

Singularities of solutions of time dependent Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Applications to Riemannian geometry

Piermarco Cannarsa*, Wei Cheng[†] & Albert Fathi[‡]

December 2019

Abstract

If $U : [0, +\infty[\times M$ is a uniformly continuous viscosity solution of the evolution Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_t U + H(x, \partial_x U) = 0,$$

where M is a not necessarily compact manifold, and H is a Tonelli Hamiltonian, we prove the set $\Sigma(U)$, of points where U is not differentiable, is locally contractible. Moreover, we study the homotopy type of $\Sigma(U)$. We also give an application to the singularities of a distance function to a closed subset of a complete Riemannian manifold.

1 Introduction

Let M be a smooth connected but not necessarily compact manifold. We will assume M endowed with a *complete* Riemannian metric g . For $v \in T_x M$, the norm $\|v\|_x$ is $g(v, v)^{1/2}$. We will denote also by $\|\cdot\|_x$ the dual norm on $T_x^* M$. If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is a curve, its length $\ell_g(\gamma)$ (for the metric g) is defined by

$$\ell_g(\gamma) = \int_a^b \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)} ds.$$

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”, Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy. cannarsa@mat.uniroma2.it

[†]Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China. chengwei@nju.edu.cn

[‡]Georgia Institute of technology & ENS de Lyon (Emeritus), School of Mathematics, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA. albert.fathi@math.gatech.edu

The distance d that we will use on M is the Riemannian distance obtained from the Riemannian metric. Namely, if $x, y \in M$ the distance $d(x, y)$ is the infimum of the length of curves joining x to y . Since g is complete, the distance d is complete, and for every pair of points $x, y \in M$, there exists a curve joining x to y whose length is $d(x, y)$. Moreover, for every compact subset $K \subset M$ and every finite $R \geq 0$, the closed R -neighborhood $\bar{V}_R(K)$ of K defined by

$$\bar{V}_R(K) = \{x \in M \mid d(x, K) \leq R\}$$

is itself compact.

Before giving our results for the general Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we will give the consequences in Riemannian geometry.

If C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) . As usual, the distance function $d_C : M \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ to C is defined by

$$d_C(x) = \inf_{c \in C} d(c, x).$$

We will denote by $\Sigma^*(d_C)$ the set of points in $M \setminus C$ where d_C is not differentiable. Note that $\Sigma^*(d_C)$ has Lebesgue measure 0, since the Lipschitz function d_C on M is differentiable almost everywhere.

Theorem 1.1. *Consider the closed subset C of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) . Then $\Sigma^*(d_C)$ is locally contractible.*

As a first application, if we take $C = \{p\}$, the set $\Sigma^*(d_p)$ is nothing but the set of $q \in M$ such that there exists two distinct minimizing geodesics from p to q . The closure is known as the cut locus $\text{Cut-locus}_{(M,g)}(p)$ of p for (M, g) . It is well-known that, for M compact, this cut locus $\text{Cut-locus}_{(M,g)}(p)$ is a deformation retract of $M \setminus p$, therefore it is locally contractible. However, even if there is an extensive literature on the cut locus, very little was known up to now about the set of $q \in M$ such that there exists two distinct minimizing geodesics from p to q . As Marcel Berger said in [4, Page 284]:

The difficulty for all these studies is an unavoidable dichotomy for cut points: the mixture of points with two different segments and conjugate points.

Our methods permit to separate the study of these two sets.

To state another consequence of Theorem 1.1, we introduce the following definition:

Definition 1.2. If (M, g) is a complete Riemannian manifold, we define the subset $\mathcal{U}(M, g) \subset M \times M$ as the set of $(x, y) \in M \times M$ such that there exists a *unique* minimizing g -geodesic between x and y . This set $\mathcal{U}(M, g)$ contains a neighborhood of the diagonal $\Delta_M \subset M \times M$. The complement

$\mathcal{NU}(M, g) = M \times M \setminus \mathcal{U}(M, g)$ is the set of points $(x, y) \in M$ such that there exists at least two distinct minimizing g -geodesics between x and y .

In fact, as we will see in Example 2.30, we have $\mathcal{NU}(M, g) = \Sigma^*(d_{\Delta_M})$, the set of singularities in $M \times M \setminus \Delta_M$ of the distance function of points in $M \times M$ to the closed subset Δ_M . Therefore, Theorem 1.1 implies:

Theorem 1.3. *For every complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) , the set $\mathcal{NU}(M, g) \subset M \times M \setminus \Delta_M$ is locally contractible. In particular, the set $\mathcal{NU}(M, g)$ is locally path connected.*

As above, from $\mathcal{NU}(M, g) = \Sigma^*(d_{\Delta_M})$, we obtain that $\mathcal{NU}(M, g)$ has Lebesgue measure 0.

Definition 1.4. For a closed subset $C \subset M$, we define its Aubry set $\mathcal{A}^*(C)$ as the set of points $x \in M \setminus C$ such that there exists a curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ parameterized by arc-length such that $d_C(\gamma(t)) = t$ and $x = \gamma(t_0)$ for some $t_0 > 0$.

Remark 1.5. A curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ parameterized by arc-length such that $d_C(\gamma(t)) = t$ is necessarily a g -minimizing geodesic. In fact, for $0 \leq s \leq t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_C(\gamma(t)) &\leq d_C(\gamma(s)) + d(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) \\ &\leq s + \ell_g(\gamma|_{[s, t]}) \\ &\leq s + (t - s) = t. \end{aligned}$$

Since $d_C(\gamma(t)) = t$, we obtain $d(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = \ell_g(\gamma|_{[s, t]}) = t - s$, which means that the curve γ , parametrized by arc-length, is a minimizing g -geodesic.

We necessarily have $\Sigma^*(d_C) \cap \mathcal{A}^*(C) = \emptyset$, see below.

Theorem 1.6. *If C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) , then the inclusion $\Sigma^*(d_C) \subset M \setminus (C \cup \mathcal{A}^*(C))$ is a homotopy equivalence.*

If U is a bounded connected component of $M \setminus C$, then $U \cap \mathcal{A}^*(C) = \emptyset$, see §7, and Theorem 1.6 implies that the inclusion $\Sigma^*(d_C) \cap U \subset U$ is a homotopy equivalence. This fact was already known. It is due to Lieutier [23] in the Euclidean case and to Albano, Cannarsa, Nguyen & Sinestrari [1] in the general Riemannian case. The non-compact case is, to our knowledge, new, see however [10] where they study the unbounded components of $\Sigma^*(d_C)$ in the Euclidean case.

A consequence of Theorem 1.6 is

Theorem 1.7. *For every compact connected Riemannian manifold M , the inclusion $\mathcal{NU}(M, g) \subset M \times M \setminus \Delta_M$ is a homotopy equivalence. Therefore the set $\mathcal{NU}(M, g)$ is path connected and even locally contractible.*

Of course, the homotopy equivalence in this theorem is a consequence of the compact version of Theorem 1.6, which is due, as we said above, to Albano, Cannarsa, Nguyen & Sinestrari [1].

We will give a version for non-compact M in §7.

For sake of completeness, we note that the subset Δ_M is a deformation retract of $\mathcal{U}(M, g)$. In fact, we can get such a retraction using the midpoint in a geodesic segment minimizing the length between the pair of points.

We now state our general results for Tonelli Hamiltonians. The local contractibility Theorem 1.8 is valid under slightly less restrictive conditions on the Hamiltonian H , see §8.

We recall that a Tonelli Hamiltonian $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on M (for the complete Riemannian metric g) is a function $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(1*) The Hamiltonian H is at least C^2

(2*) (Uniform superlinearity) For every $K \geq 0$, we have

$$C^*(K) = \sup_{(x,p) \in T^*M} K\|p\|_x - H(x, p) < \infty.$$

(3*) (Uniform boundedness in the fibers) For every $R \geq 0$, we have

$$A^*(R) = \sup\{H(x, p) \mid \|p\|_x \leq R\} < +\infty.$$

(4*) (C^2 strict convexity in the fibers) For every $(x, p) \in T^*M$, the second derivative along the fibers $\partial^2 H / \partial p^2(x, p)$ is positive definite.

Note that (2*) implies

$$\forall (x, p) \in T^*M, H(x, p) \geq K\|p\|_x - C^*(K).$$

We will consider viscosity solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. There are several classical introductions to viscosity solutions [2, 3, 8, 13]. The more recent introductions [19, 20] are well-adapted to our manifold setting.

If $u : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function defined on the manifold N , a singularity of u is a point of N where u is not differentiable. We denote by $\Sigma(u)$ the set of singularities of u .

The goal of this work is to study the topological structure of the set of singularities $\Sigma(U)$, with $U : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a continuous viscosity solution of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\partial_t U + H(x, \partial_x U) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

defined on the open subset $O \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$.

In [9], we announced the results and sketched the proofs for M compact in the case of the stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation, i.e. for U of the form $U(t, x) = u(x) - ct$, with $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. We extend the results of [9] to the case of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1) covering also the case when M is non-compact.

Our first result is a local contractibility result.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Tonelli Hamiltonian. If the function $U : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined on the open subset $O \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$ is a continuous viscosity solution, on $]0, t[\times M$, of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation*

$$\partial_t U + H(x, \partial_x U) = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

then set $\Sigma(U) \subset O$ of singularities of U is locally contractible.

In fact, as we will see, the above theorem follows from its particular case with $U :]0, +\infty[\times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

To give a more global result on the topology of $\Sigma(U)$ we need the Aubry set of a solution of (1.1). For this we first recall that the Lagrangian $L : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (associated to H) is defined by

$$L(x, v) = \sup_{p \in T_x^* M} p(v) - H(x, p).$$

This Lagrangian L is finite everywhere, and enjoys the same properties as H , namely

- (1) The Lagrangian L is at least C^2 (in fact, it is as smooth as H).
- (2) (Uniform superlinearity) For every $K \geq 0$, we have

$$C(K) = \sup_{(x, v) \in TM} K \|v\|_x - L(x, v) < \infty. \quad (1.3)$$

- (3) (Uniform boundedness in the fibers) For every $R \geq 0$, we have

$$A(R) = \sup\{L(x, v) \mid \|v\|_x \leq R\} < +\infty. \quad (1.4)$$

- (4) (C^2 strict convexity in the fibers) for every $(x, v) \in TM$, the second derivative along the fibers $\partial^2 L / \partial v^2(x, v)$ is positive definite.

Again (1.3) implies

$$\forall (x, v) \in TM, L(x, v) \geq K\|v\|_x - C(K). \quad (1.5)$$

A Lagrangian $L : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, on the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) , is said to be Tonelli if it satisfies the conditions (1) to (4) above.

Definition 1.9 (Aubry set). Let $U :]0, T[\times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $T \in]0, +\infty]$, be a viscosity solution, on $]0, T[\times M$, of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). The Aubry set $\mathcal{I}_T(U)$ of U is the set of points $(t, x) \in]0, T[\times M$ for which we can find a curve $\gamma : [0, T[\rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(t) = x$ and

$$U(b, \gamma(b)) - U(a, \gamma(a)) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds,$$

for every $a < b \in [0, T[$.

It is well-known that U is differentiable at every point of $\mathcal{I}_T(U)$, see Proposition 2.13. Therefore, we have $\Sigma(U) \cap \mathcal{I}_T(U) = \emptyset$. To avoid further machinery, in this introduction, we will state our results assuming the function $U : [0, t] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ uniformly continuous.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Tonelli Hamiltonian. Assume that the uniformly continuous function $U : [0, t] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution, on $]0, t[\times M$, of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). Then the inclusion $\Sigma_t(U) = \Sigma(U) \cap]0, t[\times M \subset]0, t[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_t(U)$ is a homotopy equivalence.*

Acknowledgments. This work is partly supported by National Natural Scientific Foundation of China (Grant No.11790272, No.11871267 and No.11631006), and the National Group for Mathematical Analysis, Probability and Applications (GNAMPA) of the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica “Francesco Severi”. The authors acknowledge support from the MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata, CUP E83C18000100006. The authors are also grateful to the departments of mathematics of Fudan University and Nanjing University, for the hospitality they received from these institutions while completing this manuscript.

Albert Fathi’s work was also supported by ANR-12-BS01-0020 WKBHJ, and the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1440140 while he was in residence as a Clay Senior Scholar at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Fall 2018 semester.

2 Background

We will need to use some of the facts about viscosity solutions and the negative Lax-Oleinik semi-groups. We refer to [19] and [20] for details and proofs.

In the remainder of this section, we will assume that $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given Tonelli Hamiltonian on the complete Riemannian manifold M . We will denote by $L : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ its associated Lagrangian defined by

$$L(x, v) = \sup_{p \in T_x^*M} p(v) - H(x, p).$$

2.1 Action and minimizers

If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is an absolutely continuous curve, its action $\mathbb{L}(\gamma)$ is defined by

$$\mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds.$$

Note that since L is bounded from below (by $-C(0)$), we always have $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) > -\infty$, although we may have $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) = +\infty$.

For $x, y \in M$, and $t > 0$, the minimal action $h_t(x, y)$ to join x to y in time t is

$$h_t(x, y) = \inf_{\gamma} \mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \inf_{\gamma} \int_0^t L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds,$$

where the infimum is taken over all absolutely continuous curves $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(t) = y$.

A minimizer (for L) is an absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ such that

$$\mathbb{L}(\gamma) = h_{b-a}(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)).$$

Tonelli's theorem [7, 11, 15] states that, for every $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $x, y \in M$, there exists a minimizer $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(a) = x, \gamma(b) = y$. All minimizers are as smooth as L .

Moreover, all minimizers are extremals, i.e. they satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equation given, in local coordinates, by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) \right] = \frac{\partial L}{\partial x}(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)). \quad (2.1)$$

As is well-known the 2nd order ODE (2.1) on M yields a 1st order ODE on TM which generates a flow ϕ_t^L on TM called the Euler-Lagrange flow. A curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is an extremal (i.e. satisfies (2.1)) if and only if its speed curve $s \mapsto (\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s))$ is (a piece of) an orbit of the Euler-Lagrange flow ϕ_t^L .

An absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is called a *local* minimizer (for L) if there exists a neighborhood U of $\gamma([a, b])$ in M such that for any other absolutely continuous curve $\delta : [a, b] \rightarrow U$, with $\delta(a) = \gamma(a)$ and $\delta(b) = \gamma(b)$, we have $\mathbb{L}(\delta) \geq \mathbb{L}(\gamma)$. The regularity part of Tonelli's theorem implies that such a local minimizer $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is as smooth as L and satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation (2.1). Therefore its speed curve $s \mapsto (\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s))$ is (a piece of) an orbit of the Euler-Lagrange flow ϕ_t^L .

Example 2.1. The simplest Tonelli Hamiltonian $H_g = T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) is given by

$$H_g(x, p) = \frac{1}{2} \|p\|_x^2.$$

Its associated Lagrangian $L_g : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by:

$$L_g(x, v) = \frac{1}{2} \|v\|_x^2.$$

If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is a curve, we will denote by $\mathbb{L}_g(\gamma)$ its action for this Lagrangian L_g .

$$\mathbb{L}_g(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)}^2 ds.$$

Lemma 2.2. *For any curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma) &\geq \frac{\ell_g(\gamma)^2}{2(b-a)} \\ &\geq \frac{d^2(\gamma(a), \gamma(b))}{2(b-a)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

with equality if and only if γ is a minimizing g -geodesic.

Therefore, for every $t > 0$ and every $x, y \in M$, we have

$$h_t^g(x, y) = \frac{d(x, y)^2}{2t}. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, a curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is L_g -minimizing if and only if it is a minimizing geodesic.

Proof. Indeed, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_g(\gamma)^2 &= \left(\int_a^b \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)} ds \right)^2 \\ &\leq (b-a) \int_a^b \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)}^2 ds \\ &= 2(b-a) \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if $\|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)}$ is constant. Since $d(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) \leq \ell_g(\gamma)$, this establishes (2.2). Moreover, we have equality in (2.2) if and only if $d(\gamma(a), \gamma(b)) = \ell_g(\gamma)$ and $\|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)}$ is constant, which is precisely the case when γ is a minimizing g -geodesic.

Since the Riemannian manifold (M, g) is complete, given $t > 0$ and $x, y \in M$, we can find a minimizing g -geodesic $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(t) = y$. From the first part of the Lemma, this proves (2.3).

The last part of the Lemma follows from the first two. \square

Example 2.3. If (M, g) is a Riemannian manifold, we define the Riemannian manifold $(M \times M, g \times g)$ as $M \times M$ with metric $g \times g$, i.e.

$$g \times g(x_1, x_2, v_1, v_2) = g(x_1, v_1) + g(x_2, v_2),$$

where we used the identification $T_{(x_1, x_2)}(M \times M) = T_{x_1}M \times T_{x_2}M$. If (M, g) is complete so is $(M \times M, g \times g)$.

Therefore $H_{g \times g} = T^*(M \times M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$H_{g \times g}(x, p) = \frac{1}{2} \|p\|_x^2.$$

Its associated Lagrangian $L_{g \times g} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by:

$$L_{g \times g}(x_1, x_2, v_1, v_2) = \frac{1}{2} \|v_1\|_{x_1}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|v_2\|_{x_2}^2.$$

A curve $\Gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M \times M$ is nothing but a pair of curves $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, such that $\Gamma(s) = (\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(s))$, for all $s \in [a, b]$. We will denote this identification by $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.

Lemma 2.4. *If $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : [a, b] \rightarrow M \times M$ is a curve in $M \times M$, its length is*

$$\ell_{g \times g}(\Gamma) = \ell_{g \times g}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \int_a^b \sqrt{\|\dot{\gamma}_1(s)\|_{\gamma_1(s)}^2 + \|\dot{\gamma}_2(s)\|_{\gamma_2(s)}^2} ds.$$

The action of Γ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_{g \times g}(\Gamma) &= \mathbb{L}_{g \times g}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_a^b \|\dot{\gamma}_1(s)\|_{\gamma_1(s)}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}_2(s)\|_{\gamma_2(s)}^2 ds \\ &= \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma_1) + \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma_2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The $g \times g$ -distance in $M \times M$ is given by

$$d((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = \sqrt{d(x_1, y_1)^2 + d(x_2, y_2)^2}.$$

Therefore, since $h_t^{(g,g)}((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = d((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2))^2/(2t)$, we get

$$h_t^{(g,g)} = \frac{d(x_1, y_1)^2 + d(x_2, y_2)^2}{2t}.$$

This equality implies that the $g \times g$ -geodesics (resp. $g \times g$ -minimizing geodesics) in $M \times M$, which are also the $L_{g \times g}$ -extremals (resp. $L_{g \times g}$ -minimizers), are the curves $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ such that γ_1 and γ_2 are both g -geodesics (resp. g -minimizing geodesics).

Most of the proof of Lemma 2.4 is similar to or uses Lemma 2.2.

In order to give the connection between action and viscosity solutions it is convenient to introduce the following (obvious) definition.

Definition 2.5 (Graph of a curve). If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, we define its graph $\text{Graph}(\gamma) \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$ as

$$\text{Graph}(\gamma) = \{(t, \gamma(t)) \mid t \in [a, b]\}.$$

We now recall the definition of domination for a function.

Definition 2.6. If $U : O \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is a function defined on the subset $O \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$, we say that U is dominated by L (on O) if for every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $\text{Graph}(\gamma) \subset O$ and $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) dt < +\infty$, we have

$$U(\gamma(b), b) \leq \mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) dt + U(\gamma(a), a), \quad (2.5)$$

Note that the right hand side of (2.5) makes always sense since we insisted that $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) < +\infty$.

Remark 2.7. 1) We used the inequality (2.5) rather than the usual

$$U(\gamma(b), b) - U(\gamma(a), a) \leq \mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) dt. \quad (2.6)$$

since it will be convenient to consider real valued functions with possibly infinite values. Of course when U is finite valued (2.5) and (2.6) are equivalent.

2) If $U : I \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval, then all curves defined on a subinterval $[a, b] \subset I$ have their graph included in $I \times M$. Therefore, in such a case, the function U is dominated by L if and only if

$$U(t', x') - U(t, x) \leq h_{t'-t}(x, x'), \text{ for every } x, x' \in M, \text{ and every } t < t' \in I. \quad (2.7)$$

A first connection between action and viscosity solutions is given by the following proposition, see [22] or [20] for a proof.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Tonelli Hamiltonian. Assume $V : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, where $O \subset R \times M$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R} \times M$. Then V is a viscosity subsolution of*

$$\partial_t V + H(x, \partial_x V) = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

on O if and only if it is dominated by L on O , where L is the Lagrangian associated to H .

2.2 Calibrated curves, backward characteristics

Definition 2.9 (Calibrated curve). Let $U : O \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be a function. An absolutely curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is said to be U -calibrated (for the Lagrangian L) if $\text{Graph}(\gamma) \subset M$, its action $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds$ is finite, and

$$U(b, \gamma(b)) = U(a, \gamma(a)) + \mathbb{L}(\gamma) = U(a, \gamma(a)) + \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds. \quad (2.9)$$

Again we used 2.9, rather than the more usual $U(b, \gamma(b)) - U(a, \gamma(a)) = \mathbb{L}(\gamma)$, because we would like to allow possibly infinite values for U .

Proposition 2.10. *Suppose $U : O \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is a function defined on the subset O .*

If the absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is piecewise U -calibrated, then it is U -calibrated.

Of course, the curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is said to be piecewise calibrated if we can find a finite sequence $a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_\ell = b$ such that each restriction $\gamma|_{[t_i, t_{i+1}]}, i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ is U -calibrated.

The notion of calibrated curve is useful when U is a viscosity subsolution as can be seen from the following well-known proposition.

Proposition 2.11. *Suppose the function $U : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and a viscosity subsolution, on O , of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is U -calibrated, with either $U(a, \gamma(a))$ or $U(b, \gamma(b))$ finite, we have:*

(1) *For every $t \in [a, b]$, the value $U(t, \gamma(t))$ is finite.*

- (2) The restriction $\gamma|_{[a', b']}$ is also U -calibrated, for any subinterval $[a', b'] \subset [a, b]$.
- (3) the curve γ is a local minimizer. Hence it is as smooth as L and a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation (2.1).

For the next proposition we will use the notion of upper and lower differentials, see [2, 3, 8, 15, 19] for more details on this notion and its relationship with viscosity solutions.

Notation 2.12. If $w : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function on the manifold N and $n \in N$, the set of upper-differentials (resp. lower-differentials) of w at n is denoted by $D^+w(n) \subset T_n^*N$ (resp. $D^-w(n) \subset T_n^*N$).

Proposition 2.13. Suppose the function $U : O \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined on the open subset $O \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$ is continuous and a viscosity subsolution of the evolution Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1) on O . Assume that $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, is a U -calibrated curve.

- (i) For every $t \in]a, b]$, we have

$$(-H(\gamma(t), \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))), \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))) \in D^+U(t, \gamma(t)),$$

$$\text{where } D^+U(t, \gamma(t)) \subset \mathbb{R} \times T_{\gamma(t)}^*N \cong T_{(t, \gamma(t))}^*(\mathbb{R} \times N).$$

- (ii) For every $t \in [a, b[$, we have

$$(-H(\gamma(t), \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))), \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))) \in D^-U(t, \gamma(t)),$$

$$\text{where } D^-U(t, \gamma(t)) \subset T_{(t, \gamma(t))}^*(\mathbb{R} \times N) \cong \mathbb{R} \times T_{\gamma(t)}^*N.$$

- (iii) In particular, if $\partial_x U$ exists at $(t, \gamma(t))$ with $t \in [a, b]$, then

$$\partial_x U(t, \gamma(t)) = \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)).$$

- (iv) If $\partial_t U$ exists at $(t, \gamma(t))$ with $t \in [a, b]$, then

$$\partial_t U(t, \gamma(t)) + H(\gamma(t), \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))) = 0.$$

- (v) Moreover, the function U is indeed differentiable at every point $(t, \gamma(t))$ with $t \in]a, b[$.

Definition 2.14 (Backward characteristic). Let $U : O \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be a function where $O \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$. A backward U -characteristic ending at $(t, x) \in]0, T[\times M$ is a U -calibrated curve $\gamma : [a, t] \rightarrow M$ with $a < t$ and $\gamma(t) = x$.

More generally, a curve $\gamma : [a, t] \rightarrow M$ is called a backward U -characteristic if it is a backward characteristic ending at $(t, \gamma(t))$.

Again this notion of backward characteristic is useful only when U is at least a viscosity subsolution of the evolution Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). Using that backward characteristics are extremals, the following proposition is a consequence of Proposition 2.13.

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose the function $U : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where O is an open subset of $\mathbb{R} \times M$, is continuous and a viscosity subsolution of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1) on O . If $\gamma : [a, t] \rightarrow M$, is a backward U -characteristic, then U is differentiable at $(s, \gamma(s))$ for all $s \in]a, t[$.*

Moreover, if U is differentiable at $(t, \gamma(t))$ then γ is the unique backward characteristic (for U) ending at $(t, \gamma(t))$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x U(t, \gamma(t)) &= \partial_v L(\gamma(t), \gamma(t)) \\ \partial_t U(t, \gamma(t)) + H(\gamma(t), \partial_x U(t, \gamma(t))) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

2.3 The negative Lax-Oleinik semi-group and the negative Lax-Oleinik evolution

In fact, viscosity solutions which are continuous are always given by the negative Lax-Oleinik evolution as we now recall.

Once the minimal action is defined, we can introduce the negative Lax-Oleinik semi-group.

If $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is a function and $t > 0$, the function $T_t^- u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is defined by

$$T_t^- u(x) = \inf_{y \in M} u(y) + h_t(y, x),$$

We also set $T_0^- u = u$. The negative Lax-Oleinik semi-group is $T_t^-, t \geq 0$.

It is convenient to define $\hat{u} : [0, +\infty[\times M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ by

$$\hat{u}(t, x) = T_t^- u(x).$$

This function \hat{u} is called the negative Lax-Oleinik evolution of u .

Example 2.16. By (2.3), for the Hamiltonian $H_g : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and Lagrangian $L_g : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined in Example 2.1, we have

$$h_t^g(x, y) = \frac{d(x, y)^2}{2t}.$$

Therefore, the associated negative Lax-Oleinik semi-group T_t^{g-} is defined, when $t > 0$, by

$$T_t^{g-} u(x) = \inf_{y \in M} u(y) + \frac{d(y, x)^2}{2t},$$

for $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$.

If $C \subset M$, we define its (modified) characteristic function $\chi_C : M \rightarrow \{0, +\infty\}$ by

$$\chi_C(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \in C, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } x \notin C. \end{cases}$$

Therefore its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution $\hat{\chi}_C$, for the Lagrangian L_g , is defined, for $t > 0$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\chi}_C(t, x) &= \inf_{y \in M} \chi_C(y) + \frac{d(y, x)^2}{2t} \\ &= \inf_{c \in C} \frac{d(c, x)^2}{2t}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $d_C : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the distance function to C , is given by

$$d_C(x) = \inf_{c \in C} d(c, x), \quad (2.10)$$

for $t > 0$, we obtain

$$\hat{\chi}_C(t, x) = \frac{d_C(x)^2}{2t}. \quad (2.11)$$

Note that $d_C = d_{\bar{C}}$, where \bar{C} is the closure of C in M . Hence, we get $\hat{\chi}_C = \hat{\chi}_{\bar{C}}$ on $]0, +\infty[\times M$. Therefore, to study of the properties of $\hat{\chi}_C$ on $]0, +\infty[\times M$, we can always assume that C is a closed subset of M .

Lemma 2.17. *Suppose C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) . A curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $a > 0$, is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated if and only if it is a minimizing g -geodesic and*

$$\frac{d_C^2(\gamma(b))}{2b} - \frac{d_C^2(\gamma(a))}{2a} = \frac{d^2(\gamma(b), \gamma(a))}{2(b-a)}.$$

A curve $\gamma : [0, b] \rightarrow M$ is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated if and only if it is a minimizing g -geodesic, with $\gamma(0) \in C$ and

$$d_C(\gamma(b)) = d(\gamma(b), \gamma(0)).$$

Proof. Suppose that the curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $a > 0$, is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated. It must be a minimizing geodesic. We now recall, see 2.2, that for a minimizing g -geodesic $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, we have

$$\mathbb{L}_g(\gamma) = \frac{d^2(\gamma(b), \gamma(a))}{2(b-a)}.$$

Therefore, using (2.11), we see that calibration for a minimizing g -geodesic $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $a > 0$, is equivalent to

$$\frac{d_C^2(\gamma(b))}{2b} = \frac{d_C^2(\gamma(a))}{2a} + \frac{d^2(\gamma(b), \gamma(a))}{2(b-a)}.$$

This finishes to prove the first part with $a > 0$.

The curve $\gamma : [0, b] \rightarrow M$ is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated if and only if

$$\frac{d_C^2(\gamma(b))}{2b} = \chi_C(\gamma(0)) + \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma).$$

Since the left hand side is finite and $\mathbb{L}_g(\gamma) > -\infty$, this is equivalent to $\gamma(0) \in C$ and $\frac{d_C^2(\gamma(b))}{2b} = \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma)$.

Assume $\gamma : [0, b] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) \in C$, is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated. As we saw above we have $\mathbb{L}_g(\gamma) = d_C^2(\gamma(b))/2b$. Since $d_C(\gamma(b)) \leq d(\gamma(b), \gamma(0))$, and $\mathbb{L}_g(\gamma) \geq d^2(\gamma(b), \gamma(0))/(2b)$, we indeed get $d_C(\gamma(b)) = d(\gamma(b), \gamma(0))$.

Conversely, if $\gamma : [0, b] \rightarrow M$ is a minimizing g -geodesic, with $\gamma(0) \in C$ and $d_C(\gamma(b)) = d(\gamma(b), \gamma(0))$, we get

$$\frac{d_C^2(\gamma(b))}{2b} = \frac{d^2(\gamma(b), \gamma(0))}{2b} = \mathbb{L}_g(\gamma).$$

Since $\gamma(0) \in C$, by what we obtained above, this implies that γ is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated. \square

We will now give the relationship between the Aubry set $\mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$ of $\hat{\chi}_C$ —see Definition 1.9— and the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}^*(C)$ of the closed set C —see Definition 1.4.

Proposition 2.18. *If C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) , then we have*

$$\mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times (C \cup \mathcal{A}^*(C)).$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.17, a curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated for the Lagrangian L_g , if and only if it is a minimizing g -geodesic satisfying

$$\gamma(0) \in C \text{ and } d_C(\gamma(t)) = d(\gamma(t), \gamma(0)), \text{ for all } t > 0. \quad (2.12)$$

Therefore, a constant curve with value in C is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrating. This implies that $]0, +\infty[\times C \subset \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$.

For a curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ and $\lambda > 0$, we define $\gamma_\lambda : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ by

$$\gamma_\lambda(t) = \gamma(\lambda t).$$

Obviously, the curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ is a minimizing g -geodesic that satisfies (2.12), if and only γ_λ is also a minimizing g -geodesic satisfying (2.12).

Assume now that $(t, y) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$, with $y \notin C$. We can find a $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(t) = y$. Since $\gamma(0) \in C$, the g -geodesic γ is not constant. Since geodesics are parametrized proportionally to arc-length, we can find λ such that γ_λ is parameterized by arc length. As we saw above, the curve γ_λ is a minimizing g -geodesic satisfying (2.12). Since, the g -geodesic γ_λ is minimizing and parametrized by arc-length, we get $d_C(\gamma_\lambda(s)) = d(\gamma_\lambda(s), \gamma_\lambda(0)) = s$. By Definition 1.4, this means that $y \in \mathcal{A}^*(C)$. Hence $\mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C) \subset]0, +\infty[\times (C \cup \mathcal{A}^*(C))$.

It remains to show that $]0, +\infty[\times \mathcal{A}^*(C) \subset \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$. Suppose $y \in \mathcal{A}^*(C)$. By Definition 1.4 and Remark 1.5, we can find a minimizing g -geodesic $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ parameterized by arc-length such that $d_C(\gamma(t)) = d(\gamma(0), \gamma(t))$ and $y = \gamma(t_0)$ for some $t_0 > 0$. Therefore, for every $\lambda > 0$, the curve γ_λ is $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated. Therefore, we get $(t/\lambda, \gamma_\lambda(t)) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$, for every $t > 0$. Since $\gamma_\lambda(t_0/\lambda) = \gamma(t_0) = y$, and $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude that $(t, y) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$, for every $t > 0$. Hence $]0, +\infty[\times \mathcal{A}^*(C) \subset \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$. \square

Example 2.19. We specialize the previous case to the diagonal $\Delta_M = \{(x, x) \mid x \in M\} \subset M \times M$ of the Riemannian manifold $(M \times M, g \times g)$. We will show that

$$\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}(x, y) = \frac{d_{\Delta_M}(x, y)^2}{2t} = \frac{d(x, y)^2}{4t}. \quad (2.13)$$

The left hand side equality follows from (2.3), with $C = \Delta_M$. It remains to compute $d_{\Delta_M}(x, y)$. We will need the following simple well-known Lemma:

Lemma 2.20. *For any $k \geq 0$ and any a, b with $a + b \geq k$, we have $a^2 + b^2 \geq k^2/2$, with equality if and only if $a = b = k/2$.*

We have

$$d_{\Delta_M}(x, y)^2 = \inf_{c \in M} d((x, y), (c, c))^2 = \inf_{c \in M} d(x, c)^2 + d(y, c)^2$$

We now note that $d(x, c) + d(y, c) \geq d(x, y)$, and, since M is complete, that we can find $c_0 \in M$, with $d(x, c_0) = d(y, c_0) = d(x, y)/2$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.20 we get

$$d_{\Delta_M}(x, y)^2 = \frac{d(x, y)^2}{2},$$

which yields the right hand side equality in (2.13).

Lemma 2.21. *Let $\Gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M \times M$ be a curve in $M \times M$, with $\Gamma(s) = (\gamma_1(s), \gamma_2(s))$, with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : [0, t] \rightarrow M$. The curve Γ is $\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}$ -calibrated if and only if γ_1 and γ_2 are both minimizing g -geodesics, with $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0)$ and*

$$d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t)) = d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t)) = \frac{d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))}{2}.$$

Therefore, if $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : [0, t] \rightarrow M \times M$ is such a $\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}$ -calibrated curve, then the curve $\gamma : [-t, t] \rightarrow M$ defined by

$$\gamma(s) = \begin{cases} \gamma_1(-s), & \text{if } s \in [-t, 0], \\ \gamma_2(s), & \text{if } s \in [0, t], \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

is a minimizing g -geodesic.

Conversely, if $\gamma : [-t, t] \rightarrow M$, is a minimizing g -geodesic, then $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : [0, t] \rightarrow M \times M$ defined, for $s \in [0, t]$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(s) &= \gamma(-s) \\ \gamma_2(s) &= \gamma(s) \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

is $\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}$ -calibrated.

Proof. From Lemma 2.17 applied to the closed set Δ_M of the Riemannian manifold $(M \times M, g \times g)$, we get that $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : [0, t] \rightarrow M \times M$ is $\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}$ -calibrated curve if and only if Γ is a minimizing $g \times g$ -geodesic (which is equivalent to the fact both γ_1 and γ_2 are minimizing g -geodesics) with $\Gamma(0) \in \Delta_M$ (which is equivalent to $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0)$) and

$$d_{\Delta_M}(\Gamma(t)) = d(\Gamma(0), \Gamma(t)).$$

By (2.13) in Example 2.19, the last identity is in turn equivalent to

$$\frac{d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))}{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t))^2 + d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t))^2}. \quad (2.16)$$

Since, we already know that $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0)$, we get

$$d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t)) + d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t)) \geq d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)).$$

By Lemma 2.20, we obtain that (2.16) is equivalent to

$$d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t)) = d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t)) = \frac{d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))}{2}.$$

This finishes to prove the characterization of $\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}$ -calibrated curves $\Gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M \times M$.

Assume now that $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : [0, t] \rightarrow M \times M$. Since $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(0)$, the curve γ in (2.14) is well defined and

$$\ell_g(\gamma) = \ell_g(\gamma_1) + \ell_g(\gamma_2).$$

As we showed above γ_1 and γ_2 are both minimizing g -geodesics, with

$$d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t)) = d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t)) = \frac{d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t))}{2}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_g(\gamma) &= d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_1(t)) + d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t)) \\ &= d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \\ &= d(\gamma(-t), \gamma(t)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that γ is a g -minimizing geodesic.

Conversely, if $\gamma : [-t, t] \rightarrow M$, is a minimizing g -geodesic, and γ_1, γ_2 are defined by (2.15), then they are minimizing g -geodesics and

$$d(\gamma_2(0), \gamma_2(t)) = d(\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(t)) = \frac{d(\gamma(-t), \gamma(t))}{2},$$

since a geodesic is parametrized proportionally to arc-length. Hence $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is $\hat{\chi}_{\Delta_M}$ -calibrated. \square

The following theorems were obtained in [20]. We will sketch a proof of the first one in Appendix A. The proof of the second one uses the methods of Appendix A together with an appropriate form of the maximum principle.

Theorem 2.22. *Assume $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Hamiltonian. Let $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be a function and denote by $\hat{u} : [0, +\infty[\times M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution. If \hat{u} is finite-valued on $]0, t_0[\times M$, then it is continuous and even locally semiconcave on $]0, t_0[\times M$.*

Moreover, the negative Lax-Oleinik evolution is a viscosity solution, on $]0, t_0[\times M$, of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1).

Theorem 2.23. *Assume $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Hamiltonian. If the continuous function $U :]0, t_0[\times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation*

$$\partial_t U + H(x, \partial_x U) = 0$$

on $]0, t_0[\times M$, then $U = \hat{u}$ on $]0, t_0[\times M$ for some function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$.

Remark 2.24. Note that in the previous two theorems no assumption (continuity or else) is made on u . However, the finiteness assumption of \hat{u} on $]0, t_0[\times M$, puts some strong restrictions on the behaviour of u . For example it is not difficult to check that this finiteness assumption implies that u is bounded below by a continuous function, even when M is not compact.

In fact, if $(t, x) \in M \times]0, t_0[$, since $\hat{u}(t, x) = \inf_{y \in M} u(y) + h_t(y, x)$, then $u(y) \geq \hat{u}(t, x) - h_t(y, x)$. But the function of $y \mapsto \hat{u}(t, x) - h_t(y, x)$ is continuous on M .

In particular, when M is compact the finiteness assumption on \hat{u} is equivalent to u being bounded from below and not equal to $+\infty$ everywhere.

Even for M non-compact, if u is bounded from below not equal to $+\infty$ everywhere, its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} is finite everywhere.

It follows from Theorem 2.23 that Theorem 1.8 for $O =]0, t_0[\times TM$ is a particular case of Theorem 3.1 below, which states that $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ is locally contractible for any $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ such that \hat{u} is finite on $]0, t_0[\times M$.

We now recall some more facts on \hat{u} obtained, for example, in [20].

Proposition 2.25. *For every function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$, we have $\hat{u} = \hat{u}_-$ on $]0, +\infty[\times M$, with $u_- : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ the lower semi-continuous regularization of u given by*

$$u_-(x) = \liminf_{y \rightarrow x} u(y) = \sup_V \inf_{y \in V} u(y),$$

where the supremum is taken over all neighborhoods V of x .

We recall that u_- is the largest lower semi-continuous function which is $\leq u$.

Example 2.26. If $C \subset M$, it is not difficult to see that the lower semi-continuous regularization of the characteristic function χ_C is precisely the characteristic function $\chi_{\bar{C}}$, where \bar{C} is the closure of C in M .

As a consequence of Proposition 2.25, without loss of generality, we can assume that the function u is lower semi-continuous when we consider properties of \hat{u} away from $\{0\} \times M$.

This is quite convenient since, as shown in [20], see also the Remark A.5 in the Appendix, it allows to have backward characteristics.

Proposition 2.27. *If the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semi-continuous, and its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} is finite on $]0, t_0[\times M$, with $t_0 \in]0, +\infty]$, then, for every $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$, we can find a backward \hat{u} -characteristic $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(t) = x$.*

The existence of backward characteristics at every points allows to give a criterion for differentiability, which complements both Propositions 2.13 and 2.15

Proposition 2.28. *Assume that the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is lower semi-continuous, and that its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} is finite on $]0, t_0[\times M$, with $t_0 \in]0, +\infty]$. Then, the function \hat{u} is differentiable at a point $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$, if and only if there exists a unique backward \hat{u} -characteristic $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(t) = x$.*

Example 2.29. If C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) , Proposition 2.27 applied to the Lagrangian L_g of Example 2.1 and the function χ_C shows that for every $x \in M$ and every $t > 0$, we can find a g -geodesic $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(0) \in C, \gamma(t) = x$ and

$$\frac{d_C(x)^2}{2t} = \int_0^t \frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)}^2 ds = \frac{d(\gamma(0), x)^2}{2t}.$$

This last equality is of course equivalent to $d_C(x) = d(\gamma(0), x)$.

Given that (M, g) is a complete Riemannian manifold, this is of course equivalent to the well-known fact that the inf in the definition (2.10) of $d_C(x)$ is always attained by a point $c \in C$, when C is closed.

Moreover, by Proposition 2.28, we obtain that d_C is differentiable at $x \notin C$ if and only if there is a unique (up to reparametrization) minimizing g -geodesic $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) \in C, \gamma(t) = x$ and $d_C(x) = d(\gamma(0), x)$.

Example 2.30. If we apply the previous example to the closed subset Δ_M of the complete Riemannian manifold $(M \times M, g \times g)$, by Lemma 2.21, we first recover the well know fact that any pair of points x, y in M can be joined by a minimizing geodesic.

Moreover, by Proposition 2.28 applied to $d_{\Delta_M}^2$, we obtain that $d_{\Delta_M}^2$ is differentiable at $(x, y) \in M \times M$ if and only if there is a unique (up to reparametrization) minimizing g -geodesic in M joining x to y . Therefore, recalling from Definition 1.2 that $\mathcal{U}(M, g)$ is the set of $(x, y) \in M \times M$ such that there exists a *unique* minimizing g -geodesic between x and y , we obtain that the set of points in $M \times M$ where $d_{\Delta_M}^2$ is differentiable is precisely $\mathcal{U}(M, g)$. Therefore, its complement $M \times M \setminus \mathcal{U}(M, g) = \mathcal{N}\mathcal{U}(M, g)$ —the set of points $(x, y) \in M \times M$ such that there exists at least two distinct minimizing g -geodesics between x and y —is the set $\Sigma(d_{\Delta_M}^2)$ of singularities of $d_{\Delta_M}^2$. Since, the diagonal Δ_M is contained in $\mathcal{U}(M, g)$, we conclude that

$$\Sigma^*(d_{\Delta_M}) = \mathcal{N}\mathcal{U}(M, g).$$

2.4 Cut points and cut time function

In this subsection, we will consider a lower semi-continuous function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ such that \hat{u} is finite on $]0, t_0[\times M$, where $t_0 \in]0, +\infty]$. By Theorem 2.22, on $]0, t_0[\times M$ the function \hat{u} is locally semiconcave and a viscosity solution of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). Moreover, by Proposition 2.27, for every $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$ we can find a backward \hat{u} -characteristic ending at (t, x) .

Recall that $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ the set of singularities of \hat{u} contained in $]0, t_0[\times M$.

We now introduce the set $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset]0, t_0[\times M$ of cut points of \hat{u} .

Definition 2.31 ($\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$). The set $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ of cut points of \hat{u} is the set of points $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$ where no backward \hat{u} -characteristic ending at (t, x) can be extended to a \hat{u} -calibrating curve defined on $[0, t']$, with $t' > t$.

Lemma 2.32. *Under the hypothesis above, the point $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$ is in $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ if and only if for any \hat{u} -calibrating curve $\delta : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $t \in [a, b]$ and $\delta(t) = x$, we have $t = b$.*

Proof. In fact, if δ is as given above, and $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ is a backward \hat{u} -characteristic ending at (t, x) , then the curve defined on $[0, b] \supset [0, t]$ which is equal to γ on $[0, t]$ and δ on $[t, b]$ is continuous and piecewise calibrated on $[0, b]$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.10, it is a \hat{u} -calibrated curve extending γ . If $(t, x) \in \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, then we must have $t = b$. \square

Proposition 2.33. *Under the hypothesis above, we have*

$$\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset]0, t_0[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_{t_0}(\hat{u}).$$

Moreover, the set $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ is dense in $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$. Hence, we have

$$\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset \overline{\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})}.$$

Proof. The fact that $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap \mathcal{I}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) = \emptyset$ follows from Lemma 2.32. Note now that for every point $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M \setminus \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, we can find a \hat{u} -calibrated curve $\gamma : [0, t'] \rightarrow M$ with $t' > t$ and $\gamma(t) = x$. Therefore, by part (v) of Proposition 2.13, the function \hat{u} is differentiable at (t, x) . Hence we get $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$.

We now prove the density of the inclusion $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$. Suppose that $V \subset]0, t_0[\times M$ is an open neighborhood of (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) which contains no point of $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$. Since \hat{u} is semiconcave and is differentiable everywhere on the open set V it is $C^{1,1}$, see [8]. Therefore, if we set

$$X(t, x) = \partial_p H(x, \partial_x \hat{u}(t, x)),$$

we conclude that the vector field \bar{X} on V defined by

$$\bar{X}(t, x) = (1, \partial_p H(x, \partial_x \hat{u}(t, x)))$$

is locally Lipschitz. Therefore, we can find a solution $\Gamma : [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \rightarrow V$ of $\dot{\Gamma}(t) = \bar{X}(t, \Gamma(t))$ with $\Gamma(0) = (\bar{t}, \bar{x})$. Given the form of the vector field \bar{X} , we have $\Gamma(s) = (\bar{t} + s, \bar{\gamma}(s))$ with $\bar{\gamma}$ a curve in M such that $\bar{\gamma}(0) = \bar{x}$. It is well known that $\gamma : [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \rightarrow M$, defined by $\gamma(t) = \bar{\gamma}(t - \bar{t})$, is \hat{u} -calibrated with $\gamma(\bar{t}) = \bar{x}$, see [14, Proposition 3.4, Page 487]. Proposition 2.32 now implies that (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) is not in $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$. Hence any open subset of $]0, t_0[\times M$ intersecting $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ contains points in $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$. \square

At this point, it is convenient to introduce the cut time function $\tau :]0, t_0[\times M \rightarrow]0, t_0]$ for \hat{u} .

Definition 2.34 (Cut Time Function). For $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$, we define $\tau(t, x)$ as the supremum of the $t' \in [t, t_0]$ such that there exists a \hat{u} -calibrating curve $\gamma : [0, t'] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(t) = x$. The function $\tau :]0, t_0[\times M \rightarrow]0, t_0]$ for \hat{u} is the cut time of \hat{u} .

We give a characterization of the cut-time function.

Proposition 2.35. *Suppose $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$. Choose a \hat{u} -calibrated curve $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(t) = x$. Since γ is a minimizer, it can be extended to an extremal $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ of L . We have*

$$\tau(t, x) = \sup\{t' \in]0, t_0[\mid \gamma|_{[0, t']} \text{ is } \hat{u}\text{-calibrated}\} \geq t.$$

Proof. Set $S = \sup\{t' \in]0, t_0[\mid \gamma|_{[0, t']} \text{ is } \hat{u}\text{-calibrated}\}$. Since $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$ is \hat{u} -calibrated, we indeed have $S \geq t$. Moreover, if $\gamma|_{[0, t']}$ is \hat{u} -calibrated, with $t' > t$, then $\gamma|_{[t, t']}$ is also \hat{u} -calibrated. Therefore, we get $S \leq \tau(t, x)$.

On the other hand if $\delta : [t, s] \rightarrow M$ is \hat{u} -calibrated, with $\delta(t) = x$, then the concatenation $\delta(\gamma|_{[0, t]})$ of $\gamma|_{[0, t]}$ and δ is also d_C -calibrated, therefore $\delta(\gamma|_{[0, t]})$ is a geodesic. Since it coincides, with γ on $[0, t]$, we must have $\delta(\gamma|_{[0, t]}) = \gamma$ on $[0, s]$. In particular, we get that $\gamma|_{[0, s]}$ is \hat{u} -calibrated. Hence, we get $\tilde{\tau}(x) \leq S$. \square

Proposition 2.36. *The properties of the cut time function τ are:*

- (i) $\tau(t, x) \in [t, t_0]$;
- (ii) $\tau(t, x) = t$ if and only if $(t, x) \in \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$;
- (iii) $\tau(t, x) = t_0$ if and only if $(t, x) \in \mathcal{I}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$;

(iv) the function τ is upper semi-continuous.

Proof. Property (i) is obvious. Property (ii) follows from Proposition 2.32.

Property (iii) follows from Proposition 2.35 and the fact that calibrated curves are minimizers (hence extremals).

For part (iv) Assume that $(t_n, x_n) \rightarrow (t, x)$ with $\tau(t_n, x_n) \rightarrow t'$. We must show that $t' \leq \tau(t, x)$. By contradiction, assume $t' > \tau(t, x) \geq t$. Fix t'' such that $t' > t'' > \tau(t, x) \geq t$. For n large, we have $\tau(t_n, x_n) > t'' > t_n$. Therefore for such an n we can find a \hat{u} -calibrated curve $\gamma_n : [0, t''] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma_n(t_n) = x_n$. Extracting, if necessary, we can obtain a curve $\gamma : [0, t''] \rightarrow M$ which is a C^1 limit of the minimizers γ_n . This curve γ is also \hat{u} -calibrated and satisfies $\gamma(t) = x$, this a contradiction since $t'' > \tau(t, x)$. \square

3 Local contractibility

Theorem 1.8 is a consequence of the following more general one.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Tonelli Hamiltonian. Assume that the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is such that its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} is finite at every point of $]0, t_0[\times M$. Then the sets $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ and $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ are locally contractible. In particular, they are locally path connected.*

At this point it is useful to introduce the concept of U -adapted homotopy.

Definition 3.2 (U -adapted homotopy). Suppose $U : [0, t_0] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution of the evolution Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). A continuous homotopy $F : S \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$, with $\delta > 0$ and $S \subset]0, t_0[\times M$, is said to be U -adapted if it satisfies

- (1) for all $(t, x) \in S$, we have $t + \delta < t_0$;
- (2) for all $(t, x) \in S$, we have $F[(t, x), 0] = x$;
- (3) if $(t + s, F[(t, x), s]) \notin \Sigma_{t_0}(U)$, for some $(t, x) \in S$ and some $s \in]0, \delta]$, then the curve $\sigma \mapsto F[(x, t), \sigma - t]$, $\sigma \in [t, t + s]$, is U -calibrated;
- (4) If $\gamma : [t, t + s] \rightarrow M$ is U -calibrated, with $(t, \gamma(t)) \in S$, then for every $\sigma \leq t + \min(s, \delta)$, we have $F[(t, \gamma(t)), \sigma - t] = \gamma(\sigma)$.

Notation 3.3. For such a U -adapted homotopy $F : S \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$, with $S \subset]0, t_0[\times M$, we define $\bar{F} : S \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow]0, t_0[\times M$ by

$$\bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t + s, F[(t, x), s]).$$

The nice feature of U -adapted homotopies is the stability by restriction and composition as given in the following lemma, whose proof is immediate.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose $U : [0, t_0] \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a viscosity solution of the evolution Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1). If $F_1 : S_1 \times [0, \delta_1] \rightarrow M$, and $F_2 : S_2 \times [0, \delta_2] \rightarrow M$ are two continuous U -adapted homotopies, with $S_1, S_2 \subset]0, t_0[\times M$ such that $\bar{F}_1[(t, x), \delta_1] = (t + \delta_1, F_1[(t, x), \delta_1]) \in S_2$, for all $(t, x) \in S_1$, then the homotopy $F : S_1 \times [0, \delta_1 + \delta_2] \rightarrow M$ defined by*

$$F[(t, x), s] = \begin{cases} F_1[(t, x), s], & \text{for } s \in [0, \delta_1], \\ F_2[\bar{F}_1[(t, x), \delta_1], s - \delta_1], & \text{for } s \in [\delta_1, \delta_1 + \delta_2], \end{cases}$$

is itself U -adapted.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is such that its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} is finite at every point of $]0, t_0[\times M$. If $F : S \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$, with $S \subset]0, t_0[\times M$, is a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy, then we have*

$$\bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t + s, F[(t, x), s]) \in \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}), \text{ for all } s \in]\tau(t, x) - t, t_0 - t[,$$

where τ is the cut time function for \hat{u} .

Proof. Assume that $\bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t + s, F[(t, x), s]) \notin \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, then, by part (3) of Definition 3.2, the curve $\sigma \mapsto F[(t, x), \sigma - t], \sigma \in [t, t + s]$, is \hat{u} -calibrated which implies that $t + s \leq \tau(t, x)$. \square

We will deduce Theorem 3.1 from the lemma below, whose proof will be postponed to section §4.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Tonelli Hamiltonian. Assume that the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is such that its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} is finite at every point of $]0, t_0[\times M$.*

Then, for every compact subset $C \subset]0, t_0[\times M$, we can find $\delta > 0$ and a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$.

Moreover, for every $(t, x) \in C$ and every $s \in]0, \delta]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}[t + s, F((t, x), s)] - h_s[x, F((t, x), s)] &= \max_{z \in M} \hat{u}(t + s, z) - h_s(x, z) \\ &\geq \hat{u}(t + s, x) - h_s(x, x). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Fix $(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) \in \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, and a neighborhood of (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) of the form $[a, b] \times K$, with $[a, b] \subset]0, t_0[$ a compact interval, and $K \subset M$ a compact subset. Hence $a < \bar{t} < b$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathring{K}$, where \mathring{K} is the interior of K .

We now remark that, to prove the theorem, it suffices to find a neighborhood $[\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$ of (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) contained in $[a, b] \times K$ and a homotopy $H : [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [a, b] \times K$ such that

(C1) $H[(t, x), 0] = (t, x)$, for all $(t, x) \in [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$;

(C2) $H[(t, x), s] \in \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ for all $(t, x) \in \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$, and all $s > 0$;

(C3) $H[(t, x), 1] \in \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, for all $(t, x) \in [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$.

In fact, properties (C1) and (C2) show that the inclusion $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V \subset \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [a, b] \times K$ (resp. $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V \subset \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [a, b] \times K$) is homotopic to $H(\cdot, 1)$ as maps with values in $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [a, b] \times K$ (resp. $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [a, b] \times K$). We now observe that, cutting down the neighborhood V of \bar{x} on the manifold M , we can assume that V is contractible in itself. Hence, so is $[\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$. Therefore, by (C3), we obtain that $H(\cdot, 1)$ on $[\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$ is homotopic to a constant as maps with values in $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u}) \cap [a, b] \times K$. This clearly finishes the proof of local contractibility for both $\Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$ and $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$.

It remains to construct H . We first use Lemma 3.6 to find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : [a, b] \times K \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$ for some $\delta > 0$. Since $F[(\bar{t}, \bar{x}), 0] = \bar{x} \in \mathring{K}$, we can find $\delta_1, \epsilon > 0$ and a neighborhood $V \subset \mathring{K}$ of x such that $[\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon + \delta_1] \subset]a, b[$, and $F([\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V \times [0, \delta_1]) \subset \mathring{K}$. Since the point (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) is in $\text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, we have $\tau(\bar{t}, \bar{x}) = \bar{t}$, where τ is the cut time function of \hat{u} . Using that τ is upper semi-continuous, we conclude that $\tau(t, x) < t + \delta_1$ in a neighborhood of (\bar{t}, \bar{x}) in $]0, t_0[\times M$. Therefore, cutting down ϵ and V if necessary, we can assume that $\tau(t, x) < t + \delta_1$, for $(t, x) \in [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$.

By the upper semi-continuity of τ , using the bound $\tau(t, x) - t < \min \delta_1$ on $[\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$ and Baire's interpolation theorem, see [6, Proposition 7.21] or [12, Section VIII.4.3], we can find a *continuous* function $\alpha : [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V \rightarrow]0, \delta_1[$ such that

$$0 \leq \tau(t, x) - t < \alpha(t, x) < \delta_1, \text{ for all } (t, x) \in [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V.$$

This implies that $\bar{F}[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)] = (t + s\alpha(t, x), F[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)])$ is well defined and is in $[a, b] \times K$, for all $(t, x) \in [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$ and all $s \in [0, 1]$.

Therefore we can now define the continuous homotopy $H : [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [a, b] \times K$ by

$$H[(t, x), s] = \bar{F}[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)] = (t + s\alpha(t, x), F[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)]). \quad (3.2)$$

Obviously, the homotopy H satisfies the required property (C1) given above. Since $\tau(t, x) < t + \alpha(t, x)$, Proposition (3.5), applied to the \hat{u} -adapted homotopy F , implies $H[(t, x), 1] = \bar{F}[(t, x), \alpha(t, x)] \in \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, for $(t, x) \in [\bar{t} - \epsilon, \bar{t} + \epsilon] \times V$. This proves (C3). To prove (C2), we remark that $\tau(t, x) = t$, for $(t, x) \in \text{Cut}_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, which, again by Proposition (3.5),@ implies $H[(t, x), s] = \bar{F}[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)] \in \Sigma_{t_0}(\hat{u})$, for every $s > 0$. \square

We now prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. If C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold M , from Example 2.16, the negative Lax-Oleinik evolution $\hat{\chi}_C$ is given, for $t > 0$, by

$$\hat{\chi}_C(x) = \frac{d_C(x)^2}{2t}.$$

The partial derivative $\partial_t \hat{\chi}_C$ is given by

$$\partial_t \hat{\chi}_C(t, x) = -\frac{d_C(x)^2}{2t^2}.$$

Hence, it is defined and continuous everywhere. This implies that

$$\Sigma(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times \Sigma(d_C^2), \quad (3.3)$$

where $\Sigma(d_C^2)$, as usual, is the set of points in M where d_C^2 is not differentiable.

From Theorem 3.1, we obtain that $\Sigma(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times \Sigma(d_C^2)$ is locally contractible, which implies that $\Sigma(d_C^2)$ is also locally contractible.

We now observe that d_C^2 is differentiable at every point $c \in C$, since $0 \leq d_C^2(x) \leq d^2(c, x)$. Therefore, from $d_C > 0$ on $M \setminus C$, we get

$$\Sigma(d_C^2) = \Sigma^*(d_C). \quad (3.4)$$

This finishes the proof Theorem 1.1. \square

4 Proof of Lemma 3.6

Since C is a compact subset of $]0, t_0[\times M$, it is contained in a subset of the form $[a, b] \times K$, where K is compact subset of M and $[a, b] \subset]0, t_0[$. We then fix a positive number $\eta > 0$ such that $[a - \eta, b + \eta] \subset]0, t_0[$.

By Theorem 2.22, the function \hat{u} is continuous and even locally semiconcave on $]0, t_0[\times M$. This implies that the family of functions $(T_t^- u)_{t \in [a - \eta, b + \eta]}$ is equi-continuous and equi-semiconcave on the compact neighborhood $\bar{V}_1(K) = \{y \in M \mid d_K(y) \leq 1\}$ of K .

We define the two continuous functions $u_0, u_1 : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u_0(x) = \inf_{t \in [a - \eta, b + \eta]} \hat{u}(t, x) \text{ and } u_1(x) = \sup_{t \in [a - \eta, b + \eta]} \hat{u}(t, x). \quad (4.1)$$

We need to use the positive Lax-Oleinik semi-group $T_t^+, t \geq 0$, whose definition we now recall.

If $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is a function and $t > 0$, the function $T_t^+ u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is defined by

$$T_t^+ u(x) = \sup_{y \in M} u(y) - h_t(x, y). \quad (4.2)$$

We also set $T_0^+ u = u$.

Remark 4.1. As is well-known, the semi-group \check{T}_t^- defined by $\check{T}_t^-(u) = -T_t^+(-u)$ is in fact the negative Lax-Oleinik semi-group associated to the Lagrangian $\check{L} : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\check{L}(x, v) = L(x, -v)$.

If u is not identically $-\infty$, then $T_s^+ u > -\infty$ everywhere for $s > 0$. Therefore $T_s^+ u$ is finite everywhere, for $s > 0$, if $T_s^+ u < +\infty$ everywhere and u is not identically $-\infty$.

For $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$, it is convenient to define $\check{u} : [0, +\infty[\times M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ by

$$\check{u}(t, x) = T_t^+ u(x).$$

We will call \check{u} the *positive* Lax-Oleinik evolution. Using the Remark 4.1 above, we obtain from Theorem 2.22 the following analogous theorem

Theorem 4.2. Assume $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Hamiltonian. Let $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be a function. If its positive Lax-Oleinik evolution \check{u} is finite-valued on $]0, t_0[\times M$, then it is continuous and even locally semiconvex on $]0, t_0[\times M$.

Lemma 4.3. For every $s, t \geq 0$, we have $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u \leq T_t^- u$. Therefore $T_s^+ T_s^- T_{s+t}^- u$ is locally semi-convex, for every $t \in [a - \eta, b]$, and $s \in]0, \eta]$.

Proof. By the semi-group property of the negative Lax-Oleinik semi-group T_t^- , $t \geq 0$, for every $t, s \geq 0$, we have $T_{s+t}^- u(x) = \inf_{y \in M} T_t^- u(y) + h_s(y, x)$. Therefore $T_{s+t}^- u(x) \leq T_t^- u(y) + h_s(y, x)$, or equivalently $T_{s+t}^- u(x) - h_s(y, x) \leq T_t^- u(y)$, which implies $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x) = \sup_{y \in M} T_{s+t}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y) \leq T_t^- u(x)$.

For the last part, note that $t + s \in [a - \eta, b + \eta]$, therefore $T_{s+t}^- u$ is finite valued. Moreover, we have $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u \leq T_t^- u$ which is also finite valued. Hence, Theorem 4.2 implies that $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is locally semiconvex. \square

With u_0 and u_1 given by (4.1), we now define $\mathcal{F}_{u_0, u_1, \eta}^+$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_{u_0, u_1, \eta}^+ = \{v : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid v \text{ is continuous, } u_0 \leq, \text{ and } T_\eta^+ v \leq u_1\}.$$

By the very definition (4.1) of u_0 , for $t \in [a - \eta, b + \eta]$, we have $T_t^- u \geq u_0$. Moreover, using Lemma 4.3 and the definition (4.1) of u_1 , for $t \in [a, b + \eta]$, we get $T_\eta^+ T_t^- u \leq T_{t-\eta}^- u \leq u_1$. This implies

$$T_t^- u \in \mathcal{F}_{u_0, u_1, \eta}^+, \text{ for all } t \in [a, b + \eta]. \quad (4.3)$$

Define $A = \min_{\bar{V}_2(K)} u_0 > -\infty$ and $B = \sup_{\bar{V}_2(K)} u_1 < +\infty$, where as usual $\bar{V}_R(K) = \{y \in M \mid d(y, K) \leq R\}$, for $R \geq 0$. Note that $\bar{V}_{R'}(\bar{V}_R(K)) \subset \bar{V}_{R+R'}(K)$, for $R, R' \geq 0$. Therefore, we have $\bar{V}_r(\bar{V}_1(K)) \subset \bar{V}_2(K)$, for $0 < r \leq 1$. This implies that

$$\mathcal{F}_{u_0, u_1, \eta}^+ \subset \mathcal{F}_{\bar{V}_1(K), A, B, \eta, r}^+,$$

for every $0 < r \leq 1$, where as is given by (A.1) in Appendix A.

$$\mathcal{F}_{\bar{V}_1(K), A, B, \eta, r}^+ = \{u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty] \mid A \leq u, T_\eta^+ u \leq B \text{ on } \bar{V}_r(\bar{V}_1(K))\},$$

from the definition given by (A.1) in Appendix A. Therefore, combining with (4.3), for every $0 < r \leq 1$, we get

$$T_t^- u \in \mathcal{F}_{\bar{V}_1(K), A, B, \eta, r}^+, \text{ for all } t \in [a, b + \eta].$$

From Proposition A.1 in Appendix A, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *For any $0 < r \leq 1$, we can find $s(r) > 0$, with $s(r) < \eta$ such that for every $s \in]0, s(r)]$, every $t \in [a, b]$ and every $x \in \bar{V}_1(K)$, we have*

$$T_s^+ T_{t+s}^- u(x) = \sup_{\gamma} T_{t+s}^- u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma,$$

where the sup is taken over all absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$.

Moreover, we can find a minimizer $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} T_s^+ T_{t+s}^- u(x) &= T_{t+s}^- u(\gamma(s)) - h_s(x, \gamma(s)) \\ &= T_{t+s}^- u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Any absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and

$$T_s^+ T_{t+s}^- u(x) = T_{t+s}^- u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma$$

is a minimizer with $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$.

In particular, for $0 < s < s(r)$, $t \in [a, b]$, $x \in \bar{V}_1(K)$, we also have

$$T_s^+ T_{t+s}^- u(x) = \sup_{y \in \bar{B}(x, r)} T_{t+s}^- u(x) u(y) - h_s(x, y). \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, if $0 < s \leq s(r)$, there exists $y \in \bar{B}(x, r)$ with

$$T_s^+ T_{t+s}^- u(x) = T_{t+s}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y). \quad (4.5)$$

and any $y \in M$ satisfying (4.5) is in $\bar{B}(x, r)$.

Corollary 4.5. *For $0 < r \leq 1$, the maps $(s, t, x) \mapsto T_s^+ T_{t+s}^- u(x)$ is continuous on $]0, s(r)] \times [a, b] \times \bar{V}_1(K)$, where $s(r) > 0$ is the number obtained in Proposition 4.4 above.*

Proof. For $(s, t, x) \in]0, s(r)] \times [a, b] \times \bar{V}_1(K)$, we get from (4.4) in Proposition 4.4 that we have

$$T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x) = \sup_{y \in \bar{V}_{r+1}(K)} T_{s+t}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y), \quad (4.6)$$

Since $(s, t, x, y) \mapsto T_{s+t}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y)$ is continuous on $(s, t, x) \in]0, \eta] \times [a, b] \times \bar{V}_1(K) \times \bar{V}_2(K)$ and $\bar{V}_{r+1}(K)$ is compact, the continuity on $]0, s(r)] \times [a, b] \times \bar{V}_1(K)$ of the map $(s, t, x) \mapsto T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x)$ follows. \square

The main point toward the existence of a homotopy is the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *There exists $\eta' \in]0, \eta]$, such that $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is C^1 (and even $C^{1,1}$) on $\bar{V}_{1/2}(K) = \{y \in |d(y, K) < 1/2\}$, for $t \in [a, b]$, and $s \in]0, \eta']$.*

As we know already from Lemma 4.3 that $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is locally semiconvex, it suffices to prove that $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is locally semi-concave on a neighborhood of $\bar{V}_{1/2}(K)$.

To prove Lemma 4.6, we use the fact the family of functions $(T_t^- u)_{t \in [a-\eta, b+\eta]}$ is equicontinuous and equi-semiconcave on the compact neighborhood of $\bar{V}_1(K)$ of K .

If M is compact, we could take $K = M$, and the C^1 property above follows from [5].

For the noncompact case, we will use [18, Appendix B], which adapts some of the results of [5] to the noncompact setting.

To be able to use [18, Appendix B], it is useful to introduce, for $r > 0$ a modified family $T_t^{+,r}$ of positive Lax-Oleinik operators defined by

$$T_t^{+,r} u(x) = \sup\{u(y) - h_t(x, y) \mid d(y, x) \leq r\},$$

for $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$.

Using a covering of a compact set by a finite number of domains of charts of the manifold M , it is not difficult to see that the following lemma is a consequence of the positive Lax-Oleinik version of [18, Lemma B.7].

Lemma 4.7. *Let K_1 and K_2 be two compact subsets of M with $K_1 \subset \mathring{K}_2$.*

Assume that \mathcal{F}^+ is a family of functions from M to \mathbb{R} , which is equicontinuous and equi-semiconcave on K_2 . Then there exists $r_0 > 0$, and $\delta_0 > 0$, such that the family $\{T_t^{+,r_0} w \mid w \in \mathcal{F}^+, t \in [0, \delta_0]\}$ is equi-semiconcave on K_1 .

End of proof of Lemma 4.6. We apply Lemma 4.7 above with the family of functions $\mathcal{F}^+ = (T_t^- u)_{t \in [a, b+\eta]}$ and the compact sets $K_2 = \bar{V}_1(K)$, $K_1 = \bar{V}_{1/2}(K)$. Note that by part (4.4) of Proposition 4.4, we have

$$T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x) = T_s^{+,r} T_{s+t}^- u(x), \text{ for } t \in [a, b], s \in]0, s(r)] \text{ and } x \in \bar{V}_1(K).$$

Therefore by Lemma 4.7, we get that, for $t \in [a, b]$ and $s \leq \eta' = \min(\delta_0, s(r_0))$, the function $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is semiconcave on $\bar{V}_{1/2}(K)$. We conclude that, for $s \in]0, \eta']$, $t \in [a, b]$, the function $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is indeed $C^{1,1}$ on $\bar{V}_{1/2}(K)$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 4.6. \square

As we will show below, the construction of the homotopy in Lemma 3.6 will follow easily from the uniqueness given in the next Lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Fix η' given by Lemma 4.6. Assume $(t, x) \in [a, b] \times K$, and $s \in]0, \eta'[,$ Then there exists a unique $y \in M$ such that*

$$T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x) = T_{s+t}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y). \quad (4.7)$$

Moreover, if $s \leq \min(\eta', s(r))$, where $s(r)$ is given by Proposition 4.4, we have $d(y, x) \leq r$, for the y given by (4.7)

For $(t, x) \in [a, b] \times K$, $s \in]0, \eta'[,$ and y given by (4.7), the minimizer $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$ joining x to y is also unique, and satisfies

$$d_x(T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u) = \partial_v L(x, \dot{\gamma}(0)) \text{ and } \partial_v L(y, \dot{\gamma}(s)) \in D^+(T_{s+t}^- u)(y).$$

If $s \leq \min(\eta', s(r))$, this minimizer γ has length $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$.

To prove this Lemma we need the T_t^+ version of Proposition 2.13. Again this version follows from Remark 4.1.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose $w : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function such that $T_s^+ w$ is finite, for some $s > 0$. Assume that $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$ is a minimizer such that*

$$T_s^+ w(\gamma(0)) = w(\gamma(s)) - h_s(\gamma(0), \gamma(s)),$$

then we have

$$\partial_v L(\gamma(0), \dot{\gamma}(0)) \in D^- T_s^- w(\gamma(0)) \text{ and } \partial_v L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) \in D^+ w(\gamma(s)). \quad (4.8)$$

In particular, if $T_s^+ w$ is differentiable at $\gamma(0)$, then $\gamma(s)$ is the unique $y \in M$, with $T_s^+ w(\gamma(0)) = w(y) - h_s(\gamma(0), y)$. Moreover, the curve γ is the unique minimizer $\delta : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\delta(0) = \gamma(0)$ and $\delta(s) = \gamma(s)$.

Proof of Lemma 4.8. Since $\eta' \leq s(r_0)$, with $r_0 \leq 1$, by (4.5) in Proposition 4.4, we know that there exists at least one $y \in M$ such that (4.7) holds. If we call $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$ the minimizer such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(s) = y$, we have

$$T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(0)) = T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(s)) - h(\gamma(0), \gamma(s)).$$

Since $s \leq \eta'$ by Lemma 4.6, the function $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$ is differentiable at $x = \gamma(t)$. We can apply Lemma 4.9 to deduce that this minimizer γ is unique, which implies also the uniqueness of y . \square

By Lemma 4.8, we can define the function $F : ([a, b] \times K) \times]0, \eta'] \rightarrow M$ by taking as $F[(t, x), s]$ the unique $y \in M$ such that

$$T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x) = T_{s+t}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y). \quad (4.9)$$

We extend this function F to $([a, b] \times K) \times [0, \eta[$ by $F[(t, x), 0] = x$. Therefore F satisfies part (2) of the Definition 3.2 of \hat{u} -adapted.

Claim 4.10. *The homotopy $F : ([a, b] \times K) \times [0, \eta'] \rightarrow M$, defined above, is continuous and \hat{u} -adapted.*

Proof. We first show that F is continuous on $([a, b] \times K) \times]0, \eta']$. For this, we remark that F takes values in the compact set $\bar{V}_2(K)$. Therefore, to show that F is continuous on $([a, b] \times K) \times]0, \eta']$, it suffices to show that its graph is closed in $([a, b] \times K) \times]0, \eta'] \times \bar{V}_2(K)$. By the definition of F , its graph $\text{Graph}(F)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Graph}(F) = \{ & ((t, x), s, y) \in ([a, b] \times K) \times]0, \eta'] \times \bar{V}_R(K) \mid \\ & T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x) = T_{s+t}^- u(y) - h_s(x, y) \}. \end{aligned}$$

We now note that we proved in Corollary 4.5 that $((t, x), s, y) \mapsto T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(x)$ is continuous. Since the functions $[(t, x), s, y] \mapsto T_{s+t}^- u(y)$ and $[(t, x), s, y] \mapsto h_s(x, y)$ are also continuous for $s > 0$, we conclude that $\text{Graph}(F)$ is closed.

To show that F is continuous at a point in $([a, b] \times K) \times \{0\}$, since $y = F[(t, x), s]$, by Proposition 4.4, we note that $d(x, F[(t, x), s]) \leq r$, for $0 < s \leq s(r)$.

We now check condition (3) of Definition 3.2 for F . Fix $(t, x) \in [a, b] \times K$. Assume that \hat{u} is differentiable at $(t + s, F[(t, x), s])$, for some $s > 0$. Choose a minimizer $\gamma : [t, t + s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(t) = x$ and $\gamma(t + s) = F[(t, x), s]$. Then, by Lemma 4.8, we have

$$\partial_v L(\gamma(t + s), \dot{\gamma}(t + s)) \in D^+(T_{s+t}^- u)(\gamma(t + s)).$$

Since we are assuming that $\hat{u}(\sigma, z) = T_\sigma^- u(z)$ is differentiable at the point $(s + t, \gamma(t + s))$, by Proposition 2.13, we obtain

$$d_{\gamma(t+s)}(T_{s+t}^- u) = \partial_v L(\gamma(t + s), \dot{\gamma}(t + s)).$$

We now observe that, by Proposition 2.15, the backward \hat{u} -characteristic $\bar{\gamma} : [0, t + s] \rightarrow M$ ending at $\gamma(t + s)$ satisfies

$$d_{\bar{\gamma}(t+s)}(T_{s+t}^- u) = \partial_v L(\bar{\gamma}(t + s), \dot{\bar{\gamma}}(t + s)).$$

Since $\gamma(t + s) = \bar{\gamma}(t + s)$, we conclude that the two extremals γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ have the same position and speed at time $t + s$, therefore $\gamma = \bar{\gamma}|[t, t + s]$. In particular, the curve γ is \hat{u} -calibrated. To finish the proof that F satisfies part (3) of Definition 3.2, and to show, at the same time, that F satisfies part (4) of Definition 3.2, it suffices to show the following fact:

Fact: If $\gamma : [t, t + s] \rightarrow M$ is \hat{u} -calibrated then

$$T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t)) = T_t^- u(\gamma(t)) = T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t + s)) - h_s(\gamma(t), \gamma(t + s)).$$

Note that the equality $T_t^- u(\gamma(t)) = T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t + s)) - h_s(\gamma(t), \gamma(t + s))$ is equivalent to $T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t + s)) = T_t^- u(\gamma(t)) + h_s(\gamma(t), \gamma(t + s))$, which is a consequence of the \hat{u} -calibration of γ . Therefore, it remains to show that $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t)) = T_t^- u(\gamma(t))$. Note that Lemma 4.3 states that $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u \leq T_t^- u$. On the other hand, by definition of $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u$, we have $T_s^+ T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t)) \geq T_{s+t}^- u(\gamma(t + s)) - h_s(\gamma(t), \gamma(t + s)) = T_t^- u(\gamma(t))$. \square

To finish the proof of Lemma 3.6, it remains to observe that (3.1) follows from the definition of F .

5 Constructions of Global Homotopy Equivalences

The goal of this section is to establish some results that will help to construct homotopies of the type mentioned in the proof of Theorem 1.10.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is such that \hat{u} is finite on $]0, +\infty[\times M$. If, for every compact subset $C \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$, we can find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, 1] \times M$, then, for every $T \in]0, +\infty]$, the inclusions*

$$\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \subset]0, +\infty[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$$

are all homotopy equivalences.

We reduce, by several lemmas, the proof of Proposition 5.1.

Lemma 5.2. *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1, for every compact subset $C \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$, there exists a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$.*

Proof. We show, by induction on the integer $n \geq 1$, how to extend the \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ to a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, n] \rightarrow M$. Assume $F : C \times [0, n] \rightarrow M$ is constructed for some $n \geq 1$. As introduced in Notation 3.3, we define $\bar{F} : C \times [0, n] \rightarrow]0, +\infty[\times M$ by

$$\bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t + s, F[(t, x), s]).$$

Since \bar{F} is continuous, the subset $C_n = \bar{F}[C \times \{n\}]$ is a compact subset of $]0, +\infty[\times M$. Therefore, by the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1 applied to C_n instead of C , we can find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F_n : C_n \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$. By Lemma 3.4, if we extend F to $C \times [n, n+1]$, by $F[(t, x), s] = F_n[\bar{F}[(t, x), n], s - n]$, it will be \hat{u} -adapted on $C \times [0, n+1]$. \square

Remark 5.3. In fact, if, instead of the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1, we assume that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every compact subset $C \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$, we can find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, \delta] \times M$, then the conclusion of Lemma 5.2 remains valid.

Lemma 5.4. *Under the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1, for every compact subset C of $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, where $T > 0$, we can find a continuous homotopy*

$$G : (]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$$

such that :

$$G[(t, x), 1] \in \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \text{ for all } (t, x) \in C, \quad (5.1)$$

$$G[(t, x), 0] = (t, x), \text{ for all } (t, x) \in]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}), \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$G(\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) \subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \quad (5.3)$$

$$G(\text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}). \quad (5.4)$$

Proof. We choose C' a compact neighborhood of C in $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$. We apply Lemma 5.2 for C' (instead of C) to obtain the homotopy $F : C' \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$. As introduced in Notation 3.3, we define $\bar{F} : C' \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow]0, +\infty[\times M$ by

$$\bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t + s, F[(t, x), s]).$$

We first observe that the image of \bar{F} avoids $\mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$. In fact, if $(t+s, y) = \bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t+s, F[(t, x), s])$ is in $\mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, then $0 < t+s < T$, and there exists a \hat{u} -calibrated curve $\gamma : [0, T[\rightarrow M$ such that $\gamma(t+s) = y$. By Proposition 2.15, this implies that \hat{u} is differentiable at $(t+s, y)$ and any \hat{u} -calibrated curve $\delta : [a, t+s] \rightarrow M$ ending at y must coincide with $\gamma|_{[a, t+s]}$. Using again that \hat{u} is differentiable at $(t+s, y) = \bar{F}[(t, x), s] = (t+s, F[(t, x), s])$, and that F is \hat{u} -adapted, we obtain that the curve $\sigma \rightarrow F[(t, x), \sigma - t], \sigma \in [t, t+s]$, which ends at y , is \hat{u} -calibrated. Therefore $F[(t, x), \sigma - t] = \gamma(\sigma)$, and $\bar{F}[(t, x), \sigma - t] \in \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, for $\sigma \in [t, t+s]$. In particular, for $\sigma = t$, this would imply $(t, x) \in \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, which is impossible, since (t, x) is in C' which is disjoint from $\mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$. Thus we obtained

$$F : C' \times]0, +\infty[\rightarrow M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}). \quad (5.5)$$

Since F is \hat{u} -adapted, we must have

$$\bar{F}((C' \cap \Sigma_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, +\infty[) \subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \quad (5.6)$$

$$\bar{F}((C' \cap \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, +\infty[) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}). \quad (5.7)$$

Since C' is a compact subset of $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, and the upper semi-continuous cut time function τ is $< T$ everywhere in $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, we can choose a finite $T_0 < T$ such that the cut time function τ is $< T_0$ on C' . Since C' is a compact neighborhood of C in $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, we can find a continuous function $\alpha : C' \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that α is identically equal to 1 on C , and α is identically 0 on $\partial C'$, the boundary of C' in $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$. We define $G : C' \times [0, 1] \rightarrow]0, +\infty[\times M$ by

$$G[(t, x), s] = \bar{F}[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)(T_0 - t)].$$

In particular, we get

$$G[(t, x), s] = (t + s\alpha(t, x)(T_0 - t), F[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)(T_0 - t)]).$$

Since $t + s\alpha(t, x)(T_0 - t) \leq T_0$, the image $G(C' \times [0, 1])$ of G is, in fact, contained in $]0, T_0] \times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}) \subset$. Taken together with (5.5), it implies

$$G(C' \times [0, 1]) \subset]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}).$$

Properties (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) of G on $C' \times [0, 1]$ follow from properties (5.6) and (5.7) of \bar{F} . Since for $(t, x) \in C$, we have $\alpha(t, x) = 1$, we get

$$G[(t, x), 1] = (t + s\alpha(t, x)(T_0 - t), F[(t, x), (T_0 - t)]).$$

Since F is \hat{u} -adapted and $\tau < T_0$ on $C' \supset C$, we obtain property (5.1).

Since $G[(t, x), s] = (t, x)$, for $(t, x) \in \partial C'$, we can extend G continuously to $]0, T_0[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]$ by $G[(t, x), s] = (t, x)$, for $(t, x) \notin C'$.

It is not difficult to check that this extension G still has the required properties (5.1) to (5.4). \square

Proposition 5.1. We can find a sequence of compact subsets $C_n, n \geq 1$ of $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, such that $C_n \subset \overset{\circ}{C}_{n+1}$, and $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}) = \cup_{n \geq 0} C_n$. We construct a homotopy $H : (]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$ such that $H(\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, +\infty[) \subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u})$, $H(\text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, +\infty[) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u})$, $H((t, x), 0) = (t, x)$, for all $(t, x) \in]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, and

$$H(C_n \times [n+1, +\infty[) \subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \text{ for all } n \geq 0.$$

We will construct H on $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, n]$ by induction on $n \geq 1$.

We start by applying Lemma 5.4 to the compact set C_1 to obtain the homotopy

$$G_1 : (]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}),$$

with

$$G_1[(t, x), 0] = (t, x), \text{ for all } (t, x) \in (]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(C_1 \times \{1\}) &\subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \\ G_1(\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) &\subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \\ G_1(\text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) &\subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}). \end{aligned}$$

We then set $H[(t, x), s] = G_1[(t, x), s]$, for $(t, x) \in]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, $s \in [0, 1]$. Assuming that H has been constructed on $(]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, n]$, we apply Lemma 5.4 to the compact set $H(C_n \times \{n\})$ to obtain the homotopy

$$G_n : (]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}),$$

with

$$G_n[(t, x), 0] = (t, x), \text{ for all } (t, x) \in (]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G_n[H(C_n \times \{n\}) \times \{1\}] &\subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \\ G_n(\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) &\subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u}), \\ G_n(\text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) &\subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}). \end{aligned}$$

We then define H on $]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}) \times [n, n+1]$ by

$$H[(t, x), s] = G_n(H[(t, x), n], t - n).$$

It is not difficult to check that G satisfies the required properties (5.1)–(5.4).

Since $C_n \subset \mathring{C}_{n+1}$, we can define a continuous function $\alpha :]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha = n + 2$ on ∂C_n , $\alpha(C_0) \subset [1, 2]$, and $\alpha(C_n \setminus \mathring{C}_{n-1}) \subset [n + 1, n + 2]$. Therefore $H[(t, x), \alpha(t, x)] \in \Sigma_T(\hat{u})$, for all $(t, x) \in]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$.

We then define the homotopy $\tilde{H} : M \setminus \mathcal{I}(u) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M \setminus \mathcal{I}(u)$ by

$$\tilde{H}[(x, t), s] = H[(t, x), s\alpha(t, x)].$$

It is not difficult to check that $\tilde{H}[(x, t), 0] = (x, t)$, $\tilde{H}[(x, t), 1] \in \Sigma_T(\hat{u})$, for all $(t, x) \in]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$, $\tilde{H}(\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) \subset \Sigma_T(\hat{u})$, and $\tilde{H}(\text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \times [0, 1]) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u})$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 5.1. \square

Here is a useful criterion that allows to show that the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1 holds.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be such that \hat{u} is finite on $]0, +\infty[\times M$. Assume for every $t_0 > 0$, we can find a constant κ_{t_0} , such that, for every compact subset $C \subset [t_0, +\infty[\times M$, we can find $\delta > 0$ and \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$, such that*

$$d(F[(t, x), s], x) \leq \kappa_{t_0} s, \text{ for all } (t, x) \in C \text{ and all } s \in [0, \delta].$$

Then for every compact subset $C \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$, we can find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$.

Proof. Assume C is a compact subset of $]0, +\infty[\times M$. We first find $a, b \in]0, +\infty[$, with $a < b$, and a compact subset $K \subset M$ such that $C \subset [a, b] \times K$.

We now use the hypothesis of the Lemma, applied to the compact set $[a, b + 1] \times \bar{V}_{\kappa_a}(K) \subset [a, +\infty[\times M$, to find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy

$$F : ([a, b + 1] \times \bar{V}_{\kappa_a}(K)) \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M,$$

such that, for all $(t, x) \in [a, b + 1] \times \bar{V}_{\kappa_a}(K)$ and all $s \in [0, \delta]$, we have

$$d(F[(t, x), s], x) \leq \kappa_a s. \quad (5.8)$$

If $\delta \geq 1$ we have finished. If $\delta < 1$, choose $n_0 \leq 2$ such that $(n_0 - 1) \times \delta < 1 \leq n_0 \delta$. Note that $n_0 \delta < 1 + \delta \leq 2$. By induction on $n = 1, \dots, n_0$,

we will construct an extension of F on $C \times [0, \delta]$ to a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, n\delta] \rightarrow M$ which also satisfies

$$d(F[(t, x), s], x) \leq \kappa_a s, \text{ for all } (t, x) \in C \text{ and all } s \in [0, n\delta]. \quad (5.9)$$

For $n = 1$, we just take the restriction of F to $C \times [0, \delta]$. Assuming $F : C \times [0, n\delta] \rightarrow M$ constructed with $n < n_0$, we note that for every $(t, x) \in C \subset [a, b] \times K$ and every $s \in [0, n\delta] \subset [0, 1]$, we have $t + s \in [a, b + 1]$ and $d(F[(t, x), s], x) \leq \kappa_a s \leq \kappa_a$. Hence $(t + n\delta, F[(t, x), n\delta]) \in [a, b + 1] \times \bar{V}_{\kappa_a}(K)$. Therefore, for $s \in [n\delta, (n + 1)\delta]$, we can set

$$F[(t, x), s] = F[(t + n\delta, F[(t, x), n\delta]), s - n\delta].$$

By Lemma 3.4, this extension of F is still \hat{u} -adapted. It remains to check (5.9) for $s \in [n\delta, (n + 1)\delta]$. Noting that $F[(t, x), s] = F[(t + n\delta, F[(t, x), n\delta]), s - n\delta]$, from (5.8), we obtain $d(F[(t, x), s], F[(t, x), n\delta]) \leq \kappa_a(s - n\delta)$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} d(F[(t, x), s], x) &\leq d(F[(t, x), s], F[(t, x), n\delta]) + d(F[(t, x), n\delta], x) \\ &\leq \kappa_a(s - n\delta) + \kappa_a n\delta = \kappa_a s. \end{aligned}$$

Since $n_0\delta > 1$, this finishes the proof of the Lemma. \square

6 Functions Lipschitz in the large

To state the generalization we have in mind, we recall the definition of Lipschitz in the large for a function, see [24, Definition A.5] or [20].

Definition 6.1. Let X be a metric space whose distance is denoted by d . A function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be Lipschitz in the large if there exists a constant $K < +\infty$ such that

$$|u(y) - u(x)| \leq K + Kd(x, y), \text{ for every } x, y \in X.$$

When the inequality above is satisfied, we will say that u is Lipschitz in the large with constant K .

Note that we do not assume in the definition above that u is continuous.

Obviously, when X is compact $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz in the large if and only if u is bounded.

As is shown in [20, Proposition 10.3], the function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz in the large if and only if there exists a (globally) Lipschitz function $\varphi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\|u - \varphi\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in X} |u(x) - \varphi(x)| < +\infty.$$

In particular, a Lipschitz in the large function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded from below by a Lipschitz function and therefore \hat{u} is finite everywhere on $[0, +\infty[\times M$.

As we will see below the next theorem generalizes Theorem 1.10 stated in the introduction.

Theorem 6.2. *Assume $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz in the large function. For every $T \in]0, +\infty]$ the inclusions $\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \subset]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$ are homotopy equivalences.*

It is not difficult to see that, for a function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ Lipschitz in the large with constant K , its lower semi-continuous regularization u_- is itself Lipschitz in the large with constant K . Therefore by Proposition 2.25, without loss of generality we can prove Theorem 6.2 adding the assumption that u is lower semi-continuous. The main step is to show the following global version of Lemma 3.6.

We now recall the following result, whose proof is standard and can be found in [20, Theorem 10.4].

Proposition 6.3. *If u is Lipschitz in the large, then for every $t_0 > 0$, the restriction of its negative Lax-Oleinik evolution \hat{u} to $[t_0, +\infty[\times M$ is (globally) Lipschitz.*

Corollary 6.4. *If u is Lipschitz in the large, then for every $t_0 > 0$, we can find a constant κ_{t_0} such that for every $t \geq t_0, s > 0, x, y \in M$ with $\hat{u}(t + s, y) - h_s(x, y) \geq \hat{u}(t + s, x) - h_s(x, x)$, we have $d(x, y) \leq \kappa_{t_0}s$.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.3 above we can find a global Lipschitz constant $\lambda < +\infty$ for \hat{u} on $[t_0, +\infty[\times M$. The inequality $\hat{u}(t + s, y) - h_s(x, y) \geq \hat{u}(t + s, x) - h_s(x, x)$ yields

$$h_s(x, y) \leq \hat{u}(t + s, y) - \hat{u}(t + s, x) + h_s(x, x).$$

Since $h_s(x, x) \leq sA(0)$ (where $A(0) = \sup_{x \in M} L(x, 0)$ was defined before, see (1.4)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_s(x, y) &\leq \hat{u}(s + t, y) - \hat{u}(s + t, x) + h_s(x, x) \\ &\leq \lambda d(x, y) + A(0)s. \end{aligned}$$

But by the uniform superlinearity of L , see (1.5), we know that $h_s(x, y) \geq (\lambda + 1)d(x, y) - C(\lambda + 1)s$. Hence, we have $(\lambda + 1)d(x, y) - C(\lambda + 1)s \leq \lambda d(x, y) + A(0)s$, from which the inequality $d(x, y) \leq [C(\lambda + 1) + A(0)]s$ follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.2. Suppose $C \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$ is compact. We show that there exists a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$. This will imply Theorem 6.2 by Proposition 5.1.

Choose $t_0 > 0$ such that $C \subset]t_0, +\infty[\times M$. By Lemma 3.6, we can find a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F_0 : C \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$ with

$$\hat{u}[t + s, F_0((t, x), s)] - h_s[x, F_0((t, x), s)] \geq \hat{u}(t + s, x) - h_s(x, x).$$

By Corollary 6.4, we obtain $d(F_0((t, x), s), x) \leq \kappa_{t_0}$. The existence of \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$ now follows from Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.10, by Theorem 2.23, we know that $U = \hat{u}$, with $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $u(x) = U(0, x)$. Note that the function u itself is uniformly continuous.

Any uniformly continuous function $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz in the large, since it is a uniform limit of Lipschitz functions, see for example [20, Lemma 7.9]. Therefore, Theorem 1.10 is a consequence of the more general Theorem 6.2. \square

Corollary 6.5. *Assume that the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$, with \hat{u} finite everywhere on $]0, +\infty[$, is such that $T_t^- u = \hat{u}(t, \cdot)$ is Lipschitz in the large, for every $t > 0$. Then, for every $T > 0$, the inclusions $\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \subset]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$ are homotopy equivalences.*

Proof. Again, like in the proof of Theorem 6.2, it suffices to show that, for every compact subset $C \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$, there exists a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy $F : C \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$.

By compactness of C , there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $C \subset]t_0, +\infty[\times M$. Set $u_{t_0} = T_{t_0}^- u = \hat{u}(t_0, \cdot)$. We have $\hat{u}_{t_0}(t, x) = \hat{u}(t_0 + t, x)$. Setting $C_{t_0} = \{(t - t_0, x) \mid (t, x) \in C\} \subset]0, +\infty[$, since u_{t_0} is Lipschitz in the large, by the beginning of the proof of Theorem 6.2, we know that we can find a \hat{u}_{t_0} -adapted homotopy $F_0 : C_{t_0} \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$. It is not difficult to see that $F : C \times [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$, defined by $F(t, x) = F_0(t - t_0, x)$, is a \hat{u} -adapted homotopy. \square

Corollary 6.6. *Suppose that the manifold M is compact. If the function $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ is such that \hat{u} is finite everywhere on $]0, +\infty[\times M$, then, for every $T > 0$, the inclusions $\Sigma_T(\hat{u}) \subset \text{Cut}_T(\hat{u}) \subset]0, T[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_T(\hat{u})$ are homotopy equivalences*

Proof. By Theorem 2.22, we know that $T_t^- u$ is continuous on M , for every $t > 0$, therefore Lipschitz in the large, since M is compact. It suffices now to apply Corollary 6.5. \square

Lemma 6.7. *Assume that $C \subset M$ is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) . If U is a relatively compact component of $M \setminus C$, then $]0, +\infty[\times U$ is disjoint from $\mathcal{I}_{+\infty}(\hat{\chi}_C)$.*

In particular, if M is compact, then for any closed subset C we have $\mathcal{I}_{+\infty}(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times C$.

Proof. Assume (t_0, x_0) , with $x_0 \in U$ and $t_0 > 0$, is in the Aubry set $\mathcal{I}_{+\infty}(\hat{\chi}_C)$. We can find a $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated curve $\gamma : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(t_0) = x_0$. By Lemma 2.17, the curve γ is a g -geodesic satisfying $\gamma(0) \in C$ and $d_C(\gamma(t)) = d(\gamma(0), \gamma(t))$, for all $t \geq 0$.

Since γ is a g -geodesic, its speed $\|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)}$ is a constant $v \geq 0$ independent of $t \in [0, +\infty[$. Therefore, the equality above is

$$d_C(\gamma(t)) = vt. \quad (6.1)$$

In particular, we get $d_C(\gamma(t_0)) = vt_0$. But $\gamma(t_0) = x_0 \notin C$, which implies $d_C(\gamma(t_0)) > 0$. Hence $v > 0$. We then deduce from (6.1) that $\gamma(t) \notin C$. Since $\gamma(t_0) = x_0 \in U$, this implies that $\gamma(t)$ is in the connected component U of $M \setminus C$, for all $t > 0$. But the continuous function d_C is bounded on U . This contradicts (6.1) since $v > 0$. \square

Corollary 6.8. *Assume that $C \subset M$ is a closed subset of the compact Riemannian manifold M . Then the inclusion $\Sigma^*(d_C) \subset M \setminus C$ is a homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. Since M is compact, by the previous Lemma 6.7 $\mathcal{I}_{+\infty}(\hat{\chi}_C) \subset]0, +\infty[\times C$. In fact, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_{+\infty}(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times C,$$

since any constant curve in C is obviously $\hat{\chi}_C$ -calibrated.

By Corollary 6.6, we obtain that the inclusion $\Sigma^*(\hat{\chi}_C) \subset]0, +\infty[\times (M \setminus C)$ is a homotopy equivalence. But, by (3.3), we have $\Sigma^*(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times \Sigma(d_C^2)$ and by (3.4), we have $\Sigma(d_C^2) = \Sigma^*(d_C)$. This finishes the proof of the Corollary. \square

7 More application to complete non-compact Riemannian manifold

Assume that C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) . If M is not compact, then neither χ_C nor $\hat{\chi}_C(t_0, \cdot) = d_C(\cdot)^2/2t$ are necessarily Lipschitz in the large. So, we cannot apply Corollary 6.5 to

obtain the global homotopy type of $\Sigma^*(d_C) = \Sigma(d_C^2)$. Instead, we will show that Proposition 5.1 directly applies.

For $y \in M$ and $t, s > 0$, we introduce the function $\varphi_{t,s,y} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{t,s,y}(x) &= \hat{\chi}_C(t+s, x) - h_s^g(x, y) \\ &= \frac{d_C(x)^2}{2(t+s)} - \frac{d(y, x)^2}{2s}.\end{aligned}\tag{7.1}$$

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that $x, y \in M$ are such $\varphi_{t,s,y}(x) \geq \varphi_{t,s,y}(y)$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}d(x, y) &\leq \frac{2s}{t}d_C(y) \\ d_C(x) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{2s}{t}\right)d_C(y).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the definition (7.1), the inequality $\varphi_{t,s,y}(x) \geq \varphi_{t,s,y}(y)$ translates to

$$\frac{d_C(x)^2}{2(t+s)} - \frac{d(y, x)^2}{2s} \geq \frac{d_C(y)^2}{2(t+s)}.$$

Using $d_C(x) \leq d_C(y) + d(x, y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d_C(y)^2}{2(t+s)} &\leq \frac{[d_C(y) + d(x, y)]^2}{2(t+s)} - \frac{d(y, x)^2}{2s} \\ &= \frac{d_C(y)^2}{2(t+s)} + \frac{2d_C(y)d(x, y)}{2(t+s)} + \left(\frac{1}{2(t+s)} - \frac{1}{2s}\right)d(x, y)^2 \\ &= \frac{d_C(y)^2}{2(t+s)} + \frac{2d_C(y)d(x, y)}{2(t+s)} - \frac{td(x, y)^2}{2s(t+s)},\end{aligned}$$

from which the inequality $d(x, y) \leq 2sd_C(y)/t$ follows.

To prove the last inequality of the lemma, we again use $d_C(x) \leq d_C(y) + d(x, y)$. \square

Lemma 7.2. *Assume that $(t_0, x_0), \dots, (t_n, x_n), \dots$ is a (finite or infinite) sequence in $]0, +\infty[\times M$, with $s_n = t_{n+1} - t_n \geq 0$, and such that*

$$\varphi_{t_n, s_n, x_n}(x_{n+1}) \geq \varphi_{t_n, s_n, x_n}(x_n).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}d_C(x_n) &\leq e^{2t_n/t_0}d_C(x_0) \\ d(x_n, x_0) &\leq 2e^{3t_n/t_0}d_C(x_0).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Lemma 7.1, we get

$$d(x_{n+1}, x_n) \leq \frac{2s_n}{t_n} d_C(x_n) \quad (7.2)$$

$$d_C(x_{n+1}) \leq \left(1 + \frac{2s_n}{t_n}\right) d_C(x_n). \quad (7.3)$$

Therefore, from (7.3), we get

$$d_C(x_n) \leq \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{2s_i}{t_i}\right) d_C(x_0).$$

To estimate the quantity $C_n = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{2s_i}{t_i}\right)$, we take its log

$$\log C_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \log \left(1 + \frac{2s_i}{t_i}\right).$$

Since $\log(1+t) \leq t$, for $t \in]0, +\infty[$, we obtain

$$\log C_n \leq 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{s_i}{t_i}.$$

Since t_i is non-decreasing and $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i = t_n - t_0 \leq t_n$, we get

$$\log C_n \leq 2 \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i}{t_0} \leq \frac{2t_n}{t_0},$$

which proves the first inequality in the lemma. By the inequality (7.2) and the already established first inequality of the lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, x_0) &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d(x_{i+1}, x_i) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{2s_i}{t_i} d_C(x_i) \\ &2d_C(x_0) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{s_i}{t_i} e^{2t_i/t_0} \end{aligned}$$

Using that t_i is non-decreasing and the fact that $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i \leq t_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
d(x_n, x_0) &\leq 2d_C(x_0) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{s_i}{t_0} e^{2t_n/t_0} \\
&= 2d_C(x_0) \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i}{t_0} e^{2t_n/t_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} s_i \leq t_n$, we get

$$d(x_n, x_0) \leq 2 \frac{t_n}{t_0} e^{2t_n/t_0} d_C(x_0),$$

which finishes the proof of the lemma, since $t \leq \exp(t)$. \square

We now prove that χ_C satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1.

Proposition 7.3. *Suppose C is a closed subset of the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) . Then for every compact subset $K \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$, we can find a $\hat{\chi}_C$ -adapted homotopy $F : K \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M$.*

Proof. The compact subset $K \subset]0, +\infty[\times M$ is contained in a set of the form $[a, b] \times A$, where A is a compact subset of M and $0 < a < b < +\infty$. We then define κ by

$$\kappa = e^{3(b+1)/A} \max_A d_C < +\infty.$$

Since A is compact, its neighborhood $\bar{V}_\kappa(A) = \{x \in M \mid d_A(x) \leq \kappa\}$ is also compact. By Lemma 3.6, we can find $\delta > 0$ and a $\hat{\chi}_C$ -adapted homotopy $F : ([a, b] \times \bar{V}_\kappa(A)) \times [0, \delta] \rightarrow M$.

If $\delta \geq 1$, then the restriction of F to $K \times [0, 1]$ does the job. If not, cutting down on δ we assume $\delta = 1/n$, with n an integer ≥ 2 .

We will show that we can extend F by induction on $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ to $F : K \times [0, i/n] \rightarrow M$ by

$$F((t, x), s) = F[F(t + i/n, x), s - i/n], \text{ for } s \in [i/n, (i+1)/n].$$

This homotopy is well-defined if we show by induction that, for $(t, x) \in K \subset [a, b] \times A$, the sequence $(x_i, t + i/n)$, with $x_0 = x$, defined by induction for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ as

$$x_i = F(t + i/n, x_{i-1}, 1/n],$$

is such that $x_i \in \bar{V}_\kappa(A)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Since $F : ([a, b] \times \bar{V}_\kappa(A)) \times [0, 1/n] \rightarrow M$ is defined by Lemma 3.6, the sequence x_i , while it make sense for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 7.2 with $t_i = t + is \leq t + 1$. Therefore

$$d(x_i, x_0) \leq e^{3t_i/t} d_C(x_0) \leq e^{3(b+1)/a} \max_A d_C = \kappa,$$

since $x_0 = x \in A, t \in [a, b]$ and $i \leq n - 1$. This implies that $x_i \in \bar{V}_\kappa(A)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Since we know by Proposition 7.3 that $\hat{\chi}_C$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 5.1, we obtain that the inclusion $\Sigma_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C) \subset]0, +\infty[\times M \setminus \mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C)$ is a homotopy equivalence. But, by (3.3) and (3.4), we have $\Sigma_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times \Sigma(d_C^2) =]0, +\infty[\times \Sigma^*(d_C)$ and, by Proposition 2.18, we have $\mathcal{I}_\infty(\hat{\chi}_C) =]0, +\infty[\times (C \cup \mathcal{A}^*(C))$. Therefore, the inclusion $]0, +\infty[\times \Sigma^*(d_C) \subset]0, +\infty[\times (M \setminus (C \cup \mathcal{A}^*(C)))$ is a homotopy equivalence, which implies that $\Sigma^*(d_C) \subset (M \setminus (C \cup \mathcal{A}^*(C)))$ is itself a homotopy equivalence. \square

We now explain the generalization of Theorem 1.7 to non-compact complete Riemannian manifold.

We first introduce the subset $\mathcal{AU}(M, g) \subset M \times M$.

Definition 7.4. For a complete connected Riemannian manifold (M, g) , the subset $\mathcal{AU}(M, g) \subset M \times M$ is the set of points $(x, y) \in M \times M$ such that there exists a *minimizing* g -geodesic $\gamma :]-\infty, +\infty[\rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(a) = x, \gamma(b) = y$, for some $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$.

The next Lemma is left to the reader.

Lemma 7.5. *We have*

$$\mathcal{AU}(M, g) = \Delta_M \cup \mathcal{A}^*(d_{\delta_M}).$$

The following generalization of Theorem 1.7 now follows from the Lemma above and Theorem 1.6.

Theorem 7.6. *For every connected complete Riemannian manifold M , the inclusion $\mathcal{NU}(M, g) \subset M \times M \setminus \mathcal{AU}(M, g)$ is a homotopy equivalence.*

8 More results on local contractibility

In fact, our local contractibility result can be applied for viscosity solution defined only on an open subset, and also for Hamiltonians which are not necessarily uniformly superlinear. More precisely, we have.

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^2 Hamiltonian such that:*

(a) *(Superlinearity on compact subsets) For every compact subset C and every real number $K \geq 0$, we have*

$$\sup\{K\|p\|_x - H(x, p) \mid x \in C, p \in T_x^*M\} < \infty.$$

(b) (C^2 strict convexity in the fibers) For every $(x, p) \in T^*M$, the second derivative along the fibers $\partial^2 H / \partial p^2(x, p)$ is positive definite.

If the continuous function $U : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on the open subset $O \subset \mathbb{R} \times M$ is a viscosity solution of

$$\partial_t U + H(x, \partial_x U) = 0, \quad (8.1)$$

then its set of singularities $\Sigma(U) \subset O$ is locally contractible.

Proof. Since the result is local, we can assume that $O =]a, b[\times W$, with $W \subset M$ open with \bar{W} compact. We will first modify H outside of T^*W to reduce to the case where the Hamiltonian is Tonelli. Choose a C^∞ function $\varphi : M \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with compact support such that φ is identically 1 on the compact subset \bar{W} . Define $\tilde{H} : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{H}(x, p) = (1 - \varphi(x))\|p\|_x^2 + \varphi(x)H(x, p).$$

Since the support of φ is compact, using the properties of H , it is not difficult to check that \tilde{H} is Tonelli and coincides with H on T^*W . This last fact implies that $U :]a, b[\times W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is also a viscosity solution of (8.1) for \tilde{H} .

Therefore without loss of generality, we can assume that H is Tonelli.

Fix $(t_0, x_0) \in]a, b[\times W$. Pick $\eta > 0$ such that $[t_0 - \eta, t_0 + \eta] \times \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta) \subset]a, b[\times W$.

The viscosity solution U is Lipschitz on the compact set $[t_0 - \eta, t_0 + \eta] \times \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta)$. Therefore, since speeds of U -calibrating curves are related to upper differentials of U by the Legendre transform, we can find a finite constant K such that for every $[\alpha, \beta] \subset [t_0 - \eta, t_0 + \eta]$ and every curve $\gamma : [\alpha, \beta] \rightarrow \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta)$, which is U -calibrating, we have $\|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_{\gamma(s)} \leq K$. Choose now $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\epsilon < \eta$ and $2K\epsilon < \eta$. Since $U : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as any viscosity solution, has backward characteristic ending at any given point, from the definition of K and the choice of ϵ , for every $(t, x) \in]t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon] \times \bar{B}(x_0, \eta)$, we can find a U -calibrated curve $\gamma_{t,x} : [t_0 - \epsilon, t] \rightarrow \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta)$. It follows that

$$U(t, x) = \inf_{y \in \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta)} U(t_0 - \epsilon, y) + h_{t-t_0+\epsilon}(y, x),$$

for all $(t, x) \in]t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon] \times \bar{B}(x_0, \eta)$. Therefore, if we define $u : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u(y) = \begin{cases} U(t_0 - \epsilon, y), & \text{if } y \in \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta), \\ +\infty, & \text{if } y \in \bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta)^c, \end{cases}$$

we obtain

$$U(t, x) = \hat{u}(t - t_0 + \epsilon, x) \text{ for all } (t, x) \in]t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon] \times \bar{B}(x_0, \eta). \quad (8.2)$$

Since U is continuous and $\bar{B}(x_0, 2\eta)$ compact and not empty, the function \hat{u} is bounded below and not identically $+\infty$. Therefore \hat{u} is finite everywhere and $\Sigma^*(\hat{u})$ is locally contractible. By (8.2), we have $\Sigma(U) \cap]t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon[\times \mathring{B}(x_0, \eta) = \{(s + t_0 - \epsilon, x) \mid (s, x) \in \Sigma^*(\hat{u}) \cap]0, 2\epsilon[\times \mathring{B}(x_0, \eta)\}$. Hence $\Sigma(U) \cap]t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon[\times \mathring{B}(x_0, \eta)$ is itself locally contractible. \square

A Some estimates

In this appendix, we suppose that $H : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Tonelli Hamiltonian on the complete Riemannian manifold (M, g) and L is its associated Lagrangian. The Lax-Oleinik operators T_t^- and T_t^+ are the ones associated to L .

Suppose K is a compact subset of M . If A, B, t, r are finite real numbers with $t, r > 0$, we set

$$\mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,t,r}^+ = \{u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty] \mid A \leq u \text{ and } T_t^+ u \leq B \text{ on } \bar{V}_r(K)\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where as usual $\bar{V}_r(K) = \{y \in M \mid d(y, K) \leq r\}$ is the closed r -neighborhood of K in M .

The goal of this appendix is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition A.1. *For any compact subset $K \subset M$, and any finite A, B, t, r , with $t, r > 0$, we can find $s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r) > 0$ such that for any function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,t,r}^+$, any $x \in K$ and any $0 < s \leq s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r)$, every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and*

$$u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma + 1 \geq T_s^+ u(x).$$

must satisfy $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$. Therefore, for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,t,r}^+$, $x \in M$ and $0 < s \leq s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r)$, we have:

$$T_s^+ u(x) = \sup_{\gamma} u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma,$$

where the sup is taken over all absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$. In particular, we have

$$T_s^+ u(x) = \sup_{y \in \bar{B}(x, r)} u(y) - h_s(x, y).$$

Moreover, if u is continuous on $\bar{V}_r(K)$, the set

$$\{y \in M \mid T_s^+ u(x) = u(y) - h_s(x, y)\}$$

is non-empty compact and contained in the closed ball $\bar{B}(x, r)$. In particular, we can find a minimizer $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$, and

$$T_s^+ u(x) = u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Any absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$, satisfying the equality (A.2) above is a minimizer with $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$.

To prove this proposition, we need a couple of lemmas.

Lemma A.2. *For every finite A and $r > 0$, we can find a constant $\eta = \eta(A, r)$ such that for every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, with $b - a \leq \eta$ and $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) = \int_a^b L(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds \leq A$, we have $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$, where $\ell_g(\gamma)$ is the Riemannian length of γ for the Riemannian metric g on M .*

Therefore, if $h_t(x, y) \leq A$, with $x, y \in M$ and $0 < t \leq \eta = \eta(A, r)$, we have $d(x, y) \leq r$.

Proof. From (1.5), with $K = 2|A|/r$, we have

$$\forall (x, v) \in TM, L(x, v) \geq \frac{2|A|}{r} \|v\|_x - C(2|A|/r). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

If $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ is an absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$, applying (A.3) at $(x, v) = (\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s))$ and integrating, we obtain

$$\mathbb{L}(\gamma) \geq \frac{2|A|}{r} \ell_g(\gamma) - C(2|A|/r)(b - a).$$

If $\mathbb{L}(\gamma) \leq A$, this yields

$$A \geq \frac{2|A|}{r} \ell_g(\gamma) - C(2|A|/r)(b - a),$$

or equivalently

$$\ell_g(\gamma) \leq \frac{r}{2} + \frac{rC(2|A|/r)}{2|A|}(b - a).$$

It suffices to set

$$\eta = \eta(A, r) = \frac{|A|}{C(2|A|/r)}.$$

The last part follows from the fact that $h_t(x, y)$ is the action of a minimizer $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(t) = y$. \square

Lemma A.3. *Suppose K is a compact subset of M . If A, B, t, r are finite real numbers with $t, r > 0$, we can find a constant $s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r) > 0$, with $s_0 \leq t$, such that for every $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K, A, B, t, r}^+$, every $x \in M$, every $0 < s \leq s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r)$, and every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) > r$, we have*

$$T_s^+ u(x) > u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma + 1.$$

Proof. We first note that for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K, A, B, t, r}^+$, $x \in V_r(K)$ and $0 < s \leq t$, we have

$$T_s^+ u(x) \geq u(x) - h_s(x, x) \geq A - A(0)s,$$

where $A(0) = \sup_{x \in M} L(x, 0) < +\infty$. Therefore if we set $\tilde{A} = A - |A(0)|t$, we have

$$T_s^+ u(x) \geq u(x) - h_s(x, x), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K, A, B, t, r}^+$, $x \in V_r(K)$ and $s \leq t$. On the other hand for $0 < s < t$, by the semi-group property, we have

$$T_t^+ u(x) \geq T_s^+ u(x) - h_{t-s}(x, x) \geq T_s^+ u(x) - A(0)(t - s).$$

Hence for $0 < s < t$ and $x \in V_r(K)$, we get

$$T_s^+ u(x) \leq B + A(0)(t - s) \geq \bar{A}.$$

Setting $\tilde{B} = B + |A(0)|t$, this yields

$$T_s^+ u(x) \leq \bar{B}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K, A, B, t, r}^+$, $x \in V_r(K)$ and $s \leq t$.

To prove the lemma, we must find $s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r) > 0$ such that any absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $0 < s \leq t$, $\gamma(0) = x \in K$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) > r$, such that

$$u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma + 1 \geq T_s^+ u(x) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

must satisfy $s > s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r)$.

Assume now that $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$ is a curve satisfying the conditions above. Since $\ell_g(\gamma) > r$, we can find $s' \in]0, s[$ such that $\ell_g(\gamma[0, s']) = r$. Using (A.6), we get

$$u(\gamma(s)) - \int_{s'}^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma - \int_0^{s'} L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma + 1 \geq T_s^+ u(x).$$

But $T_{s-s'}^+ u(\gamma(s')) \geq u(\gamma(s)) - \int_{s'}^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma$. Hence

$$T_{s-s'}^+ u(\gamma(s')) - \int_0^{s'} L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma + 1 \geq T_s^+ u(x).$$

Since $x \in K$, from (A.4), we have $T_s^+ u(x) \geq \bar{A}$. Moreover, since $\ell_g(\gamma[0, s']) = r$ and $x = \gamma(0) = x \in K$, we get $\gamma(s') \in \bar{V}_r(K)$, which, by (A.5), implies $T_{s-s'}^+ u(\gamma(s')) \leq \bar{B}$. From the last inequality, we conclude that

$$\int_0^{s'} L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma \leq \bar{B} - \bar{A} + 1.$$

By Lemma A.2, using $\ell_g(\gamma[0, s']) = r$, this last inequality implies that $s' > \eta(\bar{B} - \bar{A} + 1, r/2)$. Since $s > s'$ to finish the proof of the Lemma, it suffices to take $s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r) = \eta(\bar{B} - \bar{A} + 1, r/2)$. \square

Proof of Proposition A.1. We consider the $s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r)$ given by the last Lemma A.3. Given a function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K, A, B, t, r}^+$, $x \in K$ and $0 < s \leq s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r)$. By Lemma A.3, we have

$$T_s^+ u(x) > u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma + 1, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

for every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) > r$. Since

$$T_s^+ u(x) = \sup_{\gamma} u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where the sup is taken over all absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$, we obtain

$$T_s^+ u(x) = \sup_{\gamma} u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where the sup is taken over all absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) \geq r$. Obviously, equality (A.9) and inequality (A.7) imply

$$\begin{aligned} T_s^+ u(x) &= \sup_{y \in \bar{B}(x, r)} u(y) - h_s(x, y) \\ &> \sup_{y \notin \bar{B}(x, r)} u(y) - h_s(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

When u is, moreover, continuous on $\bar{V}_r(K)$, since $\bar{B}(x, r) \subset \bar{V}_r(K)$, the first equality above shows that $\{y \in M \mid T_s^+ u(x) = u(y) - h_s(x, y)\}$ is not empty, and the second inequality shows that this set is contained in $\bar{B}(x, r)$. The compactness of $\{y \in M \mid T_s^+ u(x) = u(y) - h_s(x, y)\}$ follows from the continuity of u on $\bar{B}(x, r) \subset \bar{V}_r(K)$.

Since, we can find $y \in M$, with $T_s^+ u(x) = u(y) - h_s(x, y)$, taking a minimizer $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(s) = y$, we obtain

$$T_s^+ u(x) = u(\gamma(s)) - \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Moreover, for any absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(0) = x$, satisfying (A.10), we get from (A.7) and (A.8) that γ is a minimizer with length $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$. \square

Our goal now is to sketch a proof of Theorem 2.22. For this we will need the T_t^- version of Proposition A.1. Thanks to Remark 4.1, this version follows from Proposition A.1.

We first define

$$\mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,t,r}^- = \{u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty] \mid A \leq T_t^- u \text{ and } u \leq B \text{ on } \bar{V}_r(K)\}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Proposition A.4. *For any compact subset $K \subset M$, and any finite A, B, t, r , with $t, r > 0$, we can find $s_0 = s(K, A, B, t, r) > 0$ such that for any function $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,t,r}^-$, any $x \in K$ and any $0 < s \leq s_0^- = s(K, A, B, t, r)$, every absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(s) = x$ and*

$$T^u(\gamma(0)) + \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma - 1 \geq T_s^- u(x).$$

must satisfy $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$. Therefore, for $u \in \mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,t,r}^+$, $x \in M$ and $0 < s \leq s_0^- = s(K, A, B, t, r)$, we have:

$$T_s^- u(x) = \inf_{\gamma} u(\gamma(0)) + \int_0^s L(\gamma(\sigma), \dot{\gamma}(\sigma)) d\sigma,$$

where the sup is taken over all absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [0, s] \rightarrow M$, with $\gamma(s) = x$ and $\ell_g(\gamma) \leq r$. In particular, we have

$$T_s^- u(x) = \inf_{y \in \bar{B}(x, r)} u(y) + h_s(y, x).$$

Moreover, if u is continuous on $\bar{V}_r(K)$, the set

$$\{y \in M \mid T_s^- u(x) = u(y) + h_s(x, y)\}$$

is non-empty, compact, and contained in the closed ball $\bar{B}(x, r)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.22. Fix now $u : M \rightarrow [-\infty, +\infty] \rightarrow M$ and $t_0 > 0$ such that \hat{u} is finite on $]0, t_0[$. If K is a compact subset and $0 < t_1 < t_2 < t_0$, we will show that \hat{u} is continuous on and locally semiconcave on $]t_1, t_2[\times \overset{\circ}{K}$. This will finish the proof of the continuity and semiconcavity of \hat{u} on $]0, t_0[\times M$.

Since \hat{u} is not identically $+\infty$ or $-\infty$, there is a point $x_0 \in M$ such that $u(x_0)$ is finite. We have

$$T_t^- u(x) \leq u(x_0) + h_t(x_0, x), \text{ for all } t > 0 \text{ and } x \in M.$$

Fix now t'_2 with $t_2 < t'_2 < t_0$. Since $(t, y, z) \mapsto h_t(y, z)$ is continuous on $]0, +\infty[\times M \times M$, we have $\sup\{h_t(x_0, x) \mid t \in [t_1, t'_2], x \in \bar{V}_1(K)\} < +\infty$. Therefore, we can find a finite constant B such that

$$T_t^- u(x) \leq B, \text{ for all } t \in [t_1, t'_2] \text{ and } x \in \bar{V}_1(K). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Fix now t''_2 such that $t'_2 < t''_2 < t_0$,

$$T_{t''_2}^- u(x_0) \leq T_t^- u(x) + h_{t''_2-t}(x, x_0), \text{ for all } 0 < t < t'_2 \text{ and } x \in M,$$

or equivalently

$$T_{t''_2}^- u(x_0) - h_{t''_2-t}(x, x_0) \leq T_t^- u(x), \text{ for all } 0 < t < t'_2 \text{ and } x \in M.$$

Since, for $t \in [t'_1, t'_2]$, we have $0 < t''_2 - t'_2 \leq t''_2 - t \leq t''_2 - t_1$, we conclude as above that there exists a finite constant A such that

$$A \leq T_t^- u(x) \leq B, \text{ for all } t \in [t_1, t'_2] \text{ and } x \in \bar{V}_1(K). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Setting now $\eta = t'_2 - t_2 > 0$, from (A.12) and (A.13), we conclude that

$$T_t^- u \in \mathcal{F}_{K,A,B,\eta,1}^-, \text{ for all } t \in [t_1, t_2].$$

Therefore, we can apply Proposition A.4, to find s_0^- , with $0 < s_0^- < \eta$ such that

$$T_{s+t}^- u(x) = T_s^- T_t u(x) = \inf_{y \in \bar{B}(x,1)} T_t u(y) + h_s(y, x) \text{ for all } t \in [t_1, t_2] \text{ and all } x \in K,$$

which of course implies

$$T_{s+t}^- u(x) = \inf_{y \in \bar{V}_1(K)} T_t u(y) + h_s(y, x) \text{ for all } t \in [t_1, t_2] \text{ and all } x \in K. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Fix now $\bar{t} \in]t_1, t_2[\times K$ and pick $\delta > 0$ such that $3\delta < s_0^-$ and $\bar{t} - 2\delta \geq t_1$. For $t \in [\bar{t} - \delta, \bar{t} + \delta]$, we have $t - (\bar{t} - 2\delta) \in [\delta, 3\delta]$. Since $3\delta < s_0^-$, and $\bar{t} - 2\delta \geq t_1$, from (A.14), we obtain

$$T_t^- u(x) = \inf_{y \in \bar{V}_1(K)} T_{(\bar{t}-2\delta)} u(y) + h_{t-(\bar{t}-2\delta)}(y, x), \text{ for all } t \in [\bar{t} - \delta, \bar{t} + \delta] \text{ and all } x \in K. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Since this map $(s, x, y) \mapsto h_s(y, x)$ is locally Lipschitz and locally semi-concave on $]0, +\infty[\times M \times M$ and $\bar{V}_1(K)$ is compact, we obtain that the family of maps $(s, x) \mapsto T_{(\bar{t}-2\delta)u}(y) + h_s(y, x), y \in \bar{V}_1(K)$ is locally uniformly semiconcave on a neighborhood of the compact set $[\delta, 3\delta] \times K$. The local semiconcavity (hence the continuity) of \hat{u} on a neighborhood of $[\bar{t} - \delta, \bar{t} + \delta] \times K$, follows now, for example, from (A.15) and [17][Corollary A.14], which states that a pointwise finite inf of a family of locally uniformly semiconcave functions is itself locally semiconcave.

We just established that \hat{u} is continuous and even locally semiconcave on $]0, t_0[\times M$. Note that since we know that \hat{u} is finite on $]0, t_0[\times M$, we get

$$\hat{u}(t, x) = \inf_{y \in F} u(y) + h_t(y, x), \text{ for all } t \in t_0 \text{ and all } x \in M,$$

where $F = \{y \in M \mid |u(y)| < +\infty\}$. We then observe that, for $y \in F$, the function $(t, x) \mapsto \varphi_y(t, x) = u(y) + h_t(y, x)$ is a viscosity solution of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1) on $]0, +\infty[\times M$. Therefore, since \hat{u} is continuous on $]0, t_0[\times M$ and is the inf, on that set, of the family $\varphi_y, y \in F$, the function \hat{u} is also a viscosity solution of the evolutionary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (1.1) on $]0, t_0[\times M$. \square

Remark A.5. Note that once we know that \hat{u} is continuous on $]0, t_0[\times M$, the inf in (A.15) is attained. Therefore, for every $(t, x) \in]0, t_0[\times M$, we can find a \hat{u} -calibrated curve $\gamma : [a, t] \rightarrow M$ with $a < t$ and $\gamma(t) = x$. Since γ is an extremal we can extend it to an extremal $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow M$. Using that there is a \hat{u} -calibrated curve ending at any point of $]0, t_0[\times M$, it can be shown that γ is \hat{u} -calibrated on every interval $[\epsilon, t]$, with $\epsilon > 0$. With some more work, using mainly Proposition A.11 in an appropriate way, it can be shown that γ is \hat{u} -calibrated on $[\epsilon, t]$. Details can be found in [20].

References

- [1] Paolo Albano, Piermarco Cannarsa, K.T. Nguyen & Carlo Sinestrari, *Singular gradient flow of the distance function and homotopy equivalence*, Math. Ann., 356 (2013) 23–43.
- [2] Guy Barles, *Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi*, Springer-Verlag, Paris, 1994.
- [3] Martino Bardi & Italo Capuzzo-Dolcetta. *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*. Systems & Control: Foundations & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1997.

- [4] Marcel Berger, *A panoramic view of Riemannian geometry*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [5] Patrick Bernard, *Existence of $C^{1,1}$ critical sub-solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation on compact manifolds*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. 40 (2007), 445–452.
- [6] A. Brown, C. Percy, *An introduction to analysis*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 154. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [7] G. Buttazzo, M. Giaquinta & S. Hildebrandt: *One-dimensional variational problems*. Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, **15** (1998), Oxford Univ. Press, New York.
- [8] Piermarco Cannarsa & Carlo Sinestrari, *Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, and optimal control*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 58, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2004.
- [9] Piermarco Cannarsa, Wei Cheng & Albert Fathi, *On the topology of the set of singularities of a solution to the Hamilton–Jacobi equation (Sur la topologie des singularités d’une solution de l’équation de Hamilton–Jacobi)*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, 355 (2017) 176–180.
- [10] Piermarco Cannarsa & Roberto Peirone, *Unbounded components of the singular set of the metric projection in \mathbb{R}^n* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 353 (2001) 4567–4581.
- [11] F.H. CLARKE: *Methods of dynamic and nonsmooth optimization*. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, **57** (1989), Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA.
- [12] J. Dugundji, *Topology*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass. 1966
- [13] Lawrence C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*, volume 19 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.
- [14] Albert Fathi, *Regularity of C^1 solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equation*. Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math., 12 (2003), 479–516.
- [15] A. Fathi. *Weak KAM Theorem in Lagrangian Dynamics*. Preliminary Version 10 (2005).

- [16] Albert Fathi & Ezequiel Maderna, *Weak KAM theorem on non compact manifolds*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl., 14 (2007) 1–27.
- [17] Albert Fathi & Alessio Figalli, *Optimal transportation on non-compact manifolds* Israel Journal of Mathematics, 175 (2010) 1–59.
- [18] Albert Fathi, Alessio Figalli & L. Rifford, *On the Hausdorff dimension of the Mather quotient*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 62 (2009) 445–500.
- [19] Albert Fathi, *Weak KAM from a PDE point of view: viscosity solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation and Aubry set*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, 120 (2012) 1193–1236.
- [20] Albert Fathi, *Viscosity solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation on a noncompact manifold* (2019)
- [21] Naoyuki Ichihara & Hitoshi Ishii, *Asymptotic Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations with Semi-Periodic Hamiltonians*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 33 (2008) 784–807.
- [22] Hitoshi Ishii, *A Short Introduction to Viscosity Solutions and the Large Time Behavior of Solutions of Hamilton–Jacobi Equations* in Y. Achdou et al., Hamilton-Jacobi Equations: Approximations, Numerical Analysis and Applications, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2074, Springer-Verlag, (2013).
- [23] Lieutier, A., *Any open bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^k has the same homotopy type as its medial axis*, Comput. Aided Des., 36 (2004) 1029–1046.
- [24] Maxime Zavidovique, *Strict sub-solutions and Mañé potential in discrete weak KAM theory*, Comment. Math. Helv., 87 (2012) 1–39.