

A TRIANGULATION OF SEMI-ALGEBRAIC SETS CONCERNING AN ANALYTICAL CONDITION FOR SHORTEST-LENGTH CURVES

CHENGCHENG YANG

ABSTRACT. This paper concerns an analytical stratification question of real algebraic and semi-algebraic sets. In 1957 Whitney [5] gave a stratification of real algebraic sets, it partitions a real algebraic set into partial algebraic manifolds. In 1975 Hironaka [1] reproved that a real algebraic set is triangulable and also generalized it to semi-algebraic sets, following the idea of Lojasiewicz's [2] triangulation of semi-analytic sets in 1964. Following their examples and wondering how geometry looks like locally, this paper tries to come up with a stratification, in particular a cell decomposition, such that it satisfies the following analytical property. Given any shortest curve between two points in a real algebraic or semi-algebraic set, it interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.

Date: February 15, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 14P10.

Key words and phrases. analytic geometry, real algebraic geometry.

The author was support in part by NSF Award#1745670.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper concerns an analytical stratification question of real algebraic and semi-algebraic sets. A real algebraic set defined by polynomials f_1, \dots, f_m is

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(x) = 0 \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

The triangulability question for algebraic sets was first considered by van de Waerden [4] in 1929. It is a well-known theorem that every algebraic set is triangulizable [1]. On the other hand, in 1957 Whitney [5] introduced another splitting process that divides a real algebraic V into a finite union of “partial algebraic manifolds.” An algebraic partial manifold M is a point set, associated with a number ρ , with the following property. Take any $p \in M$. Then there exists a set of polynomials f_1, \dots, f_ρ , of rank ρ at p , and a neighborhood U of p , such that $M \cap U$ is the set of zeros in U of these f_i . The splitting process uses the rank of a set S of functions f_1, \dots, f_s at a point p , where the rank of S at p is the number of linearly independent differentials $df_1(p), \dots, df_s(p)$.

A basic (closed) semi-algebraic set defined by polynomials f_1, \dots, f_m is

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Given finitely many basic semi-algebraic sets, we may take their unions, intersections, and complements. In general, a semi-algebraic set may be represented as a finite union of sets of the form

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(x) > 0, h_j = 0, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, p\}.$$


In 1975 Hironaka [1] proved that every semi-algebraic set is also triangulable. His proof came from a paper of Lojasiewicz [2] in 1964, in which he proved that a semi-analytic set admits a semi-analytic triangulation.

Following the examples of Whitney’s stratification and Lojasiewicz/Hironaka’s triangulation, this paper tries to come up with a cell-complex stratification that admits the analytical condition that any shortest curve between two points in a real algebraic or semi-algebraic set interacts with each cell finitely many times.

We begin with investigating the real algebraic or semi-algebraic sets in \mathbb{R}^2 .

2. REGION BELOW THE GRAPH OF A POLYNOMIAL FUNCTION IN \mathbb{R}^2

We begin with a closed region that is below the graph of a polynomial function. A general picture looks like the one as shown in Figure 1. We want to study the behavior of a shortest-length curve between any two points in the region. In particular, we look for a cell decomposition of the region so that a shortest-length curve ‘interacts’ with each open cell at most finitely many times. When we say that a curve **interacts with a cell once**, we mean that the curve enters and exits a cell once. A **shortest-length curve** between any two points is assumed to be C^2 -path with the minimum length among all possible C^2 -curves connecting the two points. We know that if such a curve exists, its length can be approximated by the length of a polygonal line inscribed in the curve as close as possible (see [1]). To be more flexible, we allow *piecewise* C^2 -curves to be included in our study for curves of shortest lengths.

FIGURE 1. A region below the graph of $f(x)$ including the boundary.

Suppose $f(x)$ is a polynomial function, X is the closed region below the graph of $f(x)$, and A, B are two arbitrary points inside X . Without loss of generality, we assume that A is to the left of B . Assume $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a piecewise C^2 -curve from A to B that is contained in X and has the shortest length among all possible piecewise C^2 -curves from A to B in X . We call such a curve **a shortest-length curve from A to B in X** . We want to come up with a cell decomposition of X such that γ interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.

If the degree of f is less than or equal to 1, f is a straight line and X is convex, so γ is the straight line segment from A to B . A cell decomposition of X is described as follows. Since X is a half plane, we can divide X into grids as shown in Figure 2. The 0- and 1-cells on the graph of $f(x)$ are $(n, f(n))$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the open intervals between them. The rest are parallel transports of them. The 2-cells are the squares. We can show that γ interacts with each cell at most once. Suppose not, we can pick a point from one interaction and another point from a second interaction, then the shortest path between these two points is either a straight line segment or a constant path. Since each cell is convex, γ should stay in one cell, which is a contradiction.

If the degree of f is greater than 1, f'' is not identically zero, so both f'' and f' have only finitely many zeros. We can check those zeros one by one to find out all the strict inflection points and the local minimum points of f . Here, a strict inflection point means that f'' changes signs from one side to the other. Then we consider the cell decomposition of X as shown in Figure 3.




FIGURE 2. A cell decomposition of X when $\deg(f) \leq 1$.

The idea is similar as before. Here we need to add a few more 0-cells on the graph of $f(x)$ and the picture looks more like a brick pattern. Let the 0-cells on the graph be $(n, f(n))$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, plus the strict inflection points and the local minimum points. For every pair of consecutive 0-cells on the graph, draw two vertical rays below those two points. Since the graph has a minimum point between the two 0-cells, we put a horizontal 1-cell at a distance of 1 unit below the minimum point, then put a second 1-cell at a distance of 1 unit below the first one, and continue in this way down. Repeat this process for all the other pairs of consecutive 0-cells on the graph, so we divide X into grids thus get a cell decomposition of X . We contend that γ interacts each cell at most finitely many times.




FIGURE 3. A cell decomposition of X when $\deg(f) > 1$.

First, we look at the 0-cells. Let e_0 be a 0-cell. If γ passes through e_0 and comes back to it later, we can replace γ with a strictly shorter piecewise C^2 -curve by letting it stay at e_0 . Thus γ interacts with each 0-cell at most once.

Second, we look at the 2-cells. Let e_2 be a 2-cell. If the closure \bar{e}_2 of e_2 does not lie on the graph, \bar{e}_2 is a rectangle. By the convexity of e_2 , γ interacts with e_2 at most once. Suppose \bar{e}_2 has one side lying on the graph, it suffices to show that γ interacts with this side at most finitely many times, then we can conclude that γ interacts with e_2 at most finitely many times. We will prove that this is true as follows.

Let e_1 be a 1-cell. Suppose e_1 is on the graph, there are three cases in general:

- (1) $f'' < 0$ on e_1 , so the cell is strictly convex downward;
- (2) $f'' > 0, f' > 0$ on e_1 , so the cell is strictly convex upward and also strictly increasing;
- (3) $f'' > 0, f' < 0$ on e_1 , so the cell is strictly convex upward and strictly decreasing.

We only need to treat the first and second cases separately, because for the third, we can apply a reflectional symmetry to get to the second case.

Case One: $f'' < 0$ on e_1 . Consider the closure \bar{e}_1 of e_1 . If C is the leftmost point in the intersection of \bar{e}_1 and γ , and D is the rightmost point, the straight line segment from C to D is contained in X , because \bar{e}_1 is convex downward. Therefore, the part of γ from C to D is a straight line segment. If C, D are both inside e_1 , γ interacts e_1 twice; if at least one of C, D is a boundary point of e_1 , it interacts e_1 at most once. Thus γ interacts at most twice with e_1 .

Case Two: $f'' > 0, f' > 0$ on e_1 . Consider the closure \bar{e}_1 of e_1 again, and let C, D be the same two points as before. We ask the questions: what is the part of γ from C to D ? Is it the part of the graph from C to D ? Is it unique? The answers are yes. Let's start proving them. First we need to study two preliminary things: zigzag tangent curves and approximation of shortest-length curves by zigzag tangent curves.


2.1. Zigzag tangent curves. A polygonal curve is a piecewise linear curve. Given two points A, B in \bar{e}_1 , assume γ is any arbitrary polygonal curve between the two points, which lie in X , then we can demonstrate one optimization of γ so that the new polygonal curve is shorter, more regular, and has no more vertices than γ . There are two steps shown as follows:

Step one: We replace γ with a shorter polygonal curve that is tangent to $f(x)$ at A and B . Let the tangent line to $f(x)$ at A be called l . Note e_1 is entirely above l , except at the point A . If the slope of γ at A is less than the slope of l , γ ducks under l at the beginning. Because B is above l , γ has to cross l later in order to end up at B . Let's call C an intersection point of γ and l . Then we can replace the part of γ from A to C with the line segment between them, thus yielding a shorter polygonal curve. On the other hand, if the slope of γ is greater than that of l , γ is above the graph of f for points near A . Thus γ goes outside of the region X , this is a contradiction to our hypothesis. Similarly, we can replace γ with a shorter polygonal curve that is tangent to $f(x)$ at B .

Step two: Let's first look at a motivation for this step. Let C be the intersection point of the two tangent lines to $f(x)$ at A and B (see Figure 4). Then $A - C - B$ is the shortest among all possible polygonal curves under the graph of $f(x)$ in the form of $A - C' - B$, where C' is any arbitrary point. This is proved in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *If $A - C - B$ is a polygonal curve such that AC and BC are tangent to the graph of $f(x)$ at A and B , respectively, and C' is any other arbitrary point such that the polygonal curve $A - C' - B$ is under the graph of $f(x)$, then $|AC| + |CB| \leq |AC'| + |C'B|$.*

Proof. Since $A - C' - B$ is under the graph of $f(x)$, AC' needs to stay below the line passing through AC , i.e. the slope of AC' is smaller than that of AC . Similarly, BC' needs to stay

FIGURE 4. $|AC| + |BC| \leq |AC'| + |BC'|$.


below the line passing through BC . Therefore we find out the region where C' could be. It is shown as the shaded region in Figure 4.

Next let's compare the length of $A - C - B$ with that of $A - C' - B$. Suppose D is the intersection point of AC' with the line passing through BC , then we can apply the triangle inequality to get the following inequalities:


$$|AC'| + |C'B| = |AD| + (|DC'| + |C'B|) \geq |AD| + |BD| = (|AD| + |DC|) + |CB| \geq |AC| + |BC|,$$

as desired. \square

If we replace our original γ with $A - C - B$, the length of $A - C - B$ is not necessarily less than or equal to that of γ . In order to fix this problem, we want to replace γ with a new polygonal curve that looks like a repetition of $A - C - B$. That is to say, the new curve touches the graph of $f(x)$ at every other vertex. Moreover, at each of those vertices, the new curve is tangent to the graph of f as shown in Figure 5. We call such a curve a **zigzag tangent curve**.

FIGURE 5. A zigzag tangent curve from A to B that is tangent to $f(x)$ at A_1, A_2, \dots, B .


The motivation is as follows. First, we start off from A . Next, at vertex A'_1 , we adjust the direction. Hoping to reach B as shortest as possible under the restriction of staying below the graph, it seems that the best direction to go next is in the direction of a line that is tangent to the graph of f and towards B . So A_1 touches the graph. Then, after passing through the tangent point A_1 , we adjust our direction again at A'_2 . Keep repeating this procedure finitely many steps until we reach B . So a zigzag tangent curve seems to be the “best” candidate to replace any polygonal curve from A to B .


 FIGURE 6. The existence of a tangent line to the graph pass through A_1 .

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose γ is any arbitrary polygonal curve from A to B , where A, B are points in the closure of some strictly convex upward and strictly increasing 1-cell e_1 . Moreover, assume γ is tangent to the graph of $f(x)$ at A and B . Then γ can be replaced by a zigzag tangent curve such that its length is no bigger than that of γ and it also has no more vertices than γ .*


Proof. We induct on the number n of intermediate vertices between A and B on γ . If $n = 1$, γ is already the zigzag tangent curve $A - C - B$ shown in Figure 4. If $n \geq 2$, let A_1, \dots, A_n be the intermediate vertices between A and B . If we look at Figure 6, we see that as D slides from A to B on the graph, its tangent line to $f(x)$ intersects with AC in a point that varies continuously from A to C . So by the intermediate value theorem, if A_1 is on AC , there exists a point D on the graph between A and B such that its tangent line to $f(x)$ intersects with AC at A_1 . On the other hand, if D is above B , its tangent line does not intersect with AC at all. Here we need to consider two cases.

Case 1: If A_1 is not on AC , we simply use $A - C - B$ as our new polygonal curve. Since C and B are both on γ and the shortest path between them is BC , the length of $A - C - B$ is shorter than that of γ (see Figure 7). Similarly, we do the same thing if $A_1 = C$, in which $A - C - B$ is no longer than γ . In both cases, $A - C - B$ has no more vertices than γ .


 FIGURE 7. A_1 is not on AC .

Case 2: Assume that A_1 is on AC , but not C . Let the tangent line to $f(x)$ at D be l_D . Then B lies above l_D . There are two subcases in this case.


Subcase 1: If A_2 is below l_D , γ must cross l_D at a point, say A'_1 , in order to reach B . One example is shown in Figure 8. Suppose A'_1 lies on the line segment between A_{k-1} and A_k ,

FIGURE 8. A_2 lies below the tangent line passing through D .

then $k \geq 3$. Replace γ with the new polygonal curve $A - A_1 - A'_1 - A_k - A_{k+1} - \dots - A_n - B$. Call the new curve γ' . For example in Figure 8, $\gamma' = A - A_1 - A'_1 - A_4 - A_5 - \dots - A_n - B$, which has one less vertex than γ and is strictly shorter than γ . In general, the number of vertices of γ' is less than or equal to that of γ , and the length of γ' is less than that of γ . We can divide γ' into two parts: one part is $A - A_1 - D$ and the other part is $D - A'_1 - A_k - A_{k+1} - \dots - A_n - B$. Since $D - A'_1 - A_k - A_{k+1} - \dots - A_n - B$ is a polygonal curve that is tangent to the graph at the endpoints and has less than n intermediate vertices, we can apply the inductive hypothesis to replace it with a zigzag tangent curve with no bigger length and no more vertices. Combining it with $A - A_1 - D$, we get a desired zigzag tangent curve for γ .

Subcase 2: If A_2 lies on l_D , we need to consider the following three separate subsubcases.

Subsubcase 1: When A_2 is to the right of D as shown in Figure 9, there are $n - 1$ vertices between D and B , so we can apply the inductive hypothesis to the polygonal curve $D - A_2 - A_3 - \dots - B$.

FIGURE 9. A_2 lies to the right of D on the tangent line passing through D .

Subsubcase 2: When A_2 is exactly D as shown in Figure 10, l_D intersects with γ at A_2 and at least one other point. This is because A_3 is either below l_D or on it, in either case l_D intersects γ at another point besides A_2 . Let's call this point A'_1 , and $A'_1 = A_3$ when A_3 is on l_D . Let the new curve be $A - A_1 - D - A'_1 - A_k - A_{k+1} - \dots - A_n - B$, where $k \geq 4$. There are at most $n - 2$ vertices from D to B , thus the inductive hypothesis applies.




FIGURE 10. A_2 lies exactly on D on the tangent line passing through D .

Subsubcase 3: When A_2 is to the left of D as shown in Figure 11, similar to the previous argument, l_D crosses γ at a point A_1' other than A_2 , and there are at most $n - 2$ vertices between D and B .




FIGURE 11. A_2 lies to the left of D on the tangent line passing through D .

□

As a summary, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.3. *If γ is a polygonal curve from A to B , where A, B lie in the closure of a 1-cell e_1 . Assume on e_1 , $f'' > 0$ and $f' > 0$, then γ can be replaced by a zigzag tangent curve from A to B which is no longer than γ and has no more vertices than γ .*

2.2. Approximation of shortest-length curves by polygonal curves. Assume γ is a piecewise C^2 -curve with endpoints in \bar{e}_1 and $f'' > 0, f' > 0$ on e_1 as before. Our goal is to approximate γ by zigzag tangent curves below the graph whose lengths can be made as close to that of γ as possible.

Let's parametrize \bar{e}_1 by a smooth function α

$$\alpha : [x_1, x_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \alpha(x) = (x, f(x)),$$

where x_1, x_2 are suitably chosen so that $f''(x) > 0, f'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (x_1, x_2)$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that if $Q = \{x_1 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_m = x_2\}$ is a partition with $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |s_j - s_{j-1}| < \eta$, then

$$|L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) - \int_{x_1}^{x_2} |\alpha'(s)| ds| < \varepsilon,$$

where $L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) = \sum_1^m |\alpha(s_i) - \alpha(s_{i-1})|$ is the length of the polygonal curve inscribed in \bar{e}_1 with respect to partition Q (see [1]). Similarly for $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, if $P = \{a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = b\}$ is a partition of the interval $[a, b]$, then we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |t_i - t_{i-1}| < \delta$ implies

$$|L_a^b(\gamma, P) - \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)| dt| < \varepsilon.$$

Furthermore, we can choose δ small enough so that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\gamma(t_i) - \gamma(t_{i-1})| < \eta$ due to the continuity of γ .

Now let's focus on the polygonal curve inscribed in γ with partition P . For convenience, we also call it P . We don't know whether each line segment in P lies in X or not, but we can fix this by modifying the part of P that is above the graph through the following two steps.

Step one: We replace each part of P that is above the graph by the corresponding part of the graph below it, and show that the difference in length between the old and new curves is less than ε . This is better understood by first looking at the Figure 12. Suppose part




FIGURE 12. Replace the part of the polygonal line that is above the graph by the graph below it.

of the line segment between $\gamma(t_{i-1})$ and $\gamma(t_i)$ is above the graph, which is shown in red in the figure. We label the endpoints of this line segment as A and B . After replacing the line segment with the graph of $f(x)$ from A to B below it, we obtain a new curve between $\gamma(t_{i-1})$ and $\gamma(t_i)$, which is shown in solid black in the figure. We do this for every i from 1 to n and call the resulting new curve $\tilde{\gamma}$. We want to show that $\tilde{\gamma}$ has a length that is within ε range of $L_a^b(\gamma, P)$.

According to the way δ was chosen, if part of the line segment from $\gamma(t_{i-1})$ and $\gamma(t_i)$ is above the graph as shown in Figure 12, then $|AB| \leq |\gamma(t_{i-1}) - \gamma(t_i)| < \eta$. We can create a partition Q by connecting those line segments which are above the graph together as shown in Figure 13. It follows that

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \leq \int_a^b |\tilde{\gamma}'(t)| dt - L_a^b(\gamma, P) \leq \int_{x_1}^{x_2} |\alpha'(s)| ds - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) < \varepsilon,$$

where $\int_a^b |\tilde{\gamma}'(t)| dt - L_a^b(\gamma, P)$ is the sum of all differences, such as the difference between the line segment from A to B and the graph from A to B in Figure 12. Furthermore, we add the following inequality:

$$-\varepsilon < L_a^b(\gamma, P) - \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)| dt < 0$$




FIGURE 13. Create a polygonal curve that includes all line segments (shown in red) above the graph between the two endpoints of \bar{e}_1 .

to (2.1) and obtain that the length of $\tilde{\gamma}$ is within ε range of that of γ as follows:

$$(2.2) \quad -\varepsilon < \int_a^b |\tilde{\gamma}'(t)| dt - \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)| dt < \varepsilon.$$

Remark: If you were careful enough, you might have spotted an error in our argument above. That is we were assuming that the line segments above the graph are not crossing each other, except possibly at the endpoints. If there were crossings, then we weren't able to connect the line segments above the graph in order to construct Q . So we need the following lemma to make sure that this situation does not happen.

Lemma 2.4. *If γ does not move back and forth in horizontal or vertical direction, then for any polygonal curve P inscribed in γ , the line segments above the graph do not overlap, except possibly at the endpoints.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that the initial point of γ is to the left of the final point of γ . Since γ does not move back and forth in the horizontal direction, the x -coordinate function of γ is increasing. The y -coordinate function of γ is either increasing or decreasing, depending upon whether the initial point is above or below the final point. The graph of γ looks like one of the two as shown in Figure 14. Notice that there can be at most countable many of these vertical line segments in γ .




FIGURE 14. Assume γ moves from left to right, γ either goes up or goes down in the vertical direction.

Without loss of generality, we assume γ is going up as it moves from left to right. Suppose P is an arbitrary polygonal curve inscribed in γ . Let $n + 1$ be the number of vertices in P and we apply the mathematical induction on n . Name the vertices of P as A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n . When $n = 1$, P is a line segment, so the lemma is trivially true. When $n \geq 2$, by inductive hypothesis, there is no crossing up to the vertex A_{n-1} . A_n is either vertically above, or to the right of A_{n-1} . Since the line segment between A_{i-1} and A_i , for

$1 \leq i \leq n-1$, is either to the left or vertically below A_{n-1} , the line segment from A_{n-1} to A_n does not cross any of them, except possibly at the endpoint A_{n-1} . \square

We can make Lemma 2.4 as part of our assumption for γ , because we are concerned with shortest-length curves and shortest-length curves do not move back and forth in horizontal or vertical direction. (If a piecewise C^2 -curve does move back and forth, we can always replace it with another one with a strictly shorter length.)

Step two: We replace each part of $\tilde{\gamma}$ which is on the graph by a zigzag tangent curve below it. Call the new curve $\tilde{\tilde{\gamma}}$, then $\tilde{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is a polygonal curve below the graph. We want to verify that the difference in length between $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is less than ε . Therefore after combining with (2.2), the difference in length between γ and $\tilde{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is less than 2ε .

Since there are only finitely many parts of $\tilde{\gamma}$ on the graph, we may assume without loss of generality that $\tilde{\gamma}$ has only one such part, namely the part from A to B as shown in Figure 12. We may assume that the part of the graph from A to B is \bar{e}_1 , then it is parametrized by α

$$\alpha : [x_1, x_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \alpha(x) = (x, f(x)),$$

where $\alpha(x_1) = A$ and $\alpha(x_2) = B$. If $Q = \{x_1 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_m = x_2\}$ is a partition of $[x_0, x_1]$, we construct a zigzag tangent curve associated to those points. Recall that a zigzag tangent curve looks like a repetition of $A-C-B$ in Figure 6. To obtain such a curve, we first draw a tangent line at each point $\alpha(s_j)$ for $0 \leq j \leq m$, then every pair of consecutive tangent lines intersect at a point. Connecting those points together, we get a zigzag tangent curve (see Figure 15). Let's denote $\alpha(s_j)$ by A_j and the intersection




FIGURE 15. Approximate the graph from A to B by a zigzag tangent curve.

point between A_{j-1} and A_j by A'_j , and thus the zigzag tangent curve is the polygonal line $A-A'_1-A_1-A'_2-A_2-\dots-B$. We denote the length of the zigzag tangent curve as $L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, ZQ)$.

If we could also make the zigzag tangent curve to have a length close to that of the polygonal curve $A-A_1-A_2-\dots-B$, then the length of the zigzag tangent curve is close to that of α , because we can make the polygonal curve to have a length close to that of α . This is what we need.

Lemma 2.5. Assume $\alpha : [x_1, x_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \alpha(x) = (x, f(x))$, satisfies $\alpha(x_1) = A$ and $\alpha(x_2) = B$, and $Q = \{x_1 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_m = x_2\}$ is a partition of $[x_1, x_2]$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that if $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |s_j - s_{j-1}| < \eta$, then

$$\left| \int_{x_1}^{x_2} |\alpha'(s)| ds - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) \right| < \varepsilon, \text{ and } \left| L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, ZQ) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) \right| < \varepsilon.$$

Consequently,

$$\left| \int_{x_1}^{x_2} |\alpha'(s)| ds - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, ZQ) \right| < 2\varepsilon.$$

Proof. The first inequality is clear, as we've already seen it few times before. Now let's prove the second inequality. The key idea here is to complete each zigzag into a triangle as shown in Figure 16.




FIGURE 16. Complete each zigzag into a triangle.

Assume that for the zigzag between A_{j-1} and A_j , we extend $A_jA'_j$ to intersect with the vertical line passing through A_{j-1} at a point A''_j . It follows that

$$|A_{j-1}A'_j| + |A'_jA_j| - |A_{j-1}A_j| < |A_{j-1}A''_j| + |A''_jA_j| - |A_{j-1}A_j|.$$

Let the length of the new polygonal curve $A - A''_1 - A_1 - \dots - A_{j-1} - A''_j - A_j - \dots - B$ be called $L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \triangle Q)$, so we get

$$0 < L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, ZQ) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) < L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \triangle Q) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q).$$

Therefore for the second inequality in the lemma, it suffices to show

$$L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \triangle Q) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) < \varepsilon,$$

if $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |s_j - s_{j-1}| < \eta$.

For each j , the tangent line at A_j has slope $f'(s_j)$, so the length of A''_jA_j is

$$|A''_jA_j| = (s_j - s_{j-1}) \sqrt{1 + f'(s_j)^2}.$$

Since the equation of the tangent line is $y = f(s_j) + f'(s_j)(x - s_j)$, the length of $A_{j-1}A''_j$ is

$$f(s_{j-1}) - f(s_j) - f'(s_j)(s_{j-1} - s_j).$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \triangle Q) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m f(s_{j-1}) - f(s_j) - f'(s_j)(s_{j-1} - s_j) \\ &\quad + (s_j - s_{j-1}) \sqrt{1 + f'(s_j)^2} - \sqrt{(s_j - s_{j-1})^2 + (f(s_j) - f(s_{j-1}))^2} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m (s_j - s_{j-1}) \left\{ f'(s_j) - \frac{f(s_j) - f(s_{j-1})}{s_j - s_{j-1}} + \sqrt{1 + f'(s_j)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sqrt{1 + \left[\frac{f(s_j) - f(s_{j-1})}{s_j - s_{j-1}} \right]^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the mean value theorem, there exists $s_{j-1} < \hat{s}_j < s_j$ such that $f(s_j - s_{j-1}) = f'(\hat{s}_j)(s_j - s_{j-1})$. Plugging into the above equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \Delta Q) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m (s_j - s_{j-1}) \{f'(s_j) - f'(\hat{s}_j) + \sqrt{1 + f'(s_j)^2} - \sqrt{1 + (f'(\hat{s}_j))^2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let's define the function $g(x) = f'(x) + \sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}$, so we can rewrite the above equality as

$$(2.3) \quad L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \Delta Q) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) = \sum_{j=1}^m (s_j - s_{j-1}) \{g(s_j) - g(\hat{s}_j)\}.$$

Since g is uniformly continuous on $[x_1, x_2]$, given $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose η small enough such that if $\max_{1 \leq j \leq m} |s_j - s_{j-1}| < \eta$,

$$g(s_j) - g(\hat{s}_j) < \varepsilon / (x_2 - x_1)$$

for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. Therefore (2.3) implies that

$$0 < L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, \Delta Q) - L_{x_1}^{x_2}(\alpha, Q) < \varepsilon,$$

as desired. \square

Putting steps one and two together, the following proposition is a formal statement of approximating shortest-length curves by polygonal curves.

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of degree ≥ 2 , and X is the closed region below the graph of $f(x)$. Let a cell decomposition of X be given as shown in Figure 3, and let e_1 be a 1-cell on the graph of $f(x)$, on which $f'' > 0$ and $f' > 0$. Assume γ is a piecewise C^2 -curve in X whose initial and final points lie inside the closure of e_1 , and γ does not move back and forth in horizontal or vertical direction, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a polygonal curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ in X such that the difference in length between γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is within ε .*

More generally, we can show that this is also true for any γ .

Proposition 2.7. *Let $f(x)$ be a polynomial function of degree ≥ 2 , and let X be the closed region below the graph of $f(x)$. Assume $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a piecewise C^2 -curve between two points in X and γ does not move back and forth in horizontal or vertical direction, then given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a polygonal curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ in X such that the difference in length between γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is within ε .*

Proof. Since the graph above γ might be convex upward or downward, we want to first divide γ by drawing vertical lines through the 0-cells on the graph, namely $(n, f(n))$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the strict inflection points and the local minimum points. As a result, each part of γ is below one of the three types of 1-cells on the graph. Recall the three types are where: $f'' < 0$, $f'' > 0$ and $f' > 0$, $f'' > 0$ and $f' < 0$.

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ so that for any partition $P = \{a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = b\}$ of $[a, b]$, if $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |t_i - t_{i-1}| < \delta$, then

$$|L_a^b(\gamma, P) - \int_a^b |\gamma'(t)| dt| < \varepsilon.$$

We may add more points to P so that each line segment in the polygonal curve is also below one of the three types of 1-cells.

For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, if the line segment between $\gamma(t_{i-1})$ and $\gamma(t_i)$ is below a 1-cell where $f'' < 0$, then it is contained in X ; if it is below a 1-cell where $f'' > 0, f' > 0$, we can approximate it with another polygonal curve below the graph according to the previous proposition; if it is below a 1-cell where $f'' > 0, f' < 0$, the argument is similar to when $f'' > 0, f' > 0$. Therefore we obtain a polygonal curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ that is below the graph whose length is within ε range of that of γ . \square

This proposition immediately gives us the following corollary.

Corollary 2.8. *Given any two points A and B in the closed region X below the graph of a polynomial function $f(x)$, if there exists a shortest-length curve γ from A to B in X , then*

$$(2.4) \quad \inf\left\{\int |\zeta'| : \zeta \text{ is a piecewise } C^2\text{-curve from } A \text{ to } B \text{ in } X\right\} = \inf\left\{\int |\zeta'| : \zeta \text{ is a polygonal curve from } A \text{ to } B \text{ in } X\right\}.$$

Proof. First, γ does not move back and forth in horizontal or vertical direction, otherwise we can replace it with another curve of strictly less length. Second, from Proposition 2.7, we can approximate γ by a sequence of polygonal curves in X whose lengths decrease to that of γ . So the equality holds. \square

Now we are ready to formally answer the questions that were asked earlier: If C, D are two points in the closure of a 1-cell e_1 , where $f'' > 0$ and $f' > 0$, and γ is a shortest curve from C to D under the graph, what does γ look like? Is it unique?

Proposition 2.9. *Suppose $f(x)$ is a polynomial function of $\deg \geq 2$, and X is the closed region below the graph of $f(x)$. Let a cell decomposition of X be given as shown in Figure 3, and let e_1 be a 1-cell on the graph of $f(x)$, where $f'' > 0$ and $f' > 0$. Assume that γ is a shortest-length curve between two points C, D in the closure of e_1 , then γ lies entirely on the graph of $f(x)$ from C to D .*

Proof. (Existence): By Corollary 2.8, it suffices to study polygonal curves in X from C to D . Let ζ be such a curve. Then Theorem 2.3 implies that ζ can be replaced by a zigzag tangent curve ζ_1 from C to D which is no longer than ζ . Suppose ζ_1 is given by

$$C - A'_1 - A_1 - \dots - A_{j-1} - A'_j - A_j - \dots - A'_n - A_n - D,$$

where ζ_1 is tangent to $f(x)$ at A_j for $1 \leq j \leq n$. We can add another tangent point B_j between A_{j-1} and A_j , then the tangent line at B_j intersects $A_{j-1}A'_j$ and A'_jA_j at the new points B'_j and B''_j , respectively. See Figure 17. Call the new curve ζ_2 . By the triangle inequality, $|B'_jB''_j| < |B'_jA'_j| + |A'_jB''_j|$, so ζ_2 has a length smaller than that of ζ_1 . Continue this process and we get a sequence $\{\zeta_k\}$ of zigzag tangent curves between C and D whose lengths are strictly decreasing. We want to show that the limit is the length of the graph from C to D .

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, since γ is a shortest-length curve in X from C to D , Proposition 2.6 implies that there exists a polygonal curve, say ζ , such that

$$\int |\zeta'| - \varepsilon < \int |\gamma| \leq \int |\zeta'|,$$

which implies that

$$(2.5) \quad \int |\zeta'| - \varepsilon < \int |\gamma| \leq \int |\zeta'_k|,$$

for any $k \geq 1$.




FIGURE 17. Decrease the length of a zigzag tangent curve by adding more tangent points.

By Lemma 2.5, the difference in length between a zigzag tangent curve and the graph can be made arbitrarily small if the tangent points on the zigzag tangent curve are close enough to each other. That is to say, when k is sufficiently large,

$$|\text{length of the graph from } C \text{ to } D - \int |\zeta'_k| < \varepsilon,$$

equivalently it can be rewritten as follows:

$$(2.6) \quad -\int |\zeta'_k| - \varepsilon < -(\text{length of the graph from } C \text{ to } D) < -\int |\zeta'_k| + \varepsilon.$$

Since $\int |\zeta'_k| < \int |\zeta'|$, (2.6) gives

$$(2.7) \quad -\int |\zeta'| - \varepsilon < -(\text{length of the graph from } C \text{ to } D) < -\int |\zeta'_k| + \varepsilon,$$

Adding (2.5) and (2.7) yields

$$-2\varepsilon < \int |\gamma'| - \text{length of the graph from } C \text{ to } D < \varepsilon.$$

This is true for any arbitrary ε . Therefore the length of the graph from C to D is equal to that of γ , and so the graph from C to D is also a shortest curve in X from C to D . Moreover, the sequence $\{\zeta_k\}$ satisfies that their lengths decrease to the length of the graph from C to D .

(Uniqueness): Suppose not, then there is a point I on γ that is not on the graph. Then I has an open neighborhood in which the line segment between any two points in the neighborhood is below the graph. It implies that near I , γ must be linear, otherwise we can pick two points where γ is not linear in between and get a shorter curve by replacing the part with a line segment. We can extend the linear curve near I on both ends until each end hits the graph of $f(x)$. This must be true because the initial and final points of γ are on the graph. In the end, we obtain a line segment below the graph with two endpoints on the graph, which is a contradiction because the graph is convex upward. \square

Remark: The proof for uniqueness gives another way of proving the proposition, which is much shorter. However, it was discovered much later. We will implement this idea and the zigzag tangent curve in the future for higher-dimensional cases. Continue our line of thinking, we get the following statement.

Theorem 2.10. Suppose $f(x)$ is a polynomial function, X is the closed region below the graph of $f(x)$, and A, B are two arbitrary points inside X . Without loss of generality, we

assume that A is to the left of B . Assume $\gamma: [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is a piecewise C^2 -curve from A to B that is a shortest-length curve from A to B in X . Then there exists a cell decomposition of X such that γ interacts with each cell at most finitely many times. Moreover, it interacts with each 0- or 1-cell at most twice.

Remark: There is possibly a triangulation theorem using our construction of a cell decomposition.

3. MORE GENERAL REGIONS IN THE PLANE

3.1. Type I regions. We think of a simply-connected region whose **sides** consist of finitely many graphs of polynomial functions. Three examples are shown in Figure 18. Let's still denote such a region by X . Previously X has only one side being the graph of a polynomial function. Here, X could have more than one side, X could be bounded or unbounded, and the boundary of X could be disconnected. We call such an X a **region of type I** and X has vertices and sides as shown in Figure 18. We ask the same question as before: does there exist a cell decomposition of X such that any shortest-length curve between two points in X interacts with each cell at most finitely many times? The answer is yes!




FIGURE 18. Three examples of regions of type I.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume X is a region of type I, then X has a cell decomposition such that any shortest-length curve between two points in X interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.*

Proof. First of all, let's construct a cell decomposition of X . Since each side of X is the graph of a polynomial function and there are finitely many of them, we name the polynomials $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$. If $k = 1$, we return to the familiar situation in section 2. For our next purpose, we call such a region a **polynomial half plane**. The name comes from the observation that such a region looks very much like a half plane, except that the boundary is a polynomial curve instead of a straight line. Furthermore, in the convention, if we rotate or translate a half plane, we still call it a half plane, so we do the same thing for a polynomial half plane.

Next, if $k \geq 2$, the intuition for constructing a cell decomposition for X is as follows. Let X_1, \dots, X_k be the corresponding polynomial half planes for $f_1(x), \dots, f_k(x)$, respectively. For each X_i , we use the same decomposition as shown in Figure 3. It is possible that we need to add more 0-cells to the graph of f_i in this decomposition, such as the vertices of X . After dividing each X_i into cells, we overlay all of them to obtain a cell decomposition for X .

Lemma 3.2. *The construction above yields a cell decomposition for X . In addition, the cell decomposition looks like a web of meshes; each mesh is enclosed by finitely many edges; and each edge is either a line segment or a section of one side of X .*

Remark: We call each mesh in the lemma a **generalized polygon** or a **mesh**, so a generalized polygon is a bounded region of type I as shown in Figure 18.

Proof. We prove by induction on k . When $k = 1$, each generalized polygon has four edges with at least three edges being linear; moreover, if it has a nonlinear edge, it must be a section of the graph of $f_1(x)$. When $k \geq 2$, let $X' = X_1 \cap X_2 \cap \dots \cap X_{k-1}$. By inductive hypothesis, overlaying the cell decompositions of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{k-1} gives a cell decomposition

of X' satisfying the property that the closure of every 2-cell is a generalized polygon with each edge being either linear or a section of the graph of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots$, or $f_{k-1}(x)$. Let e_2 be such a 2-cell in the cell decomposition. For X_k , it also has a grid-like cell decomposition satisfying the property that each edge is either linear or a section of the graph of $f_k(x)$.

Consider the web in X that is obtained from overlaying the two cell decompositions of X' and X_k . We want to show that it divides X into generalized polygons, thus is a cell decomposition of X . We need to consider two cases.

Case 1: If \bar{e}_2 is completely inside X_k , since \bar{e}_2 is compact and each mesh in X_k has a minimum area, \bar{e}_2 is covered by only finitely many generalized polygons in X_k .

Claim: \bar{e}_2 is divided into finitely many generalized polygons after overlaying the grids of X' and X_k .

Proof of Claim: First, finitely many vertices of those generalized polygons covering \bar{e}_2 are contained in \bar{e}_2 .

Second, given one edge of \bar{e}_2 , every edge of those meshes covering \bar{e}_2 either overlaps with it partially or intersects it at finitely many points. This is shown as follows. Let ω_1 be an edge of \bar{e}_2 , and let ω_2 be an edge of any of the meshes that covers \bar{e}_2 . When both ω_1 and ω_2 are linear, they either overlap partially or intersect at most at one point. When one of them is nonlinear, say ω_2 , then ω_2 is on the graph of $f_i(x)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. In the coordinate frame of $f_i(x)$, we can write the equation of the graph on which ω_1 lies as follows:

$$g(\cos(\theta)x + \sin(\theta)y) = -\sin(\theta)x + \cos(\theta)y,$$

where $g(x)$ is either a linear function or $f_k(x)$, and θ is the angle between the coordinate frames of $f_i(x)$ and $g(x)$. Then for the intersection points, we solve the following equation:

$$g(\cos(\theta)x + \sin(\theta)f_i(x)) = -\sin(\theta)x + \cos(\theta)f_i(x)$$

This is a polynomial function in x . If we get $0 = 0$, ω_1 and ω_2 overlap partially, otherwise we get finitely many zeros. In total, there are finitely many intersection points of edges in those meshes and edges in \bar{e}_2 .

Third, let D be the set of vertices of those meshes in X_k covering \bar{e}_2 and the intersection points of edges in those meshes and edges in \bar{e}_2 . From the previous two steps, D is a finite set. Furthermore, we observe that for each pair of points in this collection, they are connected by at most one curve which is either from an edge of \bar{e}_2 or from one belonging to one of those meshes in X_k . Since the generalized polygons covering \bar{e}_2 do not overlap, except possibly on the edges, \bar{e}_2 is divided into finitely many meshes, whose edges are on either \bar{e}_2 or one of the generalized polygons covering \bar{e}_2 , and so are either linear or on the graphs of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$. This finishes the proof for the claim, thus completing the case 1.

Case 2: If \bar{e}_2 is partially contained in X_k , then \bar{e}_2 is first cut off by the graph of $f_k(x)$. We claim that the graph of f_k divides e_2 into finitely many generalized polygons. The proof of this claim will be given in Theorem 3.6. For X , we select only these generalized polygons that are contained in X_k . It follows that each of these generalized polygons is further divided up by the meshes of X_k into finitely many generalized polygons using the same argument as the previous case. \square

Let's continue proving the proposition. Given the cell decomposition as in Lemma 3.2, suppose γ is a shortest-length curve between two points in X , γ interacts with each 0-cell at most once. For the 1-cells, let e_1 be one of these. By Lemma 3.2, e_1 is either linear or a section of the graph of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots$, or $f_k(x)$. If e_1 is linear, γ interacts with it at most

once. If e_1 is a section of the graph of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots$, or $f_k(x)$, there are three cases as follows.

Case 1: e_1 is linear, then γ interacts with e_1 at most once.

Case 2: e_1 is convex upward, then γ also interacts with e_1 at most once according to Proposition 2.9.

Case 3: e_1 is convex downward, then γ interacts with e_1 at most finitely many times. Suppose not, take one point from each interaction, then we have an infinite set E of these points. By the compactness of \bar{e}_1 , E has an accumulation point x in \bar{e}_1 , where x is either a boundary point of e_1 or not. Since γ is a closed curve, x is also in γ . Without loss of generality, we assume γ interacts with e_1 infinitely many times before reaching x , otherwise we can reverse the direction of γ . Here we need to separate into three subcases as follows.

Subcase 1: x is not a boundary point of e_1 . Since x is at a positive distance away from every other side of X , there exists $r > 0$ such that X contains every point below e_1 which is at a distance less than r from x (see Figure 19). Since x is an accumulation point of E , we can pick three distinct points x_1, x_2, x_3 in E that are at distances less than r from x . Thus the line segment between every pair of them is contained in X . Without loss of generality, assume γ goes through the three points in order of x_1, x_2, x_3 . Then the shortest path from x_1 to x_3 is the straight line segment, which does not intersect e_1 in between. This is a contradiction to the fact that γ has another interaction with e_1 at x_2 between x_1 and x_3 .




FIGURE 19. When x is on e_1 , we can pick three distinct points that are in $B(x, r)$.


Subcase 2: x is a boundary point of e_1 . If x is not a boundary point of the side containing e_1 , we can use the same argument as above. Now suppose x is a boundary point of the side containing e_1 , equivalently, x is a vertex point of X . Let the first 1-cell on the next side be \tilde{e}_1 . Then \tilde{e}_1 also has x as a boundary point. Assume e_1 and \tilde{e}_1 are oriented in the clockwise direction. Denote the tangent lines of e_1, \tilde{e}_1 at x as l_1, l_2 , respectively. Then there are two subsubcases as below.

Subsubcase 1: When l_1 and l_2 do not coincide, we show the following lemma is true.


Lemma 3.3. *Assume the tangent lines l_1 and l_2 do not coincide. Then when a point on e_1 is close enough to x , the line segment between them is contained in X .*

Proof. First, suppose \tilde{e}_1 is convex upward in its own coordinate frame, there are two possible configurations as shown in Figure 20. Let α be the angle from l_1 to l_2 in the counterclockwise direction, then $0 < \alpha < \pi$. Given a point y on e_1 , if y is close enough to x , the angle between the line segment $[x, y]$ and l_1 is less than α , thus $[x, y]$ is above l_2 . Since $[x, y]$ is below e_1 , $[x, y]$ is inside X .

Second, suppose \tilde{e}_1 is convex downward in its own coordinate frame, there are also two possible configurations as shown in Figure 21. If \tilde{e}_1 is below l_2 , we can use the same argument as before. On the other hand, if \tilde{e}_1 is above l_2 , \tilde{e}_1 crosses e_1 at another point, say


 FIGURE 20. $l_1 \neq l_2$ and \tilde{e}_1 is convex upward in its own coordinate frame.

a , besides x . Then for every point y on e_1 that is between a and x , the line segment $[x, y]$ is above \tilde{e}_1 and below e_1 , and thus is in X .



 FIGURE 21. $l_1 \neq l_2$ and \tilde{e}_1 is convex downward in its own coordinate frame.

□

According to Lemma 3.3, when l_1 and l_2 do not coincide with each other, there exists a point y such that γ passes y before x and the line segment $[x, y]$ lies in X . Therefore γ is a straight line before reaching x , which is a contradiction to our assumption that before arriving at x , γ interacts with e_1 at infinitely many points converging to x .

Subsubcase 2: When l_1 and l_2 do coincide, there are two possibilities.

First, when \tilde{e}_1 is convex downward in its own coordinate frame, there is only one possible configuration as shown in Figure 22. Draw the perpendicular line l' to l_1 at x . Using a similar argument as in Lemma 3.3, when a point on e_1 is close enough to x , the line segment between them is above l' and below e_1 , thus inside X . Thus it follows that γ is again a straight line before reaching x . So we get a contradiction.


 FIGURE 22. $l_1 = l_2$ and \tilde{e}_1 is convex downward in its own coordinate frame..

Second, when \tilde{e}_1 is convex upward in its own coordinate frame, there are two possible configurations as shown in Figure 23. If \tilde{e}_1 is above l_1 , we apply the previous argument to get a contradiction. If \tilde{e}_1 is below l_1 , we need another argument as follows.




FIGURE 23. $l_1 = l_2$ and \tilde{e}_1 is convex upward in its own coordinate frame.

Let A_0 be a point on γ such that γ passes through A_0 before reaching x and A_0 is not on e_1 . This is possible because we assume that γ interacts with e_1 infinitely many times before arriving at x . A_0 cannot be on \tilde{e}_1 , otherwise γ will lie on \tilde{e}_1 from A_0 to x by Proposition 2.9. It follows that A_0 is in the interior of X , and thus γ is linear near A_0 . Say A_1 is the first point after A_0 where γ stops being linear, then A_1 has to be on e_1 and $A_1 \neq x$. Next γ can't stay in e_1 , for e_1 is convex downward. Therefore, γ leaves e_1 at A_1 in a straight line towards another point A_2 on e_1 and $A_2 \neq x$. Afterward, γ leaves e_1 again, and this process never stops. As a result, γ never reaches x . This is a contradiction. (Another way to argue is that γ is not piecewise C^2 , because it has infinitely many line segments. In addition, the following corollary will show that γ does not hit e_1 at all, which provides an even shorter proof.)

As a summary, what we've proved so far is that when l_1 and l_2 do coincide, γ does not interact with any 1-cell infinitely many times. This completes subsubcase 2. Therefore γ interacts with any 1-cell at most finitely many times. For the 2-cells, since γ interacts with the boundary of each 2-cell, which consists of finitely many 1-cells, at most finitely many times, γ interacts with each 2-cell at most finitely many times. \square

The last case in the proof of the above proposition is special, and we summarize it in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *Assume X is a region of type I and x is a vertex on X . Let γ be a shortest-length curve in X which ends at x . Furthermore, suppose one side that is adjacent to x is convex downward and the other side is convex upward in their respective coordinate frames, and their tangent lines at x coincide, then γ eventually stays in the convex upward side.*

In particular, if γ starts at a point not on the convex downward side, then γ moves in a straight line toward the convex upward side and then stays in it thereafter; and γ never hits the convex downward side.

Proof. We use our setup as before. Suppose $A_0 \neq x$ is a point on γ that is not in \tilde{e}_1 . Then A_0 is either in e_1 or in the interior of X . In both cases, γ moves in a straight line towards the next point on \tilde{e}_1 or e_1 . If the next point is in \tilde{e}_1 , γ stays in \tilde{e}_1 from then on. If the next point is in e_1 , say A_1 , then $A_1 \neq x$, because the line segment $[A_1, x]$ intersects \tilde{e}_1 at some point besides x due to the fact that l_1 and l_2 coincide. Then γ leaves e_1 at A_1 and goes in a straight line towards the next point A_2 on \tilde{e}_1 or e_1 . This process stops after finitely many times. Eventually γ must hit a point on \tilde{e}_1 and stay in \tilde{e} thereafter.

In fact, γ cannot hit a A_1 that is on e_1 at all. This is because the line segments $[A_0, A_1]$ and $[A_1, A_2]$ form an angle less than 90 degrees, so we can reduce the length of γ using a line segment between one point on $[A_0, A_1]$ and another point on $[A_1, A_2]$ assuming these two points being close enough to x (see Figure 24). This is a contradiction.

As a conclusion, γ never hits e_1 unless it starts at a point on e_1 , and γ moves in a straight line toward \tilde{e}_1 and stays in it till arriving at x .




FIGURE 24. γ cannot hit e_1 otherwise we can make it shorter.

□

Corollary 3.5. *Assume X is a region of type I and γ is a shortest-length curve between two points in X . Then γ is an alternating sequence of straight line segments and curves on the boundary of X ; moreover, each curve on the boundary lies in the convex upward part of a side in its own coordinate frame. In particular, γ can be described by finitely many algebraic equations.*

Proof. Around every interior point in X , γ is a straight line. It implies that γ stops being a straight line only when it hits a point on the boundary of X . As proved in Proposition 2.9, γ could stay in the boundary only when it lies on the convex upward part of a side in its own coordinate frame. Therefore γ alternates between a line segment and a curve on the boundary. □

3.2. Generalize regions of type I. Let's start with describing a region of type I more formally. First, a region which is below the graph of a polynomial function $f(x)$ can be written as $\{(x, y) | f(x) - y \geq 0\}$. Next, we rotate it by an angle θ (see Figure 25). Then the




FIGURE 25. (i) $\{(x, y) | f(x) - y \geq 0\}$; (ii) $\{(x, y) | f(\cos(\theta)x + \sin(\theta)y) - (-\sin(\theta)x + \cos(\theta)y) \geq 0\}$.

new set is:

$$(3.1) \quad \{(x, y) | f(\cos(\theta)x + \sin(\theta)y) - (-\sin(\theta)x + \cos(\theta)y) \geq 0\}.$$

So a region of type I can be described formally as:

$$(3.2) \quad \{f_1 \geq 0\} \cap \{f_2 \geq 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k \geq 0\},$$

provided that $\{f_1 \geq 0\}$ is in the form of (3.1), and the intersection of $\{f_1 \geq 0\}, \dots, \{f_k \geq 0\}$ is simply-connected. For example, the shaded area in Figure 26 is a region of type I, and it can be described as follows:

$$\left\{ -\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}x + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}y\right)^2 + 2 - \left(-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}x + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}y\right) \geq 0 \right\} \cap \{-x + 1 \geq 0\} \cap \{y + 1 \geq 0\}.$$




FIGURE 26. A shaded area bounded by $x = 1$, $y = -1$, and the rotated graph of $y = -x^2 + 2$.

In general, a set in the form of (3.2) might not be connected, and so might not be a region of type I. However, there is a close connection between the two.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose X is a region that is the intersection of finitely many polynomial half planes determined by the polynomial functions $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$, i.e., X is in the form of (3.2), then X is a union of finitely many regions of type I satisfying the following properties:*

- (1) *Every side of a region in X is on the graph of a polynomial function $f_i(x)$, where $1 \leq i \leq k$;*
- (2) *No two adjacent sides of a region in X are on the same graph. That is to say, if two adjacent sides are subsets of $\{f_1 \geq 0\}$ and $\{f_2 \geq 0\}$, respectively, then $\{f_1 \geq 0\} \neq \{f_2 \geq 0\}$;*
- (3) *Two distinct regions intersect at most at one vertex;*
- (4) *No three regions intersect at the same vertex.*

Proof. Let X_1, \dots, X_k be the polynomial half planes corresponding to $f_1(x), \dots, f_k(x)$, respectively. We prove by induction on k . When $k = 1$, X itself is a region of type I. It has only one side which is the graph of $f_1(x)$, therefore property 1 is satisfied. For properties 2, 3, and 4, they are trivially true. When $k \geq 2$, by inductive hypothesis, $X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_{k-1} = T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_m$, where T_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) is a region of type I, and the T_j 's satisfy all the four properties.

Part I: We prove that for each j , $T_j \cap X_k$ is a finite union of type I regions satisfying properties 1 - 4. Let the sides of T_j be on the graphs of $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_r \in \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{k-1}\}$.

Then the side on the graph of g_p , $1 \leq p \leq r$, and the graph of f_k intersect at most at finitely many points. This is because we need to solve the following polynomial equation:

$$g_p(\cos(\theta)x + \sin(\theta)f_k(x)) = -\sin(\theta)x + \cos(\theta)f_k(x),$$

where θ is the angle between the coordinate frames of g_p and f_k . Since we choose $\{f_1 \geq 0\}, \dots, \{f_k \geq 0\}$ to be distinct sets, the side on the graph of g_p do not overlap partially with the graph of f_k . Therefore they have at most finitely many intersection points. It implies that f_k intersects the boundary of T_j at most at finitely many points. Let's denote them as a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q .

If $q = 0$, the boundary of T_j is either entirely inside X_k , or in the complement of X_k . When the boundary of T_j is entirely inside X_k , $T_j \cap X_k$ is equal to T_j , or a region of type I with a disconnected boundary as shown in Figure 18. When the boundary of T_j is in the complement of X_k , $T_j \cap X_k = \emptyset$ or X_k . In all cases, it is true that $T_j \cap X_k$ is a finite union of type I regions satisfying properties 1 - 4.

Let $q \geq 1$. Without loss of generality we assume that a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q are ordered from left to right on the graph of f_k (see Figure 27). Let's denote the part on the graph of $f_k(x)$ from a_i to a_{i+1} by L_i , where $1 \leq i \leq q-1$. Moreover, denote the part of graph to the left of a_1 by L_0 , and the part to the right of a_q by L_q . We note that each L_i without its endpoint(s), lies in either the interior of T_j or the exterior of T_j . Let $\text{Int } L_i$ be L_i without its endpoint(s) for $0 \leq i \leq q$. Starting from L_0 , if $\text{Int } L_0$ is in the exterior of T_j , it does not affect T_j at all. Otherwise, L_0 divides T_j into two regions of type I, say T_j^1 and T_j^2 . Both of them has L_0 as a side. Next, if $\text{Int } L_1$ is in the exterior of T_j , discard it. Otherwise, $\text{Int } L_1$ is in T_j^1 or T_j^2 , but not both. This is because the two regions have only L_0 in common, and L_0, L_1 can intersect at most at a_1 , so L_1 can't cross over L_0 . Suppose $\text{Int } L_1$ is inside T_j^2 , then L_1 divides T_j^2 into another two regions of type I. Call them T_j^2 and T_j^3 , and they have L_1 as a side. We repeat the process for L_2, L_3, \dots, L_q . In the end, T_j is divided by the graph of f_k into finitely many regions of type I with at least one side from the graph of f_k and the rest from the sides of T_j which are on the graphs of f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{k-1} . We select these which are contained in X_k , say $T_j^1, T_j^2, \dots, T_j^t$. Thus $T_j \cap X_k = T_j^1 \cup T_j^2 \cup \dots \cup T_j^t$, a finite union of regions of type I.




FIGURE 27. The graph of $f_k(x)$ and the boundary of T_j intersect at a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{10} ordered from left to right.

First, property 1 is satisfied for each of $T_j^1, T_j^2, \dots, T_j^t$, since the sides are from the graphs of f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k .

Next, property 2 can be achieved by deleting any vertex that is adjacent to two sides on the same graph. More precisely, assume without loss of generality that T_j^1 has a vertex adjacent to two sides on the same graph. This could only happen when the two sides are both on the graph of f_k . Furthermore, this vertex cannot be on any other T_j^2, \dots, T_j^t .

Moreover, this vertex cannot be on any other $T_i^1, T_i^2, \dots, T_i^{t(i)}$ for $i \neq j$, where $T_i \cap X_k = T_i^1 \cup T_i^2 \cup \dots \cup T_i^{t(i)}$. It turns out that we can make these two sides into one by removing the vertex in between.

Then, let's show property 3 is true. Before proving it, we need to first look at the following claim.

Claim: Suppose T_j is divided by the graph of $f_k(x)$ into regions S_1, S_2, \dots, S_u of type I, then S_{i_1} and S_{i_2} share either a side, a vertex, or nothing for $i_1 \neq i_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, u\}$.

Proof of claim: Let the number of L 's in L_0, L_1, \dots, L_q that are contained in T_j be m . We prove by induction on m . When $m = 1$, T_j is divided into two regions and they share a side. When $m \geq 2$, suppose the first $(m-1)$ L 's separate T_j into $S_1, \dots, S_{u-2}, \tilde{S}_{u-1}$, where $\tilde{S}_{u-1} = S_{u-1} \cup S_u$. By inductive hypothesis, given two distinct regions in $S_1, \dots, S_{u-2}, \tilde{S}_{u-1}$, they share a side, a point, or nothing. Suppose the last L divides \tilde{S}_{u-1} into S_{u-1} and S_u , then S_{u-1} and S_u share a side. Furthermore, for $1 \leq i \leq u-2$, if S_i and \tilde{S}_{u-1} share a side, S_i shares the side with either S_{u-1} or S_u ; say S_i shares the side with S_{u-1} , then S_i shares at most a vertex with S_u . If S_i and \tilde{S}_{u-1} share a vertex, then S_i shares at most a vertex with S_{u-1} and S_u . Therefore S_i and S_{u-1} have either a common side or a common vertex, or have nothing in common. Similarly, the same is true for S_i and S_u , where $1 \leq i \leq u-2$. This completes the proof for the claim.

Now let's prove property 3. By the above claim and the fact that $\{T_j^1, T_j^2, \dots, T_j^t\} \subseteq \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_u\}$, it suffices to prove that $T_j^{i_1}$ and $T_j^{i_2}$ don't have a side in common for $i_1 \neq i_2$. This is true because only the upper or lower part of the side is in X_k if this side comes from the graph of f_k . Similarly, only the inner or outer part of the side is in X_k if this side comes from the boundary of T_j . So $T_j^{i_1}$ and $T_j^{i_2}$ intersect at most at one vertex when $i_1 \neq i_2$.

Last, property 4 holds. Suppose not, there exist $T_j^{i_1}, T_j^{i_2}, T_j^{i_3}$ such that $i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3$ and they have a vertex in common. It implies that this vertex is adjacent to at least six sides. However, this is impossible due to the fact every vertex is either on the boundary of T_j which is adjacent to two sides, or an intersection point in a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q which is adjacent to four sides.

Part II: We are ready to show $X = X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_{k-1} \cap X_k$ is a finite union of type I regions satisfying all the properties. Since $X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_{k-1} = T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_m$,

$$X = (T_1 \cap X_k) \cup \dots \cup (T_m \cap X_k).$$

Properties 1, 2, and 3 are obviously true provided for what we've shown above for $T_j \cap X_k$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Let us prove property 4. By inductive hypothesis, no three of T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m intersect at the same vertex. We want to show this is also true for $T_1^1, \dots, T_1^{t(1)}, \dots, T_m^1, \dots, T_m^{t(m)}$, where $T_j^1, \dots, T_j^{t(j)}$ are type I regions in $T_j \cap X_k$. For the sake of contradiction, suppose this does not hold. It implies that there are T_{j_1} and T_{j_2} , $j_1 \neq j_2$, such that they have a vertex x in common; Moreover, one of them, say T_{j_1} , has two subregions of type I, say $T_{j_1}^1$ and $T_{j_1}^2$, which have x in common. A picture is shown in Figure 28. We'll show this situation does not happen.

Step 1: Observe that the graph of f_k is contained entirely in T_{j_1} near x . This can be seen as follows. Before being cut by the graph of f_k , T_{j_1} is a region of type I. If f_k does not go through x , we can't have two subregions in $X_k \cap T_{j_1}$ having x as a vertex, so the graph of f_k passes through x . Furthermore, it contributes one side to each of $T_{j_1}^1$ and $T_{j_1}^2$. Therefore, the graph of f_k near x is entirely inside T_{j_1} as shown in Figure 28. Furthermore, it implies that the graph of f_k does not divide T_{j_2} .




FIGURE 28. No three regions of type I intersect at the same vertex.

Step 2: Since no three of T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m intersect at x , x is adjacent to four sides: two from T_{j1} and two from T_{j2} . Denote the two sides adjacent to T_{j1} as η_1, η_2 . Then η_1 and η_2 cannot be on the same graph by property 2. Similarly, denote the sides adjacent to x in T_{j2} as ξ_1, ξ_2 , and ξ_1, ξ_2 cannot be on the same graph. Since the graph of a polynomial function can't stop at x , we have two possibilities: either η_1, ξ_1 are on the same graph, and η_2, ξ_2 are on the same graph; or η_1, ξ_2 are on the same graph, and η_2, ξ_1 are on the same graph. Using the configuration in Figure 28, we find that only the first possibility makes sense. Call the function, whose graph contains η_1 and ξ_1 , g ; and call the function, whose graph contains η_2 and ξ_2 , h .

Claim: The tangent line of g coincides with that of h at x .

Proof of claim: Let the tangent lines of g and h at x be l_1, l_2 , respectively.

Case 1: g is on one side of l_1 near x as illustrated in Figure 29. For convenience, we assume g is below l_1 . Since h is below the graph of g in Figure 28, h is also below l_1 . If l_2 is not equal to l_1 , part of l_2 is in the space above l_1 . If we rotate l_2 a little bit, it intersects h at another point besides x , because l_2 is a tangent line of h at x . (A tangent line can be approximated by a sequence of secant lines on a continuously differentiable curve.) It follows that h has another point above l_1 near x . This is a contradiction.




FIGURE 29. Near x , g is on one side of its tangent line at x .

Case 2: g is on both sides of l_1 near x as illustrated in Figure 30. Since the part of l_2 that is above g stays above it even if we rotate l_2 a little bit, we can apply the same argument as before. More precisely, if l_2 has a positive slope, the right part of l_2 increases at a faster rate than g , so l_2 stays above g for a while to the right. When we rotate l_2 a bit, the right part of l_2 still stays above g . Then we can show there is a point of h above g near x , which is a contradiction. The same is true if l_2 has a negative slope or l_2 is a vertical line. This completes the proof for the claim.




FIGURE 30. Near x , g is on both sides of its tangent line at x .

Step three: Since f_k is below g near x , the tangent line of f_k at x is also l_1 by the above claim. Draw a perpendicular line l' to l_1 through x , then T_{j_1} is in the left part of l' and T_{j_2} is in the right part of l' as shown in Figure 28. Furthermore, l' divides f_k into two curves, one to the left of l' and the other to the right. So it is impossible that f_k lies entirely in T_{j_1} near x . \square

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose X is a region (not necessarily simply-connected) that is the intersection of finitely many polynomial half planes in the form of (3.2), there exists a cell decomposition of X such that any shortest-length curve between two points in X interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.*

Proof. According to Theorem 3.6, X is a finite union of regions of type I. Denote them as T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m . Furthermore, denote the vertices which connect two of T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m as b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s . Let γ be a shortest-length curve between two points in X . If γ is solely in T_{j_0} for some $1 \leq j_0 \leq m$, then we can apply Proposition 3.1. Otherwise, γ passes through more than one of T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m . For any b_i , γ goes through it at most once. It follows that γ interacts with each T_j at most finitely many times, and each intersection is a shortest-length curve in T_j for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Therefore γ interacts with each cell of T_j at most finitely many times for $1 \leq j \leq m$. \square

Corollary 3.8. *Suppose X is a region that is the intersection of finitely many polynomial half planes in the form of (3.2), then $X = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots \cup T_m$ is a finite union of regions of type I. Assume γ is a shortest-length curve between two points in X , then in each T_j , γ is a disjoint union of finitely many shortest-length curves, each of which is either a point or an alternating sequence of line segments and curves on the boundary of T_j , and each curve on the boundary of T_j lies in the convex upward part of a side in T_j .*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 3.5. \square

4. REAL ALGEBRAIC AND SEMI-ALGEBRAIC SETS IN THE PLANE

4.1. In general, a **semi-algebraic set** in \mathbb{R}^2 is a finite union of sets in the following form:

$$\{f_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_m = 0\} \cap \{h_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{h_p > 0\},$$

where the f_i and the h_j are polynomial functions in x and y .

In 3.2 we studied sets in the form of $\{f_1 \geq 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k \geq 0\}$, which is a basic (closed) semi-algebraic set in \mathbb{R}^2 . Naturally, the next thing to study is the following set:

$$X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}.$$

Here we use $\{g_i = 0\}$ as a short-hand notation for

$$(4.1) \quad \{(x, y) | g_i(\cos(\theta_i)x + \sin(\theta_i)y) - (-\sin(\theta_i)x + \cos(\theta_i))y = 0\},$$

where θ_i is the angle of rotation of the graph of $g_i(x)$ with respect to the standard Euclidean frame, for $1 \leq i \leq m$; and $\{f_j > 0\}$ is a short-hand notation for:

$$(4.2) \quad \{(x, y) | f_j(\cos(\beta_j)x + \sin(\beta_j)y) - (-\sin(\beta_j)x + \cos(\beta_j))y > 0\},$$

where β_j is the angle of rotation of the graph of $f_j(x)$, for $1 \leq j \leq k$. We ask the same question as before: is there a cell decomposition of X such that every shortest-length curve between two points in X interacts with each cell at most finitely many times? We investigate this question by looking at the following six different cases.

Case One: $X = \{g_1 = 0\}$. X is a polynomial curve, so we can divide it into intervals using the points $(n, g_1(n))$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since any shortest-length curve γ between two points in X is the curve between them, γ interacts with each cell at most once.

Case Two: $X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\}$, $m \geq 2$. In our convention, we assume $\{g_1 = 0\}, \{g_2 = 0\}, \dots, \{g_m = 0\}$ are distinct sets, therefore X is either empty, or has finitely many points. Thus any shortest-length curve γ is a constant path, and so γ interacts with each cell at most once.

Case Three: $X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$, $m \geq 2, k \geq 1$. X is either an empty set or a set of finitely many points. It is the same as case two.

Case Four: $X = \{f_1 > 0\}$. X is a polynomial half plane without its boundary, and we call such an X an **open polynomial half plane**. In section 2, we've seen a cell decomposition of the closure of X . In our case, we need to delete all the cells on the graph of $f_1(x)$ and modify all the 2-cells whose boundaries have edges on the graph of $f_1(x)$. Let e_2 be such a 2-cell, then its boundary has an edge lying on the graph of $f_1(x)$. We replace e_2 with infinitely many 2-cells in the following way: at a distance of $\frac{1}{2}$ unit below the minimum point of the edge on the graph, we put a 1-cell with the same shape as the edge; then at a distance of $\frac{1}{4}$ unit below the minimum point, we put a 1-cell with the same shape as the edge; in general, we put a 1-cell with the same shape as the edge at a distance of $\frac{1}{2^n}$ unit below the minimum point of the edge for $n \geq 1$ (see Figure 31).

If γ is a shortest-length curve between two points in X , then γ is a straight line segment, because there is no boundary point for γ to stop by. It follows that γ interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.

Case Five: $X = \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \{f_2 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$, $k \geq 2$. Following the same outline as in section 3, we first study a region of type I without its boundary, then we generalize it to the set $\{f_1 > 0\} \cap \{f_2 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$. We define a region of type I without the boundary as a **region of type II**.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume X is a region of type II, then X has a cell decomposition such that any shortest-length curve between two points in X is a straight line segment that interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.*




FIGURE 31. When $X = \{f_1(x) - y > 0\}$, replace e_2 in \bar{X} whose boundary has an edge on the graph of $f_1(x)$ with infinitely many 2-cells.

Proof. First of all, let's construct a cell decomposition for X . Since the closure \bar{X} of X has finitely many sides and each side is on the graph of a polynomial function, we call the polynomial functions $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$. When $k = 1$, we return to case four. When $k \geq 2$, we overlay the cell decompositions of $\{f_1 > 0\}, \{f_2 > 0\}, \dots, \{f_k > 0\}$ to obtain a cell decomposition of X .

Lemma 4.2. *Assume X is a region of type II. Let $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$ be the polynomial functions whose graphs contain the sides of \bar{X} , and let Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_k be the corresponding open polynomial half planes for $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$, respectively. Then overlaying the cell decompositions of Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_k as shown in case four gives a cell decomposition of X . Moreover, the cell decomposition is a countable union of generalized polygons with disjoint interiors; each generalized polygon is enclosed by finitely many edges; and each edge is either a line segment or parallel to a section of one side of \bar{X} .*

Proof. It is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2. When $k = 1$, $X = Y_1$, then each generalized polygon in the cell decomposition of Y_1 has four edges with at least two edges being linear; if it has a nonlinear edge, it must be parallel to a section of the graph of $f_1(x)$. When $k \geq 2$, let $X' = Y_1 \cap Y_2 \cap \dots \cap Y_{k-1}$. By inductive hypothesis, overlaying the cell decompositions of Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{k-1} provides a cell decomposition of X' in which every edge is either linear or parallel to a section of the graph of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots$, or $f_{k-1}(x)$. Let e_2 be one of the 2-cells.

Case 1: If \bar{e}_2 is completely inside Y_k , then \bar{e}_2 is at a positive distance from the boundary of Y_k , thus \bar{e}_2 is covered by finitely many generalized polygons in the cell decomposition of Y_k . It follows that after overlaying the cell decompositions of X' and Y_k , \bar{e}_2 is divided into finitely many generalized polygons whose edges are either line segments or sections parallel to graphs of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$.

Case 2: If \bar{e}_2 is partially inside Y_k , then \bar{e}_2 is cut off by the graph of $f_k(x)$. As proved in Theorem 3.6, the graph of $f_k(x)$ divides \bar{e}_2 into finitely many generalized polygons, each of which has at least one edge on the graph of $f_k(x)$. For each of these generalized polygons, we remove any of its edges that is on the graph of $f_k(x)$ and then check whether it is inside Y_k or not. If it is inside Y_k , then after overlaying the cell decompositions of X' and Y_k , it is further divided up by the generalized polygons of Y_k into infinitely many generalized polygons whose edges are either line segments or sections parallel to graphs of $f_1(x), f_2(x), \dots, f_k(x)$ (see Figure 32).

As a summary of the two cases, overlaying the two cell decompositions of X' and Y_k divides X into generalized polygons and thus gives a cell decomposition of X . □




FIGURE 32. If \bar{e}_2 is partially inside Y_k , the part inside Y_k is divided into infinitely many generalized polygons.

Let's continue proving the proposition. Suppose γ is a shortest-length curve between two points in X , then γ is a straight line segment in X . Given the cell decomposition as in Lemma 4.2, γ interacts with each 0-cell at most once; γ interacts with each 1-cell at most finitely many times, because every 1-cell is either linear or on the graph of a polynomial function; and so γ interacts with each 2-cell at most finitely many times. \square

Theorem 4.3. Suppose $X = \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \{f_2 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$ is the intersection of finitely many open polynomial half planes determined by the polynomial functions $f_1(x)$, $f_2(x)$, \dots , $f_k(x)$, then X is a disjoint union of finitely many regions of type II.

Proof. By Theorem 3.6, $\{f_1 \geq 0\} \cap \{f_2 \geq 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k \geq 0\}$ is a finite union of type I regions whose sides are on the graphs of $f_1(x)$, $f_2(x)$, \dots , $f_k(x)$, and any two of which intersect at most at one vertex (which is also on a side). It follows that after removing all the sides, X is a disjoint union of finitely many regions of type II. \square

Corollary 4.4. Suppose $X = \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \{f_2 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$ is the intersection of finitely many open polynomial half planes determined by the polynomial functions $f_1(x)$, $f_2(x)$, \dots , $f_k(x)$, then X has a cell decomposition such that any shortest-length curve interacts with each at most finitely many times.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, $X = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \dots \cup T_m$ is finite disjoint union of regions of type II. Assume γ is a shortest-length curve between two points in X , then γ is a straight line segment contained in T_j for some $1 \leq j \leq m$. It follows from Proposition 4.1 that T_j has a cell decomposition such that γ interacts with each cell at most finitely many times. \square

Case Six: $X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$, $k \geq 1$. Since $\{g_1 = 0\}$ is a polynomial curve, and $\{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$ is a finite disjoint union of type II regions, X is a finite disjoint union of curves, each of which is one of the three types (see Figure 33):

- (1) the whole polynomial curve itself;
- (2) an open half of the polynomial curve;
- (3) an open bounded interval of the polynomial curve.

The reason is because the intersection of $\{g_1 = 0\}$ and a region of type II is an open, connected subset of $\{g_1 = 0\}$. If a curve is one of the three types, we say it is an **open polynomial curve**.

When X is equal to the whole polynomial curve of $g_1(x)$, it is the same as case one. Now suppose X is an open half of the polynomial curve. First, we look at a cell decomposition




FIGURE 33. Three kinds of curves in each component of $X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}, k \geq 1$

of $(0, \infty)$ on the real line: the 0-cells are positive integers and $\frac{1}{2^n}$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$; and the 1-cells are the intervals $(m, m+1)$ and $(\frac{1}{2^n}, \frac{1}{2^{n-1}})$, where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Next, we apply this idea to construct a cell decomposition of X . In the coordinate frame of $g_1(x)$, without loss of generality we assume X is the right half of the graph of $g_1(x)$, that is to say, $X = \{(x, g_1(x)) | x > x_0\}$ for some real number x_0 . Let the 0-cells be $(x_0 + m, g_1(x_0 + m))$ and $(x_0 + \frac{1}{2^n}, g_1(x_0 + \frac{1}{2^n}))$, where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let the 1-cells be the open intervals between the 0-cells. Then we get a cell decomposition for X . Last, any shortest-length curve γ between two points in X interacts with each cell at most once. Similarly, when X is an open bounded interval of the polynomial curve, we may assume that $X = \{(x, g_1(x)) | x_0 < x < x_1\}$ for some real numbers $x_0 < x_1$. Let the 0-cells be the integers between x_0 and x_1 , and $x_0 + \frac{1}{2^n}, x_1 - \frac{1}{2^n}$ for n sufficiently large, and let the 1-cells be the open intervals between the 0-cells, thus completing case six.

Let's summarize the six cases in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.5. *When $X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\}$, where $\{g_i = 0\}$ is in the form of (4.1) for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\{f_j > 0\}$ is in the form of (4.2) for $1 \leq j \leq k$, then X is either an empty set, or a set of finitely many points, or an open polynomial curve, or a disjoint union of finitely many regions of type II. Moreover, X has a cell decomposition such that any shortest-length curve between two points in X interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.*

4.2. More generally, let's study a finite union of sets of the following form:

$$\{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\},$$

where $\{g_i = 0\}$ is in the form of (4.1) for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\{f_j > 0\}$ is in the form of (4.2) for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Previously we saw that there were three basic building blocks in the union: a point, an open polynomial curve, and a region of type II. How do we put them together in the union? First, we group things of the same kind together and see what their union looks like. Then, we mix combine and check what their union is. We need to consider seven cases.

Case One: Finitely many points. When we group all the sets of finitely many points in the union together, we get only finitely many points. The cell decomposition of the union requires only finitely many 0-cells.

Case Two: Finitely many open polynomial curves. When we group all the open polynomial curves in the union together, we combine their individual cell decompositions and then add all the intersection points and some endpoints as 0-cells if necessary. More precisely, given two open polynomial curves, they either do not intersect, intersect at finitely many points, or overlap partially.

- (1) When they do not intersect, either the union is disconnected or connected. If the union is disconnected, we use the cell decomposition for each curve to get one for




FIGURE 34. Three examples for a union of two open polynomial curves with their corresponding cell decompositions.

the union. If the union is connected, it must be that the open endpoint of one curve lies on the other curve. In this case, we add a 0-cell for the open endpoint to the cell decomposition of the curve where it lies on (see Figure 34 (i)). This may require more 1-cells for the curve if needed. Then we combine the cell decompositions of the two curves together.

- (2) When they intersect at finitely many points, we need to include the intersection points as 0-cells to the cell decomposition for each curve and add more 1-cells if needed (see Figure 34 (ii)).
- (3) When they not only intersect at finitely many points, but also have open endpoints lying on other curves, we combine 1 and 2.
- (4) When two open polynomial curves overlap partially, their union is again an open polynomial curve for which we know how to find a cell decomposition (see Figure 34 (iii)).

Inductively, for a union of finitely many open polynomial curves, we can come up with a cell decomposition. Furthermore, given a shortest-length curve γ in the union, it interacts with each 1-cell at most twice. This is because γ can enter (or leave) a 1-cell through only its endpoints, otherwise it has to enter (or leave) the 1-cell in the middle, which only occurs when there is another curve intersecting with it or having an open endpoint lying on it. This is impossible in our cell decomposition, since all intersection points and the open endpoints lying on other curves are 0-cells.

Case Three: Finitely many regions of type II. When we group all regions of type II in the union together, we don't simply get a disjoint union of regions of type II and we don't even have a disjoint union of simply-connected regions (see Figure 35). What does their union look like?

First of all, we study a finite union of the boundaries of regions of type II.

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are regions of type II with their corresponding boundaries denoted as $\partial X_1, \partial X_2, \dots, \partial X_n$, then $\partial X_1 \cup \partial X_2 \cup \dots \cup \partial X_n$ divides the plane into finitely many regions of type I.*

Proof. We prove by induction on n . Suppose $n = 1$, if ∂X_1 is connected, it divides the plane into two regions of type I, each of which has ∂X_1 as its side; if ∂X_1 is disconnected, say it has l components, then by induction, the plane is divided into $l + 1$ regions of type I.

Suppose $n \geq 2$, let $X' = \partial X_1 \cup \partial X_2 \cup \dots \cup \partial X_{n-1}$. By inductive hypothesis, X' divides the plane into finitely many regions of type I, say T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m . Suppose ∂X_n consists of k components, namely C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k . Then we induct on k . When $k = 1$, since one side in ∂T_j and one side in C_1 either overlap partially, or has finitely many intersection points, or do not intersect at all, the intersection of ∂T_j ($1 \leq j \leq m$) with C_1 has four possibilities as follows:




FIGURE 35. A union of two regions of type II is not necessarily simply-connected: (i) a slit (ii) a hole.

- (1) $\partial T_j \cap C_1 = \emptyset$. If C_1 is in the complement of T_j , T_j is not affected at all; if C_1 is inside T_j , T_j is divided into two regions of type I.
- (2) $\partial T_j \cap C_1 = \text{finitely many points}$. Let the intersection points be a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q . If C_1 is not closed, we assume that a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q are ordered from left to right (see Figure 27). Then we can follow the same proof as in Theorem 3.6. If C_1 is closed, we can order a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q in the clockwise direction and name the side from a_1 to a_q as L_q . Again we can use the proof in Theorem 3.6. Therefore T_j is divided into finitely many regions of type I.
- (3) $\partial T_j \cap C_1 = \text{finitely many closed overlapping intervals}$. Let the intervals be O_1, O_2, \dots, O_s , then we can order them either from left to right if C_1 is not closed, or in the clockwise direction if C_1 is closed (see Figure 36). We denote the part of C_1 between O_i and O_{i+1} as L_i for $1 \leq i \leq q-1$. If C_1 is not closed, let the part to the left of O_1 and the part to the right of O_q be L_0 and L_q , respectively; if C_1 is closed, let the part between O_1 and O_q be L_q . Then the L_i inside T_j divide T_j into finitely many regions of type I.




FIGURE 36. ∂T_j and C_1 overlap at the closed intervals O_1, O_2, O_3 , which are ordered (i) from left to right (ii) in the clockwise direction.

- (4) $\partial T_j \cap C_1 = \text{finitely many points and finitely many closed overlapping intervals}$. Suppose the intersection points are a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q , and the intervals are O_1, O_2, \dots, O_s . We can order all of them on C_1 in order (see Figure 37). Like before the parts between them inside T_j divide T_j into finitely many regions of type I.

When $k \geq 2$, suppose X' and C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{k-1} have divided the plane into finitely many regions of type I. Then C_k divides each region further in the same way as we did for C_1 . It




FIGURE 37. ∂T_j and C_1 intersect at a_1, O_1, a_2, O_2, O_3 , which are in order: (i) from left to right (ii) in the clockwise direction.

follows that $X' \cup \partial X_n = \partial X_1 \cup \partial X_2 \cup \dots \cup \partial X_n$ divides the plane into finitely many regions of type I. \square

Now we are ready to study $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_n$. By Lemma 4.6, the plane is partitioned into regions of type II, sides without vertices (or **open sides**), and vertices. We select these that are in X . We observe that if L is an open side, then L is either in the union or on the boundary.

Lemma 4.7. *Given L as above, then L is either entirely in the union or entirely on the boundary of the union.*

Proof. Let $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_n$. Given a point x in L , L is in ∂X_j for some $1 \leq j \leq n$, then for any $r > 0$, the open ball $B(x, r)$ must contain a point in X_j , thus in X . Therefore L is inside the closure of X .

Suppose L has a nonempty intersection with the boundary ∂X of X . Since ∂X is contained in $\partial X_1 \cup \partial X_2 \cup \dots \cup \partial X_n$, L intersects with ∂X_i for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let C be a component of ∂X_i that has a nonempty intersection with L , then $L \cap C$ is either finitely many points, or finitely many overlapping intervals which are open, half-open, or closed, or both. It follows that $L \cap C$ can only be L , because we've already included all intersection points and the endpoints of all overlapping intervals as vertices in our partition of the plane (see Lemma 4.6). Therefore L is entirely inside ∂X . \square

Now we can describe X as follows.

Proposition 4.8. *Assume X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n are regions of type II, then $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ is a disjoint union of finitely many open, connected sets in \mathbb{R}^2 , such that the boundary of each set, if nonempty, consists of finitely many components, each of which is a finite union of sides belonging to $\partial X_1, \partial X_2, \dots, \partial X_n$.*

Proof. $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ has finitely many components, because there are only finitely many sides after $\partial X_1 \cup \partial X_2 \cup \dots \cup \partial X_n$ divides the plane into finitely many regions of type I. \square

Remark: The proposition seems very simple, and we ask the question: Is this all we can do to characterize $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ (I don't know)?

Since X is a disjoint union of vertices, open sides, and regions of type II, we can gather the cell decomposition for each to obtain a cell decomposition for X . Moreover, for any shortest-length curve γ in X , it interacts with each cell at most finitely many times, because γ is locally linear and X is an open set.

Now we are ready to mix points, open polynomial curves, and regions of type II in the union.

Case Four: Finitely many points \cup finitely many open polynomial curves. Let x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l be finitely many points, and let A be a finite union of open polynomial curves. In case two, we've studied A . If x_i is in A , we do nothing, otherwise we add a 0-cell for it, where $1 \leq i \leq l$.

Case Five: Finitely many points \cup finitely many regions of type II. Similar as above.

Case Six: Finitely many open polynomial curves \cup finitely many regions of type II. Let $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n$ be a finite union of regions of type II, and let l_1, l_2, \dots, l_p be open polynomial curves. Since $\partial X \cap l_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq p$) is either finitely many points, or finitely many closed or half-open intervals, or both, $l_i \setminus X$ is a union of finitely many polynomial curves, each of which may or may not lie on the boundary of X , and is either closed, or half-open. One example is illustrated in Figure 38.

First, we don't count the endpoints for each polynomial curve in $l_i \setminus X$ ($1 \leq i \leq p$), so we obtain a finite disjoint union of open polynomial curves. Next, we collect them for all $l_i \setminus X$ ($1 \leq i \leq p$), and use the cell decomposition as shown in case two. Then, we add the finitely many endpoints, which were not counted earlier, back to the union as 0-cells. This may require more 1-cells if needed. Last, we include the cell decomposition of X as shown in case three. In this way, we obtain a cell decomposition for $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n \cup l_1 \cup \dots \cup l_p$.




FIGURE 38. $l \setminus X$ is a union of five polynomial curves, in which the 1st one is half-open, the 2nd one is closed, and the 4th one is on the boundary of X .

Lemma 4.9. *Given the cell decomposition for $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n \cup l_1 \cup \dots \cup l_p$ as above, and let γ be a shortest-length curve between two points in the union, then it interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.*

Proof. Let $X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_n \cup l_1 \cup \dots \cup l_p$ be denoted as \tilde{X} . γ interacts with each cell that is in X at most finitely many times, because γ is locally linear in X . γ interacts with each 1-cell that is not in the closure \bar{X} of X at most twice, because γ can enter it only through one of its endpoints. Now let e_1 be a 1-cell with a nonempty intersection with ∂X . Then e_1 is in l_i for some $1 \leq i \leq p$. So $e_1 \cap \partial X$ is finitely many open, half-open, or closed overlapping intervals. There can't be any intersection point, because they are already included as 0-cells in the cell decomposition.

Given one of these intervals, we divide it up using the sides on ∂X , then we divide it up again according to the convexity of each side. Let one of them be denoted as ω . Then ω is on a side of ∂X_j for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. Without loss of generality we assume $\omega \subseteq \partial X_1$. Moreover, ω is either convex downward, or convex upward and increasing, or convex upward and decreasing. Furthermore, ω can be either open, or closed, or half-closed. It suffices to show that γ interacts with ω at most finitely many times.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists a point $x \in \bar{\omega}$ such that γ intersects with ω at infinitely many distinct points converging to x , where each point is picked from

one interaction between γ and ω . We've seen this setup in Proposition 3.1 before. Since γ cannot exit the closure \bar{X} of X through any point on ω , γ stays inside \bar{X} starting shortly before it reaches x . In addition, since $\omega \subseteq \partial X_1$, γ is either inside \bar{X}_1 , or X_1^c starting shortly before reaching x . This is due to the fact that after $\partial X_1 \cup \dots \cup \partial X_n$ divides the plane, every side is adjacent to two regions of type II, and X could include either of the two regions (see Lemma 4.6). Without loss of generality let us assume that γ is inside \bar{X}_1 beginning shortly before arriving at x .

Case 1: ω is convex downward. If x is not a boundary point of ω , we can use the argument as shown in Figure 19 to get a contradiction; if x is a boundary point of ω , then we can apply Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.4 to obtain a contradiction. One thing to notice is that \tilde{e}_1 in Corollary 3.4 might not be in \tilde{X} , in which case γ might not be able to reach x , which is a contradiction.

Case 2: ω is convex upward and increasing (or convex upward and decreasing). By Proposition 2.9, γ starts staying in ω shortly before reaching x . Thus we get a contradiction. This completes the proof for the lemma. \square

Case Seven: Finitely many points \cup finitely many open polynomial curves \cup finitely many regions of type II. We combine case two and case six.

Let's summarize what we have proved in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.10. *Suppose X is a finite union of sets in the following form:*

$$\{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\},$$

where $\{g_i = 0\}$ is a short-hand notation for the graph of a polynomial function $g_i(x)$ in the form of (4.1) for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\{f_j > 0\}$ is a short-hand notation for an open polynomial half plane associated with a polynomial function $f_j(x)$ in the form of (4.2) for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then there exists a cell decomposition for X such that any shortest-length curve between two points in X interacts with each cell at most finitely many times.

5. CONCLUSION

Following the footsteps of Whitney, Lojasiewicz, and Hironaka, we try to construct a cell decomposition of real algebraic and semi-algebraic sets in \mathbb{R}^n such that any shortest curve intersects each cell at most finitely many times. This paper starts with two special cases in $n = 2$: a real algebraic set, which is the graph of a polynomial function, and a closed semi-algebraic set, which is below the graph of a polynomial function. It follows that there exists a cell decomposition such that every shortest curve between any two points in the set intersects each cell at most finitely many times. Moreover, it intersects with each 0- or 1-cell at most twice.

Next, we generalize these two special cases to a region of type I, a simply-connected region whose boundary consists of finitely many graphs of polynomial function. We could show that a closed semi-algebraic that is a region of type I admits a cell decomposition with our desired analytical property. More generally, given the intersection X of finitely many polynomial half planes (that is, a half plane whose boundary is the graph of a polynomial function), we show that X is a finite union of regions of type I, say T_1, \dots, T_m . Then given any shortest-length curve γ between two points in X , it follows that in each T_j the curve γ is a finite disjoint union of shortest-length curves, each of which is either a point or an alternating sequence of line segments and curves on the boundary of T_j , where each curve on the boundary of T_j lies in the convex upward part of a graph in T_j .

Then, we generalize again to non-closed semi-algebraic sets as follows:

$$X = \{g_1 = 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{g_m = 0\} \cap \{f_1 > 0\} \cap \dots \cap \{f_k > 0\},$$

where each $\{g_i = 0\}$ represents the graph of a polynomial function up to rotation, and each $\{f_j > 0\}$ represents an open half-plane whose boundary is the graph of a polynomial function up to rotation. We prove that X is either an empty set, or a set of finitely many points, or an open polynomial curve, or a finite disjoint union of regions of type II (the interior of a region of type I). Furthermore, X admits a cell decomposition satisfying our desired analytical condition. More generally, given a finite union of sets in the above form, we could verify that a cell decomposition also exists.

In the end, we notice that in our construction of cell decompositions, it is possible obtain a triangulation for these special cases, because the cell decomposition in our construction looks like a countable disjoint union of generalized polygons. A generalized polygon replaces each edge of a regular polygon with either a line segment, or a segment of the graph of a polynomial function. These generalized polygons have disjoint interiors. So a triangulation theorem is possible in this direction.

What's more, we observe that any shortest-length curve in these cases is piecewise algebraic, whose formula is described either by a linear equation (for a straight line segment), or by one of the polynomial functions f_i defining the set (for a segment on the graph). So an algebraic characterization of shortest curves in semi-algebraic sets is also possible in this direction.

In the future, we hope to generalize our result to any semi-algebraic set in the plane. Furthermore, our methods of using a zigzag tangent curve under a convex upward graph of a polynomial function are now being generalized (in progress) to the three-dimensional case. We hope to generalize to even higher dimensions.

In connection with triangulation of semi-analytic sets, we find that the technique in the above special cases is also applicable to the analytic functions instead of polynomial functions, as long as the functions have finitely many inflection points and local minimum points.

REFERENCES

1. H. Hironaka, *Triangulations of algebraic sets*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 29, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1975, pp. 165-185.
2. S. Lojasiewicz, *Triangulations of semi-analytic sets*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (5) (3) **18** (1964), 449-474.
3. Sebastián Montiel and Antonio Ros, *Curves and Surfaces*, 2nd ed., Amer. Math. Soc., Real Sociedad Matemática Española, 2009, pp. 5.
4. B. L. van der Waerden, *Topologische Begründung des Kalküls der abzählenden Geometrie*, Math. Ann. 102 (1929), 337-362.
5. H. Whitney, *Elementary structure of real algebraic varieties*, Ann. of Math. (2) **66** (1957), 545-556.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RICE UNIVERSITY, 6100 MAIN STREET, HOUSTON TX 77005
Email address: `cy2@rice.edu`