Planar CAT($k$) Subspaces

Russell M. Ricks

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Mathematics Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Ricks, Russell M., 'Planar CAT($k$) Subspaces' (2010). All Theses and Dissertations. 2090.
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2090

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.
Planar CAT(k) Subspaces

Russell M. Ricks

A thesis submitted to the faculty of Brigham Young University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

Eric Swenson, Chair
James Cannon
Stephen Humphries
Gregory Conner

Department of Mathematics
Brigham Young University
April 2010

Copyright © 2010 Russell M. Ricks
All Rights Reserved
Planar CAT(k) Subspaces

Russell M. Ricks
Department of Mathematics
Master of Science

Let $M^2_k$ be the complete, simply connected, Riemannian 2-manifold of constant curvature $k \leq 0$. Let $E$ be a closed, simply connected subspace of $M^2_k$ with the property that every two points in $E$ are connected by a rectifiable path in $E$. We show that $E$ is CAT($k$) under the induced path metric.

Keywords: CAT($k$) spaces, Jordan Curve Theorem, nonpositive curvature, convexity
CONTENTS

1 Introduction 1

2 Properties of CAT($k$) Spaces 3
  2.1 The Euclidean Plane and the Hyperbolic Plane 3
  2.2 The CAT($k$) Condition 6

3 Planar Subspaces 8
  3.1 Unique Geodesics 9
  3.2 Simple Geodesic Triangles 12
  3.3 Limit Outer Angles 15
List of Figures

2.1 Alexandrov’s Lemma ........................................ 5
2.2 The CAT(k) Inequality ...................................... 7
3.1 The line parallel to $L$ at $p$ .................................. 10
3.2 Lemma 3.4 ...................................................... 11
3.3 Lemma 3.6 allows three types of lines through an edge of a simple triangle:
   (A) The line intersects the triangle on one side and is locally interior on the
   other side, (B) the line is locally interior on one side and locally exterior on
   the other, or (C) the line is locally interior on both sides. .................. 13
3.4 Lemma 3.9 ...................................................... 16
3.5 Lemma 3.10 ..................................................... 18
Chapter 1. Introduction

Part of geometric group theory is the study of CAT($k$) spaces, in particular CAT(0) spaces. The Russian geometer A. D. Alexandrov gave a characterization for a geodesic metric space to have curvature bounded above by some $k \in \mathbb{R}$. This characterization describes how “fat” a geodesic triangle can be in the space, and it is now called the CAT($k$) inequality (the letters C, A, and T being chosen in honor of Cartan, Alexandrov, and Toponogov). A geodesic triangle which satisfies the CAT($k$) inequality is called CAT($k$), and a geodesic space in which all geodesic triangles are CAT($k$) is called a CAT($k$) space.

The CAT($k$) inequality gives a surprising amount of information about the overall large-scale geometry of a CAT($k$) space, especially for $k \leq 0$. Since for $k < k'$, every CAT($k$) space is also a CAT($k'$) space, a negative value of $k$ gives more information about the space, while a positive value gives less information. In particular, a CAT($k$) space with $k < 0$ is in a sense negatively curved, and its geometry inherits some important properties of hyperbolic geometry. Similarly, a CAT(0) space is nonpositively curved, and its geometry inherits some important properties that both Euclidean and hyperbolic geometry have. A CAT($k$) space with $k > 0$ may have some positive curvature, and its geometry may reflect some spherical properties, but the upper bound still provides some control on the wildness of the space.

Because of the extra information gained by knowing that a space is CAT($k$), an important part of the study of CAT($k$) spaces is to provide theorems that recognize whether a given space is CAT($k$). One goal of these theorems is to provide a way to more easily construct examples of CAT($k$) spaces, by determining when a certain type of construction yields a CAT($k$) space. The goal of this paper is to provide another class of easily-constructed examples for CAT($k$) spaces with $k \leq 0$. In particular, the main theorem is the following.
Theorem 1.1. Let $M^2_k$ be the complete, simply connected, Riemannian 2-manifold of constant curvature $k \leq 0$. Let $E$ be a closed, simply connected subspace of $M^2_k$ with the property that every two points in $E$ are connected by a rectifiable path in $E$. Then $E$ is CAT($k$) under the induced path metric.

The simplest case of this construction is with $k = 0$, where the resultant spaces are “reasonable” subspaces of the Euclidean plane. These spaces are therefore easy to visualize, and they look very CAT(0). However, proving “obvious” theorems in the plane is not always as trivial as one might expect. For example, the Jordan Curve Theorem states that a simple closed curve in the plane bounds exactly two open regions, one of which is bounded, and the curve is precisely the boundary of each region; though the Jordan Curve Theorem looks obvious, it is actually fairly difficult (and long) to prove. The proof we give of Theorem 1.1 relies heavily on the Jordan Curve Theorem.

For Theorem 1.1, one could easily forget the necessity of establishing the equivalence of the obvious notion of angles in the space with the more frequently-used Alexandrov angle (this is proven in Theorem 3.11). Section 3.3 is devoted almost entirely to proving the equivalence and, in fact, represents more than half of the new material (by space consumed, at least) in the paper. On the other hand, the results in Section 3.2, needed to even define the “obvious” angles of Section 3.3, all seem fairly obvious and have simple proofs, yet they were much harder to find (both their statements and their proofs).

See [2] for an alternate treatment of Theorem 1.1 with $k = 0$, and where $E$ is the set of finite-distance points in the homeomorphic image of a closed disk.
Chapter 2. Properties of CAT($k$) Spaces

2.1 The Euclidean Plane and the Hyperbolic Plane

Let $M_k^2$ be the complete, simply connected, Riemannian 2-manifold of constant curvature $k$. Then $M_0^2$ is the Euclidean plane $\mathbb{E}^2$ ($\mathbb{R}^2$ with the standard Euclidean metric). For $k < 0$, the space $M_k^2$ can be obtained from the hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}^2 = M_1^2$ by multiplying all distances by $1/\sqrt{-k}$. Thus in many computations for $k \leq 0$, only the cases $k = 0$ and $k = -1$ are necessary.

The following standard results give a way to compute lengths and angles in $\mathbb{E}^2$ and $\mathbb{H}^2$; the angles used here are the standard angles in the spaces. First, recall the Euclidean law of cosines and the Euclidean law of sines.

**Proposition 2.1 (Law of Cosines).** Suppose $a$, $b$, and $c$ are the side lengths of a Euclidean triangle; let $\theta$ be the angle opposite the side of length $c$. Then

$$c^2 = a^2 + b^2 - 2ab\cos \theta.$$

**Proposition 2.2 (Law of Sines).** Suppose $a$, $b$, and $c$ are the side lengths of a Euclidean triangle; let $A$, $B$, and $C$ be the angles opposite the sides of length $a$, $b$, and $c$, respectively. Then

$$\frac{\sin A}{a} = \frac{\sin B}{b} = \frac{\sin C}{c}.$$

In hyperbolic space, we have the following hyperbolic law of cosines. Both [3] and [4] give a proof.

**Proposition 2.3 (Hyperbolic Law of Cosines).** Suppose $a$, $b$, and $c$ are the side lengths of
a hyperbolic triangle; let $\theta$ be the angle opposite the side of length $c$. Then

$$\cosh c = \cosh a \cosh b - \sinh a \sinh b \cos \theta.$$ 

Also, we have the following hyperbolic law of sines (proven in [4]).

**Proposition 2.4** (Hyperbolic Law of Sines). Suppose $a$, $b$, and $c$ are the side lengths of a hyperbolic triangle; let $A$, $B$, and $C$ be the angles opposite the sides of length $a$, $b$, and $c$, respectively. Then

$$\frac{\sin A}{\sinh a} = \frac{\sin B}{\sinh b} = \frac{\sin C}{\sinh c}.$$ 

Another classical fact of Euclidean geometry is that, given any line $L$ and point $p$ not on $L$, there is a unique line $L'$ parallel to $L$ (i.e., $L'$ does not intersect $L$) that passes through the point $p$. Moreover, the metric distance $d(L, L') = \inf_{x \in L} \inf_{y \in L'} d(x, y)$ between $L$ and $L'$ equals the distance between $p$ and $L'$, and the line segment from $p$ to the point $q \in L$ closest to $p$ meets both $L$ and $L'$ at an angle of $\pi/2$.

Hyperbolic geometry has parallel (non-intersecting) lines, but they are not uniquely defined by a line and a point, as in Euclidean geometry. However, given a line $L \subset \mathbb{H}_2$ and a point $p \in \mathbb{H}_2 \setminus L$, let $K$ be the line segment from $p$ to the point $q \in L$ closest to $p$; then there is a unique line $L'$ in $\mathbb{H}_2$ such that $p \in L'$ and the angle between $L'$ and $K$ is $\pi/2$ on both sides. As a result, the metric distance between $L$ and $L'$ equals the distance between $p$ and $q$. We will use this construction to simplify our arguments later (see Definition 3.3).

Finally, the following result is often useful in constructing CAT($k$) spaces. The statement here follows [3, pp. 25-26], where it is also proved; however, here we consider only $k \leq 0$, which simplifies the statement slightly.

**Proposition 2.5** (Alexandrov’s Lemma). Consider four distinct points $A, B, B', C \in M^2_k$. Suppose that $B$ and $B'$ lie on opposite sides of the line through $A$ and $C$. 


Consider the geodesic triangles $\triangle = \triangle(A, B, C)$ and $\triangle' = \triangle(A, B', C)$. Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ (resp. $\alpha', \beta', \gamma'$) be the angles of $\triangle$ (resp. $\triangle'$) at the vertices $A, B, C$ (resp. $A, B', C$). Assume that $\gamma + \gamma' \geq \pi$. Then,

$$d(B, C) + d(B', C) \leq d(B, A) + d(B', A).$$

Let $\overline{\triangle}$ be a triangle in $M^2_k$ with vertices $\overline{A}, \overline{B}, \overline{B'}$ such that $d(\overline{A}, \overline{B}) = d(A, B)$, $d(\overline{A}, \overline{B'}) = d(A, B')$ and $d(\overline{B}, \overline{B'}) = d(B, C) + d(C, B')$. Let $\overline{C}$ be the point of $[\overline{B}, \overline{B'}]$ with $d(\overline{B}, \overline{C}) = d(B, C)$. Let $\overline{\alpha}, \overline{\beta}, \overline{\beta'}$ be the angles of $\overline{\triangle}$ at the vertices $\overline{A}, \overline{B}, \overline{B'}$. Then,

$$\overline{\alpha} \geq \alpha + \alpha', \overline{\beta} \geq \beta, \overline{\beta'} \geq \beta', d(A, C) \leq d(\overline{A}, \overline{C});$$

any on equality implies the others, and occurs if and only if $\gamma + \gamma' = \pi$.

Figure 2.1: Alexandrov’s Lemma
2.2 The CAT($k$) Condition

Let $\triangle$ be a geodesic triangle (in some metric space) with side lengths $a$, $b$, and $c$. A geodesic triangle in $M^2_k$ is called a comparison triangle for $\triangle$ in $M^2_k$ if the lengths of its sides are $a$, $b$, and $c$. To describe the CAT($k$) inequality, we will use the following fact (see [3, p. 24] for a proof).

**Proposition 2.6** (Existence of Comparison Triangles in $M^2_k$). Let $a$, $b$, and $c$ be nonnegative real numbers such that $a \leq b+c$, $b \leq a+c$, and $c \leq a+b$. For every $k \leq 0$, there exists some geodesic triangle in $M^2_k$ with side lengths $a$, $b$, and $c$. Furthermore, this triangle is unique up to isometry of $M^2_k$.

Let $\triangle$ be a geodesic triangle with vertices $p$, $q$, and $r$. Let $\overline{\triangle}$ be a comparison triangle for $\triangle$ in $M^2_k$ with corresponding vertices $\overline{p}$, $\overline{q}$, and $\overline{r}$. If $x$ lies on the edge between $p$ and $q$, $\overline{x}$ lies on the edge between $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{q}$, and $d(\overline{x}, \overline{p}) = d(x, p)$, then $\overline{x}$ is called a comparison point for $x$ on $\overline{\triangle}$.

**Definition 2.7** (CAT($k$) Inequality). Let $\triangle$ be a geodesic triangle in the metric space $X$, and let $\overline{\triangle}$ be the comparison triangle for $\triangle$ in $M^2_k$. Then $\triangle$ is said to satisfy the CAT($k$) inequality if

$$d(x, y) \leq d(\overline{x}, \overline{y})$$

for all $x, y \in \triangle$ with comparison points $\overline{x}, \overline{y}$, respectively, on $\overline{\triangle}$. If $X$ is a geodesic space in which all geodesic triangles are CAT($k$), then $X$ is said to be CAT($k$).

The concept of a CAT($k$) space is closely related to the Alexandrov angle at the vertex of a geodesic triangle. Let $X$ be a geodesic space, and let $\angle^{(k)}_p(q, r)$ be the angle at $p$ in the comparison triangle $\triangle(\overline{p}, \overline{q}, \overline{r})$ in $M^2_k$ for $\triangle(p, q, r)$. (Note that although the geodesics between $p$, $q$, and $r$ may not be unique, the lengths of all geodesics are equal, hence $\angle^{(k)}_p(q, r)$ is also well-defined.) Now suppose $\sigma: [0, 1] \to X$ and $\tau: [0, 1] \to X$ are constant-speed
geodesic line segments emanating from the point $p \in X$, with $\sigma(1) = q$ and $\tau(1) = r$. The
Alexandrov angle between $\sigma$ and $\tau$ is defined as

$$\angle_p(\sigma, \tau) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \sup_{0 < t, t' < \epsilon} \angle_p^{(0)}(\sigma(t), \tau(t')).$$

If $X$ is uniquely geodesic, then we say the Alexandrov angle at $p$ between $q$ and $r$ is

$$\angle_p(q, r) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \sup_{0 < t, t' < \epsilon} \angle_p^{(0)}(\sigma(t), \tau(t')).$$

Although the Alexandrov angle is defined only in terms of comparison triangles in $M^2_0 = \mathbb{E}^2$, using comparison triangles in $M^2_k$ for any $k$ would give the same result (see [3, p. 25]):

**Proposition 2.8.** Let $X$ be a geodesic space and suppose $\sigma: [0, 1] \to X$ and $\tau: [0, 1] \to X$
are constant-speed geodesic line segments emanating from the point $p \in X$, with $\sigma(1) = q$
and $\tau(1) = r$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{R},$

$$\angle_p(q, r) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \sup_{0 < t, t' < \epsilon} \angle_p^{(k)}(\sigma(t), \tau(t')).$$
The following fact about the Alexandrov angle is often very useful (see [3, p. 10]).

**Proposition 2.9** (Triangle Inequality for Angles). Let $X$ be a metric space and let $c$, $c'$ and $c''$ be three geodesic paths in $X$ issuing from the same point $p$. Then,

$$\angle(c, c') \leq \angle(c, c'') + \angle(c'', c').$$

The CAT$(k)$ inequality is equivalent to other conditions involving the Alexandrov angles in geodesic triangles (see [3, p. 161-162]). We will use the following one.

**Theorem 2.10.** Let $X$ be a geodesic metric space and $k \leq 0$. Then $X$ is CAT$(k)$ if and only if $\angle_p(q, r) \leq \angle_p^{(k)}(q, r)$ for every triple of distinct points $p, q, r \in X$.

For more on CAT$(k)$ spaces, we refer the reader to [3] or [1].

**CHAPTER 3. PLANAR SUBSPACES**

Our goal in this section is to prove the main result (stated in the introduction):

**Theorem (1.1).** Let $M^2_k$ be the complete, simply connected, Riemannian 2-manifold of constant curvature $k \leq 0$. Let $E$ be a closed, simply connected subspace of $M^2_k$ with the property that every two points in $E$ are connected by a rectifiable path in $E$. Then $E$ is CAT$(k)$ under the induced path metric.

Note the following convention.

**Convention.** We will use the terms *line* and *line segment* to refer to standard geodesic lines and geodesic line segments in $M^2_k$. We will use *geodesic* and *geodesic segment* to refer to the geodesics and geodesic segments in $E$ under the induced path metric.
3.1 Unique Geodesics

Let $E$ be a closed, simply connected subspace of $M_k^2$ with the property that every pair of points in $E$ are connected by a rectifiable path in $E$. Let $d$ be the induced subspace metric and $\bar{d}$ the induced path metric on $E$. We will write $B_d(p, r)$ and $\bar{B}_d(p, r)$, respectively, for the open and closed balls of radius $r$ about $p \in E$ in the standard metric on $M_k^2$.

Since $E$ is closed in $M_k^2$, we know $(E, d)$ is complete. The proofs of the following two more general results are provided for completeness.

**Lemma 3.1.** The induced path metric on a complete metric space is complete.

**Proof.** Let $(X, d)$ be a complete metric space and $(X, \bar{d})$ be the induced path metric on $X$. Suppose $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(X, \bar{d})$. Since $\bar{d}(x, y) \geq d(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$, we know $\{x_n\}$ is also Cauchy in $(X, d)$. Hence $x_n$ converges under $d$ to some $x \in X$. Now a Cauchy sequence converges if and only if it has a convergent subsequence, so we may assume, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, that $\bar{d}(x_n, x_m) < 2^{-m}$ for all $m, n$ with $n > m$.

So for each $m$ there exists a path $c_m : [0, 1] \to X$ from $x_m$ to $x_{m+1}$ with $l(c_m) \leq 2^{-m}$ by assumption. By linear reparameterization, we have paths $p_m : [1 - 2^{-m+1}, 1 - 2^{-m}] \to X$ from $x_m$ to $x_{m+1}$ with $l(p_m) \leq 2^{-m}$. Pasting these paths together and setting $p(1) = x$, we have a continuous map $p : [0, 1] \to X$. Thus $p$ is a path from $x_m$ to $x$ of length at most $\sum_{j=m}^\infty 2^{-j} = 2^{-m+1}$, so $\bar{d}(x_m, x) \leq 2^{-m+1}$. Therefore, $x_m \to x$ under $\bar{d}$.

**Corollary 3.2.** Suppose $X$ is a complete metric space, and every two points in $X$ are connected by a rectifiable path. Then the induced path metric on $X$ is geodesic.

**Proof.** By definition of path length, every pair of points $x, y \in X$ has approximate midpoints (see [3, p. 164]). Thus $X$, being complete, is geodesic.

The following construction gives us a useful notion of parallel lines in $M_k^2$. 


**Definition 3.3.** Let $L$ be a line in $M_k^2$ and $p$ be a point in $M_k^2 \setminus L$. Let $K$ be the line segment from $p$ to the point $q \in L$ closest to $p$. There is a unique line $L'$ in $M_k^2$ such that $p \in L'$ and the angle between $L'$ and $K$ is $\pi/2$ on both sides. We call $L'$ the line parallel to $L$ at $p$ and write $\text{par}(L, p)$ for $L'$.

Note that the metric distance between $L$ and $L'$ equals the distance between $p$ and $q$ in the above definition.

**Lemma 3.4.** $(E, \bar{d})$ is uniquely geodesic.

**Proof.** Suppose $\sigma: [a, b] \to E$ and $\tau: [a, b] \to E$ are distinct unit-speed geodesics with $p = \sigma(a) = \tau(a)$ and $q = \sigma(b) = \tau(b)$. Note that since both are unit-speed geodesics, $\sigma(t)$ is in the image of $\tau$ if and only if $\sigma(t) = \tau(t)$, and similarly for $\tau(t)$. Since $\sigma$ and $\tau$ are distinct, there is some $t_0 \in (a, b)$ such that $\sigma(t_0) \neq \tau(t_0)$, hence $\sigma(t_0)$ is not in the image of $\tau$. Taking the last $a' \in [a, t_0]$ and the first $b' \in [t_0, b]$ such that $p' = \sigma(a')$ and $q' = \sigma(b')$ are both in the image of $\tau$, we have that $C = \sigma([a', b']) \cup \tau([a', b'])$ is a simple closed curve in $E$.

Let $L$ be the line in $M_k^2$ between $p'$ and $q'$. Let $R$ be the maximum distance from $L$ to $C$, and let $t_1$ be the first point of $[a', b']$ such that either $d(\sigma(t_1), L) = R$ or $d(\tau(t_1), L) = R$. We may assume $d(\sigma(t_1), L) = R$. Then, since $C$ is a simple closed curve and $a' < t_1 < b'$, there
is some radius $r > 0$ about $y = \sigma(t_1)$ such that $\overline{B}_d(y, r)$ does not intersect $\tau([a', b'])$. Let $A$ be the connected component of $C \cap \overline{B}_d(y, r)$ containing $y$, and let $s_0 \in [a', t_1]$ and $s_1 \in [t_1, b']$ satisfy $\sigma([s_0, s_1]) = A$.

Now let $L'$ be the line through $\sigma(s_0)$ and $\sigma(s_1)$. Note that $d(\sigma(s_0), L) < d(y, L)$ and $d(\sigma(s_1), L) \leq d(y, L)$ by choice of $y$, so $y \notin L'$ by convexity of $d$. By the Jordan curve theorem, $y$ is the limit of points in the interior region $D$ bounded by $C$. So there is some point $x \in D$ with $d(x, y) < d(x, L')$. Let $L'' = \text{par}(L', x)$; since $d(x, L') = d(L'', L')$, we also have $L' \cap L'' = \emptyset$. Since $x$ is in $D$, $L''$ hits $C$ on each side of $x$; by construction, $L''$ first hits $C$ inside $\overline{B}_d(y, r)$ in each direction. By choice of $r$, we therefore have a straight line segment through $D$ between two points on $\sigma([a', b'])$ where $\sigma$ does not follow the line segment exactly. But $D \subset E$ since $(E, \overline{d})$ is simply connected, so this contradicts $\sigma$ being geodesic. Therefore, $(E, \overline{d})$ is uniquely geodesic. \[\square\]
3.2 Simple Geodesic Triangles

We will use the following terminology: Call a geodesic triangle $T \subset (E, \bar{d})$ simple if $T \subset (E, d)$ is a simple closed curve. For this section, let $T$ be a simple geodesic triangle in $(E, \bar{d})$ with interior (under the standard $M_k^2$ metric) $S$ and exterior $U$.

**Proposition 3.5.** Let $L$ be a line in $M_k^2$ that passes through two distinct points $p$ and $q$ that lie on a single edge $A$ of $T$. Let $L_0$ be the open line segment between $p$ and $q$. If $L_0$ has empty intersection with $T$ then $L_0 \subset U$.

**Proof.** Since $T$ is a simple closed curve in $(E, d)$ and $(E, d)$ is simply connected, $S \subset E$. Hence if $L_0$ has empty intersection with $T$, we have that $L_0$ is contained entirely in either $S$ or $U$. But $L_0 \subset S$ would give us $L_0 \subset E$, and this contradicts the hypothesis that $A$ is the shortest path in $E$ from $p$ to $q$. Therefore, $L_0 \subset U$. □

**Lemma 3.6.** Let $L$ be a line in $M_k^2$ that passes through the point $p \in T$, where $p$ is not a vertex of $T$. Let $A$ be the edge of $T$ that contains $p$. Suppose that $r > 0$ is a radius such that $T \cap B_d(p, r) \subset A$, and let $L^-$ and $L^+$ be the two components of $L \cap B_d(p, r) \setminus \{p\}$. Then at least one of $L^-$ and $L^+$ has empty intersection with $U$. Moreover, if $L^- \cap T = L^- \cap A \neq \emptyset$ then $L^+ \cap U = \emptyset$.

**Proof.** First suppose, by way of contradiction, that there exist points $x \in L^- \cap U$ and $y \in L^+ \cap U$. Let $r' > 0$ be some radius with $r' < r$ such that we have both $B_d(x, r') \subset U$ and $B_d(y, r') \subset U$. Now by the Jordan Curve Theorem, $T = \partial S$, so there is some point $q \in S$ close enough to $p$ that $L' = \text{par}(L, q)$ hits points $x'$ in $B_d(x, r')$ and $y'$ in $B_d(y, r')$.

Now $L'$ must be exterior at $x'$ and $y'$, but interior at $q$; furthermore, $q$ lies between $x'$ and $y'$ on $L'$ by construction. Thus $L'$ must hit $T$ somewhere between $x'$ and $q$ and somewhere between $q$ and $y'$. Therefore, $L'$ hits $T$ at two points $x''$ and $y''$ closest to $q$ (on opposite sides). By hypothesis on the radius $r$, we must have $x'' \in A$ and $y'' \in A$. Hence $L'$ contains
Figure 3.3: Lemma 3.6 allows three types of lines through an edge of a simple triangle: (A) the line intersects the triangle on one side and is locally interior on the other side, (B) the line is locally interior on one side and locally exterior on the other, or (C) the line is locally interior on both sides.

a line segment between two points of $A$ that is completely interior by construction. This contradicts Proposition 3.5, and therefore at least one of $L^-$ and $L^+$ has empty intersection with $U$.

Suppose now that there is some point $z \in T \cap L^-$ and some point $w \in U \cap L^+$. Let $r' > 0$ be some radius with $r' < r$ such that we have $B_d(w, r') \subset U$. The Jordan Curve Theorem guarantees points in $U$ arbitrarily close to $z$, so let $z' \in U$ be close enough to $z$ that the line $L''$ passing through the points $z'$ and $p$ enters $B_d(w, r')$. But then $L''$ passes through the point $p$ and has nonempty intersection with $U$ on both sides of $p$, which contradicts the result of the previous paragraph. Hence $L^+$ must have empty intersection with $U$ if $L^-$ has nonempty intersection with $T$.

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 3.7.** Let $p_1$, $p_2$, and $p_3$ be three distinct points on a single edge $A$ of $T$. Suppose
that $p_1$, $p_2$, and $p_3$ lie on a line $L$ in $M^2_k$, with $p_1$ and $p_3$ on opposite sides of $p_2$. Let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be the open line segments from $p_1$ to $p_2$ and from $p_2$ to $p_3$, respectively. If $L_1$ and $L_2$ both have empty intersection with $T \setminus A$, then the arc from $p_1$ to $p_3$ along $T$ follows $L$.

**Proof.** Suppose both $L_1$ and $L_2$ have empty intersection with $T \setminus A$. Then Proposition 3.5 implies that both $L_1$ and $L_2$ must have empty intersection with the interior. Hence Lemma 3.6 gives us that if $L_1$ has nonempty intersection with $U$, then $L_2$ must follow $A$, so $L_2$ has nonempty intersection with $T$, and thus $L_1$ has empty intersection with $U$; this is a contradiction, so $L_1$ must have empty intersection with $U$. Thus $L_1$ follows $A$ (i.e., $L_1 \subset A$). Similarly, $L_2$ must follow $A$. Therefore, the arc from $p_1$ to $p_3$ along $T$ follows $L$. □

**Lemma 3.8.** Suppose the vertices of $T$ are $x$, $y$, and $z$. Let $\triangle'$ be the triangle in $M^2_k$ with vertices $x$, $y$, and $z$, and let $C \subset M^2_k$ be the convex hull of $\triangle'$. Then $T$ is contained in $C$.

**Proof.** Suppose, by way of contradiction, that $p \in T \setminus C$. Let $L$ be the line passing through $x$ and $y$. We may assume that $p$ lies in the component of $M^2_k \setminus L$ that contains no point of $C$; let $H$ be the closure of this component. Then $H \cap T$ is compact and nonempty, so it contains at least one point $p'$ of maximum distance to $L$. Let $L'$ be the line parallel to $L$ at $p'$. Now $L' \cap T$ is compact and nonempty, so let $q$ be a point on $L' \cap T$ of maximum distance to $p'$.

Since $q \notin C$, $q$ is not a vertex of $T$. Hence there is a radius $r > 0$ such that $B_d(q, r)$ touches no point of any edge of $T$ other than the one on which $q$ lies. Let $L'^-$ and $L'^+$ be the two components of $L' \cap B_d(q, r) \setminus \{q\}$. Lemma 3.6 requires both $L'^+$ and $L'^-$ to be in $T$ since $L' \cap S$ is empty, but this contradicts our choice of $q$. Therefore, $T \subset C$, and the theorem is proved. □
3.3 Limit Outer Angles

If \( p, q, \) and \( r \) are distinct points in \( E \), we will call the angle in \( M^2_k \) at \( p \) between \( q \) and \( r \) the outer angle at \( p \) between \( q \) and \( r \), and denote it \( A_p(q, r) \). Now suppose \( \sigma: [0, 1] \to E \) and \( \tau: [0, 1] \to E \) are constant-speed geodesic line segments emanating from the point \( p \in E \), the images of which intersect only at \( p \), with \( \sigma(1) = q \) and \( \tau(1) = r \). By Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 3.8, we have that \( A_p(\sigma(t), \tau(t')) \) decreases monotonically in both \( t \) and \( t' \), so the limit outer angle
\[
A'_p(q, r) = \lim_{t, t' \to 0} A_p(\sigma(t), \tau(t'))
\]
is well defined. We will show that the limit outer angle \( A'_p(q, r) \) equals the Alexandrov angle \( \angle_p(q, r) \).

As before, let \( T \) be a simple geodesic triangle in \((E, \bar{d})\) with interior (under the standard \( M^2_k \) metric) \( S \) and exterior \( U \); denote the vertices \( p, q, \) and \( r \). Also, let \( \sigma: [0, 1] \to E \) and \( \tau: [0, 1] \to E \) be the geodesic line segments from \( p \) to \( q \) and from \( p \) to \( r \), respectively.

**Lemma 3.9.** Suppose \( A'_p(q, r) < \frac{\pi}{2} \), and \( \tau \) follows a line \( L \) in \( M^2_k \) near \( p \) (i.e., \( \tau([0, \delta]) \subseteq L \) for some \( \delta > 0 \)). Then there exists \( t_1 > 0 \) such that, for any \( t \) with \( 0 < t < t_1 \), the line segment from \( \sigma(t) \) to \( L \) perpendicular to \( L \) is contained in \( S \cup T \).

**Proof.** Since \( A_p(\sigma(t), \tau(t')) \) decreases monotonically in both \( t \) and \( t' \), we may find some \( \delta' \in (0, \delta] \) such that \( A_p(\sigma(t), \tau(t')) < \frac{\pi}{2} \) for all \( t \) and \( t' \) with \( 0 < t, t' \leq \delta' \). Let \( D = \overline{B}_d(p, \epsilon) \), where \( \epsilon > 0 \) is small enough that \( D \cap T \subseteq \sigma([0, \delta']) \cup \tau([0, \delta']) \). Let \( P \) be projection in \( M^2_k \) onto \( L \), with domain restricted to the image of \( \sigma \), and let \( L^+ \) be the component of \( L \setminus \{p\} \) that has nonempty intersection with the image of \( \tau \).

Since \( A'_p(q, r) < \frac{\pi}{2} \), there is some \( t_0 > 0 \) with \( C = \sigma([0, t_0]) \subseteq D \) such that \( P(\sigma(t)) \in L^+ \) for every \( t \) with \( 0 < t \leq t_0 \). Since \( P \) is continuous and \( C \) is compact, \( P(C) \) has some point \( q_1 = \sigma(t_1) \in C \) such that \( P(q_1) \) attains the maximum distance from \( p \). We further require
that $t_1$ be the smallest such value.

![Figure 3.4: Lemma 3.9](image)

Now suppose, by way of contradiction, the line segment $L'$ from $q_2 = \sigma(t_2)$ to $P(q_2)$ contains a point of $U$ for some $t_2$ with $0 < t_2 < t_1$ (note that $L' \perp L$). Let $t_3$ be the smallest positive value such that $q_3 = \sigma(t_3)$ lies on $L'$. If $t_3 = t_2$ then the line segment between $q_2$ and $P(q_2)$ cuts one of $S$ or $U$ into two components; by Lemma 3.8, it must therefore have interior in $S$, which contradicts our hypothesis on $t_2$. Thus $0 < t_3 < t_2$, and $L'$ has nontrivial intersection with $U$ between $q_2$ and $q_3$. Hence some $t'_2$ with $t_3 < t'_2 < t_2$ must have $P(\sigma(t'_2))$ farther from $p$ than $P(q_2) = P(q_3)$. Let $q'_2 = \sigma(t'_2)$, and let $s$ be the midpoint between $P(q_2)$ and $P(q'_2)$. By the intermediate value theorem, there must be some $s_1$ with $t_2 < s_1 < t_1$ such that $P(s_1) = s$. Similarly, $P^{-1}(s)$ must contain points $\sigma(s_2)$ and $\sigma(s_3)$ with $t'_2 < s_2 < t_2$ and $t_3 < s_3 < t'_2$. Thus these three points lie on a line in $M^2_k$ (orthogonal to $L$), so by Corollary 3.7, $q_2$ and $q'_2$ must also lie on this line; this is a contradiction, so no such point $q_2$ can exist.
Therefore, for any $t$ with $0 < t < t_1$, the line segment from $\sigma(t)$ to $L$ perpendicular to $L$ is contained in $S \cup T$. 

\[ \text{Lemma 3.10. Suppose that } A_p'(q, r) = 0 \text{ and } \tau \text{ follows a line } L \text{ in } M^2_k \text{ near } p. \text{ Then } \angle_p(q, r) = 0. \]

\[ \text{Proof. For simplicity, we assume } k = 0 \text{ or } k = -1. \text{ Let } \epsilon > 0 \text{ be given. Since } A_p(\sigma(t), \tau(t')) \text{ decreases monotonically in both } t \text{ and } t', \text{ we may find some } \delta > 0 \text{ such that } A_p(\sigma(t), \tau(t')) < \epsilon \text{ for all } t \text{ and } t' \text{ with } \sigma(t), \tau(t') \in \overline{B}_d(p, \delta) \setminus \{p\}. \text{ Replacing } \delta \text{ by a smaller positive constant if necessary, we may assume that every point of } T \text{ in } D \text{ is in the image of } \sigma \text{ or } \tau \text{ and that the image of } \tau \text{ in } D \text{ follows } L. \text{ Let } P \text{ be the projection from the image of } \sigma \text{ onto } L, \text{ and let } t_1 \text{ be the point guaranteed by Lemma 3.9.}

\text{Let } \delta' \text{ be the distance in } M^2_k \text{ from } p \text{ to } P(\sigma(t_1)), \text{ and note that } 0 < \delta' < \delta. \text{ Suppose that } q' \text{ and } r' \text{ are points in } B_d(p, \delta') \setminus \{p\} \text{ along the images of } \sigma \text{ and } \tau, \text{ respectively. Let } a = d(p, q'), b = d(p, r'), \text{ and } c = d(q', r'), \text{ and let } \phi = A_p(q', r'). \text{ Also let } a' = \bar{d}(p, q') \text{ and } c' = \bar{d}(q', r'); \text{ note that } a' \geq a \text{ and } c' \geq c. \text{ Since } \sigma \text{ is a geodesic, the path straight from } p \text{ to } P(q') \text{ and then straight to } q', \text{ which stays in } E \text{ by choice of } t_1, \text{ must have length at least } a'. \text{ Hence if } k = 0 \text{ then}

\[ a' \leq a(\cos \phi + \sin \phi) \leq a(1 + \sin \phi) \leq a(1 + \sin \epsilon) \leq a(1 + \epsilon), \]

\[ \text{and if } k = -1 \text{ then by the hyperbolic law of sines,}
\]

\[ \sinh a' \leq (\cos \phi + \sin \phi) \sinh a \leq (1 + \epsilon) \sinh a. \]

\[ \text{Now suppose that } c' = c. \text{ By the law of cosines,}
\]

\[ \cos \angle_p^{(0)}(q', r') = \frac{(a')^2 + b^2 - c^2}{2(a')b} \geq \frac{a^2 + b^2 - c^2}{2a'b} \geq \frac{a^2 + b^2 - c^2}{2a(1 + \epsilon)b} = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \cos \phi. \]
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and by the hyperbolic law of cosines,

\[
\cos \angle_p^{(-1)}(q', r') = \cosh a' \cosh b - \cosh c \geq \frac{\cosh a \cosh b - \cosh c}{(1 + \epsilon) \sinh a \sinh b} = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \cos \phi.
\]

On the other hand, suppose \( c' > c \). Note that, by choice of \( t_1 \), the geodesic triangle with vertices \( p, \sigma(t_1), \) and \( P(\sigma(t_1)) \) is simple. The interior of this triangle is contained in \( S \), and \( q' \neq \sigma(t_1) \). Thus \( L' = \text{par}(L, q') \) must be locally interior on one side of \( q' \). Let \( L_0' \) be the segment of \( L' \) with \( q' \) as one endpoint, interior in \( S \), and other endpoint in \( T \). Let \( p' \in T \) be the other endpoint. Since \( T \) is a simple triangle, \( q' \notin L \), and therefore \( p' \notin L \). But \( p' \notin \sigma([0, t_1]) \), so \( p' \) must lie on the line segment from \( \sigma(t_1) \) to \( P(\sigma(t_1)) \). Hence both \( L_0' \) and the line segment from \( q' \) to \( P(q') \) lie in \( S \cup T \). Thus, if \( P(q') \) lies between \( p \) and \( r' \) on the line \( L \), then the line segment from \( r' \) to \( q' \) is contained in \( S \cup T \). Therefore, the outer angle \( A_{p'}(p, q') \) is greater than \( \frac{\pi}{2} \), and so \( a > c \).

![Figure 3.5: Lemma 3.10](image)

Now consider the line segment in \( M_k^2 \) from \( r' \) to \( q' \): It hits \( T \) at a first point \( s \) (the edge
hit is the one between $p$ and $q'$. Let $\gamma$ be the path which travels from $r'$ to $s$ along the line segment and then from $s$ to $q'$ along $\sigma$. Note that the length $\ell(\gamma)$ of $\gamma$ is at least $c'$. Let $\alpha$ be the path that travels in a straight line from $p$ to $s$ and then straight from $s$ to $q'$, and let $\alpha'$ be the path that travels in a straight line from $p$ to $s$ and then from $s$ to $q'$ along $\sigma$. Note that $a \leq \ell(\alpha) \leq \ell(\alpha') \leq a'$. Hence $a + c' \leq \ell(\alpha) + \ell(\gamma) = \ell(\alpha') + c \leq a' + c$, and thus $a' - c' \geq a - c$. Therefore, $a > c$ gives us $a' - c' > 0$. Since $a' \geq a > 0$ and $c' \geq c > 0$, we have

$$(a')^{n+1} - (c')^{n+1} = (a' - c') \sum_{k=0}^{n} (a')^k (c')^{n-k} \geq (a - c) \sum_{k=0}^{n} a^k c^{n-k} = a^{n+1} - c^{n+1}$$

for all integers $n \geq 0$. Hence for $k = 0$ we have

$$\cos \angle_p^{(0)}(q', r') = \frac{(a')^2 + b^2 - (c')^2}{2(a')b} \geq \frac{a^2 + b^2 - c^2}{2(a')b} \geq \frac{a^2 + b^2 - c^2}{2a(1 + \epsilon)b} = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \cos \phi,$$

and for $k = -1$ we have

$$\cosh a' - \cosh c' = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n)!} ((a')^{2n} - (c')^{2n}) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n)!} (a^{2n} - c^{2n}) = \cosh a - \cosh c.$$

Hence $\cosh a' - \cosh a \geq \cosh c' - \cosh c$, so the fact that $\cosh b \geq 1$ gives us $\cosh a' \cosh b - \cosh a \cosh b \geq \cosh c' - \cosh c$, and therefore $\cosh a' \cosh b - \cosh c' \geq \cosh a \cosh b - \cosh c$. Thus

$$\cos \angle_p^{(-1)}(q', r') = \frac{\cosh a' \cosh b - \cosh c'}{\sinh a' \sinh b} \geq \frac{\cosh a \cosh b - \cosh c}{(1 + \epsilon) \sinh a \sinh b} = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \cos \phi.$$
Thus, in either case,

\[ \cos \angle_p(q', r') \geq \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} \cos \phi, \]

and therefore we obtain \( \angle_p(q', r') \leq A_p'(q', r') = 0 \) as \( \epsilon \) tends to zero. This concludes the proof of the lemma.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 3.11.** In a simple geodesic triangle \( T \) with vertices \( p, q, \) and \( r, \)

\[ A_p'(q, r) = \angle_p(q, r). \]

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.5, the rays \( R_{1,t} \) from \( p \) through \( \sigma(t) \) limit monotonically to a ray \( R_1 \) as \( t \) tends to zero. Similarly, the rays \( R_{2,t} \) from \( p \) through \( \tau(t) \) limit monotonically to a ray \( R_2 \) as \( t \) tends to zero.

Suppose first that \( R_1 \neq R_2. \) By construction, \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) are locally contained in \( S \cup T \) near \( p. \) Let \( s_1 \) be the last point of \( R_1 \) contained in \( S \cup T. \) Clearly, \( s_1 \in T; \) if \( s_1 \) lies along \( \sigma \) then \( s_1 \) must equal \( q \) by Lemma 3.6. Since \( R_1 \) is locally contained in \( S \cup T \) near \( p, \) we have \( s_1 \neq p, \) and thus \( s_1 \) cannot lie along \( \tau. \) Therefore, \( s_1 \) lies along the geodesic arc between \( q \) and \( r. \) Similarly, the last point \( s_2 \) of \( R_2 \) that is contained in \( S \cup T \) must lie along the geodesic arc between \( q \) and \( r. \) Note that \( \angle_p(s_1, s_2) = A_p'(q, r), \) since both measure the angle between \( R_1 \) and \( R_2. \)

If \( \sigma \) follows \( R_1 \) for some positive distance beyond \( p, \) then \( \angle_p(q, s_1) = 0 \) by definition. On the other hand, if \( \sigma \) does not follow \( R_1 \) for any positive distance beyond \( p, \) then the geodesic triangle \( T_1 = \triangle(p, q, s_1) \) is simple, and \( \angle_p(q, s_1) = 0 \) by Lemma 3.10. Thus in either case, \( \angle_p(q, s_1) = 0; \) similarly, \( \angle_p(s_2, r) = 0. \) Hence

\[ \angle_p(q, r) \leq \angle_p(q, s_1) + \angle_p(s_1, s_2) + \angle_p(s_2, r) = \angle_p(s_1, s_2) \]
and
\[ \angle_p(s_1, s_2) \leq \angle_p(s_1, q) + \angle_p(q, r) + \angle_p(r, s_2) = \angle_p(q, r) \]

by Proposition 2.9. Therefore \( \angle_p(q, r) = \angle_p(s_1, s_2) = A'_p(q, r). \)

Finally, suppose \( R_1 = R_2; \) note that this gives \( A'_p(q, r) = 0. \) If \( \sigma \) follows \( R_1 \) for some positive distance beyond \( p, \) then \( \angle_p(q, r) = A'_p(q, r) = 0 \) by Lemma 3.10. Thus we may assume, by symmetry, that neither \( \sigma \) nor \( \tau \) follows \( R_1 \) for any positive distance beyond \( p. \)

Then by construction of \( R_1 = R_2, \) the last point \( s \) of \( R_1 \) contained in \( S \cup T \) must be along the geodesic arc from \( q \) to \( r. \) Hence the geodesic triangles \( T_1 = \triangle(p, q, s) \) and \( T_2 = \triangle(p, s, r) \) are simple, and since \( A'_p(q, s) = A'_p(s, r) = 0 \) by construction, \( \angle_p(q, s) = \angle_p(s, r) = 0 \) by Lemma 3.10. Therefore,
\[ \angle_p(q, r) \leq \angle_p(q, s) + \angle_p(s, r) = 0, \]

and the theorem is proved. \( \square \)

The main result result now follows easily.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Note that every geodesic triangle with distinct vertices either can be trimmed to a simple triangle, or it has 0 angle at all 3 vertices. Moreover, this trimming does not decrease the angles at the vertices. So let \( p, q, \) and \( r \) be the vertices of a simple triangle \( T. \) As in the proof of Theorem 3.11, we have two (possibly equal) limit rays \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) from \( p. \) Cutting along these rays gives three (not necessarily simple) triangles. The middle triangle has Alexandrov angle at \( p \) at most the \( k\)-comparison angle, since only the edge opposite \( p \) can be longer than the distance in \( M^2_k. \) The two outside triangles either are simple, in which case Lemma 3.10 applies, or both edges emanating from \( p \) follow the same path for a positive distance; in either case, the Alexandrov angle at \( p \) is 0. So by Alexandrov’s Lemma, \( \angle_p(q, r) \leq \angle_p^{(k)}(q, r). \) Therefore, \( (E, \bar{d}) \) is CAT(\( k). \) \( \square \)
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