooth surface  $\Sigma$  is saddle if and only if it has no hats.

Note that a saddle surface can contain a closed plane curve. For example the hyperboloid  $x^2 + y^2 - z^2 = 1$  contains the unit circle in the  $(x, y)$ -plane centered at the origin. However, a plane curve cannot bound a disc (as well any compact set) in a saddle surface.

*Proof.* Since plane is a convex set, the “only if” part follows from 8.5; it remains to prove the “if” part.

Assume  $\Sigma$  is not saddle; that is, it has a point  $p$  with strictly positive Gauss curvature; or equivalently, the principle curvatures  $k_1(p)$  and  $k_2(p)$  have the same sign.

Let  $z = f(x, y)$  be a graph representation of  $\Sigma$  in the tangent-normal coordinates at  $p$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that both principle curvatures are positive, or equivalently the

$$D_w^2 f(0, 0) = \Pi_p(w, w) > 0$$

for any unit tangent vector  $w \in T_p\Sigma$  (which is the  $(x, y)$ -plane).

Since the set of unit vectors is compact, we have that

$$D_w^2 f(0, 0) > \varepsilon$$

for some fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  and any unit tangent vector  $w \in T_p\Sigma$ . By continuity of the function  $(x, y, w) \mapsto D_w^2 f(x, y)$ , we have that  $D_w^2 f(x, y) > 0$  for  $(x, y)$  in a neighborhood of the origin. That is,  $f$  is a strictly convex function in a neighborhood of the origin in the  $(x, y)$ -plane. In particular the set

$$\Delta_\varepsilon = \{ (x, y, f(x, y)) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : f(x, y) \leq \varepsilon \}$$

is a disc for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  (see 8.10). Note that its boundary line lies on the plane  $z = \varepsilon$  and whole disc lies below it; that is,  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  is a hat.  $\square$

Note that we proved the following lemma; it will be useful later.

**8.9. Lemma.** *Let  $z = f(x, y)$  be the local description of a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  in a tangent-normal coordinates at some point  $p \in \Sigma$ . Assume both principle curvatures of  $\Sigma$  are positive at  $p$ . Then the function  $f$  is strictly convex in a neighborhood of the origin.*

In the proof above we assumed that the statement in following exercise is evident.

**8.10. Exercise.** *Let  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  be as in the proof above. Show that  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  is a smooth disc; that is,  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  is the image of regular embedding  $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ , where  $\mathbb{D} = \{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + y^2 \leq 1 \}$ .*

*Hint:* Observe that it is sufficient to construct a smooth parametrization of  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  by a closed hemisphere. To do this repeat the argument in 9.3 with the center at a point surrounded by the boundary line of  $\Delta_\varepsilon$  in its plane.

**8.11. Exercise.** *Let  $T: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a linear transformation; that is,  $T(x, y, z) = (x, y, z) \cdot A$  for a invertible  $3 \times 3$ -matrix  $A$ . Show that for any saddle surface  $\Sigma$  the image  $T(\Sigma)$  is also a saddle surface.*

## Saddle graphs

The following theorem was proved by Sergei Bernstein [21].

**8.12. Theorem.** *Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function. Assume its graph  $z = f(x, y)$  is a strictly saddle surface in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then  $f$  is not bounded; that is, there is no constant  $C$  such that  $|f(x, y)| \leq C$  for any  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .*

Before going into the proof let us discuss some examples.

Note that the theorem states that a saddle graph cannot lie between parallel horizontal planes; applying 8.11 we get that saddle graph cannot lie between parallel planes, not necessarily horizontal. The following exercise shows that the theorem does not hold for saddle surface which are not graphs.

**8.13. Exercise.** *Construct a complete strictly saddle surface that lies between parallel planes.*

*Hint:* Look for an example among the surfaces of revolution and use 7.14.

The following exercise shows that there are saddle graphs with functions bounded on one side; that is, both (upper and lower) bounds are needed in the proof of Bernshtein's theorem.

**8.14. Exercise.** Show that there are positive functions with strictly saddle graphs. In fact the graph  $z = \exp(x - y^2)$  is strictly saddle.

*Hint:* Look at two section of the graph by planes parallel to  $(x, y)$ -plane and to  $(x, z)$ -plane and apply Meusnier's theorem (7.12).

Note that according to 8.5, there are no complete saddle surfaces in a parallelepiped that boundary line lies on one of its faces. The following lemma gives an analogous statement for a parallelepiped with an infinite side.

**8.15. Lemma.** *There is no complete strictly saddle smooth surface with the boundary line in a plane that lies on bounded distance from a line.*


*Proof.* Note that in a suitable coordinate system, the statement can be reformulated the following way: *There is no complete strictly saddle smooth surface with the boundary line in the  $(x, y)$ -plane that lies in a region of the following form:*

$$R = \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq z \leq r, 0 \leq y \leq r \}.$$

Further we will prove this statement.

Assume contrary, let  $\Sigma$  be such a surface. Consider the projection  $\hat{\Sigma}$  of  $\Sigma$  to the  $(x, z)$ -plane. It lies in the upper half-plane and below the line  $z = r$ .


Consider the open upper half-plane  $H = \{ (x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : z > 0 \}$ . Let  $\Theta$  be the connected component of the complement  $H \setminus \hat{\Sigma}$  that contains all the points above the line  $z = r$ .



Note that  $\Theta$  is convex. If not then a line segment  $[pq]$  for some  $p, q \in \Theta$  cuts from  $\hat{\Sigma}$  a compact piece. Consider the plane  $\Pi$  thru  $[pq]$  that is perpendicular to the  $(x, z)$ -plane. Note that  $\pi$  cuts from  $\Sigma$  a compact region  $\Delta$ . By general position argument 6.15, we can assume that  $\Delta$  is a compact surface with boundary line in  $\Pi$  and the remaining part of  $\Delta$  lies on one side from  $\Pi$ . Since the plane  $\Pi$  is a convex, this statement contradicts 8.5.

Summarizing,  $\Theta$  is an open convex set of  $H$  that contains all points above  $z = r$ . By convexity, together with any point  $w$ , the set  $\Theta$

contains all points on the half-lines that point up from it. Whence it contains all points with  $z$ -coordinate larger than the  $z$ -coordinate of  $w$ . Since  $\Theta$  is open it can be described by inequality  $z > r_0$ . It follows that




the plane  $z = r_0$  supports  $\Sigma$  at some point (in fact at many points). By 7.6, the latter is impossible — a contradiction.  $\square$

*Proof of 8.12.* Denote by  $\Sigma$  the graph  $z = f(x, y)$ . Assume contrary; that is,  $\Sigma$  lies between two planes  $z = \pm C$ .

Note  $f$  cannot be constant. It follows that the tangent plane  $T_p$  at some point  $p \in \Sigma$  is not horizontal.

Denote by  $\Sigma^+$  the part of  $\Sigma$  that lies above  $T_p$ . Note that it has at least two connected components which are approaching  $p$  from both sides in the principle direction with positive principle curvature. Indeed if there would be a curve that runs in  $\Sigma^+$  and approaches  $p$  from both sides then it would cut a disc from  $\Sigma$  with boundary line above  $T_p$  and some points below it; the latter contradicts 8.5.



The surface  $\Sigma$  seeing from above.

Summarizing,  $\Sigma^+$  has at least two connected components, denote them by  $\Sigma_0^+$  and  $\Sigma_1^+$ . Let  $z = h(x, y) = a \cdot x + b \cdot y + c$  be the equation of  $T_p$ . Note that  $\Sigma^+$  contains all points in the region

$$R_- = \{ (x, y, f(x, y)) \in \Sigma : h(x, y) < C \}$$

which is a connected set and no points in

$$R_+ = \{ (x, y, f(x, y)) \in \Sigma : h(x, y) > C \}$$



Whence one of the connected components, say  $\Sigma_0^+$ , lies in

$$R_0 = \{ (x, y, f(x, y)) \in \Sigma : |h(x, y)| \leq C \}.$$

This set lies on a bounded distance from the line of intersection of  $T_p$  with the  $(x, y)$ -plane.

Moving the plane  $T_p$  little up, we can cut from  $\Sigma_0^+$  a complete surface with boundary line lying in this plane (see 6.15). The obtained surface is still on a bounded distance to a line which is impossible by 8.15.  $\square$

The following exercise gives a condition that guarantees that a saddle surface is a graph; it can be used in combination with Bernshtein's theorem.

**8.16. Advanced exercise.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth saddle disk in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Assume that the orthogonal projection to the  $(x, y)$ -plane maps the boundary line of  $\Sigma$  injectively to a convex closed curve. Show that the orthogonal projection to  $(x, y)$ -plane is injective on  $\Sigma$ .*

*In particular,  $\Sigma$  is the graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a function  $f$  defined on a convex figure in the  $(x, y)$ -plane.*

## Remarks

Note that Bernstein's theorem and the lemma in its proof do not hold for saddle surfaces; counterexamples can be found among infinite cylinders over a smooth regular curves. In fact it can be shown that these are only counterexamples; the proof is based on the same idea, but more technical.

By 8.8, saddle surfaces can be defined as smooth surfaces without hats. This definition can be used for arbitrary surfaces not necessarily smooth. Some results, for example Bernshtein's characterization of saddle graphs can be extended to generalized saddle surface, but this class of surfaces is far from being understood. Some nontrivial properties were proved by in Samuil Shefel [22] see also [23, Chapter 4].

# Chapter 9

## Positive Gauss curvature

### Convexity

**9.1. Exercise.** Suppose that an oriented surface  $\Sigma$  bounds a convex region  $R$ .

- (a) Show that Gauss curvature of  $\Sigma$  is nonnegative at each point.
- (b) Show that for any point  $p \in \Sigma$  and  $q$  in the interior of  $R$  we have that

$$\langle \nu_p, q - p \rangle > 0,$$

where  $\nu_p$  is the unit normal vector at  $p$  that points in  $R$ .

*Hint:* Show and use that any tangent plane  $T_p$  supports  $\Sigma$  at  $p$ .

Recall that a region  $R$  in the Euclidean space is called *strictly convex* if for any two points  $x, y \in R$ , any point  $z$  between  $x$  and  $y$  lies in the interior of  $R$ .

Clearly any open convex set is strictly convex; the cube (as well as any convex polyhedron) gives an example of a convex set which is not strictly convex. It is easy to see that a convex region is strictly convex if and only if its boundary does not contain a line segment.

The following theorem gives a global description of surfaces with positive Gauss curvature.

**9.2. Theorem.** Assume  $\Sigma$  is a complete smooth surface with positive Gauss curvature. Then  $\Sigma$  bounds a strictly convex region.


Note that in the proof we have to use that surface is a connected set; otherwise a pair of disjoint spheres which bound two disjoint balls would give a counterexample.

*Proof.* Since the Gauss curvature is positive, we can choose unit normal field  $\nu$  on  $\Sigma$  so that the both principle curvatures are positive at any point. Let  $R$  be the region bounded by  $\Sigma$  that lies on the side of  $\nu$ ; that is  $\nu$  points inside of  $R$  at any point of  $\Sigma$ .

Fix  $p \in \Sigma$ ; let  $z = f(x, y)$  be a local description of  $\Sigma$  in the tangent-normal coordinates at  $p$ . By 8.9,  $f$  is strictly convex in a neighborhood of the origin. In particular the intersection of a small ball centered at  $p$  with the epigraph  $z \geq f(x, y)$  is strictly convex. In other words,  $R$  is *locally strictly convex*; that is, for any point  $p \in R$ , the intersection of  $R$  with a small ball centered at  $p$  is strictly convex.

Since  $\Sigma$  is connected, so is  $R$ ; moreover any two points in the interior of  $R$  can be connected by a polygonal line in the interior of  $R$ .

Assume the interior of  $R$  is not convex; that is, there are points  $x, y \in R$  and a point  $z$  between  $x$  and  $y$  that does not lie in the interior of  $R$ . Consider a polygonal line  $\beta$  from  $x$  to  $y$  in the interior of  $R$ . Let  $y_0$  be the first point on  $\beta$  such that the chord  $[x, y_0]$  touches  $\Sigma$  at some point, say  $z_0$ .



Since  $R$  is locally strictly convex,  $R \cap B(z_0, \varepsilon)$  is strictly convex for all sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . On the other hand  $z_0$  lies between two points in the intersection  $[x, y_0] \cap B(z_0, \varepsilon)$ . Since  $[x, y_0] \subset R$ , we arrived to a contradiction.

Therefore the interior of  $R$  is a convex sets. Note that the region  $R$  is the closure of its interior, therefore  $R$  is convex as well.

Since  $R$  is locally strictly convex, its boundary  $\Sigma$  contains no line segments. Therefore  $R$  is strictly convex.  $\square$


In fact only minor modifications of the proof above imply that any connected locally convex region is convex.

## Closed surfaces

**9.3. Lemma.** *Assume  $\Sigma$  is a closed smooth surface with positive Gauss curvature. Then  $\Sigma$  is a smooth sphere; that is,  $\Sigma$  admits a smooth regular parametrization by  $\mathbb{S}^2$ .*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can assume that the origin lies in the interior of the convex region  $R$  bounded by  $\Sigma$ .

By convexity of  $R$ , any half-line starting at the origin intersects  $\Sigma$  at a single point; that is there is a positive function  $\rho: \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\Sigma$  is formed by points  $q = \rho(\xi) \cdot \xi$  for  $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^2$ .



Let us show that  $\rho$  is a smooth function. Fix a point  $p = (x_p, y_p, z_p)$  on  $\Sigma$ . Consider a local implicit description of  $\Sigma$  at  $p$  as a solution of equation  $h(x, y, z) = 0$  with nonvanishing gradient; so  $h(p) = 0$ . Note that for any point  $q$  in a neighborhood of  $p$ , we have that

$$h(q) = 0 \iff q \in \Sigma \iff q = \rho(\xi) \cdot \xi$$

for some  $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^2$ . In other words  $h$  defines implicitly  $\rho$  as in the implicit function theorem.

Recall that  $\nabla_p h \perp T_p$ . Since the origin lies in the interior of  $R$ , it cannot lie on  $T_p$ ; that is  $\langle \nabla_p h, p \rangle \neq 0$ ; or equivalently  $D_\eta h(p) \neq 0$ , where  $\eta = \frac{p}{|p|}$  is the unit vector in the direction of  $p$  and  $D$  denotes the directional derivative.

Fix a  $(u, v)$  chart  $s$  on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  in a neighborhood of  $\eta$ ; note that the map

$$S: (u, v, w) \mapsto w \cdot s(u, v)$$

is smooth and regular for  $w > 0$ ; that is, the vectors

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial u}, \quad \frac{\partial S}{\partial v}, \quad \frac{\partial S}{\partial w} = w$$

are linearly independent. Note that the function  $h \circ S$  is smooth and  $\frac{\partial h \circ S}{\partial \rho}(p) = D_\eta h(p) \neq 0$ . Applying implicit function theorem, we get that  $\rho$  is smooth in a neighborhood of  $\eta$ ; since  $\eta$  is arbitrary,  $\rho$  is smooth on whole  $\mathbb{S}^2$ .  $\square$

If one only needs to show that  $\Sigma$  is a topological sphere, then one only needs to show that  $\rho$  is continuous. The latter is a consequence of another classical result in topology — the so called *closed graph theorem*.

## Open surfaces

**9.4. Lemma.** *Suppose  $\Sigma$  is an open surface in with positive Gauss curvature. Then there is a coordinate system such that  $\Sigma$  is a graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a convex function  $f$  defined on a convex open region of  $(x, y)$ -plane.*

*Proof.* The surface  $\Sigma$  is a boundary of an unbounded closed convex region  $R$ .

We can assume that the origin lies on  $\Sigma$ . Consider a sequence of points  $x_n \in \Sigma$  such that  $|x_n| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Set  $u_n = \frac{x_n}{|x_n|}$ ; this

is the unit vector in the direction from  $x_n$ . Since the unit sphere is compact, we can pass to a subsequence of  $(x_n)$  such that  $u_n$  converges to a unit vector  $u$ .

Note that for any  $q \in \Sigma$ , the directions  $v_n = \frac{x_n - q}{|x_n - q|}$  converge to  $u$  as well. Indeed, the sequences of vectors  $\frac{x_n - q}{|x_n - q|}$ ,  $\frac{x_n - q}{|x_n|}$  and  $\frac{x_n}{|x_n|}$  have the same limit since  $\frac{|q|}{|x_n|} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\frac{|x_n|}{|x_n - q|} \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; the latter follows since


$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{|x_n|}{|x_n - q|} - 1 \right| &= \left| \frac{|x_n| - |x_n - q|}{|x_n - q|} \right| \leq \\ &\leq \frac{|p - q|}{|x_n - q|}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the half-line from  $q$  in the direction of  $u$  lies in  $R$ . Indeed any point on the half-line is a limit of points on the line segments  $[q, x_n]$ ; since  $R$  is closed, all of these points lie in  $R$ .

Let us choose the  $z$ -axis in the direction of  $u$ . Note that there is no point  $p \in \Sigma$  with vertical tangent plane. Otherwise  $\Sigma$  would contain a vertical half-line starting from  $p$  and therefore Gauss curvature of  $\Sigma$  would vanish. It follows that any vertical line can intersect  $\Sigma$  at most at one point. That is,  $\Sigma$  is a graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a smooth convex function  $f$ .

Let  $\Omega$  be the domain of definition of  $f$ . Note that  $\Omega$  is the projection of  $\Sigma$  to  $(x, y)$ -plane which is the same as the projection of  $R$ . Since  $R$  is convex, so is  $\Omega$ .

Since no tangent plane is vertical, the projection from  $\Sigma$  to the  $(x, y)$ -plane is regular. By inverse function theorem, the set  $\Omega$  is open.  $\square$



**9.5. Exercise.** Show that any open surface  $\Sigma$  with positive Gauss curvature is a topological plane; that is, there is an embedding  $\mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  with image  $\Sigma$ .

Try to show that  $\Sigma$  is a smooth plane; that is, the embedding  $f$  can be made smooth and regular.

**9.6. Exercise.** Show that any open smooth surface  $\Sigma$  with positive Gauss curvature lies inside of an infinite circular cone.

**9.7. Exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be an open smooth surface with positive Gauss curvature. Show that  $\Sigma$  has a point with arbitrarily small Gauss curvature.




*Hint:* Observe that the Gauss curvature of the surface of revolution of the graph  $y = a \cdot \sin(x/R)$  for  $x \in (0, \pi \cdot R)$  cannot exceed  $\frac{1}{R^2}$  (Use 3.4 and 7.12). Try to support the surface  $\Sigma$  from inside by a surface of revolution of the described type with large  $R$ .

# Chapter 10

## Geodesics

We start to study the intrinsic geometry of surfaces. The following exercise should help you to be in the right mood for this; it might look like a tedious problem in calculus, but actually it is an easy problem in geometry.

**10.1. Exercise.** *There is a mountain of frictionless ice with the shape of a perfect cone with a circular base. A cowboy is at the bottom and he wants to climb the mountain. So, he throws up his lasso which slips neatly over the top of the cone, he pulls it tight and starts to climb. If the angle of inclination  $\theta$  is large, there is no problem; the lasso grips tight and up he goes. On the other hand if  $\theta$  is small, the lasso slips off as soon as the cowboy pulls on it.*



*What is the critical angle  $\theta_0$  at which the cowboy can no longer climb the ice-mountain?*

*Hint:* Cut the lateral surface of the mountain by a line from the cowboy to the top, unfold it on the plane and try to figure out what is the image of the strained lasso.

### Shortest paths


Let  $p$  and  $q$  be two points on a surface  $\Sigma$ . Recall that  $|p - q|_\Sigma$  denotes the induced length distance from  $p$  to  $q$ ; that is, the exact lower bound on lengths of paths in  $\Sigma$  from  $p$  to  $q$ .

Note that if  $\Sigma$  is smooth, then any two points in  $\Sigma$  can be joined by a piecewise smooth path. Since any such path is rectifiable, the value  $|p - q|_\Sigma$  is finite for any pair of points  $p, q \in \Sigma$ .

A path  $\gamma$  from  $p$  to  $q$  in  $\Sigma$  that minimize the length is called a *shortest path* from  $p$  to  $q$ .

The image of a shortest path between  $p$  and  $q$  in  $\Sigma$  is usually denoted by  $[p, q]_\Sigma$ . In general there might be no shortest path between two given points on the surface and it might be many of them; this is shown in the following two examples. However if we write  $[p, q]_\Sigma$ , then we assume that a shortest path exists and we made a choice of one of them.


**Nonuniqueness.** There plenty of shortest paths between the poles on the sphere — each meridian is a shortest path.



**Nonexistence.** Let  $\Sigma$  be the  $(x, y)$ -plane with removed origin. Consider two points  $p = (1, 0, 0)$  and  $q = (-1, 0, 0)$  in  $\Sigma$ .

Note that  $|p - q|_\Sigma = 2$ . Indeed, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , consider the point  $s_\varepsilon = (0, \varepsilon, 0)$ . Note that the polygonal path  $ps_\varepsilon q$  lies in  $\Sigma$  and its length  $2 \cdot \sqrt{1 + \varepsilon^2}$  approaches 2 as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . It follows that  $|p - q|_\Sigma \leq 2$ . On the other hand  $|p - q|_\Sigma \geq |p - q|_{\mathbb{R}^3} = 2$ ; that is,  $|p - q|_\Sigma = 2$ .

Therefore a shortest path from  $p$  to  $q$  (if it exists) must have length 2. By triangle inequality any curve of length 2 from  $p$  to  $q$  must run along the line segment  $[p, q]$ ; in particular it must pass thru the origin. Since the origin does not lie in  $\Sigma$ , there is no shortest from  $p$  to  $q$  in  $\Sigma$ .



**10.2. Proposition.** *Any two points in a complete smooth surface can be joined by a shortest path.*

*Proof.* Fix a complete smooth surface  $\Sigma$  with two points  $p$  and  $q$ . Set  $\ell = |p - q|_\Sigma$ .

By the definition of induced length metric, there is a sequence of paths  $\gamma_n$  from  $p$  to  $q$  in  $\Sigma$  such that

$$\text{length } \gamma_n \rightarrow \ell \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\text{length } \gamma_n < \ell + 1$  for any  $n$  and each  $\gamma_n$  is parameterized proportional to its arc length. In particular each path  $\gamma_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma$  is  $(\ell + 1)$ -Lipschitz; that is,

$$|\gamma(t_0) - \gamma(t_1)| \leq (\ell + 1) \cdot |t_0 - t_1|$$



for any  $t_0, t_1 \in [0, 1]$ . Further the image of  $\gamma_n$  lies in the closed ball  $\bar{B}[p, \ell + 1]$  for any  $n$ . It follows that the coordinate functions of  $\gamma_n$  are uniformly equicontinuous and uniformly bounded. By A.17, we can pass to a converging subsequence of  $\gamma_n$ ; denote by  $\gamma_\infty: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  its limit. As a limit of uniformly continuous sequence,  $\gamma_\infty$  is continuous; that is,  $\gamma_\infty$  is a path. Evidently  $\gamma_\infty$  runs from  $p$  to  $q$ . Since  $\Sigma$  is a closed set,  $\gamma_\infty$  lies in  $\Sigma$ . Finally, by 2.13,

$$\gamma_\infty \leq \ell;$$

that is,  $\gamma_\infty$  is a shortest path from  $p$  to  $q$ . □

## Closest point projection

**10.3. Lemma.** *Let  $R$  be a closed convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then for every point  $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$  there is unique point  $\bar{p} \in R$  that minimizes the distance  $|p - x|$  among all points  $x \in R$ .*

*Moreover the map  $p \mapsto \bar{p}$  is short; that is,*

$$\textcircled{1} \quad |p - q| \geq |\bar{p} - \bar{q}|$$

*for any pair of points  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^3$ .*

The map  $p \mapsto \bar{p}$  is called the *closest point projection*; it maps the Euclidean space to  $R$ . Note that if  $p \in R$ , then  $\bar{p} = p$ .


*Proof.* Fix a point  $p$  and set

$$\ell = \inf \{ |p - x| : x \in R \}.$$

Choose a sequence  $x_n \in R$  such that  $|p - x_n| \rightarrow \ell$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Without loss of generality, we can assume that all the points  $x_n$  lie in a ball of radius  $\ell + 1$  centered at  $p$ . Therefore we can pass to a partial limit  $\bar{p}$  of  $x_n$ ; that is,  $\bar{p}$  is a limit of a subsequence of  $x_n$ . Since  $R$  is closed  $\bar{p} \in R$ . By construction

$$\begin{aligned} |p - \bar{p}| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |p - x_n| = \\ &= \ell. \end{aligned}$$




Hence the existence follows.

Assume there are two distinct points  $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in R$  that minimize the distance to  $p$ . Since  $R$  is convex, their midpoint  $m = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (\bar{p} + \bar{p}')$  lies in  $R$ . Note that  $|p - \bar{p}| = |p - \bar{p}'| = \ell$ ; that is

$\triangle p\bar{p}p'$  is isosceles and therefore  $\triangle p\bar{p}m$  is right with the right angle at  $m$ . Since a leg of a right triangle is shorter than its hypotenuse, we have  $|p - m| < \ell$  — a contradiction.

It remains to prove inequality ❶.



We can assume that  $\bar{p} \neq \bar{q}$ , otherwise there is nothing to prove. Note that if  $p \neq \bar{p}$  (that is, if  $p \notin R$ ), then  $\angle p\bar{p}\bar{q}$  is right or obtuse. Otherwise there would be a point  $x$  on the line segment  $[\bar{q}, \bar{p}]$  that is closer to  $p$  than  $\bar{p}$ . Since  $R$  is convex, the line segment  $[\bar{q}, \bar{p}]$  and therefore  $x$  lie in  $R$ . Hence  $\bar{p}$  is not closest to  $p$  — a contradiction.

The same way we can show that if  $q \neq \bar{q}$ , then  $\angle q\bar{q}\bar{p}$  is right or obtuse.

We have to consider the following 4 cases: (1)  $p \neq \bar{p}$  and  $q \neq \bar{q}$ , (2)  $p = \bar{p}$  and  $q \neq \bar{q}$ , (3)  $p \neq \bar{p}$  and  $q = \bar{q}$ , (4)  $p = \bar{p}$  and  $q = \bar{q}$ . In all these cases the obtained angle estimates imply that the orthogonal projection of the line segment  $[p, q]$  to the line  $\bar{p}\bar{q}$  contains the line segment  $[\bar{p}, \bar{q}]$ . In particular

$$|p - q| \geq |\bar{p} - \bar{q}|.$$

□

**10.4. Corollary.** *Assume a surface  $\Sigma$  bounds a closed convex region  $R$  and  $p, q \in \Sigma$ . Denote by  $W$  the outer closed region of  $\Sigma$ ; in other words  $W$  is the union of  $\Sigma$  and the complement of  $R$ . Then for any curve  $\gamma$  in  $W$  that runs from  $p$  to  $q$  we have*

$$\text{length } \gamma \geq |p - q|_{\Sigma}.$$

*Moreover if  $\gamma$  does not lie in  $\Sigma$ , then the inequality is strict.*

*Proof.* The first part of the corollary follows from the lemma and the definition of length. Indeed consider the closest point projection  $\bar{\gamma}$  of  $\gamma$ . Note that  $\bar{\gamma}$  lies in  $\Sigma$  and connects  $p$  to  $q$  therefore

$$\text{length } \bar{\gamma} \geq |p - q|_{\Sigma}.$$

Consider an inscribed polygonal line  $p_0 \dots p_n$  in  $\gamma$ . Denote by  $\bar{p}_i$  the closest point projection of  $p_i$  to  $R$ . Note that the polygonal line  $\bar{p}_0 \dots \bar{p}_n$  is inscribed in  $\bar{\gamma}$ ; moreover any inscribed polygonal line in  $\bar{\gamma}$  can appear this way. By 10.3  $|p_i - p_{i-1}| \geq |\bar{p}_i - \bar{p}_{i-1}|$  for any  $i$ . Therefore


$$\text{length } p_0 \dots p_n \geq \text{length } \bar{p}_0 \dots \bar{p}_n.$$

Taking least upper bound of each side of the inequality for all inscribed polygonal lines  $p_0 \dots p_n$  in  $\gamma$ , we get

$$\text{length } \gamma \geq \text{length } \bar{\gamma}.$$

Whence the first statement follows.

To prove the second statement, note that if  $s = \gamma(t_1) \notin \Sigma$ , then  $s \notin R$ . Hence there is a plane  $\Pi$  that cuts  $s$  from  $\Sigma$ . The curve  $\gamma$  must intersect at least at two points: one point before  $t_1$  and one after; let  $a = \gamma(t_0)$  and  $b = \gamma(t_2)$  be these points. Note that the arc of  $\gamma$  from  $a$  to  $b$  is strictly longer than  $|a-b|$ ; indeed on the way  $\gamma$  visits  $s$  that is not on the plane  $\Pi$  and therefore not on the line segment  $[a, b]$ .



Remove from  $\gamma$  the arc from  $a$  to  $b$  and glue in the line segment  $[a, b]$ ; denote the obtained curve by  $\gamma_1$ . From above,


$$\text{length } \gamma > \text{length } \gamma_1$$

Note that  $\gamma_1$  runs in  $W$ . Therefore by the first part of corollary, we have

$$\text{length } \gamma_1 \geq |p - q|_{\Sigma}.$$

Whence the second statement follows.  $\square$

**10.5. Exercise.** Suppose  $\Sigma$  is a complete smooth surface that bounds a convex region  $R$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\Pi$  is a plane that cuts a hat  $\Delta$  from  $\Sigma$ . Assume that the reflection of the interior of  $\Delta$  with respect to  $\Pi$  lies in the interior of  $R$ . Show that  $\Delta$  is convex with respect to the intrinsic metric of  $\Sigma$ ; that is, if both ends of a shortest path in  $\Sigma$  lie in  $\Delta$ , then the entire geodesic lies in  $\Delta$ .



Let us define the *intrinsic diameter* of a closed surface  $\Sigma$  as the exact upper bound on the lengths of shortest paths in the surface.

**10.6. Exercise.** Assume that a closed smooth surface  $\Sigma$  with positive Gauss curvature lies in a unit ball. Show that the intrinsic diameter of  $\Sigma$  cannot exceed  $\pi$ .

*Hint:* Use 10.3.

## Geodesics

A smooth curve  $\gamma$  on a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  is called *geodesic* if its acceleration  $\gamma''(t)$  is perpendicular to the tangent plane  $T_{\gamma(t)}$  for each  $t$ .

Geodesics can be understood as the trajectories of a particle that slides on  $\Sigma$  without friction. In this case the force that keeps the particle on  $\Sigma$  must be perpendicular to  $\Sigma$ . By the second Newton's laws of motion, we get that the acceleration  $\gamma''$  is perpendicular to  $T_{\gamma(t)}$ .

**10.7. Exercise.** Assume that a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  is mirror symmetric with respect to a plane  $\Pi$ . Suppose that  $\Sigma$  and  $\Pi$  intersect along a curve  $\gamma$ . Show that  $\gamma$  is a geodesic of  $\Sigma$ .

**10.8. Exercise.** Show that the helix

$$\gamma(t) = (\cos t, \sin t, a \cdot t)$$

is a geodesic on the cylindrical surface described by the equation  $x^2 + y^2 = 1$ .

Recall that asymptotic line is defined on page 76.

**10.9. Exercise.** Show that if a curve that is a geodesic and an asymptotic line on a smooth surface, then the curve is a line segment.

**10.10. Lemma.** Any geodesic  $\gamma$  has constant speed; that is  $|\gamma'(t)|$  is constant.

*Proof.* Since  $\gamma'(t)$  is a tangent vector at  $\gamma(t)$ , we have that  $\gamma''(t) \perp \gamma'(t)$ , or equivalently  $\langle \gamma'', \gamma' \rangle = 0$  for any  $t$ . Whence

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \gamma', \gamma' \rangle' &= 2 \cdot \langle \gamma'', \gamma' \rangle = \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is  $|\gamma'(t)|^2 = \langle \gamma'(t), \gamma'(t) \rangle$  is constant. □

**10.11. Proposition.** Given a tangent vector  $v$  to a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  at a point  $p$  There is a unique geodesic  $\gamma: \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \Sigma$  defined on a maximal open interval  $\mathbb{I} \ni 0$  that starts at  $p$  with velocity vector  $v$ ; that is,  $\gamma(0) = p$  and  $\gamma'(0) = v$ .

Moreover

- (a) the map  $(p, v, t) \mapsto \gamma(t)$  is smooth in its domain of definition.
- (b) if  $\Sigma$  is complete, then  $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{R}$ ; that is, the maximal interval is whole real line.

*Sketch of proof.* The first part of the proposition and part (a) follows from existence and uniqueness of a solution of initial value problem (A.14). One only needs to rewrite the condition  $\gamma''(t) \perp T_{\gamma(t)}$  as a differential equation  $\gamma''(t) = \Pi_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))$ .

The part (b) follows from 10.10. Indeed by A.14, if the maximal interval is not whole real line, then the curve  $\gamma$  must escape to infinity. But the latter is impossible since  $\gamma$  runs with constant speed.  $\square$

## Exponential map

Let  $\Sigma$  be smooth regular surface and  $p \in \Sigma$ . Given a tangent vector  $v \in T_p$  consider a geodesic  $\gamma_v$  in  $\Sigma$  that runs from  $p$  with the initial velocity  $v$ ; that is,  $\gamma(0) = p$  and  $\gamma'(0) = v$ .

The point  $q = \gamma_v(1)$  is called *exponential map* of  $v$ , or briefly  $q = \exp_p v$ . (There is a reason to call this map *exponential*, but it will takes us to far from the subject.) By 10.11, the map  $\exp_p: T_p \rightarrow \Sigma$  is smooth and defined in a neighborhood of zero in  $T_p$ ; moreover, if  $\Sigma$  is complete, then  $\exp_p$  is defined on the whole space  $T_p$ .

Note that the Jacobian of  $\exp_p$  at zero is the identity matrix. Indeed, let  $z = f(x, y)$  be a local graph representation of  $\Sigma$  in the tangent-normal coordinates. The tangent plane at  $p$  is the  $(x, y)$ -plane. Let  $\gamma_x$  and  $\gamma_y$  be the geodesics starting from  $p$  in the directions  $(1, 0, 0)$  and  $(0, 1, 0)$  correspondingly. A general tangent vector can be written as  $v = (x, y, 0)$ . Note that  $\frac{\partial \exp_p}{\partial x}(0, 0) = \gamma'_x(0) = (1, 0, 0)$  and  $\frac{\partial \exp_p}{\partial y}(0, 0) = \gamma'_y(0) = (0, 1, 0)$ . That is, the Jacobian matrix of  $\exp_p$  at  $(0, 0)$  is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that the Jacobian matrix of the projection of  $\exp_p$  to the  $(x, y)$ -plane has is the identity matrix. Therefore by the inverse function theorem (A.9), we get the following statement:

**10.12. Proposition.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be smooth surface and  $p \in \Sigma$ . Then the exponential map  $\exp_p: T_p \rightarrow \Sigma$  is a smooth regular parametrization of a neighborhood of  $p$  in  $\Sigma$  by a neighborhood of 0 in the tangent plane  $T_p$ .*

*Moreover for any  $p \in \Sigma$  there is  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for any  $x \in \Sigma$  such that  $|x - p|_\Sigma < \varepsilon$  the map  $\exp_x: T_x \rightarrow \Sigma$  is a smooth regular parametrization of the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of  $x$  in  $\Sigma$  by the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of zero in the tangent plane  $T_x$ .*

## Shortest paths are geodesics

**10.13. Claim.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth regular surface. Then any shortest path  $\gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  parameterized proportional to its length is a geodesic in  $\Sigma$ . In particular  $\gamma$  is a smooth curve.*

A partial converse to the first statement also holds: a sufficiently short arc of any geodesic is a shortest path. More precisely, given a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  there is a positive function  $\rho$  on  $\Sigma$  such that if a geodesic  $\gamma$  starts at  $p \in \Sigma$  and has length at most  $\rho(p)$  then it is a shortest path.

A geodesic might not form a shortest path, but if this is the case, then it is called *minimizing geodesic*. Note that according to the claim, any shortest path is a reparametrization of a minimizing geodesic.

This claim provides connection between intrinsic geometry of the surface and its extrinsic geometry. This connection will be important later; in particular it will play the key role in the proof of the so called remarkable theorem.

Intrinsic means that it can be expressed in terms of measuring things inside the surface, for example length of curves or angles between the curves that lie in the surface. Extrinsic means that we have to use ambient space in order to measure it.

For instance shortest path  $\gamma$  is an object of intrinsic geometry of the surface  $\Sigma$ , while definition of geodesic is not intrinsic — it requires the second derivative  $\gamma''$  which needs the ambient space. Note that there is a smooth bijection between the cylinder  $z = x^2$  and the plane  $z = 0$  that preserves the lengths of all curves; in other words cylinder can be *unfolded* on the plane. Such a bijection sends geodesics in the cylinder to geodesics on the plane and the other way around; however a geodesic on the cylinder might have nonvanishing second derivative while geodesics on the plane are straight lines with vanishing second derivative.

*Informal sketch.* The smoothness should be intuitively obvious; at least the curve should be twice differentiable otherwise it can be shortened.

Let us give an informal physical explanation why  $\gamma''(t) \perp T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$ . One may think about the geodesic  $\gamma$  as of stable position of a stretched elastic thread that is forced to lie on a frictionless surface. Since it is frictionless, the force density  $N(t)$  that keeps the geodesic  $\gamma$  in the surface must be proportional to the normal vector to the surface at  $\gamma(t)$ .

The tension in the thread has to be the same at all points (otherwise the thread would move back or forth and it would not be stable).

Denote by  $T$  the tension. We can assume that  $\gamma$  has unit speed. In this case the net force from tension to the arc  $\gamma|_{[t_0, t_1]}$  is  $T \cdot (\gamma'(t_1) - \gamma'(t_0))$ . Hence the density of net force from tension at  $t$  is  $F(t) = T \cdot \gamma''(t)$ . According to the second Newton's law of motion, we have

$$F(t) + N(t) = 0;$$

which implies that  $\gamma''(t)$  is perpendicular to  $T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$ .

Fix a point  $p \in \Sigma$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be as in 10.12. Assume a geodesic  $\gamma$  of length less than  $\varepsilon$  from  $p$  to  $q$  does not minimize the length between its endpoints. Then there is a shortest path from  $p$  to  $q$ , which becomes a geodesic if parameterized by its arc length. That is there are two geodesics from  $p$  to  $q$  of length smaller than  $\varepsilon$ . In other words there are two vectors  $v, w \in T_p$  such that  $|v| < \varepsilon$ ,  $|w| < \varepsilon$  and  $q = \exp_p v = \exp_p w$ . But according to 10.12, the exponential map is injective in  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of zero — a contradiction.  $\square$

**10.14. Exercise.** Show that two shortest paths can cross each other at most once. More precisely, if two shortest paths have two distinct common points  $p$  and  $q$  then either these points are the ends of both shortest paths or both shortest paths contain an arc from  $p$  to  $q$ .

Show by example that nonoverlapping geodesics can cross each other an arbitrary number of times.

**10.15. Exercise.** Assume that a smooth regular surface  $\Sigma$  is mirror symmetric with respect to a plane  $\Pi$ . Show that no shortest path in  $\Sigma$  can cross  $\Pi$  more than once.

**10.16. Advanced exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth closed strictly convex surface in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\gamma: [0, \ell] \rightarrow \Sigma$  be a unit-speed minimizing geodesic. Set  $p = \gamma(0)$ ,  $q = \gamma(\ell)$  and


$$p_t = \gamma(t) - t \cdot \gamma'(t),$$

where  $\gamma'(t)$  denotes the velocity vector of  $\gamma$  at  $t$ .

Show that for any  $t \in (0, \ell)$ , one cannot see  $q$  from  $p_t$ ; that is, the line segment  $[p_t, q]$  intersects  $\Sigma$  at a point distinct from  $q$ .

Show that the statement does not hold if  $\gamma$  fails to be minimizing.

*Hint:* Show that the concatenation of the line segment  $[p_t, \gamma(t)]$  and the arc  $\gamma|_{[t, \ell]}$  is a shortest path in the closed region  $W$  outside of  $\Sigma$ .



## Liberman's lemma

The following lemma is a smooth analog of lemma proved by Joseph Liberman [24].

**10.17. Liberman's lemma.** *Assume  $\gamma$  is a geodesic on the graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a smooth convex function  $f$  defined on an open subset of the plane. Suppose that  $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$ . Then  $t \mapsto z(t)$  is a convex function; that is  $z''(t) \geq 0$  for any  $t$ .*

*Proof.* Choose the orientation on the graph so that the unit normal vector  $\nu$  always points up; that is, it has positive  $z$ -coordinate.

Since  $\gamma$  is a geodesic, we have  $\gamma''(t) \perp T_{\gamma(t)}$ , or equivalently  $\gamma''(t)$  is proportional to  $\nu_{\gamma(t)}$  for any  $t$ . By 7.11, we have

$$\langle \gamma''(t), \nu_{\gamma(t)} \rangle = \Pi_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t));$$

hence

$$\gamma''(t) = \nu_{\gamma(t)} \cdot \Pi_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))$$

for any  $t$ .

Therefore

$$\textcircled{2} \quad z''(t) = \cos(\theta_\gamma(t)) \cdot \nu_{\gamma(t)} \cdot \Pi_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t)),$$

where  $\theta_\gamma(t)$  denotes the angle between  $\nu_{\gamma(t)}$  and the  $z$ -axis.

Since  $\nu$  points up, we have  $\theta_\gamma(t) < \frac{\pi}{2}$ , or equivalently

$$\cos(\theta_\gamma(t)) > 0$$

for any  $t$ .

Since  $f$  is convex, we have that tangent plane supports the graph from below at any point; in particular  $\Pi_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t)) \geq 0$ . It follows that the right hand side in  $\textcircled{2}$  is nonnegative; whence the statement follows.  $\square$

**10.18. Exercise.** *Assume  $\gamma$  is a unit-speed geodesic on a smooth convex surface  $\Sigma$  and  $p$  in the interior of a convex set bounded by  $\Sigma$ . Set  $\rho(t) = |p - \gamma(t)|^2$ . Show that  $\rho''(t) \leq 2$  for any  $t$ .*

## Bound on total curvature

**10.19. Theorem.** *Assume  $\Sigma$  is a graph  $z = f(x, y)$  of a convex  $\ell$ -Lipschitz function  $f$  defined on an open set in the  $(x, y)$ -plane. Then the total curvature of any geodesic in  $\Sigma$  is at most  $2 \cdot \ell$ .*



The above theorem was proved by Vladimir Usov [25], later David Berg [26] pointed out that the same proof works for geodesics in closed epigraphs of  $\ell$ -Lipschitz functions which are not necessary convex; that is, sets of the type

$$W = \{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : z \geq f(x, y) \}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))$  be a unit speed geodesic on  $\Sigma$ . According to Liberman's lemma  $z(t)$  is convex.

Since the slope of  $f$  is at most  $\ell$ , we have

$$|z'(t)| \leq \frac{\ell}{\sqrt{1+\ell^2}}.$$

If  $\gamma$  is defined on the interval  $[a, b]$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b z''(t) dt &= z'(b) - z'(a) \leq \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{\ell}{\sqrt{1+\ell^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, note that  $z''$  is the projection of  $\gamma''$  to the  $z$ -axis. Since  $f$  is  $\ell$ -Lipschitz, the tangent plane  $T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$  cannot have slope greater than  $\ell$  for any  $t$ . Because  $\gamma''$  is perpendicular to that plane,

$$|\gamma''(t)| \leq z''(t) \cdot \sqrt{1+\ell^2}.$$

Recall that  $\Phi(\gamma)$  denotes the total curvature of curve  $\gamma$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\gamma) &= \int_a^b |\gamma''(t)| \cdot dt \leq \\ &\leq \sqrt{1+\ell^2} \cdot \int_a^b z''(t) \cdot dt \leq \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \ell. \end{aligned}$$

□

**10.20. Exercise.** Note that the graph  $z = \ell \cdot \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$  with removed origin is a smooth surface; denote it by  $\Sigma$ . Show that it has an both side infinite geodesic  $\gamma$  with total curvature exactly  $2 \cdot \ell$ .

Note that the function  $f(x, y) = \ell \cdot \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$  is  $\ell$ -Lipschitz. The graph  $z = f(x, y)$  in the exercise can be smoothed in a neighborhood


of the origin while keeping it convex. It follows that the estimate in the Usov's theorem is optimal.

**10.21. Exercise.** Assume  $f$  is a convex function  $\frac{3}{2}$ -Lipschitz function defined on the  $(x, y)$ -plane. Show that any geodesic  $\gamma$  on the graph  $z = f(x, y)$  is simple; that is, it has no self-intersections.

Construct a convex function 2-Lipschitz function defined on the  $(x, y)$ -plane with a nonsimple geodesic  $\gamma$  on its graph  $z = f(x, y)$ .

*Hint:* Use the theorem and 3.15. The suggested argument does not give the optimal bound for the Lipschitz constant that guarantee that  $\gamma$  is simple, but later we will show that the exact bound is  $\sqrt{3} = \operatorname{tg} \frac{\pi}{3}$  — it is the same as in the case of cone; compare to 10.1.

**10.22. Theorem.** Suppose a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  bounds a convex set  $K$  in the Euclidean space. Assume  $B(0, \varepsilon) \subset K \subset B(0, 1)$ . Then the total curvatures of any shortest path in  $\Sigma$  can be bounded in terms of  $\varepsilon$ .



The following exercise will guide you thru the proof of the theorem.

**10.23. Exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be as in the theorem and  $\gamma$  be a unit-speed shortest path in  $\Sigma$ . Denote by  $\nu_p$  the unit normal vector that points outside of  $\Sigma$ ; denote by  $\theta_p$  the angle between  $\nu_p$  and the direction from the origin to a point  $p \in \Sigma$ . Set  $\rho(t) = |\gamma(t)|^2$ ; let  $k(t)$  be the curvature of  $\gamma$  at  $t$ .

- (a) Show that  $\cos \theta_p \geq \varepsilon$  for any  $p \in \Sigma$ .
- (b) Show that  $|\rho'(t)| \leq 2$  for any  $t$ .
- (c) Show that

$$\rho''(t) = 2 - 2 \cdot k(t) \cdot \cos \theta_{\gamma(t)} \cdot |\gamma(t)|$$

for any  $t$ .

- (d) Use the closest-point projection from the unit sphere to  $\Sigma$  to show that

$$\text{length } \gamma \leq \pi.$$

- (e) Use the the statements above to conclude that

$$\Phi(\gamma) \leq \frac{100}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Note that our bound on total curvature given above goes to infinity as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , but in fact there is a bound independent of  $\varepsilon$ ; it is good of any closed convex surface [27].

# Chapter 11

## Spherical map

### Differential

Let  $f: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  be a smooth map defined on a smooth surface  $\Sigma$ ; that is, for any chart  $s$  of  $\Sigma$  the composition  $f \circ s$  is smooth.

Given a smooth curve  $\gamma$  in  $\Sigma$  consider the smooth curve  $\hat{\gamma} = f \circ \gamma$ . Assume  $\gamma$  starts at a point  $p \in \Sigma$  with velocity vector  $v \in T_p\Sigma$ ; that is,  $p = \gamma(0)$  and  $v = \gamma'(0)$ . The differential of  $f$  at  $p$  is defined as

$$\textcircled{1} \quad d_p f(v) = \hat{\gamma}'(0).$$

The domain of definition of  $d_p f$  is the tangent plane  $T_p\Sigma$ . The differential is an operator that produce a map  $d_p f: T_p\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  for given smooth map  $f: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $p \in \Sigma$ .

Note that the value  $d_p f(v)$  does not depend on the choice of  $\gamma$ ; that is, if  $\gamma_1$  is another curve in  $\Sigma$  such that  $\gamma_1(0) = p$  and  $\gamma_1'(0) = v$ , then

$$\textcircled{2} \quad (f \circ \gamma)'(0) = (f \circ \gamma_1)'(0).$$

Indeed,  $v = \gamma_1'(0) = \gamma'(0)$ ; therefore we have that

$$|\gamma_1(\varepsilon) - \gamma(\varepsilon)| = o(\varepsilon).$$

Since  $f$  is smooth,

$$|f \circ \gamma_1(\varepsilon) - f \circ \gamma(\varepsilon)| = o(\varepsilon);$$

whence  $\textcircled{2}$  follows.

Note that if  $\Sigma$  is a plane, then

$$d_p f(v) = D_v f,$$

where  $D_v$  denotes the direction derivative. For general surface  $D_v f$  is not well defined since the point  $p + t \cdot v$  may not lie in  $\Sigma$  for small values  $t$ .

**11.1. Exercise.** Assume  $f$  is a smooth map from one surface  $\Sigma_0$  to another  $\Sigma_1$  and  $p \in \Sigma_0$ . Show that the range of  $d_p f$  lies in the tangent plane  $T_{f(p)} \Sigma_1$ .

**11.2. Proposition.** The differential is a linear map. That is, for any smooth map  $f: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  defined on a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  and  $p \in \Sigma$ , the map  $d_p f: T_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is linear.

*Proof.* Fix a chart  $(u, v) \mapsto s(u, v)$  on  $\Sigma$  that covers a neighborhood of  $p$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $p = s(0, 0)$ .

Any smooth curve  $\gamma$  that starts at  $p$  can be written locally in the chart as  $\gamma(t) = s(u(t), v(t))$ ; since  $\gamma$  starts at  $p$ , we have  $u(0) = v(0) = 0$ . Applying the chain rule, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma'(0) &= \frac{\partial s}{\partial u}(0, 0) \cdot u'(0) + \frac{\partial s}{\partial v}(0, 0) \cdot v'(0), \\ (f \circ \gamma)'(0) &= \frac{\partial f \circ s}{\partial u}(0, 0) \cdot u'(0) + \frac{\partial f \circ s}{\partial v}(0, 0) \cdot v'(0).\end{aligned}$$

The statement follows since  $d_p(\gamma'(0)) = (f \circ \gamma)'(0)$ . □

## A more conceptual way\*

In this section we introduce a more conceptual way to define tangent vectors. We will not use this approach in the sequel, but it is better to know about it.

A tangent vector  $v \in T_p$  to a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  is a linear functional<sup>1</sup> that takes a smooth function  $\varphi$  on  $\Sigma$ , spits a real number denoted by  $v\varphi$  and satisfies the product rule:

$$\textcircled{3} \quad v(\varphi \cdot \psi) = (v\varphi) \cdot \psi(p) + \varphi(p) \cdot (v\psi).$$

If  $v$  is a velocity vector of a smooth curve  $\gamma$  that starts at  $p$ , then you can set

$$\textcircled{4} \quad v\varphi = (\varphi \circ \gamma)'(0).$$

It follows that any velocity vector  $v = \gamma'(0)$  is also a tangent vector in the new definition. It is not hard to check the converse as well; that is,

---

<sup>1</sup>Term *functional* is used for functions that take a function as an argument and return a number.

to any linear functional  $v$  satisfying the product rule there is a curve  $\gamma$  such that ④ holds.

The new definition is less intuitive, but it is more convenient to use since it grabs the key algebraic property of tangent vectors. For example the differential could be defined using the following identity:

$$(d_p f(v))\varphi := v(\varphi \circ f);$$

that is, the result of the functional  $d_p f(v)$  on the function  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined to be the same as the result of the functional  $v$  on the function  $\varphi \circ f: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

Many statements admit simpler proofs with this approach, for example 11.2 becomes a tautology.

## Spherical map

Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth oriented surface with unit normal field  $\nu$ . The map  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  defined by  $p \mapsto \nu_p$  is called *spherical map* or *Gauss map*.

For surfaces, the spherical map plays essentially the same role as the tangent indicatrix for curves.

Recall that if  $(u, v) \mapsto s(u, v)$  is a chart on  $\Sigma$  then

$$\nu(u, v) = \pm \frac{\frac{\partial s}{\partial u} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial v}}{\left| \frac{\partial s}{\partial u} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial v} \right|}.$$

Since  $s$  is a chart  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial u} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial v} \neq 0$ , therefore the spherical map is smooth.

In particular the differential of the spherical map is defined at any point of  $\Sigma$ .

## Shape operator

Suppose  $\Sigma$  is an oriented surface with the unit normal field  $\nu$ ; in other words  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  is its spherical map.

Fix a point  $p \in \Sigma$ . The *shape operator* at  $p$  is defined as

$$\textcircled{5} \quad S_p := -d_p \nu.$$

The shape operator  $S_p$  is defined on the tangent plane  $T_p \Sigma$  and it returns a vector in the same plane (otherwise we could not call it *operator*). The latter is shown in the following proposition, which also gives a reason for the change of sign in ⑤.

**11.3. Proposition.** *Suppose  $\Sigma$  is an oriented surface. Then for any  $p \in \Sigma$  and any  $v \in T_p$  we have that  $S_p(v) \in T_p$ . Moreover*

$$\langle S_p(v), w \rangle = \langle S_p(w), v \rangle = \Pi_p(v, w)$$

for any  $v, w \in T_p$ .

*Proof.* Assume an oriented surface  $\Sigma$  is written locally as a graph  $z = f(x, y)$  in the tangent-normal coordinates at  $p \in \Sigma$ . As usual we assume that the normal vector  $\nu_p$  points in the direction of  $z$ -axis, in this case the normal vector at any point of the graph points up; that is, its  $z$ -coordinate is positive.

Consider the corresponding chart of  $\Sigma$ :

$$s(x, y) = (x, y, f(x, y)).$$

Denote by  $\nu(x, y)$  the unit normal vector at  $s(x, y)$ ; it is a shortcut notation for  $\nu_{s(x, y)}$ .

Note that  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial x}(0, 0) = (1, 0, 0)$  and  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial y}(0, 0) = (0, 1, 0)$ . For a tangent vector

$$v = (a \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} + b \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial y})(0, 0) = (a, b, 0) \in T_p$$

we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S_p(v) &= -D_v \nu(0, 0) = \\ \textcircled{6} \quad &= -(a \cdot \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x} + b \cdot \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y})(0, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where  $D_v$  denotes the directional derivative along a vector  $v$  in the  $(x, y)$ -plane which is  $T_p$ .

Indeed, the first equality follows from  $\textcircled{5}$  and the definition of differential  $\textcircled{1}$  applied for the curve  $\gamma(t) = (a \cdot t, b \cdot t, f(a \cdot t, b \cdot t))$  at  $t = 0$  and the second follow since  $D_v = a \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + b \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ .

Taking partial derivatives of  $\langle \nu, \nu \rangle = 1$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \langle \nu, \nu \rangle = \\ &= 2 \cdot \langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x}, \nu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x}, \nu \rangle = 0$  and the same way we get  $\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y}, \nu \rangle = 0$ . By  $\textcircled{6}$  it follows that  $S_p(v) \perp \nu_p$ , or equivalently  $S_p(v) \in T_p$  for any  $v \in T_p$ .

Further, since  $\frac{\partial s}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \in T_{s(x, y)}\Sigma$  and  $\nu(x, y) \perp T_{s(x, y)}\Sigma$ , we have that

$$\langle \nu, \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} \rangle \equiv 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \nu, \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \rangle \equiv 0.$$

Taking a derivative of these identities, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \textcircled{7} \quad &\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} \rangle + \langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial x^2} \rangle \equiv 0, \\ &\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} \rangle + \langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial y \partial x} \rangle \equiv 0, \\ &\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \rangle + \langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial x \partial y} \rangle \equiv 0, \\ &\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \rangle + \langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial y^2} \rangle \equiv 0, \end{aligned}$$

Fix two vectors  $v = (a, b, 0)$  and  $w = (c, d, 0)$  in  $T_p$  (which is the  $(x, y)$ -plane). Since  $\nu(0, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$  we get

$$f(x, y) \equiv \langle \nu(0, 0), s(x, y) \rangle.$$

Therefore by ❹, ❺ and ❷ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_p(v), w \rangle &= -\langle a \cdot \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x} + b \cdot \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y}, c \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} + d \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \rangle(0, 0) = \\ &= -\left( a \cdot c \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} \right\rangle + a \cdot d \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \right\rangle + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b \cdot c \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial x} \right\rangle + b \cdot d \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial s}{\partial y} \right\rangle \right)(0, 0) = \\ &= \left( a \cdot c \cdot \left\langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial x^2} \right\rangle + a \cdot d \cdot \left\langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial x \partial y} \right\rangle + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b \cdot c \cdot \left\langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial y \partial x} \right\rangle + b \cdot d \cdot \left\langle \nu, \frac{\partial^2 s}{\partial y^2} \right\rangle \right)(0, 0) = \\ &= \left( a \cdot c \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} + a \cdot d \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x \partial y} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + b \cdot c \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y \partial x} + b \cdot d \cdot \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial y^2} \right)(0, 0) = \\ &= \Pi_p(v, w). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to apply ❸ on page 68. □

Recall that

$$\Pi_p(w, v) = \langle M_p \cdot v, w \rangle,$$

where  $M_p$  is the Hessian matrix at  $p$ . It follows that

$$S_p(v) = M_p \cdot v$$

if  $v$  is written in the standard basis of  $(x, y)$ -plane. Whence we get the following theorem.

**11.4. Theorem.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth oriented surface and  $p \in \Sigma$ . A nonzero tangent vector  $v \in T_p$  points in a principle direction at  $p$  if and only if  $S_p(v) \parallel v$  and if so, then the unique coefficient  $k$  such that  $S_p(v) = k \cdot v$  is the principle curvature in this direction.*

*In particular  $K(p) = \det S_p$  and  $H(p) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{trace } S_p$ .*

**11.5. Exercise.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth oriented surface with the unit normal field  $\nu$ . Suppose that  $\Sigma$  has unit normal curvature at any point in any direction.*

- (a) *Show that  $S_p(w) = w$  for any  $p \in \Sigma$  and  $w \in T_p \Sigma$ .*
- (b) *Show that  $p + \nu_p$  is constant; that is the point  $c = p + \nu_p$  does not depend on  $p \in \Sigma$ . Conclude that  $\Sigma$  is a part of the unit sphere centered at  $c$ .*

**11.6. Exercise.** Assume that smooth surfaces  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  intersect at constant angle along a smooth regular curve  $\gamma$ . Show that if  $\gamma$  is a curvature line in  $\Sigma_1$ , then it is also a curvature line in  $\Sigma_2$ .

Conclude that if a smooth surface  $\Sigma$  intersects a plane or sphere along a smooth curve  $\gamma$ , then  $\gamma$  is a curvature line of  $\Sigma$ .

*Hint:* Denote by  $\nu_1(t)$  and  $\nu_2(t)$  the unite normal vectors to  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  at  $\gamma(t)$ . Note that  $\langle \nu_1(t), \nu_2(t) \rangle$  is constant; take it derivative and apply 11.4.

**11.7. Exercise.** Suppose that a geodesic  $\gamma$  on the surface  $\Sigma$  is also a curvature line. Show that  $\gamma$  lies in a plane.

## Area

Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth surface and  $h: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a smooth function. Let us define the integral  $\int_R h$  of the function  $h$  along a region  $R \subset \Sigma$ .

First assume that there is a chart  $(u, v) \mapsto s(u, v)$  of  $\Sigma$  defined on an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $R \subset s(U)$ . In this case set

$$\textcircled{8} \quad \int_R h := \iint_{s^{-1}(R)} h \circ s(u, v) \cdot \left| \frac{\partial s}{\partial v}(u, v) \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial u}(u, v) \right| \cdot du \cdot dv.$$

By substitution rule for multiple variables (A.12), the right hand side in  $\textcircled{8}$  does not depend on choice of  $s$ ; that is if  $s_1: U_1 \rightarrow \Sigma$  is another chart such that  $s_1(U_1) \supset R$ , then

$$\iint_{s^{-1}(R)} h \circ s \cdot \left| \frac{\partial s}{\partial v} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial u} \right| \cdot du \cdot dv = \iint_{s_1^{-1}(R)} h \circ s_1 \cdot \left| \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial v} \times \frac{\partial s_1}{\partial u} \right| \cdot du \cdot dv.$$

(In fact the factor  $\left| \frac{\partial s}{\partial v} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial u} \right|$  is chosen so to meet this property.)

For a general region  $R$  one could subdivide it into regions  $R_1, R_2, \dots$  such that each  $R_i$  lies in the image of some chart. After that one could define the integral along  $R$  as the sum

$$\int_R h = \int_{R_1} h + \int_{R_2} h + \dots$$

The area of  $R$  is defined as the integral

$$\text{area } R = \int_R 1.$$



## Spherical image

**11.8. Theorem.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be an oriented complete surface with positive Gauss curvature. Then the spherical map  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  is injective and*

$$\int_R K = \text{area}[\nu(R)]$$

for any region  $R$  in  $\Sigma$ .

*Proof.* Fix two distinct points  $p, q \in \Sigma$ . Recall that  $\Sigma$  bounds a strictly convex region. Therefore the  $\nu_p$  makes an obtuse angle with the line segment  $[p, q]$ . The same way we can show that  $\nu_q$  makes an obtuse angle with the line segment  $[q, p]$ . In other words the projections of  $\nu_p$  and  $\nu_q$  on the line  $pq$  point in the opposite directions. In particular  $\nu_p \neq \nu_q$ ; that is, the spherical map is injective.

Note that it is sufficient to prove the identity assuming that the region  $R$  is covered by one chart  $(u, v) \mapsto s(u, v)$  of  $\Sigma$ ; if not cut  $R$  into smaller regions and sum up the results. Applying the definition of integral, we have the following expression for the left hand side

$$\int_R K := \iint_{s^{-1}(R)} K[s(u, v)] \cdot \left| \frac{\partial s}{\partial v}(u, v) \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial u}(u, v) \right| \cdot du \cdot dv.$$

Applying the definition of area, we have the following expression for the right hand side

$$\text{area}[\nu(R)] := \iint_{s^{-1}(R)} \left| \frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial v}(u, v) \times \frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial u}(u, v) \right| \cdot du \cdot dv.$$

Therefore it is sufficient to show that

$$\textcircled{9} \quad \frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial v}(u, v) \times \frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial u}(u, v) = K[s(u, v)] \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial v}(u, v) \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial u}(u, v)$$

for any  $(u, v)$  in the domain of definition.

Fix a point  $p = s(u, v)$ . Recall that

$$\frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial u} = S_p\left(\frac{\partial s}{\partial u}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial v} = S_p\left(\frac{\partial s}{\partial v}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial v} \times \frac{\partial \nu \circ s}{\partial u} = \det S_p \cdot \frac{\partial s}{\partial v} \times \frac{\partial s}{\partial u}.$$

Since  $K(p) = \det S_p$ ,  $\textcircled{9}$  follows. □

**11.9. Exercise.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a closed surface with positive Gauss curvature. Show that*

$$\int_{\Sigma} K = 4 \cdot \pi.$$

**11.10. Exercise.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be an open surface with positive Gauss curvature. Show that*

$$\int_{\Sigma} K \leq 2 \cdot \pi.$$

*Hint:* Use 9.4.

# Chapter 12

## Parallel transport

### Parallel fields

Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth surface in the Euclidean space and  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \Sigma$  be a smooth curve. A smooth vector-valued function  $t \mapsto v(t)$  is called a *tangent field* on  $\gamma$  if the vector  $v(t)$  lies in the tangent plane  $T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$  for each  $t$ .

A tangent field  $v(t)$  on  $\gamma$  is called *parallel* if  $v'(t) \perp T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$  for any  $t$ .

In general the family of tangent planes  $T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$  is not parallel. Therefore one cannot expect to have a truly parallel family  $v(t)$  with  $v' \equiv 0$ . The condition  $v'(t) \perp T_{\gamma(t)}\Sigma$  means that this family is as parallel as possible — it rotates together with the tangent plane, but does not rotate inside the plane.

Note that by the definition of geodesic, the velocity field  $v(t) = \gamma'(t)$  of any geodesic  $\gamma$  is parallel along  $\gamma$ .

**12.1. Exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth regular surface in the Euclidean space,  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \Sigma$  a smooth curve and  $v(t), w(t)$  parallel vector fields along  $\gamma$ .

(a) Show that  $|v(t)|$  is constant.

(b) Show that the angle  $\theta(t)$  between  $v(t)$  and  $w(t)$  is constant.

### Parallel transport

Assume  $p = \gamma(a)$  and  $q = \gamma(b)$ . Given a tangent vector  $v \in T_p$  there is unique parallel field  $v(t)$  along  $\gamma$  such that  $v(a) = v$ . The latter follows from A.14; the uniqueness also follows from Exercise 12.1.

The vector  $v(b) \in T_q$  is called the *parallel transport* of  $v$  along  $\gamma$  and denoted as  $\iota_\gamma(v)$ .

From the Exercise 12.1, it follows that parallel transport  $\iota_\gamma: T_p \rightarrow T_q$  is an isometry; it depends on the choice of  $\gamma$  — for another curve  $\gamma_1$  connecting  $p$  to  $q$  in  $\Sigma$ , the parallel transport  $\iota_{\gamma_1}: T_p \rightarrow T_q$  might be different.

To interpret the parallel transport physically, think of walking along  $\gamma$  and carrying a perfectly balanced bike wheel in such a way that you touch only its axis and keep it normal to  $\Sigma$ . It should be physically evident that if the wheel is non-spinning at the starting point  $p$ , then it will not be spinning after stopping at  $q$ . (Indeed, by pushing axis one cannot produce torque to spin the wheel.) The map that sends the initial position of the wheel to the final position is the parallel transport  $\iota_\gamma$ .

This physical interpretation was suggested by Mark Levi [28]; it will be used further.

On a more formal level, one can choose a partition  $a = t_0 < \dots < t_n = b$  of  $[a, b]$  and consider the sequence of orthogonal projections  $\varphi_i: T_{\gamma(t_{i-1})} \rightarrow T_{\gamma(t_i)}$ . For a fine partition, the composition

$$\varphi_n \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1: T_p \rightarrow T_q$$

gives an approximation of  $\iota_\gamma$ . Each  $\varphi_i$  does not increase the magnitude of a vector and neither the composition. It is straightforward to see that if the partition is sufficiently fine, then it is almost isometry; in particular it almost preserves the magnitudes of tangent vectors.

**12.2. Exercise.** *Let  $\gamma$  is a smooth closed loop with base point  $p$  on a smooth oriented surface  $\Sigma$  with the unit normal field  $\nu$ . Suppose that the spherical image of  $\gamma$  lies in an equator. Show that the parallel translation  $\iota_\gamma: T_p \rightarrow T_p$  along  $\gamma$  is the identity map.*

*Hint:* Denote by  $w$  the pole of the equator; show and use that  $w$  is a parallel vector field along  $\gamma$ .

## Geodesic curvature

Plane is the simplest example of smooth surface. Earlier we introduced signed curvature of a plane curve. For a smooth curve  $\gamma$  in general oriented smooth surface  $\Sigma$  the analogous notion is called *geodesic curvature* which we are about to introduce.

Let  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  be the spherical map that defines the orientation on  $\Sigma$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\gamma$  has unit speed. Then for any  $t$  the vectors  $\nu(t) = \nu(\gamma(t))_\Sigma$  and the velocity vector  $\tau(t) = \gamma'(t)$  are unit vectors that are normal to each other. Denote by  $\mu(t)$  the unit vector that is normal to both  $\nu(t)$  and  $\tau(t)$  that points to

the left from  $\gamma$ ; that is,  $\mu = \nu \times \tau$ . Note that the triple  $\tau(t), \mu(t), \nu(t)$  is an oriented orthonormal basis for any  $t$ .

Since  $\gamma$  is unit-speed, the acceleration  $\gamma''(t)$  is perpendicular to  $\tau(t)$ ; therefore at any parameter value  $t$ , we have

$$\gamma''(t) = k_g(t) \cdot \mu(t) - k_n(t) \cdot \nu(t),$$

for some real numbers  $k_n(t)$  and  $k_g(t)$ . The numbers  $k_n(t)$  and  $k_g(t)$  are called *normal* and *geodesic curvature* of  $\gamma$  at  $t$  correspondingly.

Note that the geodesic curvature vanishes if  $\gamma$  is a geodesic. It measures how much a given curve diverges from being a geodesic; it is positive if  $\gamma$  turns left and negative if  $\gamma$  turns right.

## Total geodesic curvature

The total geodesic curvature is defined as integral

$$\Psi(\gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{I}} k_g(t) \cdot dt,$$

assuming that  $\gamma$  is defined on the real interval  $\mathbb{I}$ . Note that if  $\Sigma$  is a plane and  $\gamma$  lies in  $\Sigma$  then geodesic curvature of  $\gamma$  equals to signed curvature and therefore total geodesic curvature equals to the total signed curvature. By that reason we use the same notation  $\Psi(\gamma)$  as for total signed curvature; if we need to emphasize that we consider  $\gamma$  as a curve in  $\Sigma$ , we write  $\Psi(\gamma)_\Sigma$ .

If  $\gamma$  is a piecewise smooth regular curve in  $\Sigma$ , then its total geodesic curvature is defined as a sum of all total geodesic curvature of its arcs and the sum signed exterior angles of  $\gamma$  at the joints. More precisely, if  $\gamma$  is a concatenation of smooth regular curves  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$  then

$$\Psi(\gamma) = \Psi(\gamma_1) + \dots + \Psi(\gamma_n) + \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_{n-1},$$

where  $\theta_i$  is the signed external angle at the joint  $\gamma_i$  and  $\gamma_{i+1}$ ; it is positive if we turn left and negative if we turn right, it is undefined if we turn to the opposite direction. If  $\gamma$  is closed, then


$$\Psi(\gamma) = \Psi(\gamma_1) + \dots + \Psi(\gamma_n) + \theta_1 + \dots + \theta_n,$$

where  $\theta_n$  is the signed external angle at the joint  $\gamma_n$  and  $\gamma_1$ .

Note that if each arc  $\gamma_i$  in the concatenation is a geodesic, then  $\gamma$  is called *broken geodesic*. Note that in this case  $\Psi(\gamma_i) = 0$  for each  $i$  and therefore the total geodesic curvature of  $\gamma$  is the sum of its signed external angles.

**12.3. Proposition.** *Assume  $\gamma$  is a closed broken geodesic in a smooth oriented surface  $\Sigma$  that starts and ends at the point  $p$ . Then the parallel transport  $\iota_\gamma: T_p \rightarrow T_p$  is a rotation of the the plane  $T_p$  clockwise by angle  $\Psi(\gamma)$ .*

*Moreover, the same statement holds for smooth closed curves and piecewise smooth curves.*



*Proof.* Assume  $\gamma$  is a cyclic concatenation of geodesics  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ . Fix a tangent vector  $v$  at  $p$  and extend it to a parallel vector field along  $\gamma$ . Since  $w_i(t) = \gamma'_i(t)$  is parallel along  $\gamma_i$ , the angle  $\varphi_i$  between  $v$  and  $w_i$  stays constant on each  $\gamma_i$ .

If  $\theta_i$  denotes the external angle at this vertex of switch from  $\gamma_i$  to  $\gamma_{i+1}$ , we have that

$$\varphi_{i+1} = \varphi_i - \theta_i \pmod{2\pi}.$$

Therefore after going around we get that

$$\varphi_{n+1} - \varphi_1 = -\theta_1 - \dots - \theta_n = -\Psi(\gamma).$$

Hence the the first statement follows.

For the smooth unit-speed curve  $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \Sigma$ , the proof is analogous. If  $\varphi(t)$  denotes the angle between  $v(t)$  and  $w(t) = \gamma'(t)$ , then

$$\varphi'(t) + k_g(t) \equiv 0$$

Whence the angle of rotation

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(b) - \varphi(a) &= \int_a^b \varphi'(t) \cdot dt = \\ &= - \int_a^b k_g \cdot dt = \\ &= -\Psi(\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

The case of piecewise regular smooth curve is a straightforward combination of the above two cases.  $\square$

## Spherical area

**12.4. Lemma.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a spherical triangle; that is,  $\Delta$  is the intersection of three closed half-spheres in the unit sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . Then*

$$\text{area } \Delta = \alpha + \beta + \gamma - \pi,$$


where  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  are the angles of  $\Delta$ .

The value  $\alpha + \beta + \gamma - \pi$  is called *excess* of the triangle  $\Delta$ .

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\textcircled{2} \quad \text{area } \mathbb{S}^2 = 4 \cdot \pi.$$

Note that the area of a spherical slice  $S_\alpha$  between two meridians meeting at angle  $\alpha$  is proportional to  $\alpha$ . Since for  $S_\pi$  is a half-sphere, from  $\textcircled{2}$ , we get  $\text{area } S_\pi = 2 \cdot \pi$ . Therefore the coefficient is 2; that is,



$$\textcircled{3} \quad \text{area } S_\alpha = 2 \cdot \alpha.$$

Extending the sides of  $\Delta$  we get 6 slices: two  $S_\alpha$ , two  $S_\beta$  and two  $S_\gamma$  which cover most of the sphere once, but the triangle  $\Delta$  and its centrally symmetric copy  $\Delta'$  are covered 3 times. It follows that

$$2 \cdot \text{area } S_\alpha + 2 \cdot \text{area } S_\beta + 2 \cdot \text{area } S_\gamma = \text{area } \mathbb{S}^2 + 4 \cdot \text{area } \Delta.$$

Substituting  $\textcircled{2}$  and  $\textcircled{3}$  and simplifying, we get  $\textcircled{1}$ . □

If the contour  $\partial\Delta$  of a spherical triangle with angles  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  is oriented such that the triangle lies on the left, then its external angles are  $\pi - \alpha$ ,  $\pi - \beta$  and  $\pi - \gamma$ . Therefore the total geodesic curvature of  $\partial\Delta$  is  $\Psi(\partial\Delta) = 3 \cdot \pi - \alpha - \beta - \gamma$ . The identity  $\textcircled{1}$  can be rewritten as


$$\textcircled{4} \quad \Psi(\partial\Delta) + \text{area } \Delta = 2 \cdot \pi.$$

The formula  $\textcircled{4}$  holds for an arbitrary spherical polygon bounded by a simple broken geodesic. The latter can be proved by triangulating the polygon, applying the formula for each triangle in the triangulation and summing up the results.

If a spherical polygon is  $P$  divided in two polygons  $Q$  and  $R$  by polygonal line between vertexes  $v$  and  $w$  then

$$\Psi(\partial P) + 2 \cdot \pi = \Psi(\partial Q) + \Psi(\partial R).$$

Indeed, for the internal angles  $Q$  and  $R$  at  $v$  are  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , then their external angles are  $\pi - \alpha$  and  $\pi - \beta$  respectfully. The internal angle of  $P$  in this case is  $\alpha + \beta$  and its external angle is  $\pi - \alpha - \beta$ . Clearly we have that



$$(\pi - \alpha) + (\pi - \beta) = (\pi - \alpha - \beta) + \pi;$$

that is, the sum of external angles of  $Q$  and  $R$  at  $v$  is  $\pi$  plus the external angle of  $P$  at  $v$ . The same holds for the external angles at  $w$  and the rest of the external angles of  $P$  appear once on  $Q$  or  $R$ . Therefore if the formula ④ holds for  $Q$  and  $R$ , then it holds for  $P$ .

The following proposition gives a spherical analog of 5.4.

**12.5. Proposition.** *Let  $P$  be a spherical polygon bounded by a simple closed broken geodesic  $\partial P$ . Assume  $\partial P$  is oriented such that  $P$  lies on the left from  $\partial P$ . Then*

$$\Psi(\partial P) + \text{area } P = 2 \cdot \pi.$$

*Moreover the same formula holds for any spherical region  $P$  bounded by piecewise smooth simple closed curve  $\partial P$ .*

*Sketch of proof.* The proof of the first statement is given above.

The second statement can be proved by approximation. One has to show that the total geodesic curvature of an inscribed broken geodesic approximates the total geodesic curvature of the original curve. We omit the proof of the latter statement, but it can be done along the same lines as 3.24.  $\square$

**12.6. Exercise.** *Assume  $\gamma$  is a simple piecewise smooth loop on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  that divides its area into two equal parts. Denote by  $p$  the base point of  $\gamma$ . Show that  $\iota_\gamma: T_p \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow T_p \mathbb{S}^2$  is the identity map.*

## Gauss–Bonnet formula

**12.7. Theorem.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a topological disc in a smooth oriented surface  $\Sigma$  bounded by a simple piecewise smooth and regular curve  $\partial \Delta$  that is oriented in such a way that  $\Delta$  lies on its left. Then*

$$\textcircled{5} \quad \Psi(\partial \Delta) + \int_{\Delta} K = 2 \cdot \pi,$$

where  $K$  denotes the Gauss curvature of  $\Sigma$ .

For geodesic triangles this theorem was proved by Carl Friedrich Gauss [29]; Pierre Bonnet and Jacques Binet independently generalized the statement for arbitrary curves.

Note that if  $\Sigma$  is a plane, then the Gauss curvature vanished; therefore the statement of theorem follows from 5.4.

If  $\Sigma$  is the unit sphere then  $K \equiv 1$  and therefore formula ⑤ can be rewritten as

$$\Psi(\partial \Delta) + \text{area } \Delta = 2 \cdot \pi,$$



which follows from 12.5.

We will give an informal proof of 12.7 in a partial case based on the bike wheel interpretation described above. We suppose that it is intuitively clear that moving the axis of the wheel without changing its direction does not change the direction of the wheel's spikes.

More precisely, assume we keep the axis of a non-spinning bike wheel and perform the following two experiments:

- (i) We move it around and bring the axis back to the original position. As a result the wheel might turn by some angle; let us measure this angle.
- (ii) We move the direction of the axis the same way as before without moving the center of the wheel. After that we measure the angle of rotation.

Then the resulting angles in these two experiments is the same.

Consider a surface  $\Sigma$  with a Gauss map  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ . Note that for any point  $p$  on  $\Sigma$ , the tangent plane  $T_p\Sigma$  is parallel to the tangent plane  $T_{\nu(p)}\mathbb{S}^2$ ; so we can identify these tangent spaces. From the experiments above, we get the following:

**12.8. Lemma.** *Suppose  $\alpha$  is a piecewise smooth regular curve in a smooth regular surface  $\Sigma$  which has a Gauss map  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ . Then the parallel transport along  $\alpha$  in  $\Sigma$  coincides with the parallel transport along the curve  $\beta = \nu \circ \alpha$  in  $\mathbb{S}^2$ .*

*Proof of partial case of 12.7.* We will prove the formula for complete surface  $\Sigma$  with positive Gauss curvature. In this case, by 11.8 the formula can be rewritten as

$$\textcircled{6} \quad \Psi(\partial\Delta) + \text{area}[\nu(\Delta)] = 2 \cdot \pi.$$

The general case can be proved similarly, but one has to use the area formula (A.13) and oriented area surrounded by a spherical curve.

Fix  $p \in \partial\Delta$ ; assume the loop  $\alpha$  runs along  $\partial\Delta$  so that  $\Delta$  lies on the left from it. Consider the parallel translation  $\iota: T_p \rightarrow T_p$  along  $\alpha$ . According to 12.3,  $\iota$  is a clockwise rotation by angle  $\Psi(\alpha)_\Sigma$ .

Set  $\beta = \nu \circ \alpha$ . According to 12.8,  $\iota$  is also parallel translation along  $\beta$  in  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . In particular  $\iota$  is a clockwise rotation by angle  $\Psi(\beta)_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ . By 12.5

$$\Psi(\beta)_{\mathbb{S}^2} + \text{area}[\nu(\Delta)] = 2 \cdot \pi.$$

Therefore  $\iota$  is a counterclockwise rotation by  $\text{area}[\nu(\Delta)]$

Summarizing, the clockwise rotation by  $\Psi(\alpha)_\Sigma$  is identical to a counterclockwise rotation by  $\text{area}[\nu(\Delta)]$ . The rotations are identical if the angles are equal modulo  $2 \cdot \pi$ . Therefore

$$\textcircled{7} \quad \Psi(\partial\Delta)_\Sigma + \text{area}[\nu(\Delta)] = 2 \cdot \pi \cdot n$$

for an integer  $n$ .

It remains to show that  $n = 1$ . By 7, this is so for a topological disc in a plane. One can think of a general disc  $\Delta$  as about a result of a continuous deformation of a plane disc. The integer  $n$  cannot change in the process of deformation since the left hand side in 7 is continuous along the deformation.

Let us redo the last argument more formally.

First assume that  $\Delta$  lies in a local graph realization  $z = f(x, y)$  of  $\Sigma$ . Consider one parameter family  $\Sigma_t$  of graphs  $z = t \cdot f(x, y)$  and denote by  $\Delta_t$  the corresponding disc in  $\Sigma_t$ , so  $\Delta_1 = \Delta$  and  $\Delta_0$  is its projection to the  $(x, y)$ -plane. Since  $\Sigma_0$  is a plane domain, we have  $\text{area}[\nu_0(\Delta_0)] = 0$ . Therefore by 5.4 we have

$$\Psi(\partial\Delta_0)_{\Sigma_0} + \text{area}[\nu_0(\Delta_0)] = 2 \cdot \pi.$$

Note that

$$\Psi(\partial\Delta_t)_{\Sigma_t} + \text{area}[\nu_t(\Delta_t)]$$

depends continuously on  $t$ . According to 7, its value is a multiple of  $2 \cdot \pi$ ; therefore it has to be constant. Whence the Gauss–Bonnet formula follows.

If  $\Delta$  does not lie in one graph, then one could divide it into smaller discs, apply the formula for each and sum up the result. The proof is done along the same lines as 12.5.  $\square$

**12.9. Exercise.** Assume  $\gamma$  is a closed simple curve with constant geodesic curvature 1 in a smooth complete surface  $\Sigma$  with positive Gauss curvature. Show that

$$\text{length } \gamma \leq 2 \cdot \pi;$$


that is, the length of  $\gamma$  cannot exceed the length of the unit circle in the plane.

**12.10. Exercise.** Let  $\gamma$  be a closed simple geodesic on a complete surface  $\Sigma$  with positive Gauss curvature. Assume  $\nu: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  is a Gauss map. Show that the curve  $\alpha = \nu \circ \gamma$  divides the sphere into regions of equal area.

Conclude that

$$\text{length } \alpha \geq 2 \cdot \pi.$$

**12.11. Exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth closed surface with a closed geodesic  $\gamma$ . Assume  $\gamma$  has exactly 4 self-intersection at the points




$a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  that appear on  $\gamma$  in the order  $a, a, b, b, c, c, d, d$ . Show that  $\Sigma$  cannot have positive Gauss curvature.<sup>1</sup>

The following exercise gives the optimal bound on Lipschitz constant of a convex function that guarantees that its geodesics have no self-intersections; compare to 10.21.

**12.12. Exercise.** Suppose that  $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\sqrt{3}$ -Lipshitz smooth convex function. Show that any geodesic in the surface defined by the graph  $z = f(x, y)$  has no self-intersections.

*Hint.* Note that it is sufficient to show that the surface has no geodesic loops. Estimate the integral of Gauss curvature of whole surface and a disc in it surrounded by a geodesic loop.

**12.13. Advanced exercise.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a smooth regular sphere with positive Gauss curvature and  $p \in \Sigma$ . Suppose  $\gamma$  is a closed geodesic that does not pass thru  $p$ . Assume  $\Sigma \setminus \{p\}$  parametrized by the plane. Can it happen that in this parametrization,  $\gamma$  looks like one of the curves on the diagram? Say as much as possible about possible/impossible



diagrams of that type.

---

<sup>1</sup>Hint: estimate integral of Gauss curvature bounded by a simple geodesic loop.

# Appendix A

## Review

Here we state and discuss results from different branches of mathematics which were used further in the book. The reader is not expected to know proofs of these statements, but it is better to check that his intuition agrees with each.

### A.1 Metric spaces

*Metric* is a function that returns a real value  $\text{dist}(x, y)$  for any pair  $x, y$  in a given nonempty set  $\mathcal{X}$  and satisfies the following axioms for any triple  $x, y, z$ :

(a) Positiveness:

$$\text{dist}(x, y) \geq 0.$$

(b)  $x = y$  if and only if

$$\text{dist}(x, y) = 0.$$

(c) Symmetry:

$$\text{dist}(x, y) = \text{dist}(y, x).$$

(d) Triangle inequality:

$$\text{dist}(x, z) \leq \text{dist}(x, y) + \text{dist}(y, z).$$

A set with a metric is called *metric space* and the elements of the set are called *points*.

**Shortcut for distance.** Usually we consider only one metric on a set, therefore we can denote the metric space and its underlying set by the same letter, say  $\mathcal{X}$ . In this case we also use a shortcut notations

$|x - y|$  or  $|x - y|_{\mathcal{X}}$  for the distance  $\text{dist}(x, y)$  from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ . For example, the triangle inequality can be written as

$$|x - z|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq |x - y|_{\mathcal{X}} + |y - z|_{\mathcal{X}}.$$

**Examples.** Euclidean space and plane as well as real line will be the most important examples of metric spaces for us. In these examples the introduced notation  $|x - y|$  for the distance from  $x$  to  $y$  has perfect sense as a norm of the vector  $x - y$ . However, in general metric space the expression  $x - y$  has no sense, but anyway we use expression  $|x - y|$  for the distance.

If we say *plane* or *space* we mean *Euclidean* plane or space. However the plane (as well as the space) admits many other metrics, for example the so called Manhattan metric from the following exercise.

**A.1. Exercise.** Consider the function

$$\text{dist}(p, q) = |x_p - x_q| + |y_p - y_q|,$$

where  $p = (x_p, y_p)$  and  $q = (x_q, y_q)$  are points in the coordinate plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Show that  $\text{dist}$  is a metric on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Let us mention another example: the *discrete space* — arbitrary nonempty set  $\mathcal{X}$  with the metric defined as  $|x - y|_{\mathcal{X}} = 0$  if  $x = y$  and  $|x - y|_{\mathcal{X}} = 1$  otherwise.

**Subspaces.** Any subset of a metric space is also a metric space, by restricting the original metric to the subset; the obtained metric space is called a *subspace*. In particular, all subsets of Euclidean space are metric spaces.

**Balls.** Given a point  $p$  in a metric space  $\mathcal{X}$  and a real number  $R \geq 0$ , the set of points  $x$  on the distance less then  $R$  (or at most  $R$ ) from  $p$  is called open (or correspondingly closed) ball of radius  $R$  with center at  $p$ . The *open ball* is denoted as  $B(p, R)$  or  $B(p, R)_{\mathcal{X}}$ ; the second notation is used if we need to emphasize that the ball lies in the metric space  $\mathcal{X}$ . Formally speaking

$$B(p, R) = B(p, R)_{\mathcal{X}} = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |x - p|_{\mathcal{X}} < R\}.$$

Analogously, the *closed ball* is denoted as  $\bar{B}[p, R]$  or  $\bar{B}[p, R]_{\mathcal{X}}$  and

$$\bar{B}[p, R] = \bar{B}[p, R]_{\mathcal{X}} = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : |x - p|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq R\}.$$

**A.2. Exercise.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a metric space.

- Show that if  $\bar{B}[p, 2] \subset \bar{B}[q, 1]$  for some points  $p, q \in \mathcal{X}$ , then  $\bar{B}[p, 2] = \bar{B}[q, 1]$ .
- Construct a metric space  $\mathcal{X}$  with two points  $p$  and  $q$  such that  $B(p, \frac{3}{2}) \subset B(q, 1)$  and the inclusions is strict.

## A.2 Continuity

In this section we will extend standard notions from calculus to the metric spaces.

**A.3. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a metric space. A sequence of points  $x_1, x_2, \dots$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  is called *convergent* if there is  $x_\infty \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $|x_\infty - x_n| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . That is, for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a natural number  $N$  such that for all  $n \geq N$ , we have

$$|x_\infty - x_n| < \varepsilon.$$

In this case we say that the sequence  $(x_n)$  converges to  $x_\infty$ , or  $x_\infty$  is the limit of the sequence  $(x_n)$ . Notationally, we write  $x_n \rightarrow x_\infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  or  $x_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n$ .

**A.4. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be metric spaces. A map  $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is called *continuous* if for any convergent sequence  $x_n \rightarrow x_\infty$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , we have  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x_\infty)$  in  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

Equivalently,  $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is continuous if for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|x - x'|_{\mathcal{X}} < \delta \text{ implies } |f(x) - f(x')|_{\mathcal{Y}} < \varepsilon.$$

**A.5. Exercise.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be metric spaces  $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is distance non-expanding map; that is,

$$|f(x) - f(x')|_{\mathcal{Y}} \leq |x - x'|_{\mathcal{X}}$$

for any  $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$ . Show that  $f$  is continuous.

**A.6. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be metric spaces. A continuous bijection  $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is called a *homeomorphism* if its inverse  $f^{-1}: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  is also continuous.

If there exists a homeomorphism  $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{X}$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{Y}$ , or  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are homeomorphic.

If a metric space  $\mathcal{X}$  is homeomorphic to a known space, for example plane, sphere, disc, circle and so on, we may also say that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a *topological* plane, sphere, disc, circle and so on.

**A.7. Definition.** A subset  $A$  of a metric space  $\mathcal{X}$  is called *closed* if whenever a sequence  $(x_n)$  of points from  $A$  converges in  $\mathcal{X}$ , we have that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \in A$ .

A set  $\Omega \subset \mathcal{X}$  is called *open* if for any  $z \in \Omega$ , there is  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(z, \varepsilon) \subset \Omega$ .

An open set  $\Omega$  that contains a given point  $p$  is called *neighborhood of  $p$* .

**A.8. Exercise.** Let  $Q$  be a subset of a metric space  $\mathcal{X}$ . Show that  $A$  is closed if and only if its complement  $\Omega = \mathcal{X} \setminus Q$  is open.

## A.3 Regular values

A map  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  can be thought as array of functions

$$f_1, \dots, f_k: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The map  $\mathbf{f}$  is called *smooth* if each function  $f_i$  is smooth; that is, all partial derivatives of  $f_i$  are defined in the domain of definition of  $\mathbf{f}$ .

Inverse function theorem gives a sufficient condition for a smooth function to be invertible in a neighborhood of a given point  $p$  in its domain. The condition is formulated in terms of partial derivative of  $f_i$  at  $p$ .

Implicit function theorem is a close relative to inverse function theorem; in fact it can be obtained as its corollary. It is used for instance when we need to pass from parametric to implicit description of curves and surface.

Both theorems reduce the existence of a map satisfying certain equation to a question in linear algebra. We use these two theorems only for  $n \leq 3$ .

These two theorems are discussed in any course of multivariable calculus, the classical book of Walter Rudin [30] is one of my favorites.

**A.9. Inverse function theorem.** Let  $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n): \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a smooth map. Assume that the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_n} \end{pmatrix}$$

is invertible at some point  $p$  in the domain of definition of  $\mathbf{f}$ . Then there is a smooth function  $\mathbf{h}: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  defined in a neighborhood  $\Omega_q$  of  $q = \mathbf{f}(p)$  that is local inverse of  $\mathbf{f}$  at  $p$ ; that is, there are neighborhoods  $\Omega_p \ni p$  such that  $\mathbf{f}$  defines a bijection  $\Omega_p \rightarrow \Omega_q$  and  $\mathbf{f}(x) = y$  if and only if  $x = \mathbf{h}(y)$  for any  $x \in \Omega_p$  and any  $y \in \Omega_q$ .

**A.10. Implicit function theorem.** Let  $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n): \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a smooth map,  $m, n \geq 1$ . Let us consider  $\mathbb{R}^{n+m}$  as a product

space  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  with coordinates  $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m$ . Consider the following matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_1} & \dots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_n} \end{pmatrix}$$

formed by first  $n$  columns of the Jacobian matrix. Assume  $M$  is invertible at some point  $p$  in the domain of definition of  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{f}(p) = 0$ . Then there is a neighborhood  $\Omega_p \ni p$  and smooth function  $\mathbf{h}: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  defined on a neighborhood  $\Omega_0 \ni 0$  that for any  $(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) \in \Omega_p$  the equality

$$\mathbf{f}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) = 0$$

holds if and only if

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mathbf{h}(y_1, \dots, y_m).$$

If the assumption in the theorem holds for any point  $p$  such that  $\mathbf{f}(p) = 0$ , then we say that 0 is a regular value of  $\mathbf{f}$ . The following lemma states that most of the values of smooth map are regular; in particular generic smooth function satisfies the assumption of the theorem.

**A.11. Sard's lemma.** *Almost all values of a smooth map  $\mathbf{f}: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  defined on an open set  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are regular.*

The words *almost all* means that with exception of a set of zero Lebesgue measure. In particular if one chooses a random value equidistributed in arbitrary small ball  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  then it is a regular value of  $f$  with probability 1.

## A.4 Multiple integral

The following theorem is a substitution rule for multiple variables.

**A.12. Theorem.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a compact set and  $h: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded measurable function. Assume  $\mathbf{f}: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is an injective smooth map. Then*

$$\int_K h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot |J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbf{f}(K)} h \circ \mathbf{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot d\mathbf{y},$$

where  $J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the Jacobian of  $\mathbf{f}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ ; that is, the determinant of the Jacobian matrix of  $\mathbf{f}$  at  $\mathbf{x}$ .



**A.13. Area formula.** Let  $\mathbf{f}: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be a smooth map defined on a compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ; denote by  $J_{\mathbf{f}}$  the Jacobian of  $\mathbf{f}$ . Then for any function  $h: K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\int_K h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot |J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbf{f}(K)} H_K(\mathbf{y}) \cdot d\mathbf{y},$$

where

$$H_K(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in K \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}}} h(\mathbf{x}).$$

(The integrals are understood in the sense of Lebesgue.)

Let us sketch the proof of area formula using Sard's lemma (A.11) and the substitution rule (A.12).

*Sketch of proof.* Denote by  $S \subset K$  the set of critical points of  $\mathbf{f}$ ; that is,  $\mathbf{x} \in S$  if  $J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ . By Sard's lemma,  $\mathbf{f}(S)$  has vanishing measure. Note that

$$\int_S h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot |J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot d\mathbf{x} = 0$$

since  $J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  and

$$\int_{\mathbf{f}(S)} H_S(\mathbf{y}) \cdot d\mathbf{y}$$

since  $\mathbf{f}(S)$  has vanishing measure. In particular,

$$\int_S h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot |J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbf{f}(S)} H_S(\mathbf{y}) \cdot d\mathbf{y};$$

that is the area formula holds for  $S$ .

It remains to prove that

$$\int_{K \setminus S} h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot |J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbf{f}(K \setminus S)} H_{K \setminus S}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot d\mathbf{y}.$$

Since  $J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$  for any  $\mathbf{x} \in K \setminus S$ , by inverse function theorem, the restriction of  $\mathbf{f}$  to a neighborhood  $U \ni \mathbf{x}$  has a smooth inverse. Therefore for any compact set  $K' \subset U$  we have that

$$\int_{K'} h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot |J_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x})| \cdot d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbf{f}(K_1)} h(\mathbf{f}^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) \cdot d\mathbf{y}.$$

It remains to subdivide  $K_1$  into a countable collection of subsets of that type and sum up the corresponding formulas.  $\square$

## A.5 Initial value problem

The following theorem guarantees existence and uniqueness of a solution of an initial value problem for a system of ordinary differential equations

$$\begin{cases} x'_1(t) &= f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n, t), \\ &\dots \\ x'_n(t) &= f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, t), \end{cases}$$

where each  $x_i = x_i(t)$  is a real valued function defined on a real interval  $\mathbb{I}$  and each  $f_i$  is a smooth function defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{I}$ .

The array functions  $(f_1, \dots, f_n)$  can be considered as one vector-valued function  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and the array  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  can be considered as a vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore the system can be rewritten as one vector equation

$$\mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t).$$

**A.14. Theorem.** *Suppose  $\mathbb{I}$  is a real interval and  $\mathbf{f}: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a smooth function. Then for any initial data  $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{u}$  the differential equation*

$$\mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t)$$

*has a unique solution  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  defined at a maximal subinterval  $\mathbb{J}$  of  $\mathbb{I}$  that contains  $t_0$ . Moreover*

- (a) *if  $\mathbb{J} \neq \mathbb{I}$ , that is, if an end  $a$  of  $\mathbb{J}$  lies in the interior of  $\mathbb{I}$ , then  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  diverges for  $t \rightarrow a$ ;*
- (b) *the function  $(\mathbf{u}, t_0, t) \mapsto \mathbf{x}(t)$  is smooth.*

## A.6 Lipschitz condition

Recall that a function  $f$  is called Lipschitz if there is a constant  $L$  such that

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L \cdot |x - y|$$

for values  $x$  and  $y$  in the domain of definition of  $f$ . This definition works for maps between metric spaces, but we will use it for real-to-real functions only.

**A.15. Rademacher's theorem.** *Let  $f: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Lipschitz function. then derivative  $f'(x)$  is defined for almost all  $x \in [a, b]$ . Moreover the derivative  $f'$  is a bounded measurable function defined almost everywhere in  $[a, b]$  and it satisfies the fundamental theorem of*

calculus; that is, the following identity

$$f(b) - f(a) = \int_a^b f'(x) \cdot dx,$$

holds if the integral understood in the sense of Lebesgue.

It is often helps to work with measurable functions; it makes possible to extend many statements about continuous function to measurable functions.

**A.16. Lusin's theorem.** *Let  $\varphi: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable function. Then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a continuous function  $\psi_\varepsilon: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that coincides with  $\varphi$  outside of a set of measure at most  $\varepsilon$ . Moreover,  $\varphi$  is bounded above and/or below by some constants then we can assume that so is  $\psi_\varepsilon$ .*

## A.7 Uniform continuity

Let  $f$  be a real function defined on a real interval. If for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|x_1 - x_2|_X < \delta \implies |f(x_1) - f(x_2)|_Y < \varepsilon,$$

then  $f$  is called *uniformly continuous*.

Evidently every uniformly continuous function is continuous; the converse does not hold. For example, the function  $f(x) = x^2$  is continuous, but not uniformly continuous. Indeed, in this case

$$\textcircled{1} \quad |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| = |x_1 + x_2| \cdot |x_1 - x_2|$$

If  $|x_1 - x_2|$  is arbitrary small positive value, then one is free to chose  $|x_1 + x_2|$  sufficiently large, so that the product in  $\textcircled{1}$  is bigger than any given number. However if  $f$  is continuous and defined on a closed interval  $[a, b]$ , then  $f$  is uniformly continuous

If the condition above holds for any function  $f_n$  in a sequence and  $\delta$  depend solely on  $\varepsilon$ , then the sequence  $(f_n)$  is called uniformly equicontinuous. More precisely, a sequence of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow Y$  is called *uniformly equicontinuous* if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|x_1 - x_2|_X < \delta \implies |f_n(x_1) - f_n(x_2)|_Y < \varepsilon$$

for any  $n$ . The following lemma is a partial case of [30, Theorem 7.25].

**A.17. Lemma.** *Any uniformly equicontinuous sequence of function  $f_n: [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$  has a subsequence that converges pointwise to a continuous function.*

## A.8 Jordan's theorem

We sometimes characterization of homeomorphism.

**A.18. Theorem.** *A continuous bijection  $f$  between compact metric spaces has continuous inverse; that is  $f$  is a homeomorphism.*

The first part of the following theorem is proved by Camille Jordan, the second part is due to Arthur Schoenflies.

**A.19. Theorem.** *The complement of any closed simple plane curve  $\gamma$  has exactly two connected components.*

*Moreover there is a homeomorphism  $h: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  that maps the unit circle to  $\gamma$ . In particular  $\gamma$  bounds a topological disc.*

This theorem is known for simple formulation and quite hard proof. By now many proofs of this theorem are known. For the first statement, a very short proof based on somewhat developed technique is given by Patrick Doyle [31], among elementary proofs, one of my favorites is the proof given by Aleksei Filippov [32].

We use the following smooth analog of this theorem.

**A.20. Theorem.** *The complement of any closed simple smooth regular plane curve  $\gamma$  has exactly two connected components.*

*Moreover there is a diffeomorphism  $h: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  that maps the unit circle to  $\gamma$ .*

The proof of this statement is much simpler. An amusing proof of can be found in [33].

## A.9 Connectedness

A set  $X$  in the Euclidean space is called *path connected* if any two points  $x, y \in X$  can be connected by a path lying in  $X$ ; that is, there is a path  $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$  such that  $\alpha(0) = x$  and  $\alpha(1) = y$ .

A set  $X$  in the Euclidean space is called *connected* if one cannot cover  $X$  by two disjoint open sets  $V$  and  $W$  such that both intersections  $X \cap V$  and  $X \cap W$  are nonempty.

**A.21. Proposition.** *Any path connected set is connected. Moreover any open connected set in the Euclidean space or plane is path connected.*

Given a point  $x \in X$  the maximal connected subset containing  $x$  is called *connected component* of  $x$  in  $X$ .

## A.10 Convexity

A set  $X$  in the Euclidean space is called *convex* if for any two points  $x, y \in X$ , any point  $z$  between  $x$  and  $y$  lies in  $X$ . It is called *strictly convex* if for any two points  $x, y \in X$ , any point  $z$  between  $x$  and  $y$  lies in the interior of  $X$ .

From the definition, it is easy to see that intersection of arbitrary family of convex sets is convex. The intersection of all convex sets containing  $X$  is called *convex hull* of  $X$ ; it is the minimal convex set containing the given set  $X$ .

**A.22. Lemma.** *Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be a closed convex subset. Then for any point  $p \notin K$  there is a plane  $\Pi$  that separates  $K$  from  $p$ ; that is,  $K$  and  $p$  lie on the opposite open half-spaces of  $\Pi$ .*

A function of two variables  $(x, y) \mapsto f(x, y)$  is called convex if its epigraph  $z \geq f(x, y)$  is a convex set. This is equivalent to the so called Jensen's inequality

$$f(t \cdot x_1 + (1-t) \cdot x_2) \leq t \cdot f(x_1) + (1-t) \cdot f(x_2)$$

for  $t \in [0, 1]$ . If  $f$  is smooth, then the condition is equivalent to the following inequality for second directional derivative:

$$D_w^2 f \geq 0$$

for any vector  $w \neq 0$  in the  $(x, y)$ -plane.

## A.11 Elementary geometry

**A.23. Theorem.** *The sum of sum of all the internal angles of a simple  $n$ -gon is  $(n-2) \cdot \pi$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 3$  it says that sum of internal angles of a triangle is  $\pi$ , which is assumed to be known.

First let us show that for any  $n \geq 4$ , any  $n$ -gon has a diagonal that lies inside of it. Assume this is holds true for all polygons with at most  $n-1$  vertex.

Fix an  $n$ -gon  $P$ ,  $n \geq 4$ . Applying rotation if necessary, we can assume that all its vertexes have different  $x$ -coordinates. Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $P$  that minimizes the  $x$ -coordinate; denote by  $u$  and  $w$  its adjacent vertexes. Let us choose the diagonal  $uw$  if it lies in  $P$ . Otherwise the triangle  $\triangle uvw$  contains another vertex of  $P$ . Choose a vertex  $s$  in the interior of  $\triangle uvw$  that maximizes the distance to

line  $uw$ . Note that the diagonal  $vs$  lies in  $P$ ; if it is not the case then  $vs$  crosses another side  $pq$  of  $P$ , one of the vertexes  $p$  or  $q$  has larger distance to the line and it lies in the interior of  $\triangle uvw$  — a contradiction.

Note that the diagonal divides  $P$  into two polygons, say  $Q$  and  $R$ , with smaller number of sides in each, say  $k$  and  $m$  correspondingly. Note that

$$\textcircled{1} \quad k + m = n + 2;$$

indeed each side of  $P$  appears once as a side of  $P$  or  $Q$  plus the diagonal appears twice — once as a side in  $Q$  and once as a side of  $R$ . Note that the sum of angles of  $P$  is the sum of angles of  $Q$  and  $R$ , which by the induction hypothesis are  $(k-2)\cdot\pi$  and  $(m-2)\cdot\pi$  correspondingly. It remains to note that  $\textcircled{1}$  implies

$$(k-2)\cdot\pi + (m-2)\cdot\pi = (n-2)\cdot\pi. \quad \square$$

The following theorem says that triangle inequality holds for angles between half-lines from a fixed point. In particular it implies that a unit sphere with angle metric is a metric space.

**A.24. Theorem.** *The inequality*


$$\angle aob + \angle boc \geq \angle aoc$$

*holds for any three half-lines  $oa$ ,  $ob$  and  $oc$  in the Euclidean space.*

The following lemma says that angle of a triangle monotonically depends on the opposite side, assuming the we keep the remaining two sides fixed. It is a simple statement in elementary geometry; in particular it follows directly from the cosine rule.

**A.25. Lemma.** *Let  $x, y, z, x', y'$  and  $z'$  be 6 points such that  $|x-y| = |x'-y'| > 0$  and  $|y-z| = |y'-z'| > 0$ . Then*

$$\angle xyz \geq \angle x'y'z' \quad \text{if and only if} \quad |x-z| \geq |x'-y'|.$$



*Proof of A.24.* We can assume that  $\angle aob < \angle aoc$ ; otherwise the statement is evident. In this case there is a half-line  $ob'$  in the angle  $aoc$  such that

$$\angle aob = \angle aob',$$

so in particular we have that

$$\angle aob' + \angle b'oc = \angle aoc.$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $|o - b| = |o - b'|$  and  $b'$  lies on a line segment  $ac$ , so

$$|a - b'| + |b' - c| = |a - c|.$$

Then by triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \textcircled{2} \quad |a - b| + |b - c| &\geq |a - c| = \\ &= |a - b'| + |b' - c|. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the triangles  $aob$  and  $aob'$  the side  $ao$  is shared,  $\angle aob = \angle aob'$  and  $|o - b| = |o - b'|$ . By side-angle-side congruence condition, we have that  $\triangle aob \cong \triangle aob'$ ; in particular  $|a - b'| = |a - b|$ . Therefore from  $\textcircled{2}$  we have that

$$|b - c| \geq |b' - c|.$$

Applying the angle monotonicity (A.25) we get that

$$\angle boc \geq \angle b'oc.$$

Whence

$$\begin{aligned} \angle aob + \angle boc &\geq \angle aob' + \angle b'oc = \\ &= \angle aoc. \end{aligned}$$

□

# Appendix B

## Homework assignments

**HWA-01.** Exercises: A.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 2.14.

**HWA-02.** Exercises: 2.4(b), 2.5, 2.9, 2.15, 2.20.

**HWA-03.** Exercises: 2.16, 2.18, 2.19, 3.3a, 3.5.

**HWA-04.** Exercises: 3.2, 3.4, 3.15, 3.17 + 1.12.17 in the Toponogov's book.

**HWA-05.** Exercises: 3.8, 3.12, 3.13, 4.6, 5.5.

**HWA-06.** Exercises: 3.20, 5.12, 5.13, 5.14, 8.13.

---

**MIDTERM.** 5 problems, 20 points each:

- ◇ 2 theorems from the following list; in the brackets I give the corresponding statement in the Toponogov's book, if it exists.  
2.7, 2.13, 2.17 (Prob. 1.10.4),  
3.1, 3.7 (Thm. 1.10.1), 3.10, 3.11 (Lem. 1.11.2), 3.14, 3.16, 3.18 (Prob. 1.10.6), 4.10 (Thm. 1.9.1),  
5.4 (Prob. 1.7.7), 5.9, 5.15 (Prob. 1.7.1), 5.19, ~~5.23~~.
- ◇ 2 problems from HWA's;
- ◇ 1 new problem.

---

**HWA-07.** Exercises: 3.19, 4.9(a+b), 5.17, 5.21(a+b), 5.26.

**HWA-08.** Exercises: 4.9(finish), 5.28, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6.

**HWA-09.** Exercises: 6.8, 6.9, 7.2, 7.4, 7.9.

**HWA-10.** Exercises: 7.10, 7.13, 7.14, 8.11, 8.14.



**HWA-11.** Exercises: 7.3, 8.6, 8.7, 9.1, 9.6 + try to think about this 10.1.

**HWA-12.** Exercises: 9.7, 10.5, 10.6, 10.7, 10.14.

**HWA-13.** Exercises: 10.15, 10.23, 11.1, 11.5, 11.6.

**HWA-14.** Exercises: 11.7, 11.10, 12.1, 12.9, 12.11.

**FINAL.** 8 problems, 25 points each:

- ◇ 3 theorems from the following list; in the brackets I give the corresponding statement in the Toponogov's book, if it exists.  
 2.7, 2.13, 2.17 (Prob. 1.10.4),  
 3.1, 3.7 (Thm. 1.10.1), 3.10, 3.11 (Lem. 1.11.2), 3.14, 3.16, 3.18 (Prob. 1.10.6), 4.10 (Thm. 1.9.1),  
 5.4 (Prob. 1.7.7), 5.9, 5.15 (Prob. 1.7.1), 5.19, 5.23,  
 7.6, 7.11, 8.5, 8.8, 8.12, 8.15, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4,  
 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.17, 10.19, 11.3, 11.8,  
 12.3, 12.4, 12.5 (first part), TBC.
- ◇ 3 problems from HWA's;
- ◇ 2 new problems.

# Appendix C

## Semisolutions

### Exercise 5.14

*Using the spiral lemma.* If  $\gamma$  does not have a vertex at  $s$  then  $k'(s) \neq 0$  and therefore the curvature of a small arc around  $s$  is monotonic. By spiral lemma the osculating circles at this arc are nested. In particular the curve  $\gamma$  crosses the osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  at  $s$ ; that is,  $\sigma_s$  is not a local support of  $\gamma$  at  $s$ .

We proved that *if  $\gamma$  does not have a vertex at  $s$  then the osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  is not supporting at  $s$ .* The latter is equivalent to the required statement: *if the osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  supports  $\gamma$  at  $s$ , then  $\gamma$  has a vertex at  $s$ .*

*By direct calculations.* Assume the osculating circle  $\sigma_s$  is a circle. Then its center is  $p = \gamma(s) + \frac{1}{k(s)} \cdot \nu(s)$ . Since  $\sigma_s$  is supporting  $\gamma$  at  $s$ , we have that the function

$$f(t) = \langle p - \gamma(t), p - \gamma(t) \rangle$$

has a minimum or maximum at  $s$ .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= 2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), -\tau(t) \rangle; \\ f''(s) &= 2 \cdot \langle -\tau(t), -\tau(t) \rangle - 2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), k(t) \cdot \nu(t) \rangle = \\ &= 2 - 2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), k(t) \cdot \nu(t) \rangle; \\ f'''(s) &= -2 \cdot \langle -\tau(t), k(t) \cdot \nu(t) \rangle - \\ &\quad - 2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), k'(t) \cdot \nu(t) \rangle + 2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), -k^2(t) \cdot \tau(t) \rangle = \\ &= -2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), k'(t) \cdot \nu(t) \rangle + 2 \cdot \langle p - \gamma(t), -k^2(t) \cdot \tau(t) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f'(s) &= -2 \cdot \left\langle \frac{1}{k(s)} \cdot \nu(s), \tau(s) \right\rangle = \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f''(s) &= 2 - 2 \cdot \frac{k(s)}{k(s)} = \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$f'''(s) = -2 \cdot \frac{k'(s)}{k(s)}.$$

Therefore if  $f$  has a local minimum or maximum at  $s$ , then  $f'''(s) = 0$  and therefore  $k'(s) = 0$ .

# Bibliography

- [1] E. Denne. *Alternating quadrisecants of knots*. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2004, p. 119.
- [2] G. D. Chakerian. “An inequality for closed space curves”. *Pacific J. Math.* 12 (1962), pp. 53–57.
- [3] István Fáry. “Sur certaines inégalités géométriques”. *Acta Sci. Math. Szeged* 12. Leopoldo Fejér et Frederico Riesz LXX annos natis dedicatus, Pars A (1950), pp. 117–124.
- [4] G. D. Chakerian. “An inequality for closed space curves”. *Pacific J. Math.* 12 (1962), pp. 53–57.
- [5] Serge Tabachnikov. “The tale of a geometric inequality”. *MASS selecta*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 257–262.
- [6] J. Lagarias and T. Richardson. “Convexity and the average curvature of plane curves”. *Geom. Dedicata* 67.1 (1997), pp. 1–30.
- [7] A. I. Nazarov and F. V. Petrov. “On a conjecture of S. L. Tabachnikov”. *Algebra i Analiz* 19.1 (2007), pp. 177–193.
- [8] John M. Sullivan. “Curves of finite total curvature”. *Discrete differential geometry*. Vol. 38. Oberwolfach Semin. 2008, pp. 137–161.
- [9] Michel Ange Lancret. “Mémoire sur les courbes à double courbure”. *Mémoires présentés à l’Institut des Sciences, Lettres et Arts, par divers savants, et lus dans ses assemblées. Sciences mathématiques et physiques*. 1 (1802), pp. 416–454.
- [10] R. Foote, M. Levi, and S. Tabachnikov. “Tractrices, bicycle tire tracks, hatchet planimeters, and a 100-year-old conjecture”. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 120.3 (2013), pp. 199–216.
- [11] Heinz Hopf. “Über die Drehung der Tangenten und Sehnen ebener Kurven”. *Compositio Math.* 2 (1935), pp. 50–62.
- [12] Heinz Hopf. *Differential geometry in the large*. Second. Vol. 1000. Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Notes taken by Peter Lax and John W. Gray, With a preface by S. S. Chern, With a preface by K. Voss. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989, pp. viii+184.
- [13] P. G. Tait. “Note on the circles of curvature of a plane curve.” *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* 14 (1896), p. 26.
- [14] A. Kneser. „Bemerkungen über die Anzahl der Extreme der Krümmung auf geschlossenen Kurven und über verwandte Fragen in einer nichteuklidischen Geometrie.“ *Heinrich Weber Festschrift*. 1912.
- [15] D. Fuchs and S. Tabachnikov. *Mathematical omnibus*. Thirty lectures on classic mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.
- [16] G. Pestov and V. Ionin. “On the largest possible circle imbedded in a given closed curve”. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 127 (1959), pp. 1170–1172.
- [17] W. Blaschke. *Kreis und Kugel*. Verlag von Veit & Comp., Leipzig, 1916.

- [18] S. Mukhopadhyaya. “New methods in the geometry of a plane arc”. *Bull. Calcutta Math. Soc.* 1 (1909), pp. 31–37.
- [19] R. Osserman. “The four-or-more vertex theorem”. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 92.5 (1985), pp. 332–337.
- [20] J. B. Meusnier. “Mémoire sur la courbure des surfaces”. *Mem. des savans étrangers* 10.1776 (1785), pp. 477–510.
- [21] S. N. Bernstein. “Sur un théorème de géométrie et son application aux équations aux dérivées partielles du type elliptique”. *Comm. de la Soc. Math. de Kharkov (2eme ser.)*, 15 (1915–17), 38–45. 26 (1927). See also: Über ein geometrisches Theorem und seine Anwendung auf die partiellen Differentialgleichungen vom elliptischen Typus, *Math. Zeit.*, 26, pp. 551–558.
- [22] ().
- [23] S. Alexander, V. Kapovitch, and A. Petrunin. *An invitation to Alexandrov geometry: CAT (0) spaces*.
- [24] J. Liberman. “Geodesic lines on convex surfaces”. *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.)* 32 (1941), pp. 310–313.
- [25] V. V. Usov. “The length of the spherical image of a geodesic on a convex surface”. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* 17.1 (1976), pp. 233–236.
- [26] I. D. Berg. “An estimate on the total curvature of a geodesic in Euclidean 3-space-with-boundary.” *Geom. Dedicata* 13 (1982), pp. 1–6.
- [27] N. Lebedeva and A. Petrunin. “On the total curvature of minimizing geodesics on convex surfaces”. *Algebra i Analiz* 29.1 (2017). Reprinted in *St. Petersburg Math. J.* 29 (2018), no. 1, 139–153, pp. 189–208.
- [28] M. Levi. “A “bicycle wheel” proof of the Gauss–Bonnet theorem”. *Exposition. Math.* 12.2 (1994), pp. 145–164.
- [29] K. F. Gauss. “Disquisitiones generales circa superficies curvas”. *Commentationes Societatis Regiae Scientiarum Gottingensis recentiores* 6 (classis mathematicae) (1828). [Translated to English in *General investigations of curved surfaces* 1902.], pp. 99–146.
- [30] Walter Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. 1976.
- [31] P. H. Doyle. “Plane separation”. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 64 (1968), p. 291.
- [32] A. F. Filippov. “An elementary proof of Jordan’s theorem”. *Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.)* 5.5(39) (1950), pp. 173–176.
- [33] Gregory R. Chambers and Yevgeny Liokumovich. “Converting homotopies to isotopies and dividing homotopies in half in an effective way”. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 24.4 (2014), pp. 1080–1100.