

GEODESIC NETS ON NON-COMPACT RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

GREGORY R. CHAMBERS, YEVGENY LIOKUMOVICH, ALEXANDER NABUTOVSKY
AND REGINA ROTMAN

ABSTRACT. A geodesic flower is a finite collection of geodesic loops based at the same point p that satisfy the following balancing condition: The sum of all unit tangent vectors to all geodesic arcs meeting at p is equal to the zero vector. In particular, a geodesic flower is a stationary geodesic net.

We prove that in every complete non-compact manifold with locally convex ends there exists a non-trivial geodesic flower.

1. MAIN RESULTS.

We begin with the following definition:

Definition 1.1. Let M be a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold, and δ a positive number. Assume that there exists a finite collection of disjoint connected closed piecewise smooth hypersurfaces Σ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$, that divide M into a disjoint union of open submanifolds M_0, M_1, \dots, M_e (for some integer e) so that:

- (1) M_0 is bounded, and M_i are unbounded for all $i > 1$;
- (2) If $i > 0$, then the boundary of M_i is Σ_i . The boundary of M_0 is the union of all hypersurfaces Σ_i ;
- (3) (Locally convex ends condition) For each $i \geq 1$ there exists a positive ε such that each minimizing geodesic connecting every pair of δ -close points of Σ_i in M is, in fact, in $M_i \cup \Sigma_i$.

Then we say that M is a Riemannian manifold with δ -locally convex ends, and M_0 its core. If M has δ -locally convex ends for some $\delta > 0$, we say that M has locally convex ends.

Informally speaking, this condition means that each end of M can be cut off by a smooth bounded hypersurface that is locally convex to infinity.

We conjecture that:

Date: May 20, 2022.

Conjecture 1.1. *There exists a non-constant periodic geodesic on each complete non-compact Riemannian manifold with locally convex ends.*

To put this conjecture in proper perspective note that the well-known Fet-Lyusternik theorem asserts that there exists a periodic geodesic on each closed Riemannian manifold. However, this is no longer true in the non-compact case. The most obvious counterexamples are Euclidean spaces (or, more generally, \mathbb{R}^n endowed with any Riemannian metric of non-positive curvature.) However, it is easy to exhibit examples with non-trivial topology. For example, one can consider a surface of revolution in \mathbb{R}^3 obtained by rotating the hyperbola $z = \frac{1}{x}, x > 0$ in the XZ -plane about the Z -axis. The fundamental group of this surface is \mathbb{Z} , yet it is easy to see (using, for example, Clairaut's theorem) that there are no non-constant periodic geodesics on this surface. It is easy to see why the standard existence proof developed for the compact case does not work in this case: When we take a non-contractible closed curve and start shrinking it, the curve slides to infinity, and does not converge to any limiting closed curve.

Our main result asserts that the assumptions of this conjecture imply the existence of a closed geodesic net on the manifold, and, moreover of a geodesic flower.

Recall, that geodesic nets on M^n are critical points on the space of immersed (multi)graphs in M^n . More formally, a geodesic net N is a finite collection of points v_i on M^n (vertices of the net) and (not necessarily different) smooth geodesics γ_j starting and ending at vertices v_i of the net, where both ends of γ_j can be the same vertex, so that for each vertex v_i the sum of the unit tangent vectors at v_i to all geodesics γ_j starting at v_i is equal to the zero vector in $T_{v_i}M^n$. Here we orient all the tangent vectors to γ_j at v_i from v_i towards the other end of γ_j . The geodesics γ_i are called *edges* of a geodesic net. All periodic geodesics are geodesic nets. (One can choose the corresponding multigraph as the graph with one vertex and one edge.) Further, any union of a finite set of periodic geodesics is a geodesic net. Yet a geodesic loop is a geodesic net if and only if it is a periodic geodesic. Similarly to periodic geodesics, geodesic nets are rare: for a generic Riemannian metric on a closed manifold the set of geodesic nets is countable [St]. Density and equidistribution results for geodesic nets in Riemannian manifolds were proved recently in [LS] and [LiS].

Recently O. Chodosh and C. Mantoulidis showed [CM] that geodesic nets arising from Almgren-Pitts Min-Max theory on surfaces are closed geodesics. Very little is known about the existence of geodesic nets that are not unions of periodic geodesics. The only exception is a result of J. Hass and F. Morgan [HM] asserting that for each convex Riemannian metric on S^2 close to a round metric there exists a θ -graph shaped geodesic net. (The underlying graph consists of two vertices and three edges. In the geodesic net all edges must have non-zero length, and the stationarity condition

means that all angles between edges at each of two vertices are equal to $\frac{2\pi}{3}$). On the other hand, it has been proven in [NR] that the length of a shortest geodesic net on a closed Riemannian manifold M^n does not exceed $c(n)vol(M^n)^{\frac{1}{n}}$, where $vol(M^n)$ denotes the volume of M^n , and $c(n)$ is an (explicit) constant that depends only on the dimension. It also does not exceed $c(n)diam(M^n)$, where $diam(M^n)$ denotes the diameter of M^n . Later it had been proven in [R2] (see also a later improvement in [R3]) that these results also hold for a special class of geodesic nets, namely *geodesic flowers*. A *geodesic flower* is a geodesic net that consists of a finite number of geodesic loops based at the same point p , and the sum of all unit tangent vectors at p (as usually directed from p) is equal to the zero vector (in the tangent space T_pM^n). A geodesic flower is *non-trivial* if at least one of these geodesic loops is non-constant.

Here is our main theorem:

Theorem 1.2. Let M^n be a complete non-compact manifold with locally convex ends. Then there exists a non-trivial geodesic flower on M^n .

The literature on the existence of periodic geodesics on complete non-compact Riemannian manifold is scarce. We would like to note papers by V. Benci and F. Giannoni ([BG]) as well as L. Asselle and M. Mazzuchelli ([AM]) providing non-trivial sufficient conditions for the existence of non-constant periodic geodesic on non-compact Riemannian manifolds. These conditions prevent sliding to infinity of a cycle in the space of closed curves in a compact “core” of the manifold. In particular, they require the free loop space of the complete non-compact Riemannian manifold to be non-contractible and, moreover, have non-trivial homology classes in a high dimension.

In contrast, our result does not assume that complete non-compact Riemannian manifold has non-trivial topology and are applicable to the case of manifolds diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n . Further, the locally convex ends condition does not prevent a sliding of cycles in the space of free loops to infinity, but prevents movement of free loops from infinity to the “compact core” of the manifold. On the other hand, the main theorem in the paper of V. Bangert, [B], asserting the existence of a periodic geodesic on each complete surface of finite area is also applicable to surfaces diffeomorphic to the plane. (An earlier paper of G. Thorbergsson [T] established this result in the case of arbitrary surfaces with at least three ends, so, in fact, [B] dealt with the case of surfaces with either two or one ends. The first step in Bangert’s proof was to observe that all ends of surfaces of finite area can be cut off by appropriate geodesic loops with angles measured at the infinite side less than π . Therefore, all surfaces of finite area have locally convex ends (in the sense of our definition). In particular, Bangert’s work also implies that the conjecture above is true for complete surfaces.) The technique of Bangert is strictly two-dimensional. Note that for any $n > 2$ it is still not known whether or not every complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifold of

finite volume has a non-trivial periodic geodesic. It is also interesting to notice that if M is a complete surface that has a simple periodic geodesic bounding a domain with compact closure in M , then the convex ends condition is trivially satisfied: One can regard this geodesic as a one element set of hypersurfaces $\{\Sigma\}$.

Below we will assume that M^n is a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold with locally convex ends. We will be looking for a periodic geodesic or, more generally, a geodesic flower on M^n .

Our proof combines several main ideas.

2. ATTEMPTING AN IMPOSSIBLE FILLING.

The first idea is yet another adaptation of Gromov's technique from [Gr] based on attempting an impossible extension of the inclusion of M into a pseudo-manifold W such that $\partial W = M$ to W . In our context this idea works as follows.

To explain the argument it will be convenient to define the following spaces (the bar \bar{U} over set U denotes the closure of U):

- C_i is the cone over Σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, e$;
- $S = M_0 \cup \bigcup_i C_i$;
- CS is the cone over S ;
- M_i^c is the one point compactification of \bar{M}_i ;
- $M^c = M_0 \cup M_i^c$;
- $T = M^c / (\bigcup_i M_i^c)$.

We have the following inclusion maps:

$$\phi : (\bar{M}_0, \bigcup_i \Sigma_i) \longrightarrow (M^c, \bigcup_i M_i^c)$$

$$j : (\bar{M}_0, \bigcup_i \Sigma_i) \longrightarrow (CS, \bigcup_i C_i)$$

$$\tau : \bar{M}_0 / (\bigcup_i \Sigma_i) \longrightarrow T$$

Note that ϕ and τ induce isomorphisms on the n -th homology of pairs with \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients. Since CS is contractible, $0 = H_n(CS; \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_n(CS, \bigcup_{i=1}^e p_i; \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_n(CS, \bigcup_{i=1}^e C_i; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, where p_i denote tips of the cones C_i .

The following lemma easily follows:

Lemma 2.1. Let $\phi' : (\bar{M}_0, \bigcup_i \Sigma_i) \longrightarrow (M^c, \bigcup_i M_i^c)$ be homotopic to the inclusion ϕ . Then there exists no extension of ϕ' to $(CS, \bigcup_i C_i)$. In other words, there is no continuous map $\psi : (CS, \bigcup_i C_i) \longrightarrow (M^c, \bigcup_i M_i^c)$ such that $\phi' = \psi \circ j$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (\bar{M}_0, \bigcup_i \Sigma_i) & \xrightarrow{\phi'} & (M^c, \bigcup_i M_i^c) \xrightarrow{q} T \\
 \downarrow j & \nearrow \psi & \nearrow \tilde{\psi} \\
 (CS, \bigcup C_i) & &
 \end{array}$$

Moreover, the last assertion remains true if the continuity of ψ is replaced by a weaker condition that the composition $\tilde{\psi} : CS \rightarrow T$ of ψ with the quotient map $q : (M^c, \bigcup_i M_i^c) \rightarrow M^c / (\bigcup_i M_i^c) = T$ is continuous.

Proof. Indeed, if lemma is false, then $\phi' = \psi \circ j$, and, therefore, $q \circ \phi' = q \circ \psi \circ j = \tilde{\psi} \circ j$ is continuous, where both maps are regarded as defined on \bar{M}_0 . As both maps send $\bigcup_i \Sigma_i$ to the point m of T , they can be lifted to equal maps of $\bar{M}_0 / (\bigcup_i \Sigma_i)$. In other words, $q \circ \phi' = \tau^{-1} \circ q|_{\bar{M}_0}$, where, as we know, τ^{-1} induces the identity isomorphism of the n th homology groups with \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients. Similarly, $\tilde{\psi} \circ j$ can be represented as $\mu \circ q|_{\bar{M}_0}$ for some μ , which must coincide with τ^{-1} . But note that μ can be decomposed as $\tilde{j} : \bar{M}_0 / (\bigcup_i \Sigma_i) \rightarrow CS / (\bigcup_i C_i)$, and the map $\varrho : CS / (\bigcup_i C_i) \rightarrow T = M^c / (\bigcup_i M_i^c)$ induced by $\tilde{\psi}$. As the n th homology with \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients of $CS / (\bigcup_i C_i)$ is trivial, the induced homomorphism \tilde{j}_* is zero, and, therefore, μ_* is also trivial. But $\mu = \tau^{-1}$, and we obtain a contradiction proving the lemma. \square

Now we will sketch the plan of the proof of our main theorem by contradiction. We are going to assume that there are no geodesic flowers on M , and will try to extend the identity map ϕ to a map ψ of CS that cannot exist according to the previous lemma. Choose a very fine triangulation of $\bigcup_i \Sigma_i$, extend it to a very fine triangulation of \bar{M}_0 , and also extend it to a (not fine) triangulation of all C_i , $i \geq 1$ by adding new vertices q_i (= tips of cones C_i) and triangulating all C_i as cones over the chosen fine triangulations of bases of C_i . Finally, choose a vertex P_0 of the cone CS , and triangulate CS as the cone over just constructed triangulation of the base.

We are going to attempt the impossible extension of ϕ to ψ . We map P_0 to any vertex p in the fine triangulation of \bar{M}_0 in M_0 , q_i to any vertex v_i of the fine triangulation of Σ_i . Map all 1-dimensional simplices of S that connect q_i with a vertex v of Σ_i to a minimizing geodesic on Σ_i in its intrinsic metric that connects v_i and v . Observe that 1-skeleta of all n -dimensional simplices of S with a vertex at q_i will be on Σ_i . We are going to map all “new” 1-simplices of CS with one vertex at P_0 to a minimal geodesic in the intrinsic metric of \bar{M}_0 that connects p and this vertex (or p and v_i , if the vertex is q_i). Observe that 1-skeleta of all $(n + 1)$ -dimensional simplices of CS will be in \bar{M}_0 .

A natural idea is to continue extending ψ inductively to 2-skeleta, then to 3-skeleta, etc. Instead, we assume that M_0 does not have any geodesic flowers and *immediately* extend the inclusion of the 1-skeleton of each $(n + 1)$ -dimensional simplex of CS

into M to the map of the whole simplex. We do this using the idea of “filling of cages” from [R1]. This idea will be described in details in the next two sections. The description of “filling of cages” in the next two sections will immediately imply that the image of each n -simplex with vertex at q_i in S will be in \bar{M}_i , $i \geq 1$.

Here we only note that we would like to be able to eventually extend maps of the 1-skeleton of the standard $(m+1)$ -dimensional simplex Δ^{m+1} for each $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ to its interior. The extension must map the interior to M^c . If the 1-skeleton is mapped to one of \bar{M}_i (for example, to Σ_i), then the extension maps the whole simplex to M_i^c . The restriction of each of these extensions to the 1-skeleton of any $(l+1)$ -dimensional face of Δ^{m+1} must be the extension of the restriction. We want these extensions only for maps ψ , where the length of the image of each side of Δ^{m+1} does not exceed $\tilde{L} = \max\{Diam(\bar{M}_0), \max_{j \geq 1} Diam(\partial M_j)\}$, where all the diameters are calculated with respect to the inner metrics. Finally, mention that very small cages must be filled by very small simplices.

Combining all the extensions for all $(n+1)$ -dimensional simplices of the triangulation of CS , we will obtain a map $\psi : CS \rightarrow M^c$. We would like to argue that Lemma 2.1 yields a contradiction that refutes the assumption that there are no geodesic flowers on M . Yet a minor technical difficulty is that the restriction of ψ to \bar{M}_0 is not the identity map on $\Sigma_i \subset S$ as in the conditions of Lemma 2.1. (So, the composition of j and ψ is not the inclusion ϕ .) This happens because the fillings of 1-skeleta of very small simplices σ^{n-1} of the triangulations of Σ_i will be not σ^{n-1} but very close very small $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplices contained in a small collar of Σ_i in M_i . For each i there will be an obvious homotopy between the restriction of ψ to Σ_i and the inclusion map of Σ_i to M that will move all points in the fillings of 1-skeleta of small simplices triangulating Σ_i via normals to Σ_i to Σ_i inside M_i . This homotopy can be extended to a homotopy between the restriction of ψ' to \bar{M}_0 and the inclusion of \bar{M}_0 to M . Hence, applying Lemma 2.1 with $\phi = \psi|_{\bar{M}_0}$ homotopic to the inclusion ϕ we obtain the desired contradiction.

3. CAGES AND THEIR FILLINGS.

3.1. Cages, flowers, fillings. The content of this section follows [R1], adapting one of the ideas to our situation. For each $i = 2, 3, \dots, n+1$ define an i -cage in M as a map of the 1-skeleton of the standard i -dimensional simplex σ^i to M , where each edge is mapped into a broken geodesic. If this map is constant, we call the cage *a constant cage*. We extend the class of all constant cages, and, thus, all cages by allowing constant cages that map the 1-skeleton of σ^i to one of e points at infinity of M^c . Thus, formally speaking, cages map the 1-skeleta of simplices to M^c , but the image of each non-constant cage is required to be in M . We are assuming that the vertices of σ^i form a totally ordered set (the ordering might come from a numbering

of the vertices by numbers $1, \dots, N + 1$.) Denote the space of all i -cages in M by $Cage_i$. Note that for each j -dimensional face of σ^i the restriction of an i -cage k to the 1-skeleton of σ^i is a j -cage. We will call such j -cages *subcages* or j -*subcages* of k .

We will also need a special class of i -cages that we will call *flowers*. Consider the vertex v of an i -cage with the highest number. Assume that *all* edges (=1-simplices) incident to v are mapped to the same point. Thus, such cages can be also defined as maps of $\frac{i(i-1)}{2}$ circles to M . In fact, some of these circles can also be mapped to a point. We use notation $Flwr_k$ for maps of the wedge of k loops to M . As we just observed, there are natural inclusions $Flwr_{\frac{i(i-1)}{2}} \subset Cage_i$, and $Flwr_j \subset Flwr_i$ for $j \leq i$. Recall, that a set $C \subset M$ is δ -locally convex, if for all $x, y \in C$ that are δ -close in M all minimizing geodesics in M between x and y are contained in C . For each $L \in (0, \infty)$ let $Cage_i^L$ denote the subset of $Cage_i$ formed by all cages of length $\leq L$, $Cage_i^\infty$, by definition, coincides with $Cage_i$. Similarly, $Flwr_j^\infty = Flwr_j$, and for each $L \in (0, \infty)$ $Flwr_j^L$ denotes a subset of $Flwr_j$ formed by all j -flowers of length $\leq L$.

Definition 3.1. Given $\delta > 0$, and $L \in (0, \infty]$ a *strong filling* of $(n+1)$ -cages of length $\leq L$ is a family of continuous maps $H_i : Cage_i^L \times [0, 1] \rightarrow Cage_i$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, n+1\}$ such that:

- (1) For each i -cage k $H_i(k, 0) = k$ and $H_i(k, 1)$ is a constant cage. In other words, H_i is a contraction of $Cage_i^L$ inside $Cage_i$ to its subspace formed by all constant cages.
- (2) If the image of an i -cage k is in a δ -locally convex subset V of M (in particular, k might be in the closure of M_j for some j), then its trajectory $H(k, t)$, $t \in [0, 1)$ will be in V .
- (3) If k is a constant i -cage, then $H_i(k, t) = k$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.
- (4) If $k \in Flwr_j^L \subset Flwr_{\frac{i(i-1)}{2}}^L \subset Cage_i^L$, ($j \leq \frac{i(i-1)}{2}$), then for $H_i(k, t) \in Flwr_j$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

The importance of this notion lies in the following proposition:

Proposition 3.2. Assume that M admits a strong filling of cages for some $\delta > 0$ and $L \in (0, \infty]$. Let k be an i -cage in M of length $\leq L$, $L < \infty$, for some $i = 2, 3, \dots, n+1$. Then:

- (1) There exists a continuous map $\phi = \phi(k)$ of the i -simplex σ^i to M^c extending k . Further, the dependence of ϕ on k is continuous (that is, the restriction of $\phi(k)$ to the 1-skeleton of σ^i is equal to k).
- (2) Let σ^j be a j -dimensional face of σ^i , $2 \leq j < i$, k_j the corresponding j -subcage of σ^i . Then $\phi(k_j)$ coincides with the restriction of $\phi(k)$ to σ^j .
- (3) If the image of k (or one of its j -dimensional subcages k_j) is in a closed δ -locally convex subset of M (in particular, it might be in the closure of M_m for

some $m = 1, \dots, e$), the same will be true for the image of ϕ (correspondingly, the restriction of ϕ to the j -dimensional face σ^j of σ^i corresponding to k_j .)

Proof. The proof uses the induction with respect to i . To prove the base note that 2-cages are boundaries of 2-simplices, and for each 2-cage k map H_2 provides the extension of the map of the boundary of the 2-simplex to its interior. Moreover, the second property of H_2 implies that if k is in the closure of M_m , then its whole trajectory will be in M_m^c .

Now we prove the induction step. Assume that the proposition holds for all $i \leq I$. In order to prove it for $i = I + 1$ consider an i -cage k and the one-parametric family of i -cages $k_t = H_i(k, t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Each i -cage k_t has $(i + 1)$ of $(i - 1)$ -subcages $k_t(l)$, $l = 1, \dots, i + 1$ corresponding to the $(i - 1)$ -dimensional faces of the i -simplex σ^i . Applying the induction assumption extend each $k_t(l)$ to the map $\phi(k_t(l))$ of the $(i - 1)$ -dimensional simplex σ^{i-1} . Together these $i + 1$ maps provide the extension of k_t to the boundary of the σ^i . When t varies in $[0, 1)$, these extensions provide the extension of k to σ^i minus a point C at the center of σ^i , which is then mapped to $H_i(k, 1)$. The continuity of the constructed extension at C follows from property (3) of cage fillings and the continuity of H_{i-1} . This completes the proof of (1).

Now observe that for $j = i - 1$ (2) follows immediately from the construction of k , and for $j = i - l$ immediately follows from this observation and the induction assumption. Finally, (3) follows from property (2) of fillings of cages. \square

Definition 3.3. A (weak) filling of cages in $Cage_{n+1}^L$ is defined exactly as the strong filling with the only distinction that the requirement of continuity of maps H_i is replaced by a weaker requirement that only the compositions of H_i with the quotient map $M^c \rightarrow T = M^c / (\bigcup_i M_i^c)$ are continuous.

Proposition 3.4. Assume that M admits a (weak) filling of cages for some $L \in (0, \infty]$ and $\delta > 0$. Let $k \in Cage_i^L$ be an i -cage in M for some $i = 2, 3, \dots, n + 1$. Then:

- (1) There exists a map $\phi = \phi(k)$ of the i -simplex σ^i to M^c extending k . The composition $\tilde{\phi}$ of ϕ with the quotient map $M^c \rightarrow T$ is continuous. Further, the dependence of ϕ on k becomes continuous after projecting to T .
- (2) Let σ^j be a j -dimensional face of σ^i , ($2 \leq j < i$), k_j the corresponding j -subcage of σ^i . Then $\phi(k_j)$ coincides with the restriction of $\phi(k)$ to σ^j .
- (3) Moreover, if the image of k (or one of its j -dimensional subcages k_j) is in a closed convex or δ -locally convex subset of M (in particular, it might be in the closure of M_m for some $m = 1, \dots, e$), the same will be true for the image of ϕ (correspondingly, the restriction of ϕ to the j -dimensional face σ^j of σ^i corresponding to k_j .)

This proposition can be proven exactly as the previous one.

Strong and weak fillings of flowers are defined exactly as strong/weak fillings of cages. In fact, the definition of fillings of cages implies that its restriction to flowers is a filling of flowers. In section 3.2 we will demonstrate that, vice versa, given a filling of flowers we can easily extend it to fillings of cages.

We would like to finish this section by observing that combining the previous proposition with the results in the previous section we obtain the following proposition:

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be a complete non-compact n -dimensional manifold with locally convex ends. There exists $\delta_0 > 0$, $L_0 > 0$, such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ and $L \in [L_0, \infty)$ there is no weak filling of cages of length $\leq L$.*

Proof. Consider the triangulation of CS and a map ψ from the 1-skeleton of CS to M^c described in the previous section. If there exists a filling of cages, then by Proposition 3.4 we can extend ψ to a map defined on all of C , such that the composition $q \circ \psi$ is continuous. Moreover, the restriction of ψ to \overline{M}_0 is homotopic to the inclusion map ϕ . By Lemma 2.1 we obtain a contradiction. \square

3.2. From cages to flowers. Recall that some edges of a cage can be mapped by means of a constant map. Of course, in this case both endpoints are mapped to the same point. It can happen that a set of edges forming a spanning tree of a cage is being mapped to the same point p of M . In this case all vertices of the cage are mapped to p , and all other edges become loops based at p . (Some of these loops can also be constant.) Recall, that we call such cages with one vertex *flowers*, and their non-constant loops *petals*.

Our next observation is that:

Lemma 3.2. *There exists a deformation retraction of the space of i -cages to the space of flowers with at most $\frac{i(i-1)}{2}$ petals with the following properties:*

- (1) *The image of a cage in M does not change during this deformation.*
- (2) *If the lengths of all edges of a cage do not exceed l , then the lengths of all edges of the cage during the deformation (including the flower at the end of the deformation) do not exceed $3l$. Therefore, the lengths of all cages during the deformation do not exceed $\frac{i(i-1)}{2}l$.*

Remark. This deformation is unconditional, that is, it does not require any assumptions about M .

Proof. The idea is very simple. All vertices of a cage are numerated. We just move all vertices but the one with the maximal number to the vertex with the maximal number, v_{max} , along the corresponding edge of the cage. The speed is constant, and chosen so that the all vertices will collide with the maximal one at the moment $t = 1$. All edges between v_i and v_{max} shrink and become constant at $t = 1$. On the other

hand the segments $v_i(0)v_i(t)$ and $v_j(0)v_j(t)$ that are being eliminated from v_iv_{max} and v_jv_{max} , correspondingly, are being added to the edge v_iv_j at both ends of v_iv_j . So, at the moment t the edge between $v_i(t)$ and $v_j(t)$ will be the join of the three segments $v_i(t)v_i$, v_iv_j and $v_jv_j(t)$. \square

We make these deformation retractions the initial “halves” of H_i , and it will remain to “fill” only the resulting flowers. (This means that given an i -cage we use the interval $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ of time to deform this cage to a flower with the same image as in the proof of the previous lemma. We are going to use the remaining time to “fill” the resulting flower.) So, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *Given a weak (correspondingly, strong) filling of flowers in $Flwr_j$, $j \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$, there exists a weak (correspondingly strong) filling of $(n+1)$ -cages. If L is finite, then given a weak (correspondingly, strong) filling of flowers k in $Flwr_j^{nL}$, $j \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ via intermediate flowers $H(k, t)$ with length $\leq nL$, there exists a weak (correspondingly, strong) filling of $(n+1)$ -cages of length $\leq L$ (via cages of length $\leq nL$).*

Remark: Our definition of filling of cages does not contain any restrictions for lengths of intermediate cages. Yet below we will be discussing a weak length non-increasing filling of flowers of bounded length. The last assertion means that the existence of a weak filling of $(n+1)$ -cages follows from the existence of a weak filling of flowers of length bounded by a larger value nL via flowers of length bounded by the same constant. (The exact value of this larger value is not important for us, any $c(n, L)$ instead of nL will work for us.)

Combining the previous corollary with Lemma 3.1 we see that:

Lemma 3.4. *Let M be a complete non-compact n -dimensional manifold with locally convex ends. There exists $\delta_0 > 0$, $L_0 > 0$, such that for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ and $L \in [L_0, \infty)$ there does NOT exist a weak filling of flowers of length $\leq L$.*

3.3. Flows on cages and fillings. Everything that we will say in this section about cages can be verbatim repeated for flowers. We will start from the following definition.

In order to prove our main theorem, we would like to consider curve-shortening flow on cages of length $\leq L$ for some L , yet we need a weaker notion. Assume that M is a complete non-compact manifold with locally convex ends (as in Definition 1.1). Recall that $M^c \setminus M$ is a finite collection of points. Namely, it contains one point q_i for each end M_i . Let $cage_i^L$ denote $Cage_i^L \setminus \cup_j \{q_j\}$, where q_j are regarded as constant i -cages. One can map some pairs (k, t) outside of the open L -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 to points in $M^c \setminus M$ (regarded as constant cages not in $cage_i^L$) subject to the following conditions:

Definition 3.5. Assume that M is as in definition 1.1, and L is finite. A weak L -curve-shortening flow on n -cages on M is a family of maps $F_i : cage_i^L \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow Cage_i^L = cage_i^L \cup M^c \setminus M$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that for all $k, t, s > 0$ $F_i(F_i(k, t), s) = F_i(k, t + s)$ as long as the images of all F_i in this formula are in $Cage_i^L$ and that satisfies the following properties:

- (0.1) F_i is continuous on $F_i^{-1}(cage_i^L)$;
- (0.2) Assume that for some $k \in cage_i^L$ and for all positive t $F_i(k, t) = q_j$ for some j . Then k is contained in M_j and has empty intersection with the closed L -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 . On the other hand, there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that for each $k \in cage_i^L$ contained in M_j , $j > 0$, such that k does not intersect the closed $(L + \varepsilon_1)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 , $F_i(k, t) = q_j$ for all $t > 0$.
- (0.3) If $F_i(k, t) = q_j$, then for all $T > t$ $F_j(k, T) = q_j$.
- (1) F_i is length non-increasing, i.e. for each $k \in cage_i$ and t_1, t_2 such that $t_1 < t_2$, the length of $F_i(k, t_2)$ does not exceed the length of $F_i(k, t_1)$. Moreover, if k is not a stationary cage (in particular, not a constant cage), then the length of $F_i(k, t)$ is strictly less than the length of k for all positive t .
- (2) Let k be a non-stationary non-constant i -cage. Then there exists an open neighbourhood U of k in the space of i -cages and positive λ and ε such that for each i -cage $k_1 \in U$ $length(k_1) - length(F_i(k_1, \lambda)) \geq \varepsilon$.
- (3) If an i -cage k is a j -flower, then for all t $F_i(k, t)$ is a j -flower (possibly q_j regarded as a j -flower).
- (4) If k is stationary (possibly a point), then $F_i(k, t) = k$ for all t .
- (5) For each point p different from points q_j there exists $r = r(p) > 0$ such that if an i -cage k is contained in the metric ball of radius $\varrho \leq r$ centered at p , then for some $t = t(\varrho, p) > 0$ $F_i(k, t)$ is a constant cage (= a point). Moreover, this point is not one of the points q_j , and $\lim_{\varrho \rightarrow 0} t(\varrho, p) = 0$.
- (6) If C is either M_j for $j \geq 1$ or a convex metric disc centered at a point $x \in \bar{M}_0$ of radius $< conv(x)$, and $k \in C$, then $F_i(k, t)$ is in C for all values of t . Here $conv(x)$ denotes the convexity radius of M at x .

Lemma 3.6. *Let F be a curve-shortening flow on $(n + 1)$ -cages of length $\leq L$ on a complete non-compact Riemannian manifold M^n with locally convex ends M_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Assume that M^n does not contain a non-trivial stationary i -cages for all $\leq n + 1$. Then there exists a weak filling $H_i : Cage_i^L \times [0, 1] \rightarrow M^c$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n + 1\}$.*

Proof. If $k = q_j$, the $H_i(k, t) = q_j$ for all t . Now, it is sufficient to consider only cages $k \in cage_i^L$.

Step 1. For each i -cage k of length $\leq L$ there exists $t = t(k)$ such that $F_i(k, t)$ is a point (possibly, one of the points q_j , $j \geq 1$).

Indeed, the alternative is that there exists an unbounded increasing sequence t_m such that $F_i(k, t_m)$ is not a point. Therefore, these cages of length $\leq L$ are in the closed $(L+\varepsilon_1)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 . Pass to the limit of an appropriate subsequence. This limit, k_∞ , cannot be a point, as in this case for a sufficiently large $F_i(k, t_m)$ will be in a small neighbourhood of this point, and the flow will contract $F_i(k, t_m)$ to a point different from q_j in a finite time. If k_∞ is a non-trivial closed curve, then property (2) implies that the flow will simultaneously decrease the lengths of curve $F_i(k, t_m)$ for all sufficiently large m in time λ by at least $\varepsilon > 0$. Yet lengths of $F_i(k, t)$ decrease to the infimum equal to the length of k_∞ , and we obtain a contradiction.

Step 2. For each i here exists $T = T(i)$ such that for all i -cages k of length $\leq L$ either $F(k, T)$ is a point, or its image does not intersect \bar{M}_0 .

Assume that there exists an infinite sequence of i -cages k_m of length $\leq L$ and an unbounded increasing sequence of times t_m so that $F_i(k_m, t_m)$ is not a point. This implies that all k_m are in the (compact) closed $(L+\varepsilon_1)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 . Passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we can assume that the sequence k_m converges to an i -cage k_* . If k_* is a point (that cannot be one of points q_j), then all sufficiently large values of m k_m will be in a fixed small neighbourhood of this point. Now property (5) of the definition above implies that the flow contracts all of them to points in a uniformly bounded time, and we obtain a contradiction. If k_* is not a point, but the flow contracts k_* to a point p different from all q_j , then at some moment of time t and all sufficiently large m $F_i(k_m, t)$ will be in a fixed small neighbourhood of p , and property (5) in the definition again yields the contradiction. It remains to consider the case when the flow contracts k_* to one of the points q_j . In a finite (possibly zero) time the flow moves k_* out of the closed L -neighbourhood of \bar{M} , yet we choose this moment of time t_* so that $F(k_*, t_*)$ is not yet q_j . Therefore, for some m_0 and all $m > m_0$ $F(k_m, t_*)$ are also not in the closed L -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 . Therefore, none of $F_i(k_m, t_*)$ intersect \bar{M}_0 . For $l = 1, \dots, m_0$ choose $t_l = t(k_l)$ so that $F_i(k_l, t_l)$ is a point. Now define T as $\max\{t_*, t_1, \dots, t_{m_0}\}$.

Step 3. Now we can define the weak fillings as follows. For each i define $H_i(k, t)$ as $F_i(k, T(i)t)$ for all $t < 1$. If $F_i(k, T(i))$ is a point different from all points q_j , we define $H_i(k, 1)$ as the constant cage p . Finally, if $H_i(k, T(i))$ does not intersect \bar{M}_0 , it is contained in some M_j for some $j = j(k) > 1$. In this case we define $F_i(k, 1)$ as q_j .

□

In the next section we are going to prove that:

Theorem 3.7. *Let M^n be a complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with δ -locally convex ends for some positive δ . Assume that there is no non-trivial geodesic flower on M^n . Then there for each finite L and each N there exists a weak curve-shortening flow on N -cages of length $\leq L$ on M^n .*

Combining this theorem with Lemma 3.4 and the flower version of the previous lemma, we obtain Theorem 1.2. Thus, it remains only to prove Theorem 3.7. We are going to do this in the next section.

4. WEAK CURVE-SHORTENING FLOW ON SPACES OF FLOWERS

In this section we prove Theorem 3.7. We construct a weak curve shortening flow on the space of L -flowers. All flowers outside of the $(L + 2\delta)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M} will be immediately sent to one of points q_l at infinity in the same component of the complement of \bar{M}_0 . Therefore, it is sufficient to consider L -flowers in the $(L + 2\delta)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 . Our description of this flow will be an adaptation of the process described in [NR] for cages on closed Riemannian manifolds, and does not contain any new ideas.

Let i_1 denotes the infimum of the injectivity radii of points of M in this set, and I denotes $\max\{\delta/2, i_1/4\}$. Let N denote the integer part of $\frac{L}{I}$. Given a flower of length $\leq L$, we observe that the length of each petal does not exceed L . Consider first the obvious length-nonincreasing deformation of the space of all L -flowers in the $(L + \delta)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M} into the space of broken geodesic flowers with each petal subdivided into $N + 1$ segments of equal length $\leq I$ by exactly N intermediate points: One first subdivides the petal into $N + 1$ arcs of equal length using N intermediate points. Then one connects pairs of consecutive points by (unique) minimizing geodesics. If the initial curve was outside of M_0 , then the δ -convexity of the complement of M_0 implies that the new curve will be outside of M_0 . Note that replacing each broken geodesic segment of the original curve by the minimal geodesic segment in the new curve cannot increase the length. We can connect the old curve and the new curve by a length non-increasing homotopy by following the $N + 1$ arcs of the original petal for shorter and shorter periods of time and then following the minimal geodesic to the end point of the arc. This stage is similar to analogous stage in the Birkhoff curve shortening process. Therefore, we will call it *Birkhoff deformation*.

Such flowers are completely determined by the coordinates of the base point of the flower and $N \times$ the number of petals of the flowers. From now on we can identify considered flowers with a subset of $(M^n)^K$, where K is $1 + N \times$ the number of the petals, where "1" corresponds to the base point of the flower. The flow will mostly consist of stages during which we flow K points that determine the flowers along trajectory of a vector field on a domain in $(M^n)^K$. Yet, we do not want distances between pairs of points that are supposed to be connected by the unique minimizing geodesic to grow too much. It will be immediately clear from the construction of this field that the speed of movement of each point will not exceed $2(n+1)$. Therefore, we plan to stop after each time interval of length $\frac{I}{10n}$. This guarantees that the distances

between consecutive points will still be less than δ , and less than $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Therefore, the corresponding points will uniquely determine a flower. Right after stopping the flow we check if the curve is outside of L -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 . If it is, it will be immediately mapped by the flow to the corresponding point at infinity q_j and will stay there forever. Then we perform the Birkhoff deformation, that will again drop the distances between consecutive points on petals to less than I . At the end of the Birkhoff deformation we again check if the resulting curve is outside the L -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 , and map it to the corresponding point at infinity, if it is outside.

Now we are going to describe the vector field on the considered domain of $(M^n)^K$. We are going to describe it on several overlapping open subsets covering the considered domain, and then combine these vector fields into one vector field by using a subordinate partition of unity.

We are first going to describe the flow on flowers where all petals are “not too small”, where “not too small” means that the petal is not contained in $\frac{a}{2}$ -neighbourhood of the base point of the flower for some small a that will be defined later.

The vector field depends on positions of all K points that determine the flower. For each of these points p consider the adjacent geodesic segments on all petals that contain p . The number of these segments will be equal to $2 \times$ the number of petals for the base point and 2 for each of the remaining $K - 1$ points. For each of these geodesic segments consider the unit tangent vector at p directed from p and sum up all these vectors. The result will be a vector $V = V(p)$ in the tangent space $T_p M^n$ of M^n at p . These K vectors will form the vector field at the point of $(M^n)^K$ that corresponds to the considered flower, and will be used to deform it. The first variation formula for the length functional implies that the time derivative of the length functional of the flower at $t = 0$ will be equal to $-\sum_p \|V(p)\|^2$, where we sum over all K points p that determine the flower. Thus, the deformation will be length non-increasing, and will be length decreasing unless all petals of the flower are geodesics, and the flower is a stationary geodesic flower. As we assumed that there are no stationary geodesic flowers, the deformation will be uniformly length decreasing. Further, assume that the base point of the flower is on the boundary of M_0 , yet all adjacent endpoints of geodesic segments are outside of M_0 . Then all the tangent vectors at the base point are outside of M_0 , and so is their sum. Thus, a flower outside of M_0 cannot, even partially, enter M_0 when deformed along this vector field.

Now consider all flowers where ALL petals are in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the base point b . In this case the base point does not move, and the remaining $K - 1$ points move along the unique minimizing geodesics to the base point. (In other words, the component of the vector field corresponding to the base point is the zero tangent vector, for all other points p the components of the vector field at p

are unit tangent vectors to the minimizing geodesics connecting p and b and directed towards b . The size of the neighbourhood does not exceed I , and is chosen so that the flow is length-decreasing. It is easy to see that one can choose the uniform size of such neighbourhoods over all points b in the closed $(L + 2\delta)$ -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0 .

If some petals are very close to the base point, the remaining l petals are not, we move the flower as if it is a flower with just the l "long" petals. We calculate the vector field at the base point and all intermediate points on long petals as above (that is, as the sums of the unit tangent vectors to all incident geodesic segments). The tangent vectors to short petals are not included into the sum at the base point. The components of the vector field at N points p on each short petal are then calculated as follows: First, consider the vector $V(b)$ calculated for the base point b as the sum of unit tangent vectors to arcs of all long petals adjacent to b . (Each long petal contributes two unit tangent vectors at both its endpoints that coincide with b). Consider the unique minimizing geodesic between b and p and parallel translate $V(b)$ to p along this geodesic. Denote the result by V_1 . Let V_2 denote the unit tangent vector at p to the geodesic between p and b . We direct this vector towards b . Define $V(p)$ as $V_1 + V_2$. Looking at holonomies for geodesic triangles $bp_i p_{i+1}$, where p_i, p_{i+1} are adjacent points on all short geodesic segments along "short" petals, we see that there exists $a > 0$ such that if all "short" petals are in the a -neighbourhood of the base point (and the base point is in the L -neighbourhood of \bar{M}_0), then the first variation of the length for the flow defined by this vector field will be negative.

Now we can consider a covering of the set of all consider K -tuples of points in M^n by the open neighbourhoods of strata that correspond to degenerate flowers where some or all petals are constant as well as an open set corresponding to flowers where all petals are "long" (or, more precisely, not contained in a small neighbourhood of the base point). Now we can use a subordinate partition of unity to combine the constructed vector fields on open sets into one vector field. The flow along this vector field will be length-decreasing.

Acknowledgements. This work was started during the authors' visit to the Bernoulli Center of the EPFL in Summer 2017. Another part of this work was done while two of the authors (Alexander Nabutovsky and Regina Rotman) visited the Max Planck Institute of Mathematics in June-July, 2021. The authors would like to thank both the Bernoulli Center of the EPFL and the Max Planck Institute of Mathematics for their kind hospitality.

The research of Yevgeny Liokumovich was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1711053 and NSERC Discovery grant RGPAS-2019-00085.

The research of Alexander Nabutovsky was partially supported by his NSERC Discovery Grant RGPIN-2017-06068. The research of Regina Rotman was partially supported by her NSERC Discovery Grant RGPIN-2018-04523.

The research of Gregory R. Chambers was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1906543.

REFERENCES

- [B] V. BANGERT, Closed Geodesics on Complete Surfaces, *Math. Ann.* 251(1)(1980), 83-96.
- [Gr] M. GROMOV, Filling Riemannian manifolds, *J. Diff. Geom.* 18 (1983), 1-147.
- [BG] V. BENCI, F. GIANNONI, On the existence of closed geodesics on non-compact Riemannian manifolds, *Duke Math. J.* 68(2)(1992), 195-215.
- [AM] L. ASSELLE, M. MAZZUCHELLI, On the existence of infinitely many closed geodesics on non-compact manifolds, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 145 (2017), 2689-2697.
- [CM] O. CHODOSH, C. MANTOULIDIS, The p-widths of surfaces, arXiv:2107.11684.
- [HM] J. HASS, F. MORGAN, Geodesic nets on the 2-sphere, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 124(12)(1996), 3843-3850.
- [LiS] X. LI AND B. STAFFA On the equidistribution of closed geodesics and geodesic nets, preprint.
- [LS] Y. LIOKUMOVICH, B. STAFFA, Generic density of geodesic nets, arXiv:2107.12340.
- [NR] A. NABUTOVSKY, R. ROTMAN, Volume, diameter and the minimal mass of a stationary 1-dimensional cycle, *Geom. Functional Anal. (GAFA)*, 14(2004), 748-790.
- [R1] R. ROTMAN, The length of a shortest geodesic loop at a point, *J. Differential Geom.*, 78:3(2008), 497-519.
- [R2] R. ROTMAN, Flowers on Riemannian manifolds, *Math. Z.* 269(2011), 543-554.
- [R3] R. ROTMAN, Wide short geodesic loops on closed Riemannian manifolds, arXiv:1910.01772.
- [St] B. STAFFA, Bumpy metrics theorem for stationary geodesic nets, arXiv:2107.12446 .

Gregory R. Chambers
 Department of Mathematics,
 Rice University,
 MS-136, Box 1892
 Houston, TX 77251, USA
 gchambers@rice.edu

Yevgeny Liokumovich
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Toronto
 Toronto, Ontario M5S2E4
 Canada
 ylio@math.toronto.edu

Alexander Nabutovsky
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Toronto
 Toronto, Ontario M5S2E4
 Canada
 alex@math.toronto.edu

Regina Rotman
 Department of Mathematics
 University of Toronto
 Toronto, Ontario M5S 2E4
 Canada
 rina@math.toronto.edu