

A NOTE ON THE GANNON-LEE THEOREM

BENEDICT SCHINNERL

ROLAND STEINBAUER

*University of Vienna, Faculty of Mathematics
Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, A-1090 Wien, Austria*

ABSTRACT. We prove a Gannon-Lee theorem for strongly causal and null pseudoconvex Lorentzian metrics of regularity C^1 . Thereby we generalize earlier results to the non-globally hyperbolic setting in a natural way, while at the same time lowering the regularity to the most general class currently available in the context of the classical singularity theorems. Along the way we also prove that any maximizing causal curve in a C^1 -spacetime is a geodesic and hence of C^2 -regularity.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the mid 1970-ies, several years after the appearance of the singularity theorems of Penrose and Hawking (see e.g. [HE73, Ch. 8]), D. Gannon [Gan75, Gan76] and C.W. Lee [Lee76] independently derived a body of results that relate the singularities of a Lorentzian manifold to its topology. More precisely, in these results, often dubbed Gannon-Lee theorem(s), they established that under an appropriate asymptotic flatness assumption, a non-trivial fundamental group of a (partial) Cauchy surface Σ necessarily leads to the existence of incomplete causal geodesics.

Most of these early results assumed global hyperbolicity, with the notable exception of [Gan75, Thms. 2.1-2]. However, the proofs relied on the false deduction that maximizing geodesics in a covering spacetime project to maximizing geodesics, as pointed out in [Gal83]. In the same paper Galloway proved a Gannon-Lee theorem without assuming global hyperbolicity by invoking the Hawking-Penrose theorem and heavily using a result from geometric measure theory. The latter fact was also reflected in the formulation of the main theorem, which assumed an extrinsic condition on the three surface Σ and the topological condition was that Σ is not a

E-mail addresses: `benedict.schinnerl@univie.ac.at`, `roland.steinbauer@univie.ac.at`.
Date: January 12, 2021.

handlebody¹. A related recent result for the globally hyperbolic case in a setting compatible with a positive cosmological constant was given in [GL18a], providing a precise connection between the topology of a future expanding compact Cauchy surface and the existence of past singularities.

Another issue with the earlier results was that the nontrivial topology was confined to a compact region of a (partial) Cauchy surface bounded by a topological 2-sphere S . In the context of topological censorship [FSW95], S is naturally interpreted as a section of an event horizon and in four dimensions the S^2 topology is only natural in the light of Hawking's black hole topology theorem [HE73, Sec. 9.2]. However, since the latter fails to hold in higher dimensions, with more complicated horizon topologies occurring (see [ER08], but [GS06] for corresponding restrictions), the demand for higher dimensional Gannon-Lee type results with more natural assumptions on the topology of S arises. Such a result was indeed given by Costa e Silva in [CeS10] which also avoided the assumption of global hyperbolicity. More precisely the results was given for causally simple spacetimes, i.e. causal spacetimes where the causality relation is closed. However, we have recently discovered that this proof relies on an analogous false deduction: It uses that causal simplicity lifts to coverings, which is not true in general, as was explicitly shown in [MS20]. In the latter paper Minguzzi and Costa e Silva also present a corrected result, which, however makes an assumption on the causality of the covering spacetime.

In this paper we extend the validity of the Gannon-Lee theorems in two respects. We provide a result that, on the one hand, avoids the assumption of globally hyperbolic without making assumptions on the causality of the covering manifold. It is based on the notion of null pseudoconvexity, which can be placed on the causal ladder between causal simplicity and global hyperbolicity when, additionally, strong causality is assumed. On the other hand, our result applies to Lorentzian metrics of low regularity, in particular to (certain) C^1 -spacetimes. Having low regularity singularity theorems at hand is especially favorable in the context of extending spacetimes, as already noted in [HE73, Ch. 8]. In particular, they rule out the possibility to extend the spacetime to a complete one, even under mild regularity assumptions on the metric. Related results on C^0 - and Lipschitz non-extendability have recently been given in [Sbi18, GLS18, CK18, Sbi20].

Indeed during the last couple of years the classical singularity theorems of Penrose, Hawking and Hawking-Penrose have been extended to $C^{1,1}$ -regularity in [KSSV15], [KSV15], and [GGKS18]. These results built upon extensions of Lorentzian causality theory to low regularity [CG12, KSSV14, Min15, Sä16]. Most recently, Graf in [Gra20] was able to further lower the regularity assumptions for the Penrose and the Hawking theorem to C^1 . We will extend her recent techniques, in particular to the non-globally hyperbolic setting, to prove our result.

¹Under these conditions [MY82] guarantees the existence of a trapped surface within Σ .

This note is organized in the following way. In the next section we discuss preliminaries for our work, especially the intricacies arising in C^1 -regularity and we state our results. In section 3 we lay the analytical foundations of the proof of the main theorem. In particular, we will show that any causal maximizer in a C^1 -spacetime is a geodesic and hence a C^2 -curve. In section 4 we will be concerned with causality theory and in particular, with pseudoconvex spacetimes. We relate pseudoconvexity to limiting properties of geodesics in C^1 -spacetimes and also prove that under the assumption of strong causality, maximal null pseudoconvexity is equivalent to causal simplicity. Finally in section 5 we provide new focussing results for null geodesics and collect all our results together to prove the main theorem.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND RESULTS

We begin by introducing our main notations and conventions, as well as some basic notions that are necessary to give a precise formulation of our results. Our main reference for all matters of Lorentzian geometry is [O'N83].

We will assume that all manifolds M are smooth, Hausdorff, as well as second countable and of dimension n with $n \geq 3$. We will consider Lorentzian metrics g on M that are of regularity at least C^1 with signature $(-, +, \dots, +)$. Another important regularity class is $g \in C^{1,1}$ which means that g is C^1 and its first derivatives are locally Lipschitz continuous. A spacetime is a Lorentzian manifold with a time orientation, which we assume to be induced by a smooth vector field.

Throughout we will fix a complete Riemannian background metric h and use its induced norm $\|\cdot\|_h$ and distance d_h . All local estimates will be independent of the choice of h .

We will denote the fundamental group of a manifold M by $\pi_1(M)$. Also if $i : N \rightarrow M$ is a continuous map, the induced homomorphism of the fundamental groups is denoted by $i_\# : \pi_1(N) \rightarrow \pi_1(M)$.

2.1. Causality theory. A curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$ defined on some interval I is called timelike, causal, null, future or past directed, or spacelike, if γ is locally Lipschitz continuous and its velocity vector $\dot{\gamma}$ which exists Lebesgue almost everywhere has the respective property almost everywhere. We denote the timelike and causal relation by $p \ll q$ and $p \leq q$, respectively and write $I^+(A)$ and $J^+(A)$ for the chronological and causal future of a set $A \subseteq M$. Finally we denote the future horismos of A by $E^+(A) := J^+(A) \setminus I^+(A)$. The respective past versions of these sets will be denoted by I^- , J^- and E^- , respectively. When we refer to these sets with regard to a particular metric g , it will appear in subscript, e.g. $E_g^+(A)$ denotes the future horismos of A w.r.t. g .

For Lorentzian metrics g_1, g_2 one says that g_1 has narrower lightcones than g_2 (respectively, g_2 has wider lightcones than g_1), noted as $g_1 < g_2$, if $g_1(X, X) \leq 0$ implies $g_2(X, X) < 0$ for any $0 \neq X \in TM$.

One notion, central for our arguments is null pseudoconvexity which was introduced in [BP87]: Null curves connecting points in a compact set are entirely contained in a larger compact set. This property was used as a replacement for global hyperbolicity in the context of wave equations. Later in [BK92], some relations to causality conditions were proved. An essential aspect will be that in a strongly causal, null pseudoconvex spacetime a sequence of null geodesics with converging endpoints possesses a subsequence converging to a null geodesic connecting the limits of the endpoints of the sequence. Further, in strongly causal spacetimes null pseudoconvexity can be placed on the causal ladder in between causal simplicity and global hyperbolicity, as we will show even for certain C^1 -spacetimes in section 4.

2.2. Low regularity. During the last couple of years the bulk of Lorentzian causality theory has been transferred to $C^{1,1}$ -spacetimes, where the exponential map and convex neighbourhoods are still available. While convexity fails below that regularity [HW51, SS18], nevertheless most aspects of causality theory can be maintained even under Lipschitz regularity of the metric. Further below some significant changes occur [CG12, GKSS20], while some robust features continue to hold even in more general settings [Min19, KS18, BS18, GKS19].

Here we will discuss some properties of C^1 -spacetimes. As compared to the $C^{1,1}$ -setting one loses two essential features: uniqueness of solutions of the geodesic equation and the local boundedness of the curvature tensor. Given the first fact, one has to make a choice concerning the definition of geodesic completeness. We will follow the natural approach of [Gra20] and define a spacetime to be time-like (respectively null or causal) geodesically complete if *all*² inextendible timelike (respectively null or causal) geodesics are defined on \mathbb{R} .

Concerning the second issue, first note that C^1 is well within the maximal class of spacetimes allowing for a (stable definition of) distributional curvature, which is g locally in $H^1 \cap L^\infty$ [GT87, LM07, SV09]. So we may define the Riemann and Ricci tensor by the usual coordinate formulae

$$\text{Riem}^m_{ijk} := \partial_j \Gamma^m_{ik} - \partial_k \Gamma^m_{ij} + \Gamma^m_{js} \Gamma^s_{ik} - \Gamma^m_{ks} \Gamma^s_{ij}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Ric}_{ij} := \partial_m \Gamma^m_{ij} - \partial_j \Gamma^m_{im} + \Gamma^m_{ij} \Gamma^k_{km} - \Gamma^m_{ik} \Gamma^k_{jm}. \quad (2)$$

The Riemann and the Ricci tensor are then tensor distributions in $\mathcal{D}'\mathcal{T}_3^1(M)$ and $\mathcal{D}'\mathcal{T}_2^0(M)$, respectively, where we recall that

$$\mathcal{D}'\mathcal{T}_s^r(M) := \Gamma_c(M, T_r^s M \otimes \text{Vol}(M))' = \mathcal{D}'(M) \otimes_{C^\infty} \mathcal{T}_s^r(M). \quad (3)$$

²The alternative would be to only demand the existence of *one* complete geodesic for every timelike (or null or causal) initial data to the geodesic equation.

Here $\text{Vol}(M)$ is the volume bundle over M , Γ_c denotes spaces of sections with compact support and $\mathcal{D}'(M)$ is the space of scalar distributions on M , i.e. the topological dual space of the space of compactly supported volume densities $\Gamma_c(M, \text{Vol}(M))$. For all details on tensor distributions see [GKOS01, Ch. 3.1].

Naturally, we define curvature bounds resp. energy conditions using the notion of positivity for distributions, i.e. $\mathcal{D}'(M) \ni u \geq 0$ ($u > 0$) if $\langle u, \mu \rangle \geq 0$ (> 0) for all non-negative (positive) volume densities $\mu \in \Gamma_c(M, \text{Vol}(M))$. Then (M, g) is said to satisfy the strong energy condition (resp. to have non-negative Ricci curvature) if the scalar distribution $\text{Ric}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X})$ is non-negative for all smooth timelike vector fields \mathcal{X} . In the case of g being smooth this condition coincides with the classical one, $\text{Ric}(X, X) \geq 0$ for all timelike $X \in T_p M$ and all $p \in M$ by the fact that all such X can be extended to smooth timelike vector fields on M . For the same reason the condition for $g \in C^{1,1}$ is equivalent to the condition $\text{Ric}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}) \geq 0$ almost everywhere for all smooth timelike vector fields \mathcal{X} , used in the context of the $C^{1,1}$ -singularity theorems. However, to generalize the null energy condition is more tricky due to the obstacles one encounters when extending null vectors. For a detailed discussion see [Gra20, Sec. 5], and we define following her:

Definition 2.1 (Distributional null energy condition). A C^1 -metric g satisfies the *distributional null energy condition*, if for any compact set $K \subseteq M$ and any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\varepsilon(\delta, K)$ such that $\text{Ric}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}) > -\delta$ (in the sense of distributions) for any local smooth vector field $\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$, $U \subseteq K$ with $\|\mathcal{X}\|_h = 1$ and which is $\varepsilon(\delta, K)$ close to a C^1 g -null vector field \mathcal{N} on U , i.e. $\|\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{N}\|_h < \varepsilon(\delta, K)$ on U .

Again this condition is equivalent to the classical null energy condition if the metric is smooth. Moreover, in case $g \in C^{1,1}$ it is equivalent to the condition used in the $C^{1,1}$ -setting i.e. $\text{Ric}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}) > 0$ for all Lipschitz-continuous local null vector fields \mathcal{X} .

One key technique in low regularity Lorentzian geometry is regularization. More specifically Chrusciel and Grant in [CG12] have put forward a technique to regularize a continuous metric g by smooth metrics \check{g}_ε with narrower lightcones resp. by a net \hat{g}_ε with wider lightcones than g . The basic operation (denoted by $*$) is chartwise convolution with a standard mollifier ρ_ε , which is globalized using cut-offs and a partition of unity, cf. [GKOS01, Thm. 3.2.10]. To manipulate the lightcones in the desired way one has to add a “spacelike correction term”. The most recent version of this construction which also quantifies the rate of convergence in terms of ε is [Gra20, Lem. 4.2], which we recall here.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (M, g) be a spacetime with a C^1 -Lorentzian metric. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist smooth Lorentzian metrics \check{g}_ε and \hat{g}_ε with $\check{g}_\varepsilon < g < \hat{g}_\varepsilon$, both converging to g in C^1_{loc} . Additionally, on any compact set K , for all small ε*

$$\|\check{g}_\varepsilon - g * \rho_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, K} \leq c_K \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{g}_\varepsilon - g * \rho_\varepsilon\|_{\infty, K} \leq c_K \varepsilon. \quad (4)$$

A main step in the proof of singularity theorems in low regularity is to show that the energy condition (Definition 2.1, in our case) implies that the regularized metrics \hat{g}_ε and/or \check{g}_ε violate the classical energy conditions (the NEC, in our case) only by a small amount — small enough, such that null geodesics still tend to focus. Technically this is done by a Friedrich-type lemma, which in the present case is [Gra20, Lem. 4.5], and draws essentially from (4). The corresponding result is then [Gra20, Lem. 5.5]:

Lemma 2.3 (Surrogate energy condition). *Let M be a C^1 -spacetime where the distributional null energy condition holds. Given any compact set $K \subseteq M$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$, then for all $\delta > 0$ there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\forall \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ric}[\check{g}_\varepsilon](X, X) &> -\delta \quad \forall X \in TM|_K \text{ with } \check{g}_\varepsilon(X, X) = 0 \\ &\text{and } 0 < c_1 \leq \|X\|_h \leq c_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here \check{g}_ε is as in Lemma 2.2 and $\text{Ric}[\check{g}_\varepsilon]$ is its Ricci tensor.

We will use this result in an essential way, when showing compactness of the horismos of a certain set, which is needed for the causal/analytic part of the proof of our Gannon-Lee theorem. The difference to the arguments in [Gra20] is that we do not assume global hyperbolicity, but are able to compensate for it by assuming non-branching of null maximizers. Formally we define:

Definition 2.4. Let M be a spacetime and let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a maximizing null curve. We say that γ branches if there exists another maximizing null curve $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ such that $\gamma(t) = \sigma(t)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq a$ for some $0 < a < 1$ and $\gamma(t) \neq \sigma(t)$ for all $1 \geq t > a$. The point $\gamma(a)$ is called branching point. If no maximizing null curve branches, we say that there is *no null branching* in M .

In light of the fact that (even) for C^1 -metrics causal maximizers are geodesics (to be proven in Theorem 3.3, below), we see that if null branching were to occur in $\gamma(a)$, there would be (at least) two different, maximizing solutions to the geodesic equations with initial values $\gamma(a)$ and $\gamma'(a)$.

Generally speaking, in the low regularity Riemannian setting, branching of maximizers is associated with unbounded sectional curvature from below. More precisely, in length spaces with a lower curvature bound branching does not occur [Shi93, Lem. 2.4]. In smooth Lorentzian manifolds sectional curvature bounds, although more delicate to handle, are still characterized by triangle comparison [AB08] and in the setting of Lorentzian length spaces [KS18] synthetic curvature bounds extending sectional curvature bounds for smooth spacetimes have been introduced. In [KS18, Section 4] the authors show that a synthetic curvature bound from below prevents the branching of timelike maximizers. Unfortunately it is not clear at the moment how one could extend such a result to triangles with null sides.

However, in a merely C^1 -spacetime the curvature is generically not locally bounded and so it seems natural that an additional condition as in Definition 2.4

is needed. Indeed, this condition enters in an essential way into our arguments. It will be a topic of future investigations to relate null branching to curvature bounds.

2.3. Results. Next we introduce the particular notions needed for the formulation of our results. In spirit they reflect Gannon’s [Gan75] assumptions on the spacetime, inspired by asymptotic flatness, however, we stay close to the formulations of [CeS10, Sec. 2].

Definition 2.5. An *asymptotically regular hypersurface* is a spacelike, smooth, connected partial Cauchy surface Σ which possesses an enclosing surface, i.e. a compact, connected submanifold S of codim. 2 in M with the properties

- (1) S separates Σ into two (open, sub-) manifolds Σ_+, Σ_- such that $\bar{\Sigma}_+$ is non-compact and Σ_- connected,
- (2) the map $h_\# : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \pi_1(\bar{\Sigma}_+)$ is surjective,
- (3) $k_- > 0$ on S , i.e. S is inner trapped.

We further say that a surface Σ admits a *piercing*, if there exists a timelike vector field X on M such that every integral curve of X meets Σ exactly once.

To elaborate on the last item above, we first fix some notation. Throughout let us denote the future directed timelike unit vector field perpendicular to Σ near S by U . Further as S is a hypersurface in Σ we denote by N_\pm the unit normals to S in Σ such that N_- points into Σ_- and N_+ into Σ_+ . We obtain future directed null normals to S via $K_\pm := U|_S + N_\pm$. We will refer to $K_-(p)$ as the ingoing null vector. The convergence of a point in S is defined via $k_\pm := g(H_p, K_\pm(p))$, where H_p is the mean-curvature vector field of Σ at p . Observe that since $g \in C^1$, H_p is still continuous and all corresponding formulae hold “classically”.

Also note that any piercing of Σ induces a continuous, open map $\rho_X : M \rightarrow \Sigma$, which maps any point p in M to the unique intersection of the integral curve of X through p with Σ .

We are now ready to state our main result, a Gannon-Lee theorem for strongly causal, null pseudoconvex C^1 -spacetimes without null branching. We will discuss several of its special cases below.

Theorem 2.6 (C^1 -Gannon-Lee theorem). *Let (M, g) be a strongly causal, null pseudoconvex, null geodesically complete C^1 -spacetime without null branching and such that the distributional null energy condition holds. Let Σ be an asymptotically regular hypersurface, which admits a piercing and contains an enclosing surface $S \subseteq \Sigma$ such that M is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$, then the map $i_\# : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \pi_1(\Sigma)$, induced by the inclusion $i : S \rightarrow \Sigma$, is surjective.*

Note that for $C^{1,1}$ -metrics the geodesic equation is uniquely solvable and hence there can be no null branching. Moreover using that the distributional null energy condition reduces to the “almost everywhere condition” for $C^{1,1}$ -metrics we immediately obtain the following $C^{1,1}$ -Gannon-Lee theorem.

Corollary 2.7 ($C^{1,1}$ -Gannon-Lee theorem). *Let (M, g) be a strongly causal, null pseudoconvex, null geodesically complete $C^{1,1}$ -spacetime such that the null energy condition $\text{Ric}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}) \geq 0$ holds for all local Lipschitz-continuous null vector fields \mathcal{X} . Let Σ be an asymptotically regular hypersurface, which admits a piercing and contains an enclosing surface $S \subseteq \Sigma$ such that M is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R} \times \Sigma$, then the map $i_{\#} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \pi_1(\Sigma)$ is surjective.*

Going back to C^1 and assuming global hyperbolicity we clearly can skip null pseudoconvexity and, due to results in [Gra20], the assumption of no null branching. Further in this case also some of the assumptions in [CeS10] can be dropped, as they are implied by the existence of a Cauchy surface.

Corollary 2.8 (Globally hyperbolic C^1 -Gannon-Lee theorem). *Let (M, g) be a null geodesically complete C^1 -spacetime such that the distributional null energy condition holds. Further let Σ be an asymptotically regular Cauchy surface, containing an enclosing surface $S \subseteq \Sigma$, then the map $i_{\#} : \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \pi_1(\Sigma)$ is surjective.*

A simpler formulation is obtained when assuming that S is simply connected: the theorems then state that the entire spacetime is simply connected provided it is null complete. Originally the theorem of Gannon was given in contrapositive form, saying that if S is (topologically) a sphere and Σ is not simply connected, then M has to be null incomplete.

In proving our results we will follow the general layout of [CeS10]. The proof consists of a causal and analytic part as well as a purely topological part. At the heart of the causal part lies Proposition 4.1 of [CeS10], which we will prove for C^1 -spacetimes without null branching in Proposition 5.3. It essentially states that the inside region Σ_- of an asymptotically regular hypersurface Σ is relatively compact. Its proof is based on the notion of causal simplicity. But this result needs to be applied to a Lorentzian covering rather than to M itself. However, since causal simplicity does not lift to coverings, we build our arguments on null pseudoconvexity. We will show in section 4 that this property indeed lifts to coverings and that, together with strong causality, it implies causal simplicity.

So, we will first establish the needed causality properties for C^1 -spacetimes in sections 3 and 4.

3. MAXIMIZERS AND CAUSALITY IN C^1

In this section we establish properties of geodesics and results on causality in C^1 -spacetimes. Building on recent results of [GL18b] and [Gra20] we will establish

that causal maximizers in C^1 -spacetimes are geodesics. Note that this result was also independently discovered very recently in [LLS20].

First note that by [GL18b] maximizers have a causal character, even in Lipschitz spacetimes.

We start by showing that also in a C^1 -spacetime broken causal geodesics are not maximizing. As a prerequisite we use a variational argument similar to the one in [O'N83], 10.45-46, which still holds true in our setting.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a causal piecewise C^2 -curve in a C^1 -spacetime M and let X be a piecewise C^1 -vector field along c . Then there is a piecewise C^2 -variation c_s of c with variation vector field X . Moreover, if $g(X', c') < 0$ along c then for any variation c_s of c with variation vector field X and small enough s , the longitudinal curve c_s is timelike and longer than c .*

Proof. First we expand X to a vector field \tilde{X} in a neighbourhood of c and set $c_s(t) := \text{Fl}_s^{\tilde{X}}(c(t))$, which is a variation of c with variation vector field X . For the second part note that $g(c'_0(t), c'_0(t)) \leq 0$ for all t (except possible break points) as c is causal and further

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \log(c'_s(t), c'_s(t)) = 2g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\Big|_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} c_s(t), c'_0(t)\right) = 2g\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} X(t), c'(t)\right) < 0$$

by assumption. So for small s we have $g(c'_s(t), c'_s(t)) < g(c'(t), c'(t)) \leq 0$ (for almost all t) and hence $L(c_s) = \int_0^1 (-g(c'_s(t), c'_s(t)))^{\frac{1}{2}} dt > \int_0^1 (-g(c'_0(t), c'_0(t)))^{\frac{1}{2}} dt = L(c)$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *In a C^1 -spacetime no broken causal geodesic is maximizing.*

Proof. Let $\gamma : [0, 2] \rightarrow M$ be a broken causal geodesic with a break point at $\gamma(1)$. Hence $v := \lim_{t \uparrow 1} \gamma'(t)$ and $w := \lim_{t \downarrow 1} \gamma'(t)$ are linearly independent. Also since both vectors are either future or past pointing, we have $\langle v, w \rangle < 0$.

We next establish that

$$\langle v, v \rangle - \langle v, w \rangle > 0 \quad \text{as well as} \quad \langle v, w \rangle - \langle w, w \rangle < 0. \quad (6)$$

If both v and w are null, this is clear by $\langle v, w \rangle < 0$. If both vectors are timelike we can w.l.o.g. assume them to be unit vectors. By the Lorentz-Schwarz inequality we then have $|\langle v, w \rangle| > 1$ (recall that v and w are not colinear) and hence $\langle v, w \rangle < -1$. So $\langle v, v \rangle - \langle v, w \rangle > 0$, and in the same way it follows that $\langle v, w \rangle - \langle w, w \rangle < 0$.

We now show that there exists a timelike curve from $\gamma(0)$ to $\gamma(2)$ longer than γ . First note that by continuity of the the Christoffel symbols we can solve the linear equations for parallel transport along γ (uniquely) and the solution is a C^1 -vector field.

We set $y = v - w$ and let Y_1 and Y_2 be the vector fields along $\gamma|_{[0,1]}$ and $\gamma|_{[1,2]}$, obtained by parallel transport of y along $\gamma|_{[0,1]}$ and $\gamma|_{[1,2]}$, respectively. Next we define a piecewise C^1 -vector field Y along γ by setting $Y|_{[0,1]} = Y_1$ and $Y|_{[1,2]} = Y_2$.

Since γ is a geodesic and Y is parallel we have on $[0, 1]$ using (6)

$$\langle \gamma'(t), Y(t) \rangle = \langle v, v - w \rangle = \langle v, v \rangle - \langle v, w \rangle > 0 \quad (7)$$

and similarly on $[1, 2]$ we have $\langle \gamma'(t), Y \rangle < 0$.

Now let $f : [0, 2] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a continuous, piecewise linear function such that $f(0) = 0 = f(2)$, $f'|_{[0,1]} = 1$, and $f'|_{(1,2]} = -1$ and set $X(t) := f(t)Y(t)$. Then X is a piecewise C^1 -vector field along γ . Now consider the variation γ_s of γ with variation vector field X . By (7) we have $\langle \gamma', X' \rangle < 0$ and hence by Lemma 3.1 there exists some small s , such that γ_s is longer than γ . By the choice of f the endpoints agree and we have shown the statement. \square

Theorem 3.3. *Let (M, g) be a C^1 -spacetime, then any maximizing causal curve is a causal geodesic and hence a C^2 -curve.*

Proof. Observe that being a geodesic is a local property and that any part of a maximizing curve is maximizing. Moreover, since any point in a C^1 -spacetime has a globally hyperbolic neighbourhood³, we can assume M to be globally hyperbolic.

Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a maximizer and set $p = \gamma(0)$, $q = \gamma(1)$. By [Gra20], Proposition 2.13, there exists a maximizing causal geodesic from p to q of the same causal character as γ . Also there exist maximizing, causal geodesics σ_1 from p to $\gamma(\frac{1}{2})$ and σ_2 from $\gamma(\frac{1}{2})$ to q . Note that since σ_i are maximizing, we have $L(\sigma_1) = L(\gamma|_{[0, \frac{1}{2}]})$ and $L(\sigma_2) = L(\gamma|_{[\frac{1}{2}, 1]})$. This means $L(\sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2) = L(\gamma)$. So the curve $\gamma_1 := \sigma_1 \circ \sigma_2$ is maximizing and hence by Lemma 3.2 it is an unbroken geodesic.

This procedure can be iterated to obtain a sequence of maximizing causal geodesics γ_n from p to q , which meet γ at all parameter values $\frac{k}{2^n}$, for $\mathbb{N} \ni k \leq 2^n$. Observe that γ_n converge to γ uniformly: First, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we cover γ by finitely many open, causally convex, sets $V_{p_i}^\varepsilon$ around $p_i \in \gamma$ of h -diameter at most ε . The union $V^\varepsilon = \sup_i V_{p_i}^\varepsilon$ is a neighbourhood of γ , and there exist dyadic numbers t_m , $m = 0, \dots, k$, $t_0 = 0$ and $t_k = 1$, such that $\gamma(t_m)$ and $\gamma(t_{m+1})$ lie in a single $V_{p_i}^\varepsilon$ for some i . Moreover, there exists some $N(\varepsilon)$, such that for all $n \geq N$ all curves γ_n meet every $\gamma(t_m)$ and hence the segments of γ_n from t_m to t_{m+1} are contained in $V_{p_i}^\varepsilon$. So we conclude that $d_h(\gamma(t), \gamma_n(t)) \leq \varepsilon$, so $\gamma_n \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly.

We can now parameterize γ_n , such that $\|\gamma'_n(0)\|_h = 1$ and hence pass to a subsequence (again denoted by γ_n) such that $\gamma'_n(0) \rightarrow v$. By [Har02], Sec. II Theorem 3.2, there exists a subsequence of γ_n which converges uniformly on compact sets to a geodesic σ with initial values $\sigma(0) = p$ and $\sigma'(0) = v$. But as γ_n converges to γ , so must any subsequence and hence $\gamma = \sigma$ on the entire domain of γ . Finally σ reaches q since otherwise, σ would agree with γ on its entire maximal domain of definition, would be future inextendible and contained in the compact set $\gamma([0, 1])$,

³Actually there exists a smooth metric with wider lightcones, which has a neighbourhood base of globally hyperbolic sets, but these are also globally hyperbolic for g .

a contradiction to non-imprisonment which holds in any globally hyperbolic C^1 -spacetime. \square

Assuming non-branching we are able to prove results on limits of maximizers needed in the following sections.

Proposition 3.4. *Let M be a C^1 -spacetime without null branching. If two causal geodesic segments contained in an achronal set intersect, they are segments of the same geodesic or they intersect at the endpoints.*

Proof. Suppose such a segment intersects a second one in the interior of its domain. Then either their tangents at the meeting point are not proportional and so by Lemma 3.2 their concatenation, which is a broken causal geodesic, stops maximizing, contradicting the fact that both segments are contained in an achronal set. Or otherwise their tangents at the meeting point are proportional and hence null branching would occur, again a contradiction. \square

Using Theorem 3.3 we may also give a slightly different formulation: If two different initially maximizing null curves starting at the same point meet again, they stop maximizing.

The final result of this section will be essential in the proof of the main theorem and it is the essential point at which we use the assumption that null branching doesn't occur. Again, \check{g}_ε is as in Lemma 2.2.

Corollary 3.5. *Let (M, g) be a C^1 -spacetime without null branching. Let $S \subseteq M$, then any g -null curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow E_g^+(S)$ is a limit of $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}$ -null curves contained in $E_{\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}}^+(S)$ for an appropriate subsequence of $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}$.*

Proof. Let γ be a future directed g -null S -maximizer starting at $p = \gamma(0) \in S$, so $\gamma \subseteq E^+(p)$. For any small $\delta > 0$ there exist points $q_n^\delta \in \partial I_{\varepsilon_n}^+(S) := \partial I_{\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}}^+(S)$ converging to $\gamma(1 - \delta) =: q^\delta$: To see this let U_k be a sequence of connected nested neighbourhoods of q^δ with $\bigcap_k U_k = \{q^\delta\}$. Choose some $q_k^e \in U_k \setminus \overline{J^+(S)}$ and $q_k^i \in U_k \cap I^+(S)$. For large n we can achieve $q_k^i \in I_{\varepsilon_n}^+(S)$ and since also $q_k^e \in U_k \setminus \overline{J_{\varepsilon_n}^+(S)}$ there exists a curve from q_k^i to q_k^e which starts in $I_{\varepsilon_n}^+(S)$ and leaves it and hence must meet $\partial I_{\varepsilon_n}^+(S)$ in a point which we call q_n^δ .

Hence there are future directed $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}$ -null maximizing geodesics γ_n^δ ending at q_n^δ and contained in $\partial I_{\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}}^+(S)$. Note that the γ_n^δ either meet S or are past inextendible.

Now by [Har02, Sec. II, Thm. 3.2] there exists a subsequence of γ_n^δ , denoted again by γ_n^δ , converging to a maximizing g -null geodesic σ^δ ending at q^δ which is entirely contained in $\partial I^+(S)$. By 3.3 γ is a geodesic and continues to be maximizing after q^δ . Also, by construction σ^δ is non-trivial, so γ and σ^δ coincide on some $\gamma|_{[a, 1-\delta]}$ (with $a < 1 - \delta$) by Proposition 3.4. As this works for any small δ , letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we obtain a sequence of $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}$ -geodesics denoted by γ_n converging to a past-directed g -null geodesic σ starting at $\gamma(1)$, and γ and σ agree where both are defined.

There are now two possibilities: Either there exists a subsequence of $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}$ such that any γ_n meets S , in which case, by passing to this subsequence, also σ meets S and hence $\sigma \supseteq \gamma$ and we obtain the desired property.

The other possibility is that there is no subsequence, such that all γ_n meet S . We show that this is impossible. If it were the case we may choose a subsequence γ_n of past-inextendible curves. Then also σ is past-inextendible and hence must leave $\gamma([0, 1])$. Thus again $\sigma \supseteq \gamma$ and it remains to show that $\gamma_n \subseteq E_n^+(S)$ for large n . To this end let U be a globally hyperbolic neighbourhood of $p = \gamma(0) \in S$, which is w.l.o.g. also globally hyperbolic for $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_n}$ for all n ⁴. Then there are points $p_n \in \gamma_n$ with $p_n \rightarrow p$ and so for large n , $p_n \in \partial I_n^+(S) \cap U = E_n^+(S) \cap U$ and hence γ_n must meet S , a contradiction. \square

Observe that Corollary 3.5 clearly holds true for $C^{1,1}$ -spacetimes but also for globally hyperbolic C^1 -spacetimes (where, in principle, null branching can occur) by [Gra20, 2.16], however, with stronger assumptions on S .

4. ON PSEUDOCONVEXITY

In this section we discuss null pseudoconvexity, the central causality notion in our approach. As we work in C^1 -spacetimes, we have to take more care in dealing with convergence properties of geodesics, and we will build on the results of the previous section. However, to our knowledge, the if-part of the main result of this section, Theorem 4.4, was also unproven in the smooth case.

Definition 4.1. A spacetime (M, g) is called causal (null) pseudoconvex, if for any compact set K , there exists another compact set K' , such that each causal (null) geodesic with endpoints in K must be entirely contained in K' .

It is said to be maximally null pseudoconvex, if each maximal null geodesic with endpoints in K is contained in K' .

Our aim is to relate this notion to convergence of geodesics, so let us first collect some related facts in C^1 -spacetimes.

Lemma 4.2. *Let p_n, q_n be points in a C^1 -spacetime and $\gamma_n : [0, b_n] \rightarrow M$ be future directed causal geodesics from $\gamma_n(0) = p_n$ to $\gamma_n(b_n) = q_n$. Further let $p_n \rightarrow p$ and $q_n \rightarrow q \neq p$. Then there exists a causal geodesic $\gamma : [0, c) \rightarrow M$ starting at p , such that c is maximal and such that there is a subsequence of γ_n , which converges in C^1 on compact subsets of $[0, c)$ to γ . Either γ reaches q or $c \leq \liminf b_n := b$. In either case, if all γ_n are maximizing, so is γ until it reaches q or up to c , respectively.*

Proof. We can assume w.l.o.g. that $\|\gamma_n'(0)\|_h = 1$ and hence that $\gamma_n'(0) \rightarrow v \in T_p M$. Re-writing the geodesic equations as a first order system in TM , we can apply

⁴In our case this follows since we approximate from the inside. However, global hyperbolicity is stable in the interval topology even for continuous metrics [Sä16] and C^1 -convergence is stronger.

[Har02, Sec. II Theorem 3.2] to infer that there exists a solution $\gamma : [0, c) \rightarrow M$ of the geodesic equation with initial conditions $\gamma(0) = p$ and $\gamma'(0) = v$ and a subsequence γ_{n_k} of γ_n such that for any $a < c$ we have $\gamma'_{n_k}|_{[0, a]} \rightarrow \gamma'|_{[0, a]}$ uniformly in TM . Here $[0, c)$ is the maximal domain of γ to the future. If $b = \liminf b_n < c$, there is a subsequence such that $b_{n_l} \rightarrow b < c$ and hence $q_{n_l} = \gamma_{n_l}(b_{n_l}) \rightarrow \gamma(b) = q$.

For the final point, note that by [Sä16, Thm. 6.3] the length functional is upper-semi continuous and by [KS18, Prop. 5.7] the time-separation function τ is lower-semi continuous. We can thus apply the usual estimates for any point $\gamma(a) = \lim_k \gamma_{n_k}(a_k)$ on γ

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(p, \gamma(a)) &\leq \liminf_k \tau(p_{n_k}, \gamma_{n_k}(a_k)) \leq \limsup_k \tau(p_{n_k}, \gamma_{n_k}(a_k)) \\ &\leq \limsup_k L(\gamma_{n_k}|_{[0, a_k]}) \leq L(\gamma|_{[0, a]}) \leq \tau(p, \gamma(a)), \end{aligned}$$

and so $\gamma|_{[0, a]}$ is maximizing. \square

One very useful characterisation of pseudoconvexity in strongly causal spacetimes, is via limits of geodesics. The proof is straightforward for $C^{1,1}$ -metrics, see e.g. [BP89, Lem. 3] [VPE19, Prop. 4] and will follow from Lemma 4.2 in the C^1 -case.

Lemma 4.3. *Let M be a strongly causal C^1 -spacetime, then M is (maximally) null or causal pseudoconvex if and only if for any sequence of (maximal) null or causal geodesics γ_n with endpoints $p_n \rightarrow p$ and $q_n \rightarrow q \neq p$, there is a subsequence of γ_n which converges locally uniformly to a (maximal) null or causal geodesic γ from p to q , respectively.*

Proof. We only deal with the case of maximal null pseudoconvexity, the other cases follow analogously.

So let M be maximal null pseudoconvex and let $p_n \rightarrow p$, $q_n \rightarrow q$. Further let γ_n be maximal null geodesics from p_n to q_n . By Lemma 4.2 there exists a maximal null geodesic $\gamma : [0, c)$ and a subsequence of the γ_n which converges to γ on any $[0, a]$ for $a < c$. If γ reaches q we are done.

Otherwise γ is maximal up to c and inextendible. Now consider the closed h -ball $\overline{B_r(p)}$ for $r > d_h(p, q)$, which is a compact neighbourhood of p and q . By maximal null pseudoconvexity there exists a compact set \tilde{K} such that for n large enough all γ_n are contained in \tilde{K} . But then γ is also contained in \tilde{K} contradicting strong causality⁵.

Let us show the reverse implication. We assume that the limiting property for maximizing null geodesics holds, but M is not maximal null pseudoconvex. Take a compact exhaustion K_i of M . By assumption there exists a compact set K and a sequence of maximizing null geodesics γ_n from $p_n \in K$ to $q_n \in K$ such that γ_n leaves

⁵which implies non-imprisonment also for C^1 metrics.

K_n . By passing to a subsequence we can assume $p_n \rightarrow p \in K$ and $q_n \rightarrow q \in K$, where $p \neq q$ due to strong causality. By the limiting property a subsequence, again denoted by γ_n , converges to a maximizing null geodesic γ from p to q . Hence there exists some N such that $\gamma \subseteq \text{int}(K_N)$ and hence for n large, also $\gamma_n \subseteq \text{int}(K_N)$, a contradiction. \square

The main result of this section is the following characterization of causally simple spacetimes.

Theorem 4.4. *Let (M, g) be a strongly causal C^1 -spacetime without null branching, then M is causally simple if and only if it is maximally null pseudoconvex.*

Proof. The fact that every causally simple smooth spacetime is maximally null pseudoconvex is proved in [BK92, Thm. 1]. An inspection of the proof reveals that it also holds in the C^1 -case assuming no null branching and using Proposition 3.4.⁶

For the converse direction we enhance the proof of [VPE19, Thm. 2]⁷. We assume indirectly that M is not causally simple. So there is $p \in M$ with $J^+(p)$ not closed and hence some $q \in \overline{J^+(p)} \setminus J^+(p)$.

Let U be a globally hyperbolic neighbourhood of q and choose $r \in I^+(q) \cap U$ then there exists some future directed timelike curve $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ with $c(0) = q$, $c(1) = r$. Note that push-up also works in the case where $q \in \overline{I^+(p)}$, i.e. $I^+(\overline{I^+(p)}) \subseteq I^+(p)$ and so there exists a timelike curve γ_1 from p to r .

Let $x \in c((0, 1])$ and note that $r \notin I^-(x)$ by chronology, but $p \in I^-(x)$ by push-up and so there exists a unique intersection point q_x of γ_1 with $\partial I^-(x)$ (since the latter is an achronal boundary). We will look at the subset of all points $x \in c((0, 1])$ for which there exists a maximizing geodesic from x to q_x and define

$$A := \{x \in c((0, 1]) \mid \gamma_1 \cap \partial I^-(x) = \{q_x\} \subseteq E^-(x)\} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \{t \in (0, 1] \mid c(t) \in A\}.$$

First we will show that A is non-empty and closed and hence so is B by continuity of c . Now, $A \neq \emptyset$, as $r \in A$, and further, as long as the intersection $q_x = \partial I^-(x) \cap \gamma_1$ is in U , we have $x \in A$.

Further A is closed by maximal null pseudoconvexity: Let $x_n \in A$, $x_n \rightarrow x$, for all n there exists a maximal null geodesic segment from x_n to $q_{x_n} = \gamma_1 \cap \partial I^-(x_n)$, which is unique. By compactness of the image of γ_1 we have that up to a subsequence $q_{x_n} \rightarrow y \in \gamma_1$ ⁸. By maximal null pseudoconvexity the geodesics from x_n to q_{x_n} have a subsequence, which converges to a maximal null geodesic from x to y and hence $y = q_x$, and $x \in A$.

⁶Besides the non-branching property the proof in [BK92, Thm. 1] requires that causal simplicity implies causal continuity, which also holds for C^1 -metrics.

⁷In our opinion that proof is not conclusive since in step (2) it cannot be ruled out that $s = q_x$, which forecloses the application of maximal null pseudoconvexity.

⁸Note that we can not a priori guarantee that $y = q_x$, this would need the spacetime to be reflecting.

To conclude the proof set $t_0 := \inf B$. If $t_0 = 0$ we are done, since then there is a sequence $B \ni t_n \rightarrow 0$ and maximizing null geodesics from $c(t_n) = x_n$ to points q_{x_n} on γ_1 . By maximal null pseudoconvexity there is a maximizing null geodesic from $q = c(0)$ to an accumulation point of q_{x_n} in γ_1 . So $p \leq q$, a contradiction.

So assume $t_0 > 0$. Then $B \subseteq [t_0, 1]$ and $c(t_0) \in A$ by closedness of $A \subsetneq c((0, 1])$. But as $t_0 > 0$ there exists an increasing sequence $t_n \uparrow t_0$ and $x_n := c(t_n) \notin A$.

Setting $x = c(t_0)$ and using the above notation we show that $\lim q_{x_n} := y = q_x$: If this is not the case then as $y \in \gamma_1$ we either have $y \gg q_x$ or $y \ll q_x$ and in either case we can w.l.o.g. assume all $q_{x_n} \gg q_x$ or all $q_{x_n} \ll q_x$. In the first case, since $q_{x_n} \in \overline{I^-(x_n)}$ by push-up we obtain $x \gg x_n \gg q_x$, a contradiction. In the second case as $q_x \in J^-(x)$ we obtain $y \in I^-(x)$ and by openness of \ll also $q_{x_n} \in I^-(x_n)$ for large n , again a contradiction. Thus we have established $q_x = y$.

Let $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a future directed maximal null geodesic from q_x to x , $\alpha(0) = q_x$ and $\alpha(1) = x$. We can assume $\gamma_1(0) = p$ and $\gamma_1(1) = q_x$ and γ_1 to be future directed. Take any timelike variation of γ_1^s of γ_1 through p such that $\gamma_1^s(1) = \alpha(s)$. For all n there again exists a unique $q_{x_n}^s \in \partial I^-(x_n) \cap \gamma_1^s$ and future directed null geodesics $\eta_n^s \subseteq \partial I^-(x_n)$ starting at $q_{x_n}^s$.

We claim there exists a subsequence of x_n denoted in the same way, such that all η_n^s reach x_n , i.e. such that $q_{x_n}^s \in E^-(x_n)$. If not, then there exists some N such that $\forall n \geq N$ the geodesics η_n^s do not reach x_n , i.e. they are future inextendible and contained in $\partial I^-(x_n)$. In the same way as for q_{x_n} we obtain $q_{x_n}^s \rightarrow \alpha(s)$ and hence $\eta_n^s \rightarrow \eta^s$, where $\eta^s : [0, c) \rightarrow M$ is a future inextendible, maximizing null geodesic starting at $\alpha(s)$. We will show that $(\eta^s)'(0)$ and $\alpha'(s)$ are linearly dependent. In this case by the assumption of no null branching we obtain $\alpha_{[s, 1]} \subseteq \eta^s$. If they are linearly independent, then by Lemma 3.2 the broken geodesic $\alpha|_{[0, s]} \cup \eta^s$ is not maximizing beyond $\alpha(s)$, i.e. $\eta^s(t) \in I^+(q_x)$ for any $t > 0$. But then by openness of \ll we have $q_{x_n} \ll \eta_n^s(t) \in \partial I^-(x_n)$ for large n , which by push-up implies $q_{x_n} \ll x_n$, a contradiction. So we conclude that $\eta^s \supseteq \alpha_{[s, 1]}$. But as $\alpha(1) = x$ also η_n^s must come close to x and hence enter U . Moreover, η_n^s is inextendible so it must reach x_n , a contradiction.

Let x_n be a subsequence as above and let $s_m \rightarrow 0$ for $m \rightarrow \infty$, then $q_{x_n}^{s_m} \rightarrow q_{x_n}$ by construction of γ_1^s and the fact that $\gamma_1 \cap \partial I^-(x_n) = \{q_{x_n}\}$. So, for any n we obtain a sequence of maximizing null geodesics $\eta_n^{s_m}$ from $q_{x_n}^{s_m}$ to x_n , which, by another appeal to maximal null pseudoconvexity, converge to a maximal null geodesic from q_{x_n} to x_n and hence $x_n \in A$, a contradiction. So $t_0 > 0$ is impossible and the proof is finished. \square

Lorentzian coverings clearly preserve local geometric properties. However, maximality of causal curves is not local and given a maximal causal curve in the

covering, its projection need not be maximal. This is why maximal null pseudoconvexity and causal simplicity do not lift. However, we will show that one can lift null pseudoconvexity to any Lorentzian covering of a strongly causal C^1 -spacetime.

As null pseudoconvexity is stronger than maximal null pseudoconvexity, by Theorem 4.4 strong causality and null pseudoconvexity imply causal simplicity. One can thus place strongly causal, null pseudoconvex spacetimes on the causal ladder between causal simplicity and global hyperbolicity, where in the C^1 -case one also needs to assume no null branching.

Theorem 4.5. *Let M be a strongly causal, null pseudoconvex C^1 -spacetime and let $\pi : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ a Lorentzian-covering. Then \tilde{M} is null pseudoconvex.*

Proof. First note that any Lorentzian covering of a strongly causal C^1 -spacetime is again strongly causal. We show the limiting property of Lemma 4.3.

Assume this property fails, so there exist $\tilde{p}_n, \tilde{q}_n \in \tilde{M}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_n : [0, b_n] \rightarrow \tilde{M}$ future directed null geodesics from \tilde{p}_n to \tilde{q}_n and such that $\tilde{p}_n \rightarrow \tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}_n \rightarrow \tilde{q} \neq \tilde{p}$, such that no subsequence of $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ converges to a null geodesic from \tilde{p} to \tilde{q} .

By Lemma 4.2 there exists a subsequence of $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ (denoted again by $\tilde{\gamma}_n$) which converges to a null geodesic $\tilde{\gamma} : [0, c) \rightarrow \tilde{M}$, starting at \tilde{p} . By our indirect assumption it never meets \tilde{q} , and, moreover, it is inextendible, and $c \leq \liminf b_n$.

Now set $p = \pi(\tilde{p})$, $q = \pi(\tilde{q})$, $p_n = \pi(\tilde{p}_n)$, $q_n = \pi(\tilde{q}_n)$ and $\gamma_n = \pi \circ \tilde{\gamma}_n$. Then $p \neq q$, since otherwise $p = q$ possess an evenly covered, causally convex neighbourhood W and $\tilde{\gamma}_n$ would remain in a single sheet of $\pi^{-1}(W)$, implying $\tilde{p} = \tilde{q}$. Since M is null pseudoconvex γ_n has a subsequence (which we again denote by γ_n) converging to a null geodesic $\gamma : [0, b] \rightarrow M$ from p to q . Let $\sigma : [0, b] \rightarrow \tilde{M}$ be the unique lift of γ through \tilde{p} , then σ is a null geodesic and moreover we claim that it is equal to $\tilde{\gamma}$ on its entire domain $[0, b]$. To see this we cover γ by finitely many neighbourhoods U_i and σ by neighbourhoods \tilde{U}_i , such that $\pi : \tilde{U}_i \rightarrow U_i$ is an isometry. As $\gamma|_{U_i}$ is the limit of $\gamma_n|_{U_i}$, its lift $\sigma|_{\tilde{U}_i}$ is the limit of $\tilde{\gamma}_n|_{\tilde{U}_i}$. This means that, wherever both σ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ are defined, their images agree. But as $\tilde{\gamma}$ is inextendible it must leave $\sigma([0, b])$ and hence $\tilde{\gamma}([0, c)) \not\subseteq \sigma([0, b])$, so $\tilde{\gamma}$ exists longer than σ .

Now since γ reaches q , σ reaches a point $\tilde{r} \in \pi^{-1}(q)$ and hence, by the above so does $\tilde{\gamma}$, and by assumption $\tilde{r} \neq \tilde{q}$. Let V be a causally convex, evenly covered neighbourhood of q and let \tilde{V}_1 be the isometric copy in \tilde{M} containing \tilde{r} and \tilde{V}_2 the one containing \tilde{q} . We have $\tilde{V}_1 \cap \tilde{V}_2 = \emptyset$ and for some large n we have $\tilde{\gamma}_n(t_n) \in \tilde{V}_1$ for a suitable t_n and $\tilde{\gamma}_n(b_n) \in \tilde{V}_2$. Hence the causal curve $\tilde{\gamma}_n|_{[t_n, b_n]}$ leaves \tilde{V}_1 and enters \tilde{V}_2 . Since $\pi(\tilde{V}_1) = \pi(\tilde{V}_2) = V$, $\gamma_n|_{[t_n, b_n]}$ is a causal curve which leaves and re-enters V , a contradiction to V being causally convex. \square

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

We will split the proof of Theorem 2.6 into two parts. The first, analytic part will be concerned with showing that the set Σ_- is relatively compact. Here we will

generalize (the proof of) [CeS10, Prop. 4.1] by proving new focusing statements for null geodesics using the results from section 3.

The second, topological part uses the results from causality theory detailed in section 4 to generalize (the proof of) [CeS10, Thm. 2.1]. The key argument is that null pseudoconvexity and strong causality lift to the covering to imply causal simplicity.

To be self-contained we will briefly sketch also those parts of the original (smooth) proofs which do not need major revision.

5.1. Analytic aspects. The main analytical ingredient of our proof is a generalization of [CeS10, Prop. 4.1] to C^1 -spacetimes, which we will give below in Proposition 5.3.

In order to do so we need a focusing results for null geodesics in smooth spacetimes which violate the null energy condition by a small margin δ , as in Lemma 2.3. To this end we apply a result of [FK20]⁹, which itself is a generalization of [O’N83, Prop. 10.43].

Proposition 5.1. ([FK20, Prop. 2.7]) *Let S be a spacelike submanifold of codimension 2 in a smooth spacetime and let γ be a null geodesic joining $p \in S$ to $q \in J^+(S)$. If there exists a smooth f on γ which is nonvanishing at p but vanishes at q and so that*

$$\int_{\gamma} ((n-2)(f')^2 - f^2 \text{Ric}(\gamma', \gamma')) \leq (n-2) \langle f^2 \gamma', H \rangle|_p, \quad (8)$$

then there is a focal point to S along γ .

Lemma 5.2. *Let S be a C^2 -spacelike submanifold of codimension 2 in a smooth spacetime. Let γ be a geodesic starting at some $p \in S$ such that $\nu := \gamma'(0)$ is a future pointing null normal to S . Let the convergence*

$$c := k_S(\nu) := \langle H_{\gamma(0)}, \nu \rangle > 0 \quad (9)$$

and choose some $b > \frac{1}{c}$ and $0 < \delta(b, c) =: \delta \leq \frac{3}{b^2}(n-2)(bc-1)$. Now, if $\text{Ric}(\gamma', \gamma') \geq -\delta$ along γ , then $\gamma|_{[0, b]}$ cannot be maximizing to S , provided it exists that long.¹⁰

Proof. We set $f(t) := 1 - \frac{t}{b}$ and check condition (8). For our choice of δ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^b (n-2) \frac{1}{b^2} dt - \int_0^b \left(1 - 2\frac{t}{b} + \frac{t^2}{b^2}\right) \text{Ric}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t)) dt \\ & \leq \frac{n-2}{b} + \delta \frac{b}{3} \leq (n-2)c = (n-2)k_S(\nu) = (n-2) \langle f^2 \gamma', H \rangle|_p, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and hence $\gamma|_{[0, b]}$ cannot be maximizing. \square

⁹Observe the opposite signature convention used there.

¹⁰One can specify the choice of b further to allow for bigger violations of δ , but we do not need this here.

Recall that for C^1 -metrics the mean curvature and the convergence of S are still continuous. The core of the following proof is in the spirit of [Gra20, Thm. 5.7], however, we have to make up for the lack of global hyperbolicity.

Proposition 5.3. *Let (M, g) be an n -dimensional (with $n \geq 3$), causally simple, null geodesically complete C^1 -spacetime without null branching which satisfies the distributional null energy condition and admits an asymptotically regular hypersurface Σ with a piercing. Then for any enclosing surface $S \subseteq \Sigma$ the closure of its inside, $\overline{\Sigma}_- = S \cup \Sigma_-$ is compact.*

Using the notation $T = \partial I^+(\Sigma_+) \setminus \Sigma_+$, the proof consists in successively establishing the following three claims:

$$(1) \ T \subseteq E^+(S), \quad (2) \ T \text{ is compact}, \quad (3) \ \rho_X(T) = \overline{\Sigma}_-.$$

Note that it is steps (1) and (3) that rely on causal simplicity, while step (2) depends upon the study of conjugate points along null geodesics. As announced we will be sketchy in the proofs of (1) and (3).

Proof. (1) By causal simplicity $E^+(S) = \partial J^+(S) = \partial I^+(S)$ and we show that $T \subseteq \partial I^+(S)$. Let $p \in T$, and note that if $p \in \overline{\Sigma}_+ \setminus \Sigma_+ = S \subseteq E^+(S)$ we are done. So let $p \notin \overline{\Sigma}_+$ and take any neighbourhood U of p with $U \cap \overline{\Sigma}_+ = \emptyset$. Then we pick $p_{\pm} \in I^{\pm}(p) \cap U$ and we show that $p_+ \in I^+(S)$ and $p_- \in M \setminus I^+(S)$, which will prove (1).

By definition of $\partial I^+(\Sigma_+)$ we know, $p_- \notin I^+(\Sigma_+)$ (if it were, then $p \in I^+(\Sigma_+)$) and so $p_- \notin I^+(S)$. By achronality of $\partial I^+(\Sigma_+)$ and the existence of a piercing we have $p \in I^+(\Sigma)$ and we may assume $U \subseteq I^+(\Sigma)$. This yields $p_- \in I^+(\Sigma) \setminus I^+(\overline{\Sigma}_+)$ hence $p_- \in I^+(\Sigma_-)$, while clearly $p_+ \in I^+(\Sigma_+)$. Now for $C := I^-(p_+) \cap \Sigma$ we have $C \cap \Sigma_+ \neq \emptyset$ and $C \cap \Sigma_- \neq \emptyset$. Also C is connected since any pair of points in C can first be connected via a path in $I^-(p_+)$ which projects via the piercing to a path in C . But this implies that $C \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and so $p_+ \in I^+(S)$.

(2) First, T is closed: Assume it were not, then there would exist a sequence $p_n \in T$ such that $p_n \rightarrow p \notin T$. We know $p \in \partial I^+(\Sigma_+)$ as this set is closed, and hence $p \in \Sigma_+ = \partial I^+(\Sigma_+) \setminus T$. Further as $E^+(S)$ is closed and $T \subseteq E^+(S)$, also $p \in E^+(S)$ and hence there must exist a causal curve from S to p , which is a contradiction to acausality of Σ .

Any point p on T lies on a null geodesic emanating from S by Theorem 3.3 and its initial tangent vector is inward pointing, i.e. proportional to $K_-(q)$ for some $q \in S$: That such a tangent vector is perpendicular to S is shown for $C^{1,1}$ -metrics in [GGKS18, Remark 6.6(ii)] by constructing a timelike variation starting in S if it were not perpendicular, however an inspection reveals that this method also works for C^1 -metrics.

Further since the two normal future null congruences starting from S are disjoint, see e.g. [Gan75, Lemma 1.1]¹¹, the only other possibility is that the tangent is outward pointing, i.e. proportional to K_+ , but then the geodesic would enter $I^+(\Sigma_+)$, hence not be in T . This can again be shown in a similar fashion as above by constructing a variation as in [GGKS18, Remark 6.6(ii)].

By continuity k_- possesses a minimum $c := \min_{p \in S} k_-(p) = \min_{p \in S} \langle H_p, K_-(p) \rangle$ on S . Also, the set $K := \{(p, \lambda K_-(p)) \in TS^\perp \mid 0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{2}{c}\} \subseteq TM$ is compact and, by [Gra20, Prop. 2.11] (or rather a simplified version without ε) the set

$$F := \bigcup_{\dot{\gamma} \text{ with } \dot{\gamma}(0) \in K} \text{im}(\dot{\gamma}|_{[0,1]}) \quad (11)$$

is relatively compact.

We will show that $T \subseteq \pi(F)$, where $\pi : TM \rightarrow M$ is the projection. Assume not and let $p \in T \setminus \pi(F)$. By Theorem 3.3 there exists a null geodesic $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ from S to p maximizing the distance to S . As $\gamma \subseteq T$ we know that $\gamma'(0) = \mu K_-(\gamma(0))$ for some $\mu > \frac{2}{c}$, since $\gamma'(0) \notin K$. This means that $k_S(\gamma'(0)) = \langle H(\gamma(0)), \mu K_-(\gamma(0)) \rangle \geq \mu c > 2$.

Let $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_k}$ be as in Lemma 2.2. By Corollary 3.5 γ is the C^1 -limit of $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_k}$ -null geodesics $\gamma_{\varepsilon_k} : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ maximizing the $\check{g}_{\varepsilon_k}$ -distance to S and contained in $E_{\check{g}_{\varepsilon_k}}^+(S)$. Further we can assume that all γ_{ε_k} are contained in a compact neighbourhood \tilde{K} of γ and that $k_1 < \|\gamma'_{\varepsilon_k}\|_h < k_2$ for some $k_i > 0$. Additionally for k large enough we have $k_S^{\varepsilon_k}(\gamma'_{\varepsilon_k}(0)) := c_k > 2$ and by Lemma 2.3 we can also achieve $\text{Ric}[g_{\varepsilon_k}](\gamma'_{\varepsilon_k}, \gamma'_{\varepsilon_k}) \geq -3(n-2)$. In order to apply Lemma 5.2, in our case for $b = 1$ we set $-\delta_k = -\frac{3}{b^2}(n-2)(bc_k - 1) = 3(n-2)(c_k - 1)$. Since $c_k > 2$ for all large k , we have $-\delta_k < -3(n-2)$ and hence $\text{Ric}[g_{\varepsilon_k}](\gamma'_{\varepsilon_k}, \gamma'_{\varepsilon_k}) \geq -3(n-2) > -\delta_k$. So by Lemma 5.2 γ_{ε_k} cannot be maximizing up to $\frac{1}{c_k} < \frac{1}{2} < 1 = b$, a contradiction.

(3) First $\rho_X(T) \subseteq \bar{\Sigma}_-$ (since otherwise $T \cap I^+(\Sigma_+) \neq \emptyset$) and $\bar{\Sigma}_- \setminus \rho_X(T) \subseteq \Sigma_-$ (since $S = \rho_X(S) \subseteq \rho_X(T)$). Now assuming indirectly that $\bar{\Sigma}_- \setminus \rho_X(T) \neq \emptyset$, there is $p \in \partial_{\Sigma} \rho_X(T) \cap \Sigma_-$ and we will reach a contradiction by showing that $p \in \text{int} \rho_X(T)$.

By (2) there is $q \in T$ with $\rho_X(q) = p$, and $q \notin S$ (otherwise $p = q \in S \cap \Sigma_- = \emptyset$). So $q \in T \setminus S = \partial I^+(\Sigma_+) \setminus \bar{\Sigma}_+$ which is a topological hypersurface (S being the edge of the achronal set T). So there is V_0 , an M -neighbourhood of q with $V_0 \cap T$ open in $T \setminus S$, $\rho_X(V_0) \subseteq \Sigma_-$, and $V_0 \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$. Next denote by Ψ the local flow of X and choose $\varepsilon > 0$ and U_0 , an open M -neighbourhood of q , so small that $\Psi(U_0 \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)) \subseteq V_0$. Further set $\Psi_0 := \Psi|_{(U_0 \cap T) \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)}$, and $W := \text{Im} \Psi_0$. By achronality of T and invariance of domain W is open and Ψ_0 is a homeomorphism. But then $p \in \rho_X(U_0 \times (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)) = \rho_X(W)$ and the latter set is open by openness of ρ_X ([O'N83, 14.31]) and so $p \in \text{int} \rho_X(T)$. \square

¹¹The proof there is given for smooth spacetimes and one assumes S to be simply connected, however the method of proof also works in our case.

5.2. Topological aspects. Finally we invoke Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 5.3 to prove our main result. Here we will be brief on the topological aspects laid out already in the proof of [CeS10, Thm. 2.1].

Proof of theorem 2.6. Let $\Phi : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ be connected (smooth) covering with $\Phi_{\#}(\pi_1(\tilde{M})) = j_{\#}(\pi_1(S))$, where j is the inclusion of S in M . By assumption the inclusion m of Σ in M induces an isomorphism $m_{\#} : \pi_1(\Sigma) \rightarrow \pi_1(M)$. In particular, $\Phi_{\Sigma} := \Phi|_{\tilde{\Sigma}} : \Phi^{-1}(\Sigma) := \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a Riemannian covering with $\tilde{\Sigma}$ connected.

In Lemma 5.4 below we will establish that Φ_{Σ} is trivial. Accepting this for the moment, we will show the theorem, i.e. for every $y \in \pi_1(\Sigma)$ there is $x \in \pi_1(S)$ with $i_{\#}(x) = y$. From the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & M & \\
 j \nearrow & & \nwarrow \Phi \\
 S & \xrightarrow{i} & \Sigma & \xrightarrow{m} & M \\
 & \searrow \Phi_{\Sigma} & \downarrow \tilde{m} & & \nearrow \tilde{m} \\
 & & \tilde{\Sigma} & & \tilde{M}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & & & j_{\#} \\
 & & & & \curvearrowright \\
 \pi_1(S) & \xrightarrow{i_{\#}} & \pi_1(\Sigma) & \xleftarrow{m_{\#}} & \pi_1(M) & \xleftarrow{\Phi_{\#}} & \pi_1(\tilde{M}) \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 & & \pi_1(\tilde{\Sigma}) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1(\tilde{M}) & &
 \end{array}$$

we see that

$$m_{\#}(y) = (\Phi \circ \tilde{m} \circ \Phi_{\Sigma}^{-1})_{\#}(y) = \Phi_{\#}(\tilde{m} \circ \Phi_{\Sigma}^{-1})_{\#}(y) \in \Phi_{\#}(\pi_1(\tilde{M})) = j_{\#}(\pi_1(S)). \quad (12)$$

Since $j = m \circ i$ we have $m_{\#}(y) = j_{\#}(x) = m_{\#}(i_{\#}(x))$, and since $m_{\#}$ is an isomorphism and we are done. \square

Lemma 5.4. $\Phi_{\Sigma} := \Phi|_{\tilde{\Sigma}} : \tilde{\Sigma} := \Phi^{-1}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a trivial covering.

Proof. First, by definition there is a local deformation $F : S \times (-1, 1) \rightarrow \Sigma$ of S . Further set $U_F^- := F(S \times (0, 1))$ and $V := U_F^- \cup S \cup \Sigma_+$. Then $\tilde{\Sigma}_+$ is a deformation retract of V and hence $\pi_1(\tilde{\Sigma}_+) \cong \pi_1(V)$.

Next we establish that on every connected component \tilde{V} of $\Phi_{\Sigma}^{-1}(V)$ the map $\Phi_V := \Phi|_{\tilde{V}} : \tilde{V} \rightarrow V$ is a diffeomorphism.

We only have to show injectivity since Φ_V is a local diffeomorphism. Take $\tilde{p}, \tilde{q} \in \tilde{V}$ such that $\Phi_V(\tilde{p}) = \Phi_V(\tilde{q}) =: p \in V$. Let $\tilde{\alpha} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ be a path connecting these two points, then $\alpha := \Phi \circ \tilde{\alpha}$ is a loop in V , homotopic to a loop in S since $\pi_1(V) \cong \pi_1(\tilde{\Sigma}_+) \cong \pi_1(S)$. Further since $\Phi_{\#}(\pi_1(\tilde{M})) = j_{\#}(\pi_1(S))$, there is a loop $\tilde{\beta}$ in \tilde{M} , fixed endpoint-homotopic to $\tilde{\alpha}$ and so we must have $\tilde{p} = \tilde{q}$.

In order to show that Φ_{Σ} is trivial we assume the converse, and, in particular that $\Phi_{\Sigma}^{-1}(S)$ has more than one component. Since $S \subseteq V$ each of these components is diffeomorphic to S , and they separate $\tilde{\Sigma}$.

Let \tilde{S}_1, \tilde{S}_2 be two such different components and let \tilde{V}_1, \tilde{V}_2 be the respective copies of V containing them. Since $\tilde{\Sigma}_+ \subseteq V$, each \tilde{V}_i ($i = 1, 2$) contains a diffeomorphic copy of $\tilde{\Sigma}_+$ called \tilde{C}_i , which are closed and non-compact. Further since $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is connected and separated by \tilde{S}_1 , the set \tilde{C}_2 is contained in $\tilde{S}_1 \cup \tilde{\Sigma}_-^{(1)} := \tilde{S}_1 \cup (\tilde{\Sigma} \setminus \tilde{C}_1)$, since otherwise $\tilde{V}_1 \cap \tilde{V}_2 \neq \emptyset$.

So $\tilde{C}_2 \subseteq \tilde{S}_1 \cup \tilde{\Sigma}_-^{(1)}$. Being local properties, both null geodesic completeness and the distributional null convergence condition lift to \tilde{M} , as does null pseudoconvexity by Theorem 4.5. So the covering \tilde{M} is causally simple by Theorem 4.4. Further as null branching is a local property as well, it also cannot occur in \tilde{M} . Thus the assumptions of Proposition 5.3 are fulfilled for \tilde{M} , $\tilde{\Sigma}$, \tilde{C}_1 and $\tilde{\Sigma} \setminus \tilde{C}_1$ implying that $\tilde{S}_1 \cup (\tilde{\Sigma} \setminus \tilde{C}_1)$ is compact. However this set contains the non-compact, closed set \tilde{C}_2 , a contradiction and we are done. \square

Finally we *sketch the proof of Corollary 2.8*, i.e. the globally hyperbolic C^1 -Gannon-Lee theorem. We can proceed analogously to the one of Theorem 2.6, where most points will even be significantly easier. The only aspect one has to pay attention to is proving that T is compact, i.e. step (2) above: We have to prove that any maximizing g -null geodesic is a limit of maximizing \check{g}_ε -null geodesics. Since Corollary 3.5 does not apply we have to replace it by the “limiting-result” [Gra20, Prop. 2.13].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to Michael Kunzinger for sharing his experience and to Melanie Graf and Clemens Sämann for helpful discussions. This work was supported by FWF-grants P28770, P33594 and the Uni:Docs program of the University of Vienna.

REFERENCES

- [AB08] Stephanie B. Alexander and Richard L. Bishop. Lorentz and semi-Riemannian spaces with Alexandrov curvature bounds. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 16(2):251–282, 2008. 2.2
- [BK92] John K. Beem and Andrzej Królak. Cosmic censorship and pseudoconvexity. *J. Math. Phys.*, 33(6):2249–2253, 1992. 2.1, 4, 6
- [BP87] John K. Beem and Phillip E. Parker. Pseudoconvexity and general relativity. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 4(1):71–80, 1987. 2.1
- [BP89] John K. Beem and Phillip E. Parker. Pseudoconvexity and geodesic connectedness. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 155:137–142, 1989. 4
- [BS18] Patrick Bernard and Stefan Suhr. Lyapounov functions of closed cone fields: from Conley theory to time functions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 359(2):467–498, 2018. 2.2
- [CeS10] I. P. Costa e Silva. On the Gannon-Lee singularity theorem in higher dimensions. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 27(15):155016, 13, 2010. 1, 2.3, 2.3, 2.3, 5, 5.1, 5.2
- [CG12] Piotr T. Chruściel and James D. E. Grant. On Lorentzian causality with continuous metrics. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 29(14):145001, 32, 2012. 1, 2.2, 2.2
- [CK18] Piotr T. Chruściel and Paul Klinger. The annoying null boundaries. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 968:012003, feb 2018. 1

- [ER08] Roberto Emparan and Harvey S. Reall. Black Holes in Higher Dimensions. *Living Rev. Rel.*, 11:6, 2008. 1
- [FK20] Christopher J. Fewster and Eleni-Alexandra Kontou. A new derivation of singularity theorems with weakened energy hypotheses. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 37(6):065010, 31, 2020. 5.1, 5.1
- [FSW95] John L. Friedman, Kristin Schleich, and Donald M. Witt. Comment on: “Topological censorship” [Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993), no. 10, 1486–1489; MR1234452 (94e:83071)]. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 75(9):1872, 1995. 1
- [Gal83] Gregory J. Galloway. Minimal surfaces, spatial topology and singularities in space-time. *J. Phys. A*, 16(7):1435–1439, 1983. 1
- [Gan75] Dennis Gannon. Singularities in nonsimply connected space-times. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 16(12):2364–2367, 1975. 1, 2.3, 5.1
- [Gan76] Dennis Gannon. On the topology of spacelike hypersurfaces, singularities, and black holes. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 7(2):219–232, 1976. 1
- [GGKS18] Melanie Graf, James D. E. Grant, Michael Kunzinger, and Roland Steinbauer. The Hawking-Penrose singularity theorem for $C^{1,1}$ -Lorentzian metrics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 360(3):1009–1042, 2018. 1, 5.1
- [GKOS01] Michael Grosser, Michael Kunzinger, Michael Oberguggenberger, and Roland Steinbauer. *Geometric theory of generalized functions with applications to general relativity*, volume 537 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001. 2.2, 2.2
- [GKS19] James D. E. Grant, Michael Kunzinger, and Clemens Sämann. Inextendibility of spacetimes and Lorentzian length spaces. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 55(1):133–147, 2019. 2.2
- [GKSS20] James D. E. Grant, Michael Kunzinger, Clemens Sämann, and Roland Steinbauer. The future is not always open. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 110(1):83–103, 2020. 2.2
- [GL18a] Gregory J. Galloway and Eric Ling. Topology and singularities in cosmological spacetimes obeying the null energy condition. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 360(2):611–617, 2018. 1
- [GL18b] Melanie Graf and Eric Ling. Maximizers in Lipschitz spacetimes are either timelike or null. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 35(8):087001, 6, 2018. 3
- [GLS18] Gregory J. Galloway, Eric Ling, and Jan Sbierski. Timelike completeness as an obstruction to C^0 -extensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 359(3):937–949, 2018. 1
- [Gra20] Melanie Graf. Singularity theorems for C^1 -Lorentzian metrics. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 378(2):1417–1450, 2020. 1, 2.2, 2.2, 2.2, 2.2, 2.2, 2.3, 3, 3, 3, 5.1, 5.1, 5.2
- [GS06] Gregory J. Galloway and Richard Schoen. A generalization of Hawking’s black hole topology theorem to higher dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 266(2):571–576, 2006. 1
- [GT87] Robert Geroch and Jennie Traschen. Strings and other distributional sources in general relativity. *Phys. Rev. D (3)*, 36(4):1017–1031, 1987. 2.2
- [Har02] Philip Hartman. *Ordinary differential equations*, volume 38 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2002. Corrected reprint of the second (1982) edition [Birkhäuser, Boston, MA; MR0658490 (83e:34002)], With a foreword by Peter Bates. 3, 3, 4
- [HE73] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis. *The large scale structure of space-time*. Cambridge University Press, London-New York, 1973. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, No. 1. 1
- [HW51] Philip Hartman and Aurel Wintner. On the problems of geodesics in the small. *Amer. J. Math.*, 73:132–148, 1951. 2.2

- [KS18] Michael Kunzinger and Clemens Sämann. Lorentzian length spaces. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 54(3):399–447, 2018. 2.2, 2.2, 4
- [KSSV14] Michael Kunzinger, Roland Steinbauer, Milena Stojković, and James A. Vickers. A regularisation approach to causality theory for $C^{1,1}$ -Lorentzian metrics. *Gen. Relativity Gravitation*, 46(8):Art. 1738, 18, 2014. 1
- [KSSV15] Michael Kunzinger, Roland Steinbauer, Milena Stojković, and James A. Vickers. Hawking’s singularity theorem for $C^{1,1}$ -metrics. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 32(7):075012, 19, 2015. 1
- [KSV15] Michael Kunzinger, Roland Steinbauer, and James A. Vickers. The Penrose singularity theorem in regularity $C^{1,1}$. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 32(15):155010, 12, 2015. 1
- [Lee76] C. W. Lee. A restriction on the topology of Cauchy surfaces in general relativity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 51(2):157–162, 1976. 1
- [LLS20] Christian Lange, Alexander Lytchak, and Clemens Sämann. Lorentz meets Lipschitz. 9 2020. 3
- [LM07] Philippe G. LeFloch and Cristinel Mardare. Definition and stability of Lorentzian manifolds with distributional curvature. *Port. Math. (N.S.)*, 64(4):535–573, 2007. 2.2
- [Min15] E. Minguzzi. Convex neighborhoods for Lipschitz connections and sprays. *Monatsh. Math.*, 177(4):569–625, 2015. 1
- [Min19] Ettore Minguzzi. Causality theory for closed cone structures with applications. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 31(5):1930001, 139, 2019. 2.2
- [MS20] Ettore Minguzzi and Ivan P. Costa e Silva. A note on causality conditions on covering spacetimes. 5 2020. 1
- [MY82] William W. Meeks, III and Shing Tung Yau. The existence of embedded minimal surfaces and the problem of uniqueness. *Math. Z.*, 179(2):151–168, 1982. 1
- [O’N83] Barrett O’Neill. *Semi-Riemannian geometry with applications to relativity*, volume 103 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York, 1983. 2, 3, 5.1, 5.1
- [Sä16] Sämann, Clemens. Global hyperbolicity for spacetimes with continuous metrics. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 17(6):1429–1455, 2016. 1, 4, 4
- [Sbi18] Jan Sbierski. The C^0 -inextendibility of the Schwarzschild spacetime and the spacelike diameter in Lorentzian geometry. *J. Differential Geom.*, 108(2):319–378, 2018. 1
- [Sbi20] Jan Sbierski. On holonomy singularities in general relativity and the $C_{loc}^{0,1}$ -inextendibility of spacetimes. 7 2020. 1
- [Shi93] Katsuhiko Shiohama. *An introduction to the geometry of Alexandrov spaces*, volume 8 of *Lecture Notes Series*. Seoul National University, Research Institute of Mathematics, Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul, 1993. 2.2
- [SS18] Clemens Sämann and Roland Steinbauer. On geodesics in low regularity. *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 968:012010, 14, 2018. 2.2
- [SV09] R. Steinbauer and J. A. Vickers. On the Geroch-Traschen class of metrics. *Classical Quantum Gravity*, 26(6):065001, 19, 2009. 2.2
- [VPE19] Mehdi Vatandoost, Rahimeh Pourkhandani, and Neda Ebrahimi. On null and causal pseudoconvex space-times. *J. Math. Phys.*, 60(1):012502, 7, 2019. 4, 4