

**SYMMETRIC ORTHOGONALITY AND NON-EXPANSIVE  
PROJECTIONS IN METRIC SPACES**

MARTIN KELL

ABSTRACT. In this paper known results of symmetric orthogonality, as introduced by G. Birkhoff, and non-expansive nearest point projections are extended from the linear to the metric setting. If the space has non-positive curvature in the sense Busemann then it is shown that those concepts are actually equivalent. In the end it is shown that every space having non-positive curvature in the sense of Busemann is a  $CAT(0)$ -space provided that its tangent cones are uniquely geodesic and their nearest point projections onto convex are non-expansive.

Orthogonality in the Euclidean setting can be described either by an angle condition or by a nearest point projection property using Pythagoras' theorem. More precisely, one says a geodesic  $\gamma$  intersects a geodesic  $\eta$  orthogonally if the intersection point  $p$  is the closest point of  $\gamma_1$  on  $\eta$ . We denote this by  $\gamma \perp_p \eta$ . It is not difficult to see that in the Euclidean setting  $\gamma$  intersects  $\eta$  orthogonally if and only if  $\eta$  intersects  $\gamma$  orthogonally. Hence Euclidean spaces are said to have the *symmetric orthogonality property (SO)*.

For general normed spaces the orthogonality condition in terms of projections appeared the first time in Birkhoff's work [Bir35, Theorem 2]. He showed that the only higher dimensional Banach spaces having symmetric orthogonalities are Hilbert spaces. Later the symmetric orthogonality property appeared again in the setting of Hilbert geometries [KP52] where it was called symmetric perpendicularity. More recently, it appeared in the metric setting under the name of property (B) in [Kuw13].

An essential ingredient to obtain the non-expansive behavior for gradient flows of convex functionals in spaces having non-positive curvature in the sense of Alexandrov is the fact that nearest point projections onto convex sets are themselves non-expansive. This result is well-known for Hilbert spaces. In fact, Kakutani [Kak39, Theorem 3] showed that Hilbert spaces are the only higher dimensional Banach spaces having *non-expansive projections* onto convex sets. This result was rediscovered later by Phelps [Phe57, Theorem 5.2]. Subsequently, it was generalized to Hadamard manifolds and  $CAT(0)$ -spaces, see bibliographic remarks of [Bač14, Chapter 2 & 5].

The non-expansive projection property (NE) can be also used to prove a *convexity principle*, a kind of generalized maximum principle for harmonic maps into non-positively curved spaces. More precisely, if  $h : M \rightarrow N$  is harmonic, i.e. a local minimizer of the Dirichlet energy, then  $h(M)$  is contained in the closed convex hull of  $h(\partial M)$ . Indeed, this follows from the non-expansive projection property and the fact that the Dirichlet energy  $E$  satisfies  $E(\pi_C \circ f) \leq E(f)$  whenever  $f|_{\partial M} = h|_{\partial M}$ ,

see [Jos94, Chapter 8]. Here  $\pi_C$  denotes the nearest point projection onto the convex hull  $C$ , i.e.

$$\pi_C(z) = \{z_C \in C \mid d(z, z_C) = \inf_{z' \in C} d(z, z')\}.$$

Using projection one readily verifies that  $\gamma \perp_p \eta$  holds whenever  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  intersect in  $p$  and satisfy  $p \in \pi_\eta(\gamma_1)$ .

In this note we show that the concepts of non-expansive projections (*NE*) and symmetric orthogonalities (*SO*) are strongly related. Indeed, Proposition 17 shows that having non-expansive projections implies the symmetric orthogonality property. Note that the opposite is wrong as can be observed on a small convex domain of the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$ .

Assuming a form of non-positive curvature assumption introduced by Busemann we are able to prove the following equivalence between the two conditions.

**Theorem 1** (see Lemma 14 and Theorem 18). *Assume  $(M, d)$  is a complete Busemann convex geodesic space, i.e. for all geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  with  $\gamma_0 = \eta_0$  it holds*

$$d(\gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}, \eta_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2}d(\gamma_1, \eta_1).$$

*Then the following properties are equivalent:*

- (PROPERTY (*SO*)) *For all geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  with  $\gamma_0 = \eta_0$  it holds*

$$\gamma \perp_{\gamma_0} \eta \iff \eta \perp_{\gamma_0} \gamma.$$

- (PROPERTY (*A*)) *Whenever  $\gamma$  is geodesic and  $x \in M$  then for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $x_C \in \pi_\gamma(x)$  it holds*

$$d(x_C, \gamma_t) \leq d(x, \gamma_t).$$

- (PROPERTY (*NE*)) *Whenever  $C$  is a closed convex set and  $x, y \in M$  then for all  $x_C \in \pi_C(x)$  and  $y_C \in \pi_C(y)$  it holds*

$$d(x_C, y_C) \leq d(x, y).$$

In the following  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  denotes the metric space  $(M \times \mathbb{R}, \tilde{d})$  equipped with the metric  $\tilde{d}((x, t), (y, s))^2 = d(x, y)^2 + |t - s|^2$ . Though the properties of the theorem above suggest that the space in question has well-defined angles, this turns out to be wrong. Indeed, Birkhoff showed there is an abundance of strictly convex norms on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  having symmetric orthogonalities [Bir35].

Observe, however, that whenever  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  has symmetric orthogonalities for a normed space  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|)$  then by Birkhoff's result  $\mathbb{R}^2 \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  and thus  $\mathbb{R}^2$  must be Euclidean. Hence the symmetric orthogonality property is not stable under taking products. If we can ensure that tangent spaces are still uniquely geodesic then we obtain the following characterization by assuming a stable version of either the symmetric orthogonality property or the non-expansive projection property.

**Theorem 2** (see Theorem 19). *Assume  $(M, d)$  and all its tangent space  $(T_x^{(o)} M, d_x)$  are Busemann convex geodesic spaces. If  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  satisfies either of the properties (*SO*), (*A*) or (*NE*) then  $(M, d)$  is a  $CAT(0)$ -space.*

Note that any  $CAT(0)$ -space  $(M, d)$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2 implying that the stable version of the properties (*SO*), (*A*) and resp. (*NE*) are Riemannian properties. Indeed, even without Busemann convexity Proposition 13 shows that a weak form of angles exists assuming the stable symmetric orthogonality property and a weak form of convexity of the metric.

**Preliminaries.** A metric space  $(M, d)$  is said to be a *geodesic space* if for each  $x, y \in M$  there is a 1-Lipschitz map  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  such that  $\gamma_0 = x$ ,  $\gamma_1 = y$  and

$$d(\gamma_t, \gamma_s) = |s - t|d(x, y).$$

The map  $\gamma$  is called a  $[0, 1]$ -*parametrized geodesic*.  $(M, d)$  is said to be *uniquely geodesic* if for each  $x, y \in M$  there is exactly one geodesic connecting those points. Similarly, a  $[a, b]$ -parametrized geodesic  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$  if  $\tilde{\gamma}_t = \gamma_{a+t(b-a)}$  is a  $[0, 1]$ -parametrized geodesic. A unit speed geodesic between  $x$  and  $y$  is a  $[0, d(x, y)]$ -parametrized geodesic between  $x$  and  $y$ . Finally, we say  $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow M$  is a geodesic ray and  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  is a geodesic line if for all  $t, s \in [0, \infty)$  and  $t', s' \in \mathbb{R}$  it holds  $d(\eta_t, \eta_s) = |t - s|$  and  $d(\gamma_{t'}, \gamma_{s'}) = |t' - s'|$ . Note that a geodesic line  $\gamma$  induces two geodesic rays  $\gamma^\pm$  defined by  $\gamma_t^\pm = \gamma_{\pm t}$ ,  $t \in [0, \infty)$ .

In the following, we always assume that metric spaces are complete and geodesic and, if not mentioned otherwise, geodesics are assumed to be  $[0, 1]$ -parametrized.

A subset  $C \subset M$  is *weakly convex* if for all  $x, y \in C$  there is a geodesic  $\gamma$  connecting  $x$  and  $y$  such that  $\gamma_t \in C$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ . If all geodesics connecting  $x$  and  $y$  lie entirely in  $C$  then  $C$  is said to be *convex*. Note that the image of any geodesic is weakly convex.

Given any subset  $A \subset M$  we define the convex hull of  $A$  as follows: Let  $G_0 = A$  and for  $n \geq 1$  define

$$G_n = \bigcup_{x, y \in G_{n-1}} \{\gamma_t \mid \gamma \text{ is a geodesic connecting } x \text{ and } y, \text{ and } t \in [0, 1]\}$$

$$\text{conv } A = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n.$$

The closed convex hull of  $A$  is now defined to be the closure of  $\text{conv } A$ .

Given a subset  $C \subset M$  and  $x \in M$ , denote by  $\pi_C(x)$  the set of nearest points of  $x$  onto  $C$ , i.e.

$$\pi_C(x) = \{y \in C \mid d(x, y) = d(x, C) = \inf_{z \in C} d(x, z)\}.$$

If  $C$  is compact then  $\pi_C(x)$  is always non-empty. If  $\pi_C$  is single-valued then we regard  $\pi_C$  as a (partially-defined) map. In general  $\pi_C(x)$  is neither non-empty nor single-valued.

We say  $(M, d)$  is *uniformly  $\infty$ -convex* if there is a function  $\rho : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  such that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  and all points  $x, y, z \in M$  with

$$d(y, z) > \epsilon \max\{d(x, y), d(x, z)\}$$

it holds

$$d(x, m) \leq (1 - \rho(\epsilon)) \max\{d(x, y), d(x, z)\}$$

whenever  $m$  is a midpoint of  $y$  and  $z$ . Note that in a uniformly  $\infty$ -convex space the projections  $\pi_C$  onto any closed convex set is single-valued.

This definition of uniform convexity is equivalent to uniform convexity in Banach spaces. Among several uniform convexity assumptions in the metric setting this is one of the weakest (see e.g. [Foe04, Kel14]). This condition is needed to ensure that the tangent spaces in terms of ultralimit blow-ups are uniquely geodesic (compare Lemma 20 and 21 below). Every Riemannian and Finsler manifold is locally uniformly  $\infty$ -convexity as this condition is equivalent to strong convexity of balls in the smooth finite dimensional setting (see [She97, Theorem 5.2]).

A popular and stronger condition is called *Busemann convexity* or *non-positive curvature in the sense of Busemann* [Bus55, Section 36]. For this one requires that for any geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  the map

$$t \mapsto d(\gamma_t, \eta_t)$$

is convex. As one may readily verify the condition is equivalent to the following: for all geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  with  $\gamma_0 = \eta_0$  it holds

$$d(\gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}, \eta_{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \frac{1}{2}d(\gamma_1, \eta_1).$$

Note that Busemann convex spaces are uniquely geodesic and the projection onto compact convex sets, e.g. geodesics, is well-defined and single-valued. Busemann's condition also implies the following rigidity theorem.

**Lemma 3** ([Bus55, Theorem (36.9)]). *Let  $(M, d)$  be Busemann convex metric space. Assume there are two geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  such that  $t \mapsto d(\gamma_t, \eta_t)$  is affine, i.e.*

$$d(\gamma_t, \eta_t) = (1-t)d(\gamma_0, \eta_0) + td(\gamma_1, \eta_1).$$

*Then the closed convex hull of  $\gamma([0, 1]) \cup \eta([0, 1])$  is isometric to a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  equipped with a strictly convex norm.*

However, Busemann convexity is not stable under taking limit spaces as can be observed by letting the  $n$ -dimensional  $\ell^p$ -spaces converge to  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ . Furthermore, it is not known whether tangent spaces of Busemann convex spaces are themselves Busemann convex.

A condition which is stable under limit operations is the *CAT(0)*-condition which can be formulated via comparison triangles (see e.g. [BH99, Chapter II.1]). More precisely,  $(M, d)$  is said to be a *CAT(0)-space* if for all  $x, y, z \in M$  and  $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  satisfying

$$d(x, y) = \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\|, d(x, z) = \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{z}\|, d(y, z) = \|\tilde{y} - \tilde{z}\|$$

it holds

$$d(x, m) \leq \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{m}\|$$

where  $m$  and  $\tilde{m}$  are the midpoints of  $y$  and  $z$ , resp.  $\tilde{y}$  and  $\tilde{z}$ .

In the following we define tangent spaces in terms of ultralimits of a sequence of blow-ups at a fixed point. For this let  $\omega$  be a *non-principle ultrafilter* on  $\mathbb{N}$ . We will regard  $\omega$  as a finitely additive measure on  $\mathbb{N}$  such that for all  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$  it holds  $\omega(A) \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\omega(A) = 0$  whenever  $A$  is finite. Given a sequence  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ , the ultrafilter  $\omega$  “selects” exactly one converging subsequence of  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We denote the unique limit by  $\lim_\omega (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and called the *ultralimit* of  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

With of the ultrafilter  $\omega$  we define *blow-up tangent spaces* as follows: Fix a sequence  $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of positive numbers converging to zero. Then the tangent space  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x, x)$  at  $x$  is the ultralimit of the sequence of pointed metric spaces  $(M, \lambda_n^{-1}d, x)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  where the points of  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x, x)$  are just the set of sequences  $(x_n)$  with  $\lim_\omega \lambda_n^{-1}d(x_n, x) < \infty$  and the metric is given by  $d_x((x_n), (y_n)) = \lim_\omega \lambda_n^{-1}d(x_n, y_n)$ . More precisely, the ultralimit is the set of equivalence classes since we identify two sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(y_n)$  whenever  $\lim_\omega \lambda_n^{-1}d(x_n, y_n) = 0$ . Note that  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$  depends on both the sequence  $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the ultrafilter  $\omega$ .

One can show that  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$  is complete and geodesic whenever  $(M, d)$  is geodesic. Indeed, if  $(x_n)$  and  $(y_n)$  are points in  $T_x^{(o)}M$  and  $(\gamma_n)$  a sequence of

geodesics connecting  $x_n$  and  $y_n$  then  $(\gamma_n(t))$  is in  $T_x^{(o)}M$  and

$$\lim_{\omega} \frac{1}{t} d((x_n), (\gamma_n(t))) = \lim_{\omega} d((x_n), (y_n)) = \frac{1}{1-t} \lim_{\omega} d((x_n), (\gamma_n(1-t)))$$

so that  $t \mapsto (\gamma_n(t))$  is a geodesic in  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$ . Thus if  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$  is uniquely geodesic then any geodesic in  $T_x^{(o)}M$  is given as an ultralimit of geodesics in  $M$ .

We denote the equivalence class obtained from the constant sequence  $x_n = x$  by  $\mathbf{0}_x$ . An *ultraray*  $\bar{\gamma} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow M$  is a geodesic ray obtained as follow: For a point  $y \in M$  let  $\gamma$  be a geodesic between  $x$  and  $y$ . Then

$$\bar{\gamma}_s := \lim_{\omega} \gamma_{\lambda_n s}, s \geq 0.$$

Similarly, an *ultraline*  $\bar{\gamma} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  is a geodesic line obtained from a unit geodesic  $\gamma : [-a, a] \rightarrow M$  with  $\gamma_0 = x$  by setting

$$\bar{\gamma}_s := \lim_{\omega} \gamma_{\lambda_n s}, s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note if  $(M, d)$  is Busemann convex then for two ultrarays  $\bar{\gamma}$  and  $\bar{\eta}$  we have

$$d_x(\bar{\gamma}_s, \bar{\eta}_{s'}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{d(\gamma_{\lambda s}, \gamma_{\lambda s'})}{\lambda}.$$

In particular, the metric is independent of the ultrafilter and the scaling  $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Using Lemma 3 above the following holds.

**Lemma 4.** *Assume  $(M, d)$  and  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$  are Busemann convex. Then the convex hull of any two ultrarays is flat, i.e. it is isometric to a flat sector in the two-dimensional plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$  equipped with a strictly convex norm.*

We also need the following technical lemma.

**Lemma 5.** *Assume  $(M, d)$  is Busemann convex,  $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$  is a line and  $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow M$  a ray such that  $\gamma_0 = \eta_0$ . If the convex hulls of  $\gamma([0, \infty)) \cup \eta([0, \infty))$  and  $\gamma((-\infty, 0]) \cup \eta([0, \infty))$  each span a flat Euclidean sector then for all  $s_- < 0 < s_+$  and  $t \in [0, \infty)$  it holds*

$$d(\eta_t, \gamma_0)^2 \leq (1-\lambda)d(\eta_t, \gamma_{s_-})^2 + \lambda d(\eta_t, \gamma_{s_+})^2 - (1-\lambda)\lambda d(\gamma_{s_-}, \gamma_{s_+})^2$$

where  $(1-\lambda)s_- + \lambda s_+ = 0$  and  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Denote the two flat Euclidean sector by  $C_{\pm}$ . The metric spaces  $(C_{\pm}, d|_{C_{\pm} \times C_{\pm}})$  are both  $CAT(0)$ -spaces. If we glue them along the common ray  $\eta$  then we obtain a new  $CAT(0)$ -space  $(\tilde{C}, \tilde{d})$  satisfying the above inequality for  $\tilde{d}$ . Observe now that for each  $(x, y) \in \{(\eta_t, \gamma_0), (\eta_t, \gamma_{s_-}), (\eta_t, \gamma_{s_+})\}$  it holds  $\tilde{d}(x, y) = d(x, y)$  as  $x$  and  $y$  are both either in  $C_+$  or  $C_-$ . Finally, as  $\gamma$  is a line in  $M$ , it must be a line in  $\tilde{C}$  as well, i.e. it holds

$$d(\gamma_{s_-}, \gamma_{s_+}) = |s_+ - s_-| = \tilde{d}(\gamma_{s_-}, \gamma_{s_+}).$$

Hence the inequality holds for the metric  $d$ .  $\square$

## SYMMETRIC ORTHOGONALITY

In this section we introduce the concept of symmetric orthogonality and prove some corollaries which can be deduced directly deduced from Birkhoff's main result on normed spaces (Lemma 8).

**Definition 6** (Birkhoff orthogonal). A geodesic  $\gamma$  is said to be *orthogonal* to a geodesic  $\eta$  if they intersect in a common point  $p = \gamma_0 = \eta_0$  and

$$\forall t, s \in [0, 1] : d(p, \gamma_t) \leq d(\eta_s, \gamma_t).$$

In other words, for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  the point  $p$  is a closest point of  $\gamma_t$  on  $\eta$ . In this case, we write  $\gamma \perp_p \eta$ .

For Riemannian manifolds it is known that if  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  are short enough, i.e.  $\gamma_t$  and  $\eta_t$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ , stay sufficiently close to  $\gamma_0$  then  $\gamma \perp_{\gamma_0} \eta$  is equivalent to

$$g_{\gamma_0}(\dot{\gamma}_0, \dot{\eta}_0) \leq 0.$$

Note that this angle characterization is symmetric. In particular, for short geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  in a Riemannian manifold it holds  $\eta \perp_{\gamma_0} \gamma$  if and only if  $\eta \perp_{\gamma_0} \gamma$ . If the Riemannian manifold is a Hadamard spaces, i.e. it is simply connected and has non-positive sectional curvature, then  $\gamma \perp_{p_0} \eta$  is equivalent to  $g_{\gamma_0}(\dot{\gamma}_0, \dot{\eta}_0) \leq 0$  for all geodesics  $\gamma, \eta$ . The symmetry “ $\gamma \perp_{\gamma_0} \eta$  if and only if  $\eta \perp_{\gamma_0} \gamma$ ” holds actually for all simply connected Riemannian manifolds without focal points. We leave the details to the interested reader.

**Definition 7** (Symmetric Orthogonality). A geodesic space  $(M, d)$  is said to satisfy the *symmetric orthogonality property* (*SO*) if  $\gamma \perp_p \eta$  implies  $\eta \perp_p \gamma$ . We say that  $(SO)_{loc}$  holds if each point admits a neighborhood  $U$  such that the symmetry holds for all geodesics lying in  $U$ .

Any normed space satisfies  $(SO)$  if it satisfies  $(SO)_{loc}$ . Furthermore, for reflexive normed spaces whose dual space have strictly convex norm, property  $(SO)$  is equivalent to “ $\ell_v(w) = 0$  iff  $\ell_w(v) = 0$ ” where  $\ell_v$  and  $\ell_w$  are the duals of  $v$  and resp.  $w$  obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_v(w') &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|v + \epsilon w'\|^2 - \|v\|^2}{2\epsilon} \\ \ell_w(v') &= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|w + \epsilon v'\|^2 - \|w\|^2}{2\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

In Finsler geometry,  $\ell_v$  is equal to  $g_v(v, \cdot)$  where  $g_v$  is called the fundamental tensor at  $v$ . We refer to [She97, Oht08] for all concepts of Finsler manifolds needed for the discussion below.

**Lemma 8** (Linear Orthogonal Rigidity [Bir35, Jam47]). *If  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$  is a normed vector space with  $n > 2$  then  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$  satisfies  $(SO)$  if and only if  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$  is Euclidean, i.e. the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is induced by an inner product.*

Actually this result holds more general for any Finsler manifolds.

**Proposition 9.** *Assume  $(M, F)$  is a smooth Finsler manifold. Then  $(M, F)$  satisfies  $(SO)_{loc}$  if and only if each tangent space  $(T_x M, F_x)$  satisfies  $(SO)$ . In particular,  $(M, F)$  is either 2-dimensional or a Riemannian manifold.*

*In case  $(M, F)$  is has non-positive flag curvature then the local condition  $(SO)_{loc}$  implies the global condition  $(SO)$ .*

*Remark.* The proposition also holds for  $L^2$ -products of Finsler manifolds which, in general, do not have  $C^2$ -Finsler structures. However, the first variation and the local strong convexity of the square of the distance still holds for the factors and hence their product.

*Proof.* For simplicity assume  $F$  is symmetric. The proof can be easily adapted to the asymmetric case as it only relies on the first variation formula and local strong convexity of the square of the distance.

Assume for some  $x_0 \in M$  the tangent space  $(T_{x_0}M, F_{x_0})$  does not satisfy property  $(SO)$ . Denote by  $g_v$  the fundamental tensor at  $v \in TM$ . Since the symmetric orthogonality property  $(SO)$  does not hold for  $(T_{x_0}M, F_{x_0})$ , there are  $v, w \in T_{x_0}M$  such that

$$g_v(v, w) = 0 \neq g_w(w, v).$$

Let  $\gamma_v, \gamma_w : (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$  be geodesics with  $\dot{\gamma}_v(0) = v$  and  $\dot{\gamma}_w(0) = w$ . The first variation formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\epsilon} d^2(\gamma_v(-t), \gamma_w(\epsilon)) &= g_v(v, w) = 0 \\ \frac{d}{d\epsilon} d^2(\gamma_v(\epsilon), \gamma_w(-s)) &= g_w(w, v) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By [She97, Theorem 5.2] (see also [Oht08, Corollary 5.2]), in a neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  the square of the distance from a fixed point  $x' \in U$  is strongly convex (in  $U$ ) hence any critical point along a geodesic in  $U$  is automatically a global minimum (in  $U$ ). Thus we see that  $\gamma_v \perp_{x_0} \gamma_w$  but  $\gamma_w \not\perp \gamma_v$ . In particular,  $(M, F)$  cannot satisfy the symmetric orthogonality property  $(SO)$ .

In case  $(M, F)$  has non-positive flag curvature, the square of the distance from fixed points is strictly convex [Egl97] (see also remark after [Oht08, Corollary 5.2]). Therefore,  $g_v(v, w) = 0$  iff  $\gamma_v \perp_{x_0} \gamma_w$ .  $\square$

A well-known class of  $n$ -dimensional simply connected Finsler manifolds with non-positive flag curvature are Hilbert geometries (see [PT14] for an introduction to Hilbert geometries). One may verify that Hilbert geometries whose tangent norms satisfy everywhere  $(SO)$  must already be Riemannian manifolds and therefore isometric to the hyperbolic space. Using a very elegant and short argument this fact was obtained by Kelly and Paige in [KP52].

**Proposition 10** (Hyperbolic Orthogonal Rigidity in Hilbert Geometry [KP52]). *Any  $n$ -dimensional Hilbert geometry satisfying  $(SO)$  is isometry the  $n$ -dimensional hyperbolic space.*

The general condition  $(SO)$  does not exclude all non-Riemannian geometry. Nevertheless, it indicates that it is not stable, i.e. in general the  $L^2$ -product of two spaces satisfying  $(SO)$  does not satisfy  $(SO)$ , not even locally. For that reason we define a stronger condition. Indeed, if  $(\mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}, (\|\cdot\|^2 + |\cdot|)^{\frac{1}{2}})$  satisfies the symmetric orthogonality property  $(SO)$  then its norm must be Euclidean. In particular, its subspace  $(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|)$  must be Euclidean as well. Thus we are led to define the following.

**Definition 11** (Stable Symmetric Orthogonality). A geodesic space  $(M, d)$  is said to satisfy the *stable symmetric orthogonality* property  $(SO^*)$  if the metric space  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R} = (M \times \mathbb{R}, \tilde{d})$  satisfies symmetric orthogonality property  $(SO)$  where  $\tilde{d}((x, t), (y, s))^2 = d(x, y)^2 + |t - s|^2$ . The local version will be denoted by  $(SO^*)_{loc}$ .

**Corollary 12.** *Every normed vector space and every Finsler manifold satisfying  $(SO^*)_{loc}$  is a Riemannian manifold.*

More generally, we can show that the stable symmetric orthogonality ( $SO^*$ ) implies the existence of symmetric angles if one-sided angles are well-defined. This is the case if the metric is *strictly  $p$ -convex*,  $p > 1$ , i.e. if for any  $x \in M$  the map  $y \mapsto d^p(x, y)$  is strictly convex.

**Proposition 13.** *Assume  $(M, d)$  is strictly  $p$ -convex for some  $p > 1$ . Then  $(M, d)$  satisfies the stable symmetric orthogonality property ( $SO^*$ ) if and only if for all unit speed geodesics  $\gamma, \eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  starting at  $\gamma_0 = \eta_0$  it holds*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d^2(\eta_t, \gamma_1) - d^2(\eta_0, \gamma_1)}{t} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d^2(\eta_1, \gamma_s) - d^2(\eta_1, \gamma_0)}{s}.$$

*Remark.* This kind of symmetry condition was introduced in [OP14] and has strong implications on the behavior of gradient flows of convex functional. In particular, it shows that spaces satisfying ( $SO^*$ ) must be Riemannian-like. Also note that this symmetry property is stable under taking  $L^2$ -products justifying the terminology.

*Proof.* Note that  $p$ -convexity implies that  $\partial_s^+ d^2(\eta_1, \gamma_s)|_{s=0}$  and  $\partial_t^+ d^2(\eta_t, \gamma_1)|_{t=0}$  exist.

Denote by  $\tilde{d}$  the  $L^2$ -product metric on  $M \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then there is an  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\partial_s^+ \tilde{d}^2((\eta_1, 1), (\gamma_s, a \cdot s))|_{s=0} = 0.$$

Since  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  is also strictly  $p$ -convex [Foe04], we see that the closest point of  $(\eta_1, 1)$  onto  $s \mapsto (\gamma_s, a \cdot s)$  is  $(\eta_0, 0) = (\gamma_0, 0)$ .

Since the orthogonality in  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  is symmetric we must have

$$\partial_s^+ \tilde{d}^2((\eta_t, t), (\gamma_1, a))|_{s=0} \geq 0$$

implying

$$\partial_s^+ d^2(\eta_1, \gamma_s)|_{s=0} \leq \partial_t^+ d^2(\eta_t, \gamma_1)|_{t=0}.$$

Exchanging the roles of  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d^2(\eta_t, \gamma_1) - d^2(\eta_0, \gamma_1)}{t} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d^2(\eta_1, \gamma_s) - d^2(\eta_1, \gamma_0)}{s}.$$

Conversely, if the commutativity condition holds then it also holds for  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$ . Together with strict  $p$ -convexity one sees that ( $SO$ ) holds for  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$ . Hence  $M$  satisfies ( $SO^*$ ).  $\square$

*Remark* (Jensen's inequality). In [Kuw13] Kuwae proved Jensen's inequality for spaces satisfying ( $SO$ ). However, it seems that the proof of [Kuw13, Theorem 4.1] requires the stronger condition ( $SO^*$ ). Indeed, [Kuw13, Lemma 2.12] cannot hold in general, because if an  $L^2$ -product of two non-trivial spaces satisfies ( $SO$ ) then both of its factors have to satisfy property  $(SO^*)_{loc}$ . Furthermore, a general  $L^p$ -product of smooth spaces with property ( $SO$ ) can have at most dimension two. Therefore, for general  $p \neq 2$ , Jensen's inequality on higher dimensional spaces seems still open.

In the following we focus only on the global version of ( $SO$ ). If  $(M, d)$  is *locally convex*, i.e. each point admits a convex neighborhood, then almost all results below hold with respect to their local version. However, local convexity seems rather strong as there are spaces without convex sets with interior.

The following lemma gives an equivalent characterization of the symmetric orthogonality property in terms of a weak form of non-expansiveness of projections onto geodesics.



**Lemma 14.** *The condition (SO) is equivalent to the following property (A): For all weakly convex sets  $C$  it holds*

$$d(x_C, y) \leq d(x, y)$$

for all  $x \in M$ ,  $y \in C$  and  $x_C \in \pi_C(x)$ .

*Remark.* In [Kuw13, Lemma 2.10] Kuwae proved that property (SO), property (B) in that paper, implies property (A).

*Proof.* Assume first the symmetric orthogonality property (SO) holds and let  $C$  be a weakly convex subset. Choose  $x_C \in \pi_C(x)$  and  $y \in C$ . Let  $\eta$  be a geodesic connecting  $x_C$  and  $y$  in  $C$  and  $\gamma$  be a geodesic connecting  $x_C$  and  $x$ . Since  $\eta_t \in C$  and  $x_C \in \pi_C(\gamma_s)$  we have

$$d(x_C, \gamma_s) = d(\eta_0, \gamma_s) \leq d(\eta_t, \gamma_s),$$

i.e.  $\gamma \perp_{x_C} \eta$ . Then the symmetric orthogonality (SO) implies  $\eta \perp_{x_C} \gamma$  which is nothing but

$$d(x_C, y) = d(\gamma_0, y) \leq d(\gamma_1, y) = d(x, y).$$

Conversely, assume for all weakly convex set  $C$  it holds

$$d(x_C, y) \leq d(x, y)$$

for all  $x \in M$ ,  $y \in C$  and  $x_C \in \pi_C(x)$ . Take now two geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  with  $\gamma \perp_p \eta$ . Note that  $C = \cup_{t \in [0,1]} \{\eta_t\}$  is weakly convex and  $\gamma_0 \in \pi_C(x)$ . Thus if  $x = \gamma_t$  and  $y = \eta_1 \in C$  then

$$d(\eta_0, y) = d(p_0, y) \leq d(x, y) = d(\gamma_t, y)$$

implying  $\eta \perp_{p_0} \gamma$ . As  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  are arbitrary  $(M, d)$  must have symmetric orthogonalities.  $\square$

## NON-EXPANSIVE PROJECTIONS

In this section we introduce the non-expansive projection property and prove Theorem 1.

**Definition 15** (Non-expansive Projections). We say a geodesic space  $(M, d)$  satisfies the *non-expansive projection property (NE)* if for all closed weakly convex sets  $C$  and all  $x, y \in M$  it holds

$$d(x_C, y_C) \leq d(x, y)$$

whenever  $x_C \in \pi_C(x)$  and  $y_C \in \pi_C(y)$ .

*Remark.* Property (NE) is well-known for linear spaces, see [Kak39, Theorem 3] and [Phe57, Theorem 5.2] where it is shown that the only higher dimensional Banach spaces with non-expansive projections are Hilbert spaces, compare also with Lemma 8.

It is easy to see that a set must be weakly convex if the a projection onto it is non-expansive. The following properties can be shown from the non-expansive projection property (NE). We leave the details to the interested reader.

**Lemma 16.** *Assume  $(M, d)$  has non-expansive projections (NE). Then the following holds:*

- $(M, d)$  is uniquely geodesic
- the projection map  $\pi_C$  onto weakly convex sets  $C$  is at most single-valued.

- closed balls are strictly convex.

In particular, any weakly convex set is convex and  $\pi_C$  can be regarded as a non-expansive map whenever  $C$  is compact.

We first observe that the non-expansive projection property (*NE*) is stronger than the symmetric orthogonality property (*SO*).

**Proposition 17.** *If  $(M, d)$  satisfies (*NE*) then it also satisfies (*SO*).*

*Proof.* Assume the non-expansive projection property (*NE*) holds and  $\gamma \perp_{\gamma_0} \eta$ , i.e.  $\gamma_0 = \pi_\eta(\gamma_s)$ ,  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $\eta$  is (weakly) convex, by property (*NE*) we have

$$d(\gamma_0, \eta_t) \leq d(\gamma_s, \eta_t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

This implies that  $\gamma_0 = \pi_\gamma(\eta_t)$  and hence  $\eta \perp_{\gamma_0} \gamma$ . Because  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  are arbitrary we see that the symmetric orthogonality property (*SO*) holds.  $\square$

The converse of the statement does not hold, not even if every ball is strictly convex. Indeed, if  $(M, d)$  is a closed ball of radius  $R < \frac{\pi}{2}$  on the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^n$  with standard metric then its balls are strictly convex. However, the projection onto a non-constant geodesic is never non-expansive.

Assuming Busemann convexity it is even possible to prove equivalence of the two properties.

**Theorem 18.** *A Busemann convex metric space has symmetric orthogonalities (*SO*) if and only if it has non-expansive projections (*NE*).*

*Remark.* (1) As  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  is Busemann convex spaces whenever  $M$  is Busemann convex, we also see that (*SO*<sup>\*</sup>) and (*NE*<sup>\*</sup>) are equivalent for Busemann convex spaces.

(2) An earlier version of this note also proved the equivalence of (*SO*) and (*NE*) for Pedersen convex metric spaces, i.e. geodesic spaces such that

$$\bigcup_{x \in C} \bar{B}_\epsilon(x)$$

is weakly convex for all closed (weakly) convex sets  $C$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that (*SO*) implies (*NE*). Let  $x, y \in M$  and  $C$  be a closed convex sets such that  $\pi_C(x)$  and  $\pi_C(y)$  are non-empty. Let  $x_C \in \pi_C(x)$  and  $y_C = \pi_C(y)$  and assume by exchanging  $x$  and  $y$  if necessary that  $m = d(x, C) \leq d(y, C)$ .

Set  $C_r = \bar{B}_r(C)$  and note that  $\pi_{C_r}(x)$  and  $\pi_{C_r}(y)$  are non-empty as they contain points on the geodesics connecting  $x$  and  $x_C$  and resp.  $y$  and  $y_C$ . Note that each  $C_r$  is convex by Busemann convexity. Denote the projection of  $x$  and  $y$  onto  $C_r$  by  $x_r$  and  $y_r$ , respectively. Since  $x = x_m$  and  $C_m$  is convex, the geodesic  $\eta$  connecting  $x$  and  $y_m$  is in  $C_m$ . In particular,  $\pi_\eta(y) = \pi_{C_m}(y)$ . Now property (*SO*) (see Lemma 14) implies

$$d(x, y_m) \leq d(x, y).$$

Replacing  $y$  by  $y_m$  we see that it suffices to show that  $d(x_C, y_C) \leq d(x, y)$  whenever  $m = d(x, C) = d(y, C)$ .

Let  $t \mapsto x_t$  and  $t \mapsto y_t$  be  $[0, m]$ -parametrized geodesics connecting  $x_C$  and  $x$ , and  $y_C$  and  $y$ , respectively. Note that  $x_t \in \pi_{C_{mt}}(x)$  and  $y_t \in \pi_{C_{mt}}(y)$ .

Denote by  $\gamma^{(t)}$  the geodesic connecting  $x_t$  and  $y_t$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Since

$$s \mapsto d(\gamma_s^{(t)}, \gamma_s^{(0)})$$

is convex by Busemann convexity and  $\gamma^{(0)}$  in  $C$  we see that

$$d(\gamma_s^{(t)}, C) \leq (1-s)d(x_t, C) + sd(y_t, C) = mt \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

Furthermore, if

$$d(\gamma_s^{(t)}, C) = mt \quad \text{for some } s \in [0, 1]$$

then

$$s \mapsto d(\gamma_s^{(t)}, \gamma_s^{(0)}) = mt \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1]$$

implying that the closed convex hull of  $\gamma^{(t)}([0, 1]) \cup \gamma^{(0)}([0, 1])$  is isometric to a closed convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  equipped with a strictly convex norm, see Lemma 3. But in this two-dimensional setting  $s \mapsto d(\gamma_s^{(t)}, \gamma_s^{(0)})$  is constant if and only if  $t \mapsto d(\gamma_0^{(t)}, \gamma_1^{(t)}) = d(x_t, y_t)$  is constant. In particular,  $d(x_C, y_C) = d(x_{t'}, x_{t'})$  for all  $t \in [0, t']$ .

Thus, replacing  $C$  by  $C_t$  we may assume that  $m_0 = d(\gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}^{(t)}, C) < tm$  for all  $t \in (0, 1]$ . Observe by applying an argument as above to the pairs  $(z, x)$  and  $(z, y)$  where  $z = \gamma_{\frac{1}{2}}^{(1)}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{m_0}, z) &\leq d(x, z) \\ d(y_{m_0}, z) &\leq d(y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by triangle inequality

$$d(x_{m_0}, y_{m_0}) < d(x, y)$$

where the strict inequality is due to the fact that  $z$  cannot be midpoint of  $x_{m_0}$  and  $y_{m_0}$ . Replacing  $(x, y)$  by  $(x_{m_0}, y_{m_0})$  we obtain inductively a  $(m_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $m_n = d(x_{m_n}, C)$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_{m_n}, C)$$

where  $z_t$  is the midpoint of  $x_t$  and  $y_t$ . By assumption  $d(z_t, C) < m_n$  implying  $(x_{m_n}, x_{m_n}) \rightarrow (x_0, y_0) = (x_C, y_C)$ . Thus we obtain the desire inequality

$$d(x_C, y_C) < d(x, y).$$

□

#### BUSEMANN CONVEX SPACES WITH NON-EXPANSIVE PROJECTION PROPERTY ( $NE^*$ )

In this section we are going to prove the second main result of this note.

**Theorem 19.** *Let  $(M, d)$  be a complete geodesic space which is uniformly  $\infty$ -convex. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $(M, d)$  is a  $CAT(0)$ -space
- (2)  $(M, d)$  is a Busemann convex space satisfying the stable non-expansive projection property ( $NE^*$ )
- (3)  $(M, d)$  is a Busemann convex space satisfying the stable symmetric orthogonality property ( $SO^*$ ).

We first prove the following lemma on stability of the condition ( $SO$ ).

**Lemma 20.** *Let  $(M_n, d_n, x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of geodesic spaces satisfying the symmetric orthogonality ( $SO$ ) (resp. its stable version ( $SO^*$ )). If the ultralimit  $\lim_{\omega} (M_n, d_n, x_n)$  is uniquely geodesic and projections onto compact convex sets are unique then it satisfies the symmetric orthogonality property ( $SO$ ) (resp. its stable version ( $SO^*$ )).*

*Proof.* The \*-version follows by noting that

$$\left(\lim_{\omega}(M_n, d_n, x_n) \times_2 (\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|, 0)\right) = \left(\lim_{\omega}(M_n, d_n, x_n)\right) \times_2 (\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|, 0).$$

Since  $(M_{\omega}, d_{\omega}, x_{\omega}) = \lim_{\omega}(M_n, d_n, x_n)$  is uniquely geodesic, any geodesic in  $(M_{\omega}, d_{\omega})$  is given by an ultralimit of a sequence geodesics  $\gamma_n$ . So it suffices to show for geodesic  $(\gamma_n)$  and  $(\eta_n)$  in  $M_{\omega}$  with  $(\gamma_n)_{\perp(p_n)}(\eta_n)$  also  $(\eta_n)_{\perp(p_n)}(\gamma_n)$  holds.

Assume  $(\gamma_n)_{\perp(p_n)}(\eta_n)$ . Since projections onto  $(\eta_n)([0, 1])$  are unique and  $p_n = \gamma_n(0) = \eta_n(0)$  we have

$$\lim_{\omega} d_n(p_n, \gamma_n(t)) < \lim_{\omega} d_n(\eta_n(s), \gamma_n(t))$$

for all  $s, t \in (0, 1]$ .

Fix  $t \in (0, 1]$  and let  $q_n$  be a closest point of  $\gamma_n(t)$  on  $\eta_n$ . Then  $d_n(q_n, \gamma_n(t)) \leq d_n(p_n, \gamma_n(t))$  so that

$$\lim_{\omega} d_n(p_n, \gamma_n(t)) \leq \lim_{\omega} d_n(q_n, \gamma_n(t)).$$

But the ultralimit of  $(q_n)$  is on the ultralimit of the geodesics  $(\eta_n)$  implying that the ultralimits of  $(p_n)$  and  $(q_n)$  agree.

Denote by  $\tilde{\gamma}_n$  the geodesic connecting  $q_n$  and  $\gamma_n(1)$ . Then  $\tilde{\gamma}_n \perp_{q_n} \eta_n$  so that property (SO) for  $(M_n, d_n)$  implies  $\eta_n \perp_{q_n} \tilde{\gamma}_n$ . In particular, since  $\tilde{\gamma}_n(1) = \gamma_n(1)$  it holds

$$d_n(\eta_n(s), q_n) \leq d_n(\eta_n(s), \gamma_n(1)) \quad \text{for all } s \in [0, 1].$$

Combining the above we obtain for the ultralimit

$$\lim_{\omega} d_n(\eta_n(s), p_n) = \lim_{\omega} d_n(\eta_n(s), q_n) \leq \lim_{\omega} d_n(\eta_n(s), \gamma_n(t))$$

for all  $s \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $t \in (0, 1]$  is arbitrary we see that  $(\eta_n)_{\perp(p_n)}(\gamma_n)$ . Thus property (SO) holds for  $(M_{\omega}, d_{\omega})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 21.** *Assume  $(M_n, d_n, x_n)$  is a sequence of uniformly  $\infty$ -convex metric spaces with same uniformity function  $\rho$  then any ultralimit  $\lim_{\omega}(M_n, d_n, x_n)$  is uniformly  $\infty$ -convex with uniformity function  $\rho$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n), (y_n)$  and  $(z_n)$  be three points in  $(M_{\omega}, d_{\omega}, x_{\omega}) = \lim_{\omega}(M_n, d_n, x_n)$  with

$$d_{\omega}((y_n), (z_n)) > \epsilon \max\{d_{\omega}((x_n), (y_n)), d_{\omega}((x_n), (z_n))\}.$$

Assume w.l.o.g.  $d_{\omega}((x_n), (y_n)) \geq d_{\omega}((x_n), (z_n))$ . Then  $\omega(A) = 1$  for

$$A = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid d_n(y_n, z_n) > \epsilon d_n(x_n, y_n)\}.$$

Now let  $(w_n)$  be a midpoint of  $(y_n)$  and  $(z_n)$  (w.r.t.  $d_{\omega}$ ). Note that  $w_n$  may not be a midpoint  $m_n$  of  $y_n$  and  $z_n$ .

We claim that  $(w_n) = (m_n)$  in  $M_{\omega}$ . Assume by contradiction this is not the case. Then  $d_{\omega}((m_n), (w_n)) > 0$  and thus  $d_{\omega}((y_n), (z_n)) > 0$ . So for some  $\delta > 0$  it holds  $\omega(B) = 1$  where

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \{n \in A \mid d_n(m_n, w_n), d_n(y_n, z_n) \geq \delta, \\ &\quad d_n(y_n, w_n), d_n(z_n, w_n) \leq \frac{1}{2}(d_n(y_n, z_n) + \rho_0)\} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\rho_0 = \frac{\rho(\delta/2)\delta}{2(1 - \rho(\delta/2))} > 0.$$

Note that we used the fact that  $(w_n)$  is a midpoint of  $(y_n)$  and  $(z_n)$ .

Let  $(v_n)$  be the sequence of midpoints of  $m_n$  and  $w_n$ . Then by uniform convexity

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(y_n, v_n) &\leq (1 - \rho(\delta/2)) \max\{d_n(y_n, w_n), \frac{1}{2}d(y_n, z_n)\} \\ d_n(z_n, v_n) &\leq (1 - \rho(\delta/2)) \max\{d_n(z_n, w_n), \frac{1}{2}d(y_n, z_n)\} \end{aligned}$$

for  $n \in B$ . But then

$$\begin{aligned} d_n(y_n, v_n) + d_n(z_n, v_n) &\leq \frac{1}{2}(1 - \rho(\delta/2))(d_n(y_n, z_n) + \rho_0) \\ &\leq d_n(y_n, z_n) - \rho(\delta/2)(d(y_n, z_n) - \frac{\delta}{2}) \\ &< d_n(y_n, z_n) \end{aligned}$$

for  $n \in B$  which contradicts the triangle inequality. Thus it holds  $(m_n) = (w_n)$ .

Then uniform convexity implies

$$d_n(x_n, m_n) \geq (1 - \rho(\epsilon))d_n(x_n, y_n)$$

for  $n \in B$  so that

$$d_\omega((x_n), (w_n)) \geq (1 - \rho(\epsilon))d_\omega((x_n), (y_n)).$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 19.* Let  $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be sequence in  $(0, 1)$  with  $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$  and choose any ultrafilter  $\omega$  on  $\mathbb{N}$ . In the following each tangent cone  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$  will denote the ultralimit (with respect to  $\omega$ ) of the space pointed metric space  $(M, d_n, x)$  where  $d_n = \lambda_n^{-1}d$ .

The assumptions of the theorem imply that each tangent cone  $(T_x^{(o)}M, d_x)$  is uniformly  $\infty$ -convex and hence uniquely geodesic and has single-valued projections onto closed convex sets. In particular, they are Busemann convex and satisfy the stable symmetric orthogonality property (SO).

Choose any triple  $x, y, z \in M$ . Let  $m$  be the midpoint of  $x$  and  $y$ ,  $\gamma : [-1, 1] \rightarrow M$  be the geodesic between  $x$  and  $y$  and  $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$  be the geodesic between  $m$  and  $z$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} m_n &= m \\ x_n &= \gamma_{-\lambda_n} \\ y_n &= \gamma_{\lambda_n} \\ z_n &= \eta_{\lambda_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote the ultralimits of the sequences in  $T_m^{(o)}M$  by  $m_\infty, x_\infty, y_\infty$  and  $z_\infty$  respectively.

From Busemann convexity and the properties of the geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}d_n(x_n, z_n)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d_n(y_n, z_n)^2 - d_n(m_n, z_n)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d_n(x_n, y_n)^2 \\ \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, z)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d(y, z)^2 - d(m, z)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d(x, y)^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}d_m(x_\infty, z_\infty)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d_m(y_\infty, z_\infty)^2 - d_m(m_\infty, z_\infty)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d_m(x_\infty, y_\infty)^2 \\ \leq \frac{1}{2}d(x, z)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d(y, z)^2 - d(m, z)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d(x, y)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the geodesics  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  induce an ultraline  $\bar{\gamma} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow T_m^{(o)}M$  and an ultraray  $\bar{\eta} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow T_m^{(o)}M$ . Note that  $x_\infty, y_\infty$  and  $m_\infty$  lie on  $\bar{\gamma}$  and  $z_\infty$  and  $m_\infty$  lie on  $\bar{\eta}$ .

Let  $\bar{\gamma}^\pm$  be the two ultrarays obtained from  $\bar{\gamma}$ . If  $\bar{\gamma}^+ = \bar{\eta}$  or  $\bar{\gamma}^- = \bar{\eta}$  then  $x_\infty, y_\infty, m_\infty$  and  $z_\infty$  all lie on  $\bar{\gamma}$  so that the one-dimensional parallelogram identity yields

$$\frac{1}{2}d_m(x_\infty, z_\infty)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d_m(y_\infty, z_\infty)^2 - d_m(m_\infty, z_\infty)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d_m(x_\infty, y_\infty)^2 = 0.$$

Assume the ray  $\bar{\eta}$  is distinct from the rays  $\bar{\gamma}^\pm$ . Then by Lemma 4 the convex hulls  $C^\pm$  of  $\bar{\gamma}^\pm([0, \infty)) \cup \bar{\eta}([0, \infty))$  are both flat non-trivial sectors. As both  $C^+$  and  $C^-$  are closed convex subsets of  $(T_m^{(o)}M, d_m)$ , the geodesic spaces  $(C^\pm, d_m)$  satisfy the stable symmetric orthogonality property, so that by Corollary 12  $(C^\pm, d_m)$  are both flat Euclidean sectors. But then Lemma 5 implies that

$$\frac{1}{2}d_m(x_\infty, z_\infty)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d_m(y_\infty, z_\infty)^2 - d_m(m_\infty, z_\infty)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d_m(x_\infty, y_\infty)^2 \geq 0.$$

Combined with the inequality above we have shown that

$$\frac{1}{2}d(x, z)^2 + \frac{1}{2}d(y, z)^2 - d(m, z)^2 - \frac{1}{4}d(x, y)^2 \geq 0.$$

As  $x, y, z \in M$  are arbitrary,  $(M, d)$  must be a  $CAT(0)$ -space proving the claim of the theorem.  $\square$

*Remark.* (1) A previous version of this note used the result in [FLS07].

(2) The proof uses the following observation of Busemann convex spaces: If  $(M, d)$  is Busemann convex and each point has a tangent cone which is a  $CAT(0)$ -space then  $(M, d)$  itself is a  $CAT(0)$ -space. A similar argument holds for non-negatively curved spaces in the sense of [Kel16], i.e. if  $(M, d)$  is Busemann concave and each tangent cone is non-negatively curved in the sense of Alexandrov then  $(M, d)$  is non-negatively curved in the sense of Alexandrov.

**Generalizations.** The assumption of uniform  $\infty$ -convexity can be dropped if it is possible to show the following.

**Problem 22.** Assume  $(M, d)$  is Busemann convex and  $\gamma$  and  $\eta$  are two geodesics starting at  $x$ . Let  $\bar{\gamma}$  and  $\bar{\eta}$  the corresponding ultrarays in  $T_x^{(o)}M$ . Then there is a (weakly convex) 2-dimensional flat sector  $C$  containing  $\bar{\gamma}$  and  $\bar{\eta}$ .

Indeed,  $C \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  is often convex along the ultralimits of geodesics in  $M \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  (see [Kle99, FLS07]) and the proof of Lemma 20 shows that (SO) holds for those geodesics. Since Lemma 8 (see [Jam47]) only needs (SO) for the straight lines it follows that  $C \times_2 \mathbb{R}$  is Euclidean.

## REFERENCES

- [Bač14] M. Bačák, *Convex analysis and optimization in Hadamard spaces*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2014.
- [BH99] M. R. Bridson and A. Häflicher, *Metric Spaces of Non-Positive Curvature*, Springer, 1999.
- [Bir35] G. Birkhoff, *Orthogonality in linear metric spaces*, Duke Mathematical Journal **1** (1935), no. 2, 169–172.
- [Bus55] H. Busemann, *The geometry of geodesics*, Academic Press, 1955.
- [Egl97] D. Egloff, *Uniform Finsler Hadamard manifolds*, Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré (A) Physique théorique **66** (1997), no. 3, 323–357 (eng).
- [FLS07] T. Foertsch, A. Lytchak, and V. Schroeder, *Nonpositive Curvature and the Ptolemy Inequality*, International Mathematics Research Notices **2007** (2007), 1–15.
- [Foe04] T. Foertsch, *Ball versus distance convexity of metric spaces*, Contributions to Algebra and Geometry (2004).
- [Jam47] R. C. James, *Orthogonality and linear functionals in normed linear spaces*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **61** (1947), no. 2, 265–292.
- [Jos94] J. Jost, *Equilibrium maps between metric spaces*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations **2** (1994), no. 2, 173–204.
- [Kak39] Sh. Kakutani, *Some characterizations of Euclidean space*, Japanese journal of mathematics **16** (1939), 93–97.
- [Kel14] M. Kell, *Uniformly convex metric spaces*, Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces **2** (2014), no. 1, 359–380.
- [Kel16] ———, *Sectional curvature-type conditions on metric spaces*, arXiv:1601.03363 (2016).
- [Kle99] B. Kleiner, *The local structure of length spaces with curvature bounded above*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **231** (1999), no. 3, 409–456.
- [KP52] P. J. Kelly and L. J. Paige, *Symmetric perpendicularity in Hilbert geometries.*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **2** (1952), no. 3, 319–322.
- [Kuw13] K. Kuwae, *Jensen’s inequality on convex spaces*, Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations **49** (2013), no. 3-4, 1359–1378.
- [Oht08] S. Ohta, *Uniform convexity and smoothness, and their applications in Finsler geometry*, Math. Ann. **343** (2008), no. 3, 669–699.
- [OP14] S. Ohta and M. Pálfi, *Gradient flows and a Trotter–Kato formula of semi-convex functions on CAT(1)-spaces*, arxiv:1411.1461 (2014), 27.
- [Phe57] R. R. Phelps, *Convex sets and nearest points*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **8** (1957), no. 4, 790–797.
- [PT14] A. Papadopoulos and M. Troyanov (eds.), *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*, irma lectu ed., EMS, Zurich, CH, 2014.
- [She97] Z. Shen, *Curvature, Distance and Volume in Finsler Geometry*, preprint (1997).

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT TÜBINGEN, TÜBINGEN, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* martin.kell@math.uni-tuebingen.de