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Abstract

In this paper, we determine the automorphism group of the \( p \)-cones \((p \neq 2)\) in dimension greater than two. In particular, we show that the automorphism group of those \( p \)-cones are the positive scalar multiples of the generalized permutation matrices that fix the main axis of the cone. Next, we take a look at a problem related to the duality theory of the \( p \)-cones. Under the Euclidean inner product it is well-known that a \( p \)-cone is self-dual only when \( p = 2 \). However, it was not known whether it is possible to construct an inner product depending on \( p \) which makes the \( p \)-cone self-dual. Our results shows that no matter which inner product is considered, a \( p \)-cone will never become self-dual unless \( p = 2 \) or the dimension is less than three.

1 Introduction

In this work, we prove two results on the structure of the \( p \)-cones

\[
\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p = \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid t \geq \|x\|_p\}.
\]

First, we describe the automorphism group of the \( p \)-cones \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p \) for \( n \geq 2 \) and \( p \neq 2 \). We show that every automorphism of \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p \) must have the format

\[
\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( \alpha > 0 \) and \( P \) is an \( n \times n \) generalized permutation matrix. The second result is that, for \( n \geq 2 \) and \( p \neq 2 \), it is not possible to construct an inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) for which \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p \) becomes self-dual. In fact, the second result is derived as a corollary of a stronger result that \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p \) and \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_q \) cannot be linearly isomorphic if \( p < q \) and \( n \geq 2 \), except when \((p, q, n) = (1, \infty, 2)\).

The motivation for this research is partly due to the work by Gowda and Trott \([5]\), where they determined the automorphism group of \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty \). However, they left open the problem of determining the automorphisms of the other \( p \)-cones, for \( p \neq 2 \). Here, we recall that the case \( p = 2 \) correspond to the second order cones and they are symmetric, i.e., self-dual and homogeneous. The structure of second-order cones and their automorphisms follow from the more general theory of Jordan Algebras \([4]\), see also \([8]\).

In \([5]\), Gowda and Trott also proved that \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1 \) and \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty \) are not homogenous cones and they posed the problem of proving/disproving that \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p \) is not homogenous for \( p \neq 2 \). Recall that a cone is said to be homogenous if its group of automorphisms acts transitively on the interior of the cone. In \([6]\), using the theory of \( T \)-algebras \([11]\), we gave a proof that \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p \) is not homogenous for \( p \neq 2 \) and \( n \geq 2 \). However, there are two unsatisfactory aspects of our previous result. The first is that we were
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not able to compute the automorphism group of $L^{n+1}_p$. The second is that although we showed that $L^{n+1}_p$ is not homogeneous, we were unable to obtain two elements $x, y$ in interior of $L^{n+1}_p$ such that no automorphism of $L^{n+1}_p$ maps $x$ to $y$. That is, we were unable to show concretely how homogeneity breaks down on $L^{n+1}_p$. The results discussed here remedy those flaws and provide an alternative proof that $L^{n+1}_p$ is not homogeneous.

Another motivation for this work is the general problem of determining when a closed convex cone $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is self-dual. If $\mathbb{R}^n$ is equipped with some inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, the dual cone of $K$ is defined as

$$K^* = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0, \forall x \in K \}.$$ 

As discussed in Section 1 of [6], an often overlooked point is that $K^*$ depends on $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Accordingly, it is entirely plausible that a cone that is not self-dual under the Euclidean inner product might become self-dual if the inner product is chosen appropriately.

This detail is quite important because sometimes we see articles claiming that a certain cone is not a symmetric cone because it is not self-dual under the Euclidean inner product. This is, of course, not enough. As long as a cone is homogeneous and there exists some inner product that makes it self-dual, the cone can be investigated under the theory of Jordan Algebras.

This state of affairs brings us to the case of the $p$-cones. Up until the recent articles [5, 6], there was no rigorous proof that the $p$-cones $L^{n+1}_p$ were not symmetric when $p \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$. Now, although we know that $L^{n+1}_p$ is not homogeneous for $p \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$, it still remains to investigate whether $L^{n+1}_p$ could become self-dual under an appropriate inner product. This question was partly discussed by Miao, Lin and Chen in [9], where they showed that a $p$-cone (again, $p \neq 2$, $n \geq 2$) is not self-dual under an inner product induced by a diagonal matrix. The results described here show, in particular, that no inner product can make $L^{n+1}_p$ self-dual, for $p \neq 2$, $n \geq 2$.

We now explain some of the intuition behind our proof techniques. Let $n \geq 2$ and let $f_p : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function that maps $x$ to $\|x\|_p$. When $p \in (1, 2)$, we have that $f_p$ is twice differentiable only at points $x$ for which $x_i \neq 0$, for all $i$. In contrast, if $p \in (2, \infty)$, $f_p$ is twice differentiable throughout $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Now, we let $M_p$ be the boundary without the zero of the cone $L^{n+1}_p$. With that, $M_p$ is exactly the graph of the function $f_p$. Furthermore, $M_p$ is a $C^1$-embedded smooth manifold if $p \in (1, 2)$. If $p \in (2, \infty)$, $M_p$ is a $C^2$-embedded smooth manifold. Now, any linear bijection between $L^{n+1}_p$ and $L^{n+1}_q$ must map the boundary of $L^{n+1}_p$ to the boundary of $L^{n+1}_q$, thus producing a map between $M_p$ and $M_q$. Then, if $p \in (1, 2)$ and $q \in (2, \infty)$, there can be no linear bijection between $L^{n+1}_p$ and $L^{n+1}_q$ because this would establish a diffeomorphism between submanifolds that are embedded with different levels of smoothness.

Now suppose that $p, q$ are both in $(1, 2)$ and that there exists some linear bijection $A$ between $L^{n+1}_p$ and $L^{n+1}_q$. If $(f_p(x), x) \in M_p$ is such that $f_p$ is not twice differentiable at $x$, then $A$ must map $(f_p(x), x)$ to a point $(f_q(y), y)$ for which $f_q$ is not twice differentiable at $y$. This idea is made precise in Proposition 4. In particular, this fact imposes severe restrictions on how Aut($L^{n+1}_p$) acts on $L^{n+1}_p$ and this is the key observation necessary for showing that the matrices in Aut($L^{n+1}_p$) can be written as in (1).

This work is divided as follows. In Section 2 we present the notation used in this paper and review some facts about cones, self-duality and $p$-cones. In Section 3, we discuss the tools from manifold theory necessary for our discussion. Finally, in Section 4 we prove our main results.

## 2 Preliminaries

A **convex cone** is a subset $K$ of some real vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\alpha x + \beta y \in K$ holds whenever $x, y \in K$ and $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$. A cone $K$ is said to be **pointed** if $K \cap -K = \{0\}$. For a subset $S$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the (closed) **conical hull** of $S$, denoted by cone($S$), is the smallest closed convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing $S$. 


If \( v \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we write \( \mathbb{R}^+(v) \) for the half-line generated by \( v \) and \( \mathbb{R}^{++} \) for \( \mathbb{R}^+(v) \setminus \{0\} \), i.e.,
\[
\mathbb{R}^+(v) = \{ \alpha v \mid \alpha \geq 0 \}, \\
\mathbb{R}^{++}(v) = \{ \alpha v \mid \alpha > 0 \}.
\]

A convex subset \( F \) of \( K \) is said to be a face of \( K \) if the following condition hold: If \( x, y \in K \) satisfies \( \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y \in F \) for some \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) then \( x, y \in F \) holds. A one dimensional face is called an extreme ray. A polyhedral convex cone is a convex cone that can be expressed as the solution set of finitely many linear inequalities.

If \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) is an inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^n \), we can define the dual cone of \( K \) with respect to the inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) by
\[
K^* = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0, \forall y \in K \}.
\]

A convex cone \( K \) is self-dual if there exists an inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) for which the dual cone coincides with \( K \) itself.

Two convex cones \( K_1 \) and \( K_2 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) are said to be isomorphic if there exists a linear bijection \( A \in GL_n(\mathbb{R}) \), called an isomorphism, such that \( AK_1 = K_2 \). An automorphism of a convex cone \( K \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is a map \( A \in GL_n(\mathbb{R}) \) such that \( AK = K \). The group of all automorphisms of \( K \) is written by \( \text{Aut}(K) \) and called the automorphism group of \( K \).

A convex cone \( K \) is said to be homogeneous if \( \text{Aut}(K) \) acts transitively on the interior of \( K \), that is, for every elements \( x \) and \( y \) of the interior of \( K \), there exists \( A \in \text{Aut}(K) \) such that \( y = Ax \).

### 2.1 On self-duality

Let \( K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) be a closed convex cone. As we emphasized in Section 1, self-duality is a relative concept and depends on what inner product we are considering. Let \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E \) denote the Euclidean inner product and consider the dual of \( K \) with respect \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E \).

\[
K^* = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x, y \rangle_E \geq 0, \forall x \in K \}.
\]

We have the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** Let \( K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) be a closed convex cone and let \( K^* \) be the dual of \( K \) with the respect to the Euclidean inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_E \). Then, there exists an inner product on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) that turns \( K \) into a self-dual cone if and only if there exists a symmetric positive definite matrix \( A \) such that \( AK = K^* \).

**Proof.** First, suppose that there exist some inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_K \) for which \( K \) becomes self-dual. Then, there is a symmetric positive definite matrix \( A \) such that
\[
\langle x, y \rangle_K = \langle x, Ay \rangle_E,
\]
for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \). In fact, \( A_{ij} = \langle e_i, e_j \rangle_K \), where \( e_i \) is the \( i \)-th standard unit vector in \( \mathbb{R}^n \). By assumption, we have
\[
K = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x, Ay \rangle_E \geq 0, \forall y \in K \}
= \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle Ax, y \rangle_E \geq 0, \forall y \in K \}
= A^{-1}\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle z, y \rangle_E \geq 0, \forall y \in K \}
= A^{-1}K^*.
\]
This shows that \( AK = K^* \).

Reciprocally, if \( AK = K^* \), we define the inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_K \) such that
\[
\langle x, y \rangle_K := \langle x, Ay \rangle_E,
\]
for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Then, a straightforward calculation shows that the dual of \( K \) with respect \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_K \) is indeed \( K \). \( \square \)
Therefore, determining whether $\mathcal{K}$ is self-dual for some inner product boils down to determining the existence of a positive definite linear isomorphism between cones, which is a difficult problem in general.

### 2.2 $p$-cones

Here we present some basic facts on $p$-cones. The $p$-cone is the closed convex cone in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p = \{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid t \geq \|x\|_p \}$$

where $\|x\|_p$ is the $p$-norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\|x\|_p = (|x_1|^p + \cdots + |x_n|^p)^{1/p} \text{ for } p \in [1, \infty) \text{ and } \|x\|_\infty = \max(|x_1|, \ldots, |x_n|).$$

The dual cone of the $p$-cone with respect to the Euclidean inner product is given by $(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p)^* = \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_q$ where $q$ is the conjugate of $p$, that is, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. The cones $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty$ are polyhedral. In fact, $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1$ has $2n$ extreme rays

$$\mathbb{R}+(1, \sigma e^i_n), \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \quad \sigma \in \{-1, 1\},$$

where $e^i_n$ denotes the $i$-th standard unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty$ has $2^n$ extreme rays

$$\mathbb{R}+(1, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n), \quad \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n \in \{-1, 1\}.$$

The difference in the number of extreme rays shows that $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty$ are not isomorphic if $n \geq 3$. However, for $n = 2$, they are indeed isomorphic as

$$A, L_1^3 = L_\infty^3, \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \cos(\pi/4) & -\sqrt{2} \sin(\pi/4) \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} \sin(\pi/4) & \sqrt{2} \cos(\pi/4) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

The second order cone $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_2$ is known to be a symmetric cone, that is, it is both self-dual and homogeneous, admitting a Jordan algebraic structure [4]. The automorphism group of the second order cone can be identified by the result of Loewy and Schneider [8]: $A\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_2 = \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_2$ or $A\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_2 = -\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_2$ holds if and only if $A^T J_n+1 A = \mu J_{n+1}$ for some $\mu > 0$ where $J_{n+1} = \text{diag}(1, -1, \ldots, -1)$.

Gowda and Trott determined the structure of the automorphism group of the $p$-cones in the case $p = 1, \infty$:

**Proposition 2** (Gowda and Trott, Theorem 7 in [5]). For $n \geq 2$, $A$ belongs to $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1)$ if and only if $A$ has the form

$$A = \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha > 0$ and $P$ is an $n \times n$ generalized permutation matrix, that is, a permutation matrix multiplied by a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are $\pm 1$. Moreover, $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty) = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1)$ holds.

In particular, Proposition 2 yields the following consequences.

- $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty$ are not homogeneous for $n \geq 2$ because any $A \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1) = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty)$ fixes the “main axis” $\mathbb{R}+(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ of these cones.

- $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty$ are never self-dual for $n \geq 2$. This is a known fact, but we will also obtain this result as a consequence of Corollary 14 where Proposition 2 will be helpful to prove the case $n = 2$. At this point, we should remark that Barker and Foran proved in Theorem 3 of [1] that a self-dual polyhedral cone in $\mathbb{R}^3$ must have an odd number of extreme rays. Since $\mathcal{L}^{3}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}^{3}_\infty$ have four extreme rays, Barker and Foran’s result implies that they are never self-dual.
3 Manifolds, tangent spaces and the Gauss map

In this subsection, we will provide a brief overview of the tools we will use from manifold theory, more details can be seen in Lee’s book [7] or the initial chapters of do Carmo’s book [3]. First, we recall that a \( n \)-dimensional smooth manifold \( M \) is a second countable Hausdorff topological space equipped with a collection \( \mathcal{A} \) of maps \( \varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) with the following properties.

(i) each map \( \varphi \in \mathcal{A} \) is such that \( \varphi(U) \) is an open set of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Furthermore, \( \varphi \) is an homeomorphism between \( U \) and \( \varphi(U) \), i.e., \( \varphi \) is a continuous bijection with continuous inverse.

(ii) if \( \varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \psi : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) both belong to \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( U \cap V \neq \emptyset \), then \( \psi \circ \varphi^{-1} : \varphi^{-1}(U \cap V) \rightarrow \psi(U \cap V) \) is a \( C^\infty \) diffeomorphism, i.e., \( \psi \circ \varphi^{-1} \) is a bijective function such that \( \psi \circ \varphi^{-1} \) and \( \varphi \circ \psi^{-1} \) have continuous derivatives of all orders.

(iii) for every \( x \in M \), we can find a map \( \varphi \in \mathcal{A} \) for which \( x \) belongs to the domain of \( \varphi \).

(iv) if \( \psi \) is another map defined on a subset of \( M \) satisfying (i) and (ii), then \( \psi \in \mathcal{A} \). That is, \( \mathcal{A} \) is maximal.

The set \( \mathcal{A} \) is called a maximal smooth atlas and the maps in \( \mathcal{A} \) are called charts. If \( \varphi : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \) is a chart and \( x \in U \), we say that \( \varphi \) is a chart around \( x \).

Let \( M_1, M_2 \) be smooth manifolds and \( f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \) be a function. The function \( f \) is said to be differentiable at \( x \in M_1 \) if there is a chart \( \varphi \) of \( M_1 \) around \( x \) and a chart \( \psi \) of \( M_2 \) around \( f(x) \) such that

\[
\psi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1}
\]

is differentiable at \( \varphi(x) \). Then, \( f \) is said to be differentiable, if it is differentiable throughout \( M_1 \).

Similarly, we say that \( f \) is differentiable of class \( C^k \) if \( \psi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1} \) is of class \( C^k \), for every pair of charts of \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) such that the image of \( \varphi^{-1} \) and the domain of \( \psi \) intersect. Whether a function is differentiable at some point or is of class \( C^k \) does not depend on the particular choice of charts. The function \( \psi \circ f \circ \varphi^{-1} \) is also said to be a local representation of \( f \). If \( f \) is a bijection such that it is \( C^k \) everywhere and whose inverse \( f^{-1} \) is also \( C^k \) everywhere, then \( f \) is said to be a \( C^k \) diffeomorphism.

Let \( M \) be a \( n \)-dimensional smooth manifold. Let \( C^\infty(M) \) denote the ring of \( C^\infty \) real functions \( g : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \). A derivation of \( M \) at \( x \) is a function \( v : C^\infty(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) such that for every \( g, h \in C^\infty(M) \), we have

\[
v(gh) = (v(g))h(x) + g(x)v(h).
\]

Given a \( n \)-dimensional smooth manifold \( M \) and \( x \in M \), we write \( T_x M \) for the tangent space of \( M \) at \( x \), which is the subspace of derivations of \( M \) at \( x \). It is a basic fact that the dimension of \( T_x M \) as a vector space coincides with the dimension of \( M \) as a smooth manifold.

Let \( f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \) be a \( C^1 \) map between smooth manifolds. Then, at each \( x \in M_1 \), \( f \) induces a linear map between \( df_x : T_x M_1 \rightarrow T_{f(x)} M_2 \) such that given \( v \in T_x M_1 \), \( df_x(v) \) is the derivation of \( M_2 \) at \( f(x) \) satisfying

\[
(df_x(v))(g) = v(g \circ f),
\]

for every \( g \in C^\infty(N) \). The map \( df_x \) is the differential map of \( f \) at \( x \). If the linear map \( df_x \) is injective everywhere, then \( f \) is said to be an immersion. Furthermore, if \( f \) is a \( C^k \) diffeomorphism with \( k \geq 1 \), then \( df_x \) is a linear bijection for every \( x \). Recall that in order to check whether \( f \) is immersion, it is enough to check that the local representations of \( f \) are immersions.

Now, suppose that \( \alpha : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M \) is a \( C^\infty \) curve with \( \alpha(0) = x \). Then \( d\alpha_0(0) \in T_x M \). Furthermore, \( T_x M \) coincides with the set of velocity vectors of smooth curves passing through \( x \). With a slight abuse of notation, let us write \( \alpha'(t) = d\alpha_0(t) \). With that, we have

\[
T_x M = \{ \alpha'(0) \mid \alpha : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow M, \alpha(0) = x, \alpha \in C^1 \},
\]
see more details in Proposition 3.23 and pages 68-71 in [7]. With this, we can compute a differential $df_x(v)$ by first selecting a $C^1$ curve $\alpha$ contained in $M$ with $\alpha(0) = x$, $\alpha'(0) = v$. Then, we have $df_x(v) = (f \circ \alpha)'(0)$, see Proposition 3.24 in [7].

A map $\iota: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is said to be a $C^k$-embedding if it is a $C^k$ immersion and a homeomorphism on its image (here, $\iota(M_1)$ has the subspace topology induced from $M_2$). Now, suppose that, in fact, $M_1 \subseteq M_2$ and let $\iota: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ denote the inclusion map, i.e., $\iota(x) = x$, for all $x \in M_1$. If $\iota$ is a $C^k$ embedding, we say that $M_1$ is a $C^k$-embedded submanifold of $N$.

We remark that when $M$ is a $m$-dimensional $C^k$-embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$, the requirement that $\iota$ be an $C^k$ embedding has the following consequences. First, the topology of $M$ has to be the subspace topology of $\mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., the open sets of $M$ are open sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ intersected with $M$. Now, let $\varphi: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a chart of $M$. Then, $\iota \circ \varphi^{-1}: \varphi(U) \rightarrow U$ is a $C^k$ diffeomorphism. That is, although $\varphi^{-1}$ is $C^\infty$ when seen as a map between $\varphi(U)$ and $M$, its class of differentiability might decrease$^1$ when seen as a map between $U$ and $\mathbb{R}^m$. For embedded manifolds of $\mathbb{R}^n$, as a matter of convention, we will always see the inverse of a chart $\varphi$ as a function whose codomain is $\mathbb{R}^n$ and we will omit the embedding $\iota$.

Furthermore, whenever $M$ is a $C^k$-embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$, we will define tangent spaces in a more geometric way. Given $x \in M$, we will define $T_xM$ as the space of tangent vectors of $C^1$ curves that pass through $x$:

$$T_xM = \{ \alpha'(0) | \alpha: (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \alpha(0) = x, \alpha \subseteq M, \alpha \text{ is } C^1 \},$$

where $\alpha \subseteq M$ means that $\alpha(t) \in M$, for every $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$. Here, since we have an ambient space, $\alpha'(0)$ is the derivative of $\alpha$ at 0 in the usual sense.

Both definitions of tangent spaces presented so far are equivalent in the following sense. Let $\tilde{T}_xM$ denote the space of derivations of $M$ at $x$ and let $\iota: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the inclusion map. Then, $d\iota_x$ is a map between $\tilde{T}_xM$ and $T_x\mathbb{R}^n$. Then, identifying $T_x\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbb{R}^n$, it holds that $d\iota_x(\tilde{T}_xM) = T_xM$. In particular, $\tilde{T}_xM$ and $T_xM$ have the same dimension.

Finally, we recall that for smooth manifolds, the topological notion of connectedness is equivalent to the notion of path-connectedness, see Proposition 1.11 in [7]. Therefore, a manifold $M$ is connected if and only if for every $x, y \in M$ there is a continuous curve $\alpha: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ such that $\alpha(0) = x$ and $\alpha(1) = y$.

### 3.1 Graphs of differentiable maps

For a real valued function $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the graph of $f$ is defined by

$$\text{graph } f := \{(y, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times U | y = f(x)\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

In item (i) of the next proposition, for the sake of completeness, we give a proof of the well-known fact that if $f$ is a $C^k$ function, then graph $f$ must be a $C^k$-embedded manifold. In item (ii) we observe the fact, also known but perhaps less well-known, that the converse also holds. This is important for us because if we know that $f$ is $C^1$ but not $C^2$, then this creates an obstruction to the existence of certain maps between graph $f$ and $C^2$ manifolds.

**Proposition 3.** For $k \geq 1$, let $f: U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a $C^1$ function defined on an open subset $U$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

1. If $f$ is $C^k$ on an open subset $V$ of $U$, then $\text{graph } f|_V$ is an $n$-dimensional $C^k$-embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

---

$^1$Here is an example of what can happen. Let $M$ be graph of the function $f(x) = |x|$. $M$ is a differentiable manifold and to create a maximal smooth atlas for $M$ we first start with a set $A$ containing only the map $\varphi: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that takes $([-x], x)$ to $x$. At this point, conditions (i), (ii), (iii) of the definition of atlas are satisfied. Then, we add to $A$ every map $\psi$ such that $\mathcal{A}(\psi)$ still satisfies (i), (ii), (iii). The resulting set must be a maximal smooth atlas. Following the definition of differentiability between manifolds, the map $\varphi^{-1}$ is $C^\infty$ if we see it as a map between $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$, since $\varphi \circ \varphi^{-1}(x) = x$. However, $\iota \circ \varphi^{-1}$ is not even a $C^1$ map, because $|x|$ is not differentiable at 0.
(ii) Suppose that a subset $M$ of graph $f$ is an $n$-dimensional $C^k$-embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, with $k \geq 1$. Then $f$ is $C^k$ on the open set $\pi_U(M)$, where $\pi_U : \mathbb{R} \times U \to U$ is the projection onto $U$.

Proof. (i) The proof here is essentially the one contained Example 1.30 and Proposition 5.4 of [7], except that here we take into account the level of smoothness of the embedding.

First, let $M = \text{graph}(f|_V)$ and consider the subspace topology inherited from $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ (again, see Examples 1.3 and 1.30 in [7] for more details). With the subspace topology, the map $\varphi : V \to M$, given by $\varphi(x) = (f(x), x)$ is a homeomorphism between $V$ and $M$, whose inverse is the projection restricted to $M$, that is $\varphi^{-1}(f(x), x) = x$. Furthermore, $\varphi^{-1}$ induces a maximal smooth atlas of $M$ making $\varphi^{-1} : M \to V$ a chart. We now check that the inclusion $\iota : M \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a $C^k$ embedding. A local representation for $\iota$ is obtained by considering $\iota \circ \varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, which shows that $\iota$ is a $C^k$ differentiable map. The inverse $\iota^{-1} : \iota(M) \to M$ is given by restricting the identity map in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ to $M$. Since the topology on $M$ is the subspace topology, this establishes that $\iota$ is an homeomorphism.

Furthermore, since the $(n + 1) \times n$ Jacobian matrix $J_{\varphi \varphi}$ of the representation of $\iota$ has rank $n$, we see that $\iota$ is an immersion. Hence, $M$ is a $C^k$-embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

(ii) Take $x_0 \in \pi_U(M)$. Let $\Phi : V \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a chart of $M$ around $(f(x_0), x_0)$. We can write the map $\Phi^{-1}$ as $\Phi^{-1}(z) = (\psi(z), \varphi(z)) \in \mathbb{R} \times U$ for $z \in \Phi(V)$, for functions $\psi : \Phi(V) \to \mathbb{R}$, $\varphi : \Phi(V) \to U$. Since $\text{Im } \Phi^{-1} \subseteq M \subseteq \text{graph } f$, we have $\psi(z) = f(\varphi(z))$ for all $z \in \Phi(V)$. Then we obtain a local representation $\tilde{\iota} : \Phi(V) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ of the inclusion map $\iota : M \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\iota}(z) := \iota \circ \Phi^{-1} = (\psi(z), \varphi(z)) = (f \circ \varphi(z), \varphi(z)).$$

Since $M$ is $C^k$-embedded, $\varphi$ and $\psi$ are $C^k$ when seen as maps $\Phi(V) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi(V) \to \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. Let $z_0 = \Phi((f(x_0), x_0))$. Then $\varphi(z_0) = x_0$ since

$$(f(x_0), x_0) = \Phi^{-1}(z_0) = (\psi(z_0), \varphi(z_0)).$$

Note that $\text{rank}(J_{\tilde{\iota}}(z_0)) = n$ holds because $\iota$ is an immersion. On the other hand, since $f$ is $C^1$ by the assumption, it follows by the chain rule for the function $\psi = f \circ \varphi$ that

$$J_{\psi}(z_0) = J_f(\varphi(z_0))J_{\varphi}(z_0) = J_f(x_0)J_{\varphi}(z_0).$$

This means that each row of $J_{\varphi}(z_0)$ is a linear combination of rows of $J_{\psi}(z_0)$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$n = \text{rank } J_{\tilde{\iota}}(z_0) = \text{rank } (J_{\psi}(z_0)^T, J_{\varphi}(z_0)^T)^T = \text{rank } J_{\varphi}(z_0).$$

Namely, the $n \times n$ matrix $J_{\varphi}(z_0)$ is nonsingular. Since $\varphi$ is $C^k$, the inverse function theorem states that there exists a $C^k$ inverse $\varphi^{-1} : W \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defined on a neighborhood $W$ of $\varphi(z_0) = x_0$. Then, we conclude that the function

$$\psi \circ \varphi^{-1} = f \circ \varphi \circ \varphi^{-1} = f$$

is $C^k$ on $W$.

To conclude, we will show that $\pi_U(M)$ is open. Since $\varphi^{-1}(W)$ is contained in the domain $\Phi(V)$ of the map $\varphi$, it follows that $W = \varphi \circ \varphi^{-1}(W) \subseteq \Phi(\Phi(V))$. Now, let $z \in \Phi(V)$. By definition, we have

$$(\psi(z), \varphi(z)) = \Phi^{-1}(z) \in V,$$

which shows that $\varphi(z) \in \pi_U(V)$. Therefore, $\varphi(\Phi(V)) \subseteq \pi_U(V) \subseteq \pi_U(M)$. Hence, we have $W \subseteq \pi_U(M)$ and so $\pi_U(M)$ is open in $\mathbb{R}^n$, since $x_0$ was arbitrary.

\footnote{The idea is the same as in Footnote 1, we start with $A = \{\varphi^{-1}\}$ and add every map $\psi$ for which $A \cup \{\psi\}$ still satisfies properties (i), (ii), (iii) of the definition of atlas.}
Given a diffeomorphism \( A \) between two graphs of \( C^1 \) maps \( f, g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), the next proposition shows a relation of the categories of differentiability of \( f \) and \( g \) through the diffeomorphism \( B : U \rightarrow U \) defined by

\[
B(x) = \pi_U(A(f(x), x))
\]

where \( \pi_U : \mathbb{R} \times U \rightarrow U \) is the projection onto \( U \). The map \( B \) will play a key role in the proof of our main result applied with \( U = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}, f(x) = \|x\|_p \) and \( g(x) = \|x\|_q \). We give an illustration of the map \( B \) in Figure 1.

**Proposition 4.** Let \( f, g : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) be \( C^1 \) maps defined on an open subset \( U \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Suppose that \( A : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a \( C^\infty \) diffeomorphism such that \( A(\text{graph } f) = \text{graph } g \).

(i) The map \( B : U \rightarrow U, B(x) := \pi_U(A(f(x), x)) \) is a \( C^1 \) diffeomorphism, where \( \pi_U : \mathbb{R} \times U \rightarrow U \) satisfies \( \pi_U(y, x) = x \).

(ii) For \( k \geq 1 \), \( f \) is \( C^k \) on a neighborhood of \( x \) if and only if \( g \) is \( C^k \) on a neighborhood of \( B(x) \).

**Proof.** (i) Since \( f \) is \( C^1 \) while \( \pi_U \) and \( A \) are \( C^\infty \) maps, it is must be the case that \( B(x) = \pi_U(A(f(x), x)) \) is \( C^1 \).

Let us check that the inverse of \( B \) is the map \( B^{-1}(y) = \pi_U(A^{-1}(g(y), y)) \). Denote

\[
B'(y) = \pi_U(A^{-1}(g(y), y)).
\]

For any \( x \in U \), the relation \( A(\text{graph } f) = \text{graph } g \) implies the existence of \( y \in U \) such that \( A(f(x), x) = (g(y), y) \). Then we have

\[
B(x) = \pi_U(A(f(x), x)) = \pi_U(g(y), y) = y.
\]

and, therefore,

\[
B'(B(x)) = B'(y) = \pi_U(A^{-1}(g(y), y)) = \pi_U(f(x), x) = x.
\]

Similarly, we obtain \( B(B'(y)) = B'(y) \) and \( B^{-1}(y) = B'(y) \) holds.

Since \( B^{-1}(y) = \pi_U(A^{-1}(g(y), y)) \) is also \( C^1 \), we conclude that \( B \) is a \( C^1 \) diffeomorphism.

(ii) If \( f \) is \( C^k \) on a neighborhood \( V \) of \( x \), then \( \text{graph } f|_V \) is an \( n \)-dimensional \( C^k \)-embedded submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) by Proposition 3 (i). Then, by the assumption on \( A \), the set \( M := A(\text{graph } f|_V) \) is also an \( n \)-dimensional \( C^k \)-embedded submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) which satisfies \( M \subseteq \text{graph } g \). Therefore Proposition 3 (ii) implies that \( g \) is \( C^k \) on the open set \( \pi_U(M) = \pi_U(A(\text{graph } f|_V)) \) which contains the point \( \pi_U(A(f(x), x)) \).

The converse of the assertion follows by applying the same argument to the diffeomorphism \( A^{-1} \) because \( A^{-1}(\text{graph } g) = \text{graph } f \) and \( \pi_U(A^{-1}(g(y), y)) = x \) holds for \( y = B(x) = \pi_U(A(f(x), x)) \).  

![Figure 1: Illustration of the map \( B(x) = \pi_U(A(f(x), x)) \)](image_url)
3.2 The Gauss map

In this subsection, let \( M \) be a \( C^k \)-embedded submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) with dimension \( n - 1 \) and \( k \geq 1 \). In this case, \( M \) is sometimes called a hypersurface and when \( n = 3 \), \( M \) is called a surface. The differential geometry of surfaces is, of course, a classical subject discussed in many books, e.g., [2].

In the theory of surfaces, a Gauss map is a continuous function that associates to \( x \in M \) a unit vector which is orthogonal to \( x \). Since \( x \) is a Gauss map that is defined globally over \( T_x M \). Unless \( M \) is an orientable surface, it is not possible to construct a Gauss map that is defined globally over \( M \). However, given any \( x \in M \), it is always possible to construct a Gauss map in a neighborhood of \( x \). For the sake of self-containment, we will give a brief account of the construction of the Gauss map for hypersurfaces.

For what follows, we suppose that \( \mathbb{R}^n \) is equipped with some inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) and the norm is given by \( \| x \| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle} \), for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Recalling (4), \( T_x M \) is seen as a subspace of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and we will equip \( T_x M \) with the same inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \).

Definition 5. Let \( M \) be a \( C^k \)-embedded submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) and let \( x \in M \). A \( C^r \) Gauss map around \( x \) is a \( C^r \) function \( N : U \to \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( U \subseteq M \) is a neighborhood of \( x \) in \( M \) and

\[
N(x) \in (T_x M)^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad \| N(x) \| = 1,
\]

for all \( x \in U \), where \( (T_x M)^\perp \) is the orthogonal complement to \( T_x M \).

For what follows, let \( x^1, \ldots, x^n \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and let \( \det(x^1, \ldots, x^n) \) denote the determinant of the matrix such that its \( i \)-th column is given by \( x^i \). Since the determinant is a multilinear function, if we fix the first \( n - 1 \) elements, we obtain a linear functional \( f \) such that

\[
f(x) = \det(x^1, \ldots, x^{n-1}, x).
\]

Since \( f \) is a linear functional, there is a unique vector \( \Lambda(x^1, \ldots, x^{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfying

\[
\langle \Lambda(x^1, \ldots, x^{n-1}), x \rangle = f(x),
\]

for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Furthermore, \( \Lambda(x^1, \ldots, x^{n-1}) = 0 \) is zero if and only if the \( x^i \) are linearly dependent.

Proposition 6. Let \( M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \) be an \((n - 1)\) dimensional \( C^k \)-embedded manifold, with \( k \geq 1 \). Then, for every chart \( \varphi : U \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \), there exists a \( C^{k-1} \) local Gauss map of \( M \) defined over \( U \).

Proof. Let \( \varphi : U \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \) be a chart of \( M \). Then, \( \varphi^{-1} \) is a function with domain \( \varphi(U) \) (which is an open set of \( \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \)) and codomain \( \mathbb{R}^{n} \). Let \( u \in U \). It is well-known that the partial derivatives of \( \varphi^{-1} \) at \( \varphi(u) \) are a basis for \( T_u M \), e.g., page 60 and Proposition 3.15 in [7]. Let \( v^i(u) \) be the partial derivative of \( \varphi^{-1} \) at \( \varphi(u) \) with respect the \( i \)-th variable. We define a Gauss map \( N \) over \( U \) by letting

\[
N(x) = \frac{\Lambda(v^1(u), \ldots, v^{n-1}(u))}{\| \Lambda(v^1(u), \ldots, v^{n-1}(u)) \|}.
\]

Since the \( v^i(u) \) are a basis for \( T_u M \), \( \Lambda(v^1(u), \ldots, v^{n-1}(u)) \) is never zero. In addition, because \( \varphi^{-1} \) is of class \( C^k \), \( N \) must be of class \( C^{k-1} \).

\[\Box\]

3.3 A lemma on hyperplanes and embedded submanifolds

Let \( M \) be a connected \( C^1 \)-embedded \( n - 1 \) dimensional submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) (i.e., a hypersurface) that is contained in a finite union of distinct hyperplanes \( H_1, \ldots, H_r \). The goal of this section is to prove that \( M \) must be entirely contained in one of the hyperplanes. The intuition comes from the case \( n = 3 \): a surface in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) cannot, say, be contained in \( H_1 \cup H_2 \) and also intersect both \( H_1 \) and \( H_2 \) because it would generate a “corner” at the intersection \( M \cap H_1 \cap H_2 \), thus destroying smoothness. This is illustrated in Figure 2.
Figure 2: A surface $M$ cannot be smooth if it is connected, contained in $H_1 \cup H_2$, but not entirely contained in neither $H_1$ nor $H_2$.

This is probably a well-known differential geometric fact but we could not find a precise reference, so we give a proof here. Nevertheless, our discussion is related to the following classical fact: a point in a surface for which the derivative of the Gauss map vanishes is called a planar point and a connected surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that all its points are planar must be a piece of a plane, see Definitions 7, 8 and the proof of Proposition 4 of Chapter 3 of [2].

In our case, the fact that $M$ is contained in a finite number of hyperplanes hints that the image of any Gauss map of $M$ should be confined to the directions that are orthogonal to those hyperplanes. This, by its turn, suggests that the derivative of $N$ should vanish everywhere, i.e., all points must be planar. In fact, our proof is inspired by the proof of Proposition 4 of Chapter 3 of [2] and we will use the same compactness argument at the end.

To start, we observe that the tangent of a curve contained in $H_1, \ldots, H_r$ must also be contained in those hyperplanes.

**Proposition 7.** Let $H_i = \{a_i\}^\perp$ be hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Suppose that a $C^1$ curve $\alpha : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is contained in $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^r H_i$. Then, $\alpha'(0) \in X$.

**Proof.** Changing the order of the hyperplanes if necessary, we may assume that

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha(0) &\in H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_s \\
\alpha(0) &\not\in H_{s+1}, \ldots, H_r.
\end{align*}
\]

Since $\alpha$ is contained in $X$, we have $s \geq 1$. Furthermore, because $\alpha$ is continuous, there is $\tilde{\epsilon} > 0$ such that

\[
\alpha(\epsilon) \not\in H_{s+1}, \ldots, H_r,
\]

for $-\tilde{\epsilon} < \epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}$.

Now, suppose for the sake of obtaining a contradiction that $\alpha'(0)$ does not belong to any of these hyperplanes $H_1, \ldots, H_s$. Therefore, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, we have

\[
\langle \alpha(0), a_i \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \alpha'(0), a_i \rangle \neq 0.
\]

Since $\alpha'(\cdot)$ is continuous, we can select $0 < \tilde{\epsilon} < \epsilon$ such that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ and $\epsilon \in (-\tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\epsilon})$, we have

\[
\langle \alpha'(\epsilon), a_i \rangle \neq 0.
\]

By the mean value theorem applied to $\langle \alpha(\cdot), a_i \rangle$ on the interval $[0, \tilde{\epsilon}/2]$, we obtain that $\langle \alpha(\tilde{\epsilon}/2), a_i \rangle \neq 0$, for all $i \in 1, \ldots, s$. Since $\tilde{\epsilon}/2 \in (-\tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\epsilon})$, (5) implies that

\[
\langle \alpha(\tilde{\epsilon}/2), a_i \rangle \neq 0,
\]

for $i \in \{s+1, \ldots, r\}$ too. This shows that $\alpha(\tilde{\epsilon}/2) \not\in X$, which is a contradiction. \qed
Before we prove the main lemma of this subsection, we need the following observation on finite dimensional vector spaces.

**Proposition 8.** A finite dimensional real vector space $V$ is not a countable union of subspaces of dimension strictly smaller than $\dim V$.

**Proof.** Suppose that $V$ is a countable union $\bigcup W_i$ of subspaces of dimension smaller than $\dim V$. Take the unit ball $B \subseteq V$. Then, $B = \bigcup W_i \cap B$. However, this is not possible since each $W_i \cap B$ has measure zero, while $B$ has nonzero measure. \qed

We now have all the necessary pieces to prove the main lemma.

**Lemma 9.** Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a union of finitely many hyperplanes $H_i = \{a_i\}^\perp$, $a_i \neq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Let $M$ be an $(n-1)$ dimensional differentiable manifold that is connected, $C^1$-embedded in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and contained in $X$. Then, $M$ must be entirely contained in one of the $H_i$.

**Proof.** We proceed by induction in $r$. The case $r = 1$ is clear, so suppose that $r > 1$.

Consider a chart $\varphi : U \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $U \subseteq M$ is connected and construct a $C^n$ (i.e., continuous) Gauss map $N$ in $U$, as in Proposition 6. Let $u \in U$ and let us examine the tangent space $T_u M$. We have

$$T_u M = \{ \alpha'(0) \mid \alpha : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \to M, \alpha(0) = u, \alpha \text{ is } C^1 \}. $$

By Proposition 7,

$$T_u M \subseteq X. $$

Therefore,

$$T_u M = \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} H_i \cap T_u M. $$

Each $H_i \cap T_u M$ is a subspace of $T_u M$ (an intersection of subspaces is also a subspace!). By Proposition 8, $T_u M$ cannot be a union of subspaces of dimension less than $\dim T_u M = n - 1$. Therefore, there exists some index $j$ such that $H_j \cap T_u M = T_u M$. Since both $T_u M$ and $H_j$ have dimension $n - 1$, we conclude that $H_j = T_u M$.

In particular, the Gauss map $N$ satisfies $N(u) = a_j/\|a_j\|$ or $N(u) = -a_j/\|a_j\|$. Therefore, for all $u \in U$, we have

$$N(u) \in \left\{ \pm \frac{a_i}{\|a_i\|} \mid i = 1, \ldots, r \right\}. $$

Since $U$ is connected and $N$ is continuous, we conclude that the Gauss map $N$ is constant. Denote this constant vector by $v$.

Let $\psi = \langle \varphi^{-1}(\cdot), v \rangle$. Since $\varphi$ is a chart, given any $w \in \varphi(U)$, the differential

$$d\varphi^{-1}_w : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to T_{\varphi^{-1}(w)} M $$

is a linear bijection. Since $T_{\varphi^{-1}(w)} M$ is orthogonal to $v$, we conclude that $\psi' = 0$. Therefore $\psi$ must be constant and there is $\kappa_0$ such that $\langle \varphi^{-1}(w), v \rangle = \kappa_0$, for all $w \in \varphi(U)$. That is, $\langle u, v \rangle = \kappa_0$, for all $u \in U$.

Recall that, given $x \in M$, we can always obtain a chart $\varphi : U \to M$ around $x$ such that $U$ is connected. Therefore, the discussion so far shows that every $x \in M$ has a neighborhood $U$ such that $U$ is entirely contained in a hyperplane

$$\{ z \mid \langle z, v_x \rangle = \kappa_x \}, $$

where $v_x$ has the same direction as one of the $a_1, \ldots, a_r$. Now, fix some $x \in M$ and let $y \in M$, $y \neq x$. Since $M$ is connected, there is a continuous path $\alpha : [0, 1] \to M$ such that $\alpha(0) = x$ and $\alpha(1) = y$. 


Similarly, for every \( t \in [0,1] \), we can find a neighborhood \( U_t \subseteq M \) of \( \alpha(t) \) such that \( U_t \) is contained in a hyperplane \( \{ z \mid \langle z, v_t \rangle = \kappa_t \} \) where \( v_t \) is parallel to one of \( a_1, \ldots, a_r \). In particular

\[
[0,1] \subseteq \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \alpha^{-1}(U_t).
\]

Since the \( U_t \) are open in \( M \) and \( \alpha \) is continuous, the \( \alpha^{-1}(U_t) \) form an open cover for the compact set \([0,1]\). Therefore, the Heine-Borel theorem implies that a finite number of the \( \alpha^{-1}(U_t) \) are enough to cover \([0,1]\). As a consequence, \( \alpha \) itself is contained in finitely many neighborhoods \( U_{t_1}, \ldots, U_{t_c} \). Now, we note the following:

- If \( U_{t_i} \cap U_{t_j} \neq \emptyset \) then \( U_{t_i} \cap U_{t_j} \) is a nonempty open set in \( M \) and therefore, an embedded submanifold of dimension \( n-1 \), see Proposition 5.1 in [7]. Furthermore \( U_{t_i} \cap U_{t_j} \) is contained in the set

\[
H = \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle z, v_{t_i} \rangle = \kappa_{t_i}, \langle z, v_{t_j} \rangle = \kappa_{t_j} \}.
\]

Therefore, the smooth manifold \( H \) must have at least dimension \( n-1 \). We conclude that \( \langle z, v_{t_i} \rangle = \kappa_{t_i} \) and \( \langle z, v_{t_j} \rangle = \kappa_{t_j} \) define the same hyperplane. So, \( U_{t_i} \) and \( U_{t_j} \) are in fact, contained in the same hyperplane.

- \( U_{t_i} \) must intersect some of the \( U_{t_{i_2}}, \ldots, U_{t_{i_r}} \) because if it does not, then \( \alpha^{-1}(U_{t_1}) \) and \( \alpha^{-1}(\bigcup_{i=2}^r U_{t_i}) \) disconnect the connected set \([0,1]\). Changing the order of the sets if necessary, we may therefore assume that \( U_{t_1} \) and \( U_{t_2} \) intersect and, therefore, lie in the same hyperplane. Similarly, the union \( U_{t_1} \cup U_{t_2} \) must intersect one of the remaining neighborhoods \( U_{t_3}, \ldots, U_{t_r} \), lest we disconnect the interval \([0,1]\). By induction, we conclude that all neighborhoods lie in the same hyperplane.

In particular, \( x \) and \( y \) lie in the same hyperplane and, therefore, \( M \) is entirely contained in some hyperplane whose normal direction has the same direction as one of the \( a_1, \ldots, a_r \).

So far, we have shown that \( M \) is entirely contained in a hyperplane of the form

\[
\{ z \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle z, v \rangle = \kappa_0 \}.
\]

Without loss of generality, we may assume that \( v \) has the same direction as \( a_1 \). If \( \kappa_0 = 0 \), we are done. Otherwise, since \( v \) has the same direction as \( a_1 \), it follows that \( M \) does not intersect \( H_1 \) and

\[
M \subseteq \bigcup_{i=2}^r H_i.
\]

By the induction hypothesis, \( M \) must be contained in one of the \( H_2, \ldots, H_r \). \( \square \)

### 4 Main results

In this section, we show the main results on \( p \)-cones. We begin by observing a basic fact on the differentiability of \( p \)-norms.

**Lemma 10.** Let \( n \geq 2 \) and \( p \in (1, \infty) \).

(i) \( \| \cdot \|_p \) is \( C^1 \) on \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \).

(ii) If \( p \in (1,2) \) then \( \| \cdot \|_p \) is \( C^2 \) on a neighborhood of \( x \) if and only if \( x_i \neq 0 \) for all \( i \).

(iii) If \( p \in [2, \infty) \) then \( \| \cdot \|_p \) is \( C^2 \) on \( \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \).
Proof. (i) $\|\cdot\|_p$ is $C^1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ because

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \|\cdot\|_p(x) = \|x\|_p^{1-p} |x_i|^{p-1} \text{sign}(x_i).$$

(ii) If $x_i \neq 0$ for all $i$, it is easy to see that $\|\cdot\|_p$ is $C^2$ on a neighborhood of $x$. For the converse, consider a point $x \neq 0$ with $x_i = 0$ for some $i$. Then, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \|\cdot\|_p(x) = 0$ holds and so

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{h} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \|x + he_j\|_p - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \|x\|_p \right) = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{h^{-1}}{h} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \|x + he_j\|_p - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \|x\|_p \right)
= \lim_{h \to 0} h^{-1} \frac{1}{|x + he_j|^{1-p} |h|^{p-2}}
= \begin{cases} +\infty & (p < 2) \\ 0 & (p > 2) \end{cases}.$$

Hence, when $p \in (1,2)$, the derivative $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \|\cdot\|_p(x)$ exists if and only if $x_i \neq 0$.

(iii) For $p > 2$ (the assertion in the case $p = 2$ is clear),

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \|\cdot\|_p(x) = (1-p) \|x\|_p^{1-2p} |x_i x_j|^{p-1} \text{sign}(x_i) \text{sign}(x_j)$$

holds if $i \neq j$, otherwise we have

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} \|\cdot\|_p(x) = (1-p) \|x\|_p^{1-2p} x_i^{2(p-1)} + (p-1) \|x\|_p^{1-p} |x_i|^{p-2}.$$

We now move on to the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 11.** Let $p,q \in [1,\infty]$, $p \leq q$, $n \geq 2$ and $(p,q,n) \neq (1,\infty,2)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p$ and $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_q$ are isomorphic, that is,

$$\mathcal{A} \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p = \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_q$$

holds for some $A \in GL_{n+1}$. Then $p = q$ must hold. Moreover, if $p \neq 2$, then we have $A \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1)$.

**Proof.** The proof consists of three parts I, II, and III.

I First we consider the case $p \in (1,\infty)$. For the case when $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p$ is polyhedral. Since $A$ preserves polyhedrality, $q$ must be 1 or $\infty$ too. Note that $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_\infty$ cannot be isomorphic if $n \geq 3$ because they have different numbers of extreme rays, see Section 2.2. Therefore, $p = q = 1$ or $p = q = \infty$ must hold. Since $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}) = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_1)$ holds (Proposition 2), the assertion is verified in the case $p \in (1,\infty)$.

II Now let $p,q \in (1,\infty)$. Then the set

$$M_p := \{(t,x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \mid t = \|x\|_p\}$$

becomes a $C^1$-embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by Lemma 10 (i) and Proposition 3 (i). Note that $A \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p = \mathcal{L}^{n+1}_q$ implies $A M_p = M_q$ since $A$ maps the boundary of $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_p$ onto the boundary of $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}_q$.

It suffices to consider the case $p,q \in (1,2)$ by the following observation.

(a) The case $1 < p < 2 \leq q < \infty$ does not happen in view of Proposition 4 and Lemma 10. In fact, since $\|\cdot\|_q$ is $C^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $A^{-1} M_q = M_p$ holds, Proposition 4 implies that $\|\cdot\|_p$ is $C^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ but this is a contradiction.
(b) If \(2 \leq p \leq q < \infty\) holds, then taking the dual of the relation \(A\mathcal{L}_{p}^{n+1} = \mathcal{L}_{q}^{n+1}\) with respect to the Euclidean inner product, it follows that

\[ A^{-T} \mathcal{L}_{p}^{n+1} = \mathcal{L}_{q}^{n+1} \]

where \(p^*\) and \(q^*\) are the conjugates of \(p\) and \(q\), respectively. Either \(p^* = q^* = 2\) or \(p^*, q^* \in (1, 2)\) must hold by (a). If \(p^* = q^* = 2\), then we are done since this implies that \(p = q = 2\). Now, suppose that \(p^*, q^* \in (1, 2)\). If we prove that \(p^* = q^*\) and \(A^{-T} \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{n+1}^{1})\), then we conclude that \(p = q\) and \(A \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{n+1}^{1})^{-T}\). However, by Proposition 2, \(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{n}^{1})^{-T} = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1})\)

(Note that, if \(P\) is a generalized permutation matrix, then so is \(P^{-T}\)).

From cases (a), (b) we conclude that it is enough to consider the case \(p, q \in (1, 2)\), which we will do next.

\[ \text{III}\] Let \(p, q \in (1, 2)\). We show by induction on \(n\) that every \(A \in GL_{n+1}(\mathbb{R})\) with \(A\mathcal{L}_{p}^{n+1} = \mathcal{L}_{q}^{n+1}\) is a bijection on the set

\[ E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}(1, \sigma e_{i}^{p}), \]

where \(e_{i}^{n}\) is the \(i\)-th standard unit vector in \(\mathbb{R}^{n}\). First, let us check that this claim implies \(A \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1})\) and \(p = q\). Taking the conical hull of the relation \(AE = E\), we conclude that

\[ A\mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1} = A(\text{cone}(E)) = \text{cone}(AE) = \text{cone}(E) = \mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1}, \]

where the relation \(\text{cone}(E) = \mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1}\) holds because a pointed closed convex cone is the conical hull of its extreme rays (see Theorem 18.5 in [10]) and \(E\) is precisely the union of all the extreme rays of \(\mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1}\) with the origin removed, see Section 2.2. Therefore, we have

\[ A \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{n}^{n+1}) \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_{p}^{n+1}), \]

where the last inclusion follows by Proposition 2 because \(\|Pz\|_{p} = \|z\|_{p}\) for any generalized permutation matrix \(P\). Then \(\mathcal{L}_{p}^{n+1} = A\mathcal{L}_{p}^{n+1} = \mathcal{L}_{q}^{n+1}\) and so \(p = q\) must hold.

Now, let us show the claim that \(A\) is a bijection on \(E\). Consider the map \(\xi_{p} : \mathbb{R}^{n} \setminus \{0\} \to M_{p}\) defined by \(\xi_{p}(x) = (\|x\|_{p}, x)\) whose inverse \(\xi_{p}^{-1} : M_{p} \to \mathbb{R}^{n} \setminus \{0\}\) is the projection \(\xi_{p}^{-1}(t, x) = x\). By Proposition 4, the map \(B : \mathbb{R}^{n} \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^{n} \setminus \{0\}\) defined by

\[ B(x) = \xi_{q}^{-1} \circ A |_{M_{p}} \circ \xi_{p}(x) \]

is a \(C^{1}\) diffeomorphism. Moreover, \(\|\cdot\|_{p}\) is \(C^{2}\) on a neighborhood of \(x\) if and only if \(\|\cdot\|_{q}\) is \(C^{2}\) on a neighborhood of \(B(x)\). Since \(p, q \in (1, 2)\), each of the functions \(\|\cdot\|_{p}\) and \(\|\cdot\|_{q}\) is \(C^{2}\) on a neighborhood of \(x\) if and only if \(x_{i} \neq 0\) for all \(i\) (Lemma 10). This implies that the set

\[ X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \setminus \{0\} \mid x_{i} = 0 \text{ for some } i\} \]

satisfies

\[ B(X) = X \]

because \(x\) belongs to \(X\) if and only if \(\|\cdot\|_{p}\) and \(\|\cdot\|_{q}\) are never \(C^{2}\) on any neighborhood of \(x\).

\[ \text{III.a}\] Consider the case \(n = 2\). Then the set \(X\) can be written as

\[ X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{2} \setminus \{0\} \mid x_{1} = 0 \text{ or } x_{2} = 0\} = \mathbb{R}_{++}(0, 1) \cup \mathbb{R}_{++}(0, -1) \cup \mathbb{R}_{++}(1, 0) \cup \mathbb{R}_{++}(-1, 0) \]

\[ = \bigcup_{i=1}^{2} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{\pm 1\}} \mathbb{R}_{++}(\sigma e_{i}^{2}). \]
Then \( \xi_p(X) \) and \( \xi_q(X) \) coincide with \( E \):

\[
\xi_p(X) = \xi_q(X) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{2} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \mathbb{R}_{++}(1, \sigma e_1^2) = E.
\]

Moreover, \( A \) is bijective on \( E \) because

\[
A(\xi_p(X)) = \xi_q \circ \xi_q^{-1} \circ A|_{M_p} \circ \xi_p(X) = \xi_q \circ B(X) = \xi_q(X).
\]

Thus, the claim \( AE = E \) holds in the case \( n = 2 \).

Now let \( n \geq 3 \) and suppose that the claim is valid for \( n - 1 \). Denote

\[
X_i := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{ 0 \} \mid x_i = 0 \}, \quad M^i_p := \xi_p(X_i) = \{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{ 0 \} : t = \| x \|_p, \ x_i = 0 \}.
\]

With that, we have

\[
X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} X_i.
\]

We show that for any \( i \in \{ 1, \ldots, n \} \) there exists \( j \in \{ 1, \ldots, n \} \) such that

\[
B(X_i) = X_j.
\]

For any \( i \), the set \( X_i \) is a connected \((n - 1)\) dimensional \( C^1 \)-embedded submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) contained in \( X \). Since \( B : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{ 0 \} \to \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{ 0 \} \) is a \( C^1 \) diffeomorphism satisfying \( B(X) = X \), the set \( B(X_i) \) is also a connected \((n - 1)\) dimensional \( C^1 \)-embedded submanifold of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) contained in \( X \). Then, since \( X \cup \{ 0 \} \) is the union of the hyperplanes \( X_i \cup \{ 0 \}, i = 1, \ldots, n \), it follows from Proposition 9 that \( B(X_i) \) is entirely contained in some hyperplane \( X_j \cup \{ 0 \} \). Then we have

\[
B(X_i) \subseteq X_j.
\]

By the same argument, the set \( B^{-1}(X_j) \) is contained in some hyperplane \( X_k \cup \{ 0 \} \), that is, \( B^{-1}(X_j) \subseteq X_k \) holds. This shows that

\[
X_i = B^{-1}(B(X_i)) \subseteq B^{-1}(X_j) \subseteq X_k.
\]

Since \( X_i \) cannot be a subset of \( X_k \) if \( i \neq k \), it follows that \( i = k \). Then, we obtain \( X_i = B^{-1}(X_j) \), i.e., \( B(X_i) = X_j \).

Since \( B \) is a bijection, the above argument shows that there exists a permutation \( \tau \) on \( \{ 1, \ldots, n \} \) such that

\[
B(X_i) = X_{\tau(i)}.
\]

Then we have

\[
A(M^i_p) = \xi_q \circ \xi_q^{-1} \circ A|_{M_p} \circ \xi_p(X_i) = \xi_q \circ B(X_i) = \xi_q(X_{\tau(i)}) = M^\tau(i).
\]

Taking the linear span both sides, we also have

\[
A(V_i) = V_{\tau(i)} \quad \text{where} \quad V_i := \{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid x_i = 0 \}.
\]

Now we apply the induction hypothesis to the isomorphism \( A|_{V_i} \) as follows. Define the isomorphism \( \varphi_i : V_i \to \mathbb{R}^n \) by

\[
\varphi_i(t, x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, 0, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n) = (t, x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)
\]

and consider the isomorphism \( A_i := \varphi_{\tau(i)} \circ A|_{V_i} \circ \varphi_i^{-1} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n \). By the above argument, we see that

\[
A_i(\mathcal{L}^p_q) = \mathcal{L}^n_q,
\]

where

\[
A_i(\mathcal{L}^n_p) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} \circ A|_{V_i} \circ \varphi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{L}^p_q) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} \circ A(\text{cone } M^i_p) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\text{cone } M^\tau(i)) = \mathcal{L}^n_q.
\]
So the induction hypothesis implies that $A_i$ is bijective on
$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \mathbb{R}_{++}(1, \sigma e_j^{n-1}).$$
Therefore, $A|_{V_i} = \varphi_{\tau(i)}^{-1} \circ A_i^{-1} \circ \varphi_i$ is a bijection from
$$\bigcup_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \setminus \{i\}} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \mathbb{R}_{++}(1, \sigma e_j^n)$$
on to
$$\bigcup_{j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \setminus \{\tau(i)\}} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \mathbb{R}_{++}(1, \sigma e_j^n).$$
Combining this result for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, it turns out that $A$ is bijective on
$$E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \bigcup_{\sigma \in \{-1,1\}} \mathbb{R}_{++}(1, \sigma e_i^n).$$

Combining the latter assertion of Theorem 11 and Proposition 2, we obtain the description of the automorphism group of the $p$-cones.

**Corollary 12.** For $p \in [1, \infty)$, $p \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$, we have $\text{Aut}(L^{n+1}_p) = \text{Aut}(L^{n+1}_1)$. In particular, any $A \in \text{Aut}(L^{n+1}_p)$ can be written as
$$A = \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & P \end{pmatrix},$$
where $\alpha > 0$ and $P$ is an $n \times n$ generalized permutation matrix.

We can also recover our previous result on the non-homogeneity of $p$-cones with $p \neq 2$. In contrast to [6], here we do not require the theory of $T$-algebras.

**Corollary 13.** For $p \in [1, \infty)$, $p \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$, the $p$-cone $L^{n+1}_p$ is not homogeneous.

**Proof.** By Corollary 12, for any $A \in \text{Aut}(L^{n+1}_p) = \text{Aut}(L^{n+1}_1)$, we have that the vector $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is an eigenvector of $A$. So, there is no automorphism of $L^{n+1}_p$ that maps $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ to an interior point of $L^{n+1}_p$ that does not belong to
$$\{(\beta, 0, \ldots, 0) \mid \beta > 0\}.$$ Hence, $L^{n+1}_p$ cannot be homogeneous.

Now the non-self-duality of $p$-cones $L^{n+1}_p$ for $p \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$ is an immediate consequence of Theorem 11 in view of Proposition 1, while we need an extra argument for the case $(p, q, n) = (1, \infty, 2)$.

**Corollary 14.** For $p \in [1, \infty)$, $p \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$, the $p$-cone $L^{n+1}_p$ is not self-dual under any inner product.

**Proof.** Suppose that $L^{n+1}_p$ is self-dual under some inner product. Then, by Proposition 1, there exists a symmetric positive definite matrix $A$ such that
$$A L^{n+1}_p = L^{n+1}_q$$
where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1.$
If $(p, q, n) \neq (1, \infty, 2), (\infty, 1, 2)$, then $p = q = 2$ must hold by Theorem 11. Now let us consider the case $(p, q, n) = (1, \infty, 2)$, i.e., $A\mathcal{L}_1^3 = \mathcal{L}_\infty^3$. Recalling (2), we have $B\mathcal{L}_1^3 = \mathcal{L}_3^1$ with

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2}\cos(\pi/4) & -\sqrt{2}\sin(\pi/4) \\ 0 & \sqrt{2}\sin(\pi/4) & \sqrt{2}\cos(\pi/4) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

Therefore, $B^{-1}A \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{L}_1^3)$ holds. Then, by Proposition 2, the matrix $A$ can be written as $A = BC$ where $C$ is of the form

$$C = \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \pm 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \pm 1 \\ 0 & \pm 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

Since $A$ is symmetric, it has one of the following forms:

$$\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. $$

None of them is positive definite. Therefore, we obtain a contradiction. \qed 
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