

Horofunction compactifications of symmetric cones under Finsler distances

Bas Lemmens*

*School of Mathematics, Statistics & Actuarial Science, University of Kent,
Canterbury, CT2 7NX, United Kingdom*

Abstract

In this paper we consider symmetric cones as symmetric spaces equipped with invariant Finsler distances, namely the Thompson distance and the Hilbert distance. We establish a correspondence between the horofunction compactification of a symmetric cone A_+° under these invariant Finsler distances and the horofunction compactification of the normed space in the tangent bundle. More precisely, for the Thompson distance on A_+° we show that the exponential map extends as a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of the normed space in the tangent bundle, which is a JB-algebra, and the horofunction compactification of A_+° . We give a complete characterisation of the Thompson distance horofunctions and provide an explicit extension of the exponential map. Analogous results are established for the Hilbert distance on the projective cone PA_+° . The analysis yields a geometric description of the horofunction compactifications of these spaces in terms of the facial structure of the closed unit ball of the dual norm of the norm in the tangent space.

Keywords: Euclidean Jordan algebras, Finsler symmetric spaces, Hilbert distance, horofunction compactification, symmetric cones, Thompson distance

Subject Classification: Primary 17C36; Secondary 14M27, 53C60

1 Introduction

Symmetric cones provide an important class of Riemannian symmetric spaces of non-compact type. They support many invariant Finsler metrics, that are not Riemannian, which turn them into Finsler symmetric spaces. In particular, every symmetric cone can be identified as the interior, A_+° , of the cone of squares in a finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebra A by the Koecher-Vinberg theorem. The real Jordan algebra A with unit u can be equipped with the spectral norm:

$$\|x\|_u = \inf\{\mu > 0: -\mu u \leq x \leq \mu u\} = \max\{|\lambda|: \lambda \in \sigma(x)\},$$

where $x \leq y$ if $y - x$ is positive, and $\sigma(x)$ is the spectrum of x , which turns it into a JB-algebra [3]. One can use the spectral norm to put an invariant Finsler distance on A_+° by defining the Finsler metric $F: TA_+^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $F(x, w) = \|U_{x^{-1/2}}w\|_u$, where $U_z: A \rightarrow A$ is the quadratic representation of z . (It should be noted that in this setting F does not satisfy the smoothness and strong convexity conditions commonly used in the theory of Riemann-Finsler manifolds [4].) The Finsler distance between x and y in A_+° is the infimum of lengths,

$$L(\gamma) = \int_0^1 F(\gamma(t), \gamma'(t)) dt,$$

*Email: B.Lemmens@kent.ac.uk, Bas Lemmens gratefully acknowledges the support of the EPSRC (grant EP/R044228/1)

over all piecewise C^1 -smooth paths $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow A_+^\circ$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = 1$. In fact, this distance is known [32, 34] to coincide with the Thompson distance on A_+° , which is given by

$$d_T(x, y) = \max\{|\mu| : \mu \in \sigma(\log U_{y^{-1/2}}x)\} = \|\log U_{x^{-1/2}}y\|_u$$

for all $x, y \in A_+^\circ$.

In this setting the Riemannian symmetries $S_x: A_+^\circ \rightarrow A_+^\circ$, which are given by $S_x(y) = U_x y^{-1}$, are global d_T -isometries (see [29]) that make A_+° a Finsler symmetric space. Moreover, the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(A_+) = \{T \in \text{GL}(A) : T(A_+) = A_+\}$ is a subgroup of the isometry group of (A_+°, d_T) and acts transitively on A_+° .

A prime example is the symmetric cone of $n \times n$ strictly positive definite Hermitian matrices $\Pi_n(\mathbb{C})$, which can be identified with the symmetric space $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})/\text{U}_n$ by letting $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ act on $\Pi_n(\mathbb{C})$ by $A \mapsto MAM^*$. In this setting the quadratic representation $U_A: B \mapsto ABA$, so the Finsler metric in the tangent space at A satisfies $F(A, M) = \|A^{-1/2}MA^{-1/2}\|_I = \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(A^{-1/2}MA^{-1/2})\}$, and the Thompson distance is given by $d_T(A, B) = \|\log A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}\|_I = \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(\log A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})\}$.

Given a symmetric cone A_+° it also interesting to consider the projective cone $PA_+^\circ = A_+^\circ/\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, so $x \sim \lambda x$ for $x \in A_+^\circ$ and $\lambda > 0$. We will identify this space with the set of points x in A_+° with $\det x = 1$, that is,

$$PA_+^\circ = \{x \in A_+^\circ : \det x = 1\}.$$

The tangent space at the unit $u \in PA_+^\circ$ is given by $T_u = \{w \in A : \text{tr } w = 0\}$, as $(D_w \det)(x) = (\det x)\text{tr}(U_{x^{-1/2}}w)$ for $x \in A_+^\circ$, see [17, p. 53]. In fact, the tangent space at $x \in PA_+^\circ$ is $T_x = U_{x^{1/2}}(T_u)$.

There is a natural Finsler metric H on the tangent bundle. For the unit $u \in PA_+^\circ$ and $w \in T_u$, let

$$H(u, w) = \inf\{\lambda : w \leq \lambda u\} - \sup\{\lambda : \lambda u \leq w\} = \max \sigma(w) - \min \sigma(w) = \text{diam } \sigma(w).$$

Note that $H(u, \cdot)$ is a norm on T_u , which is called the variation norm and will be denoted by $|\cdot|_u$. For $x \in PA_+^\circ$ and $w \in T_x$, let $H(x, w) = |U_{x^{-1/2}}w|_u$.

In this case the Finsler distance d_H on PA_+° coincides with the Hilbert distance on PA_+° , see [34] or [30, Proposition 5.3], and satisfies

$$d_H(x, y) = \max \sigma(\log U_{x^{-1/2}}y) - \min \sigma(\log U_{x^{-1/2}}y) = \text{diam } \sigma(\log U_{x^{-1/2}}y).$$

for all $x, y \in PA_+^\circ$. The space PA_+° is a Finsler symmetric space, where the Riemannian symmetry $S_x: y \mapsto U_x y^{-1}$ for $y \in PA_+^\circ$, is a global d_H -isometry, see [29]. Note that S_x maps PA_+° into itself, as $\det U_x y^{-1} = (\det x)^2(\det y)^{-1}$, see [17, Proposition III.4.2]. For the space $P\Pi_n(\mathbb{C})$, which corresponds to the symmetric space $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})/\text{SU}_n$, we have that $d_H(A, B) = \text{diam } \sigma(\log A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})$.

In this paper we consider the horofunction compactifications of the Finsler symmetric spaces (A_+°, d_T) and (PA_+°, d_H) . We show that the exponential map extends as a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactifications of the JB-algebra $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$, i.e., the tangent space at u , and (A_+°, d_T) . In addition, we establish a similar result for the horofunction compactifications of (PA_+°, d_H) and the normed space $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$. More precisely, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let A_+° be a symmetric cone in a finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebra A .*

- (a) *The exponential map, $\exp_u: x \in A \mapsto e^x \in A_+^\circ$, extends as a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of the JB-algebra $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$ and the horofunction compactification of (A_+°, d_T) , such that each part in the horofunction boundary of A is mapped onto a part of the horofunction boundary of A_+° .*
- (b) *The exponential map, $\exp_u: x \in T_u \mapsto e^x \in PA_+^\circ$, extends as a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$ and the horofunction compactification of (PA_+°, d_H) , such that each part in the horofunction boundary of T_u is mapped onto a part of the horofunction boundary of PA_+° .*

To prove Theorem 1.1 we give complete descriptions of the horofunction compactifications of (A_+°, d_T) and $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$, together with their parts and the detour distances, see Theorems 3.2 and 3.4, Theorem 5.3 and Propositions 5.4 and 5.5. Combining these theorems with the results in [30] allows us to give explicit extensions of the exponential map to the horofunction boundaries.

The horofunction compactification of a finite dimensional JB-algebra $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$ was determined in [30, Section 4], and it was shown there that it is naturally homeomorphic to the closed unit ball in the dual space of $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$. Combining the results from [30, Section 4] with Theorem 1.1(a) gives the following geometric description of the horofunction compactification of (A_+°, d_T) .

Corollary 1.2. *There exists a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of (A_+°, d_T) onto the closed unit ball in the dual space of $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$, which maps each part of the horofunction boundary onto a relative open boundary face of the ball.*

With regard to part (b) of Theorem 1.1 it is known that there exists a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of (PA_+°, d_H) and the closed unit ball in the dual space of $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$, see [30, Section 5]. So Theorem 1.1(b) has the following corollary.

Corollary 1.3. *There exists a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$ onto the closed unit ball in the dual space of $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$, which maps each part of the horofunction boundary onto a relative open boundary face of the ball.*

The results in this paper are motivated by work of Kapovich and Leeb [24] and subsequent works by, Ji and Schilling [22, 23], Haettel, Schilling, Walsh and Wienhard [16], Schilling [37], and the author and Power [30]. In [24, Question 6.18] the question was raised if the horofunction compactification of a finite dimensional normed space is naturally homeomorphic to the closed unit ball of the dual normed space. Corollary 1.3 shows that this is the case for the normed spaces $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$. More generally, it is interesting to understand when there exists a natural homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of a Finsler symmetric space and the closed unit ball of the dual norm of the norm in the tangent space. It is also interesting to determine when there exists a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of a Finsler symmetric space and the horofunction compactification of the normed space in the tangent bundle at the basepoint. Theorem 1.1 provides interesting classes of Finsler symmetric spaces for which both questions have a positive answer.

Compactifications of symmetric spaces is a rich subject, which has been studied extensively, see for instance [6, 15]. In recent years Finsler structures have been used to study Satake compactifications of symmetric spaces. In particular, Haettel, Schilling, Walsh and Wienhard [16], see also [37], showed that each generalised Satake compactification can be realised as a horofunction compactification with respect to an invariant polyhedral Finsler metric on the flats. Kapovich and Leeb [24] realised the maximal Satake compactification of a symmetric space $X = G/K$ of non-compact type as the horofunction compactification with respect to an invariant Finsler metric on X . Friedland and Freitas [19] showed that the horofunction compactification of the Siegel upper half plane of rank n under the Finsler 1-metric agrees with the bounded symmetric domain compactification, which is a minimal Satake compactification. Greenfield and Ji [12] used invariant Finsler distances to study compactifications of the Teichmüller spaces of flat tori. In particular, they study the horofunction compactification of $SL_n(\mathbb{R})/SO_n$ under the Thompson distance, which they refer to as the generalised Hilbert metric. For the Satake and Martin compactifications of symmetric spaces Ji [21] showed that they are homeomorphic to the closed unit ball in the tangent space, see also [26].

The Hilbert and Thompson distances are important invariant Finsler distances on the classes of symmetric spaces we consider here. It would be interesting to know if their horofunction compactifications realise a generalised Satake compactification. In the final section we briefly discuss this problem.

Horofunction compactifications of Finsler symmetric spaces have been studied in a variety of settings. Friedland and Freitas [18] determined the horofunction compactification for Finsler p -metrics on $GL_n(\mathbb{C})/U_n$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$. The case $p = \infty$ on $GL_n(\mathbb{C})/U_n$ corresponds to the Thompson distance on the symmetric cone $\Pi_n(\mathbb{C})$, and is an example of the spaces discussed here. For general normed spaces the horofunction compactification has been studied by Walsh in [38, 41], who gave a complete description of

the Busemann points. The horofunction for classical ℓ_p -spaces have been analysed by Gutiérrez [13, 14], see also [18]. For normed spaces with a polyhedral unit ball, the horofunction boundary has been determined in [8, 25, 22], and it was shown in [23] that they are related to projective toric varieties. In [37, Chapter 3] Schilling showed that the horofunction compactification is homeomorphic to the closed dual unit ball for various classes of normed spaces including certain l_1 -sums of normed spaces. The Thompson distance horofunctions on general finite dimensional cones were studied by Walsh in [40], who gave a general characterisation of the Busemann points and the detour distance. In Section 3 we will give an explicit description of the Thompson distance horofunctions and the detour distance on symmetric cones in terms of the underlying Jordan algebra. As we shall see, the Jordan algebra structure and the symmetry of the space will allow us to give simple and direct proofs of these characterisations. The horofunctions for general Hilbert distance spaces were studied in [39], see also [9]. For Riemannian symmetric spaces the horofunction compactification is homeomorphic to the Euclidean ball, see [10]. In fact, for CAT(0) spaces it is known that the horofunction compactifications coincides with the visual boundary, see [5, 7].

2 Preliminaries

To fix the terminology and notation we recall the basic concepts and results concerning the horofunction compactification, the Hilbert and Thompson distances on cones, and the theory of symmetric cones.

2.1 Horofunction compactifications

Let (M, d) be a metric space and \mathbb{R}^M be the space of all real functions on M equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence. Fix a *basepoint* $b \in M$, and let $\text{Lip}_b^c(M)$ denote the set of all c -Lipschitz functions $h \in \mathbb{R}^M$ such that $h(b) = 0$, so $|h(x) - h(y)| \leq cd(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in M$. Then $\text{Lip}_b^c(M)$ is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^M . For $y \in M$ define the real valued function,

$$h_y(z) = d(z, y) - d(b, y) \quad \text{with } z \in M. \quad (2.1)$$

Then $h_y(b) = 0$ and $|h_y(z) - h_y(w)| = |d(z, y) - d(w, y)| \leq d(z, w)$. Thus, $h_y \in \text{Lip}_b^1(M)$ for all $y \in M$. Using the fact that $\text{Lip}_b^1(M)$ is compact, one defines the *horofunction compactification* of (M, d) to be the closure of $\{h_y : y \in M\}$ in \mathbb{R}^M , which we denote by \overline{M}^h . Its elements are called *metric functionals*, and the boundary $\partial\overline{M}^h = \overline{M}^h \setminus \{h_y : y \in M\}$ is called the *horofunction boundary*. The metric functionals in $\partial\overline{M}^h$ are called *horofunctions*.

The topology of pointwise convergence on $\text{Lip}_b^1(M)$ coincides with the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets, see [33, Section 46]. If (M, d) is separable, then the topology of pointwise convergence on $\text{Lip}_b^1(M)$ is metrisable, and in that case each horofunction is the limit of a sequence (x^n) in M . If (M, d) is proper (i.e. closed balls are compact) and geodesic, then the embedding $\iota : y \in M \mapsto h_y \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is a homeomorphism from M onto $\iota(M)$, and \overline{M}^h is a compactification in the usual topological sense. Recall that a map γ from a (possibly unbounded) interval $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ into a metric space (M, d) is called a *geodesic path* if

$$d(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)) = |s - t| \quad \text{for all } s, t \in I.$$

The image, $\gamma(I)$, is called a *geodesic*, and a metric space (M, d) is said to be *geodesic* if for each $x, y \in M$ there exists a geodesic path $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ connecting x and y , i.e. $\gamma(a) = x$ and $\gamma(b) = y$.

The following well-known fact will be useful in the sequel. see [36, Theorem 4.7].

Lemma 2.1. *If (M, d) is a proper geodesic metric space, then $h \in \partial\overline{M}^h$ if and only if there exists a sequence (x^n) in M with $d(b, x^n) \rightarrow \infty$ such that (h_{x^n}) converges to $h \in \overline{M}^h$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

A path $\gamma : T \rightarrow M$, where $T \subseteq [0, \infty)$ is unbounded and $0 \in T$, is called an *almost geodesic* if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $M \geq 0$ such that

$$|d(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) + d(\gamma(s), \gamma(0)) - t| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } s, t \in T \text{ with } t \geq s \geq M.$$

The notion of an almost geodesic sequence goes back to Rieffel [36] and was further developed by Walsh and co-workers in [1, 31, 41]. In particular, every almost geodesic yields a horofunction for a proper geodesic metric space [36, Lemma 4.5].

Lemma 2.2. *Let (M, d) be a proper geodesic metric space. If γ is an almost geodesic in M , then*

$$h(z) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d(z, \gamma(t)) - d(b, \gamma(t))$$

exists for all $z \in M$ and $h \in \partial \overline{M}^h$.

A horofunction h in a proper geodesic metric space (M, d) , is called a *Busemann point* if it is the limit of an almost geodesic γ in M , and we denote the collection of all Busemann points by \mathcal{B}_M .

Suppose that h and h' are horofunctions of a proper geodesic metric space (M, d) . Let W_h be the collection of neighbourhoods of h in \overline{M}^h . The *detour cost* is defined by

$$H(h, h') = \sup_{W \in W_h} \left(\inf_{x: \iota(x) \in W} d(b, x) + h'(x) \right),$$

and the *detour distance* is given by $\delta(h, h') = H(h, h') + H(h', h)$.

It is known, see for instance [31, Lemma 3.1], that if $\gamma: T \rightarrow M$ is an almost geodesic converging to a horofunction h , then

$$H(h, h') = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d(b, \gamma(t)) + h'(\gamma(t)) \quad (2.2)$$

for all horofunctions h' . It is also known, that on the set of Busemann points \mathcal{B}_M the detour distance is a metric, where points can be at infinite distance from each other, see e.g. [31, Proposition 3.2]. The detour distance yields a partition of \mathcal{B}_M into equivalence classes, called *parts*, where h and h' are equivalent if $\delta(h, h') < \infty$.

2.2 Cones and the Hilbert and Thompson distances

Let A be a real vector space. A *cone* A_+ in A is a convex subset such that $\lambda A_+ \subseteq A_+$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$ and $A_+ \cap -A_+ = \{0\}$. A cone A_+ induces a partial ordering \leq on A by $x \leq y$ if $y - x \in A_+$. We write $x < y$ if $x \leq y$ and $x \neq y$. The cone A_+ is said to be *Archimedean* if for each $x \in A$ and $y \in A_+$ with $nx \leq y$ for all $n \geq 1$, we have that $x \leq 0$. A point $u \in A_+$ is called an *order-unit* if for each $x \in A$ there exists $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $-\lambda u \leq x \leq \lambda u$. The triple (A, A_+, u) , where A_+ is an Archimedean cone and u is an order-unit, is called an *order-unit space*, see [2, Chapter 1]. An order-unit space can be equipped with the *order-unit norm*,

$$\|x\|_u = \inf\{\lambda \geq 0: -\lambda u \leq x \leq \lambda u\}.$$

So for each $x \in A$ we have that $-\|x\|_u u \leq x \leq \|x\|_u u$. Moreover, the cone A_+ is closed with respect to the order-unit norm. The interior of A_+ will be denoted by A_+° , and is nonempty, as $u \in A_+^\circ$.

Given $x \in A$ and $y \in A_+$, we say that y *dominates* x if there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\alpha y \leq x \leq \beta y$. In that case, we let

$$M(x/y) = \inf\{\beta \in \mathbb{R}: x \leq \beta y\} \quad \text{and} \quad m(x/y) = \sup\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}: \alpha y \leq x\}.$$

We note that for each $x \in A$ we have that $\|x\|_u = \max\{M(x/u), M(-x/u)\}$. If $w \in A_+^\circ$, then w dominates each $x \in A$, as it is an order-unit. In that case we define

$$|x|_w = M(x/w) - m(x/w) \quad \text{for } x \in A.$$

It can be shown that $|\cdot|_w$ is a semi-norm on A , see [28, Lemma A.1.1], and $|x|_w = 0$ if and only if $x = \lambda w$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. So, $|\cdot|_w$ is a genuine norm on the quotient space $A/\mathbb{R}w$. Furthermore,

$$|x + \lambda w|_w = |x|_w \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } x \in V. \quad (2.3)$$

The domination relation yields an equivalence relation on A_+ by $x \sim y$ if y dominates x and x dominates y . So, $x \sim y$ if and only if there exist $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ such that $\alpha y \leq x \leq \beta y$. The equivalence classes are called *parts* of A_+ . The parts of a cone in a finite dimensional order-unit space correspond to the relative interiors of its faces, see [28, Lemma 1.2.2].

The *Thompson distance* on A_+ is defined follows:

$$d_T(x, y) = \max\{\log M(x/y), \log M(y/x)\}$$

for all $x \sim y$ with $y \neq 0$, $d_T(0, 0) = 0$, and $d_T(x, y) = \infty$ otherwise. The Thompson distance is a metric on each part of A_+ , see [28, Chapter 2]. In particular, it is a metric on A_+° .

Likewise, the *Hilbert distance* on A_+ is given by,

$$d_H(x, y) = \log M(x/y) + \log M(y/x)$$

for all $x \sim y$ with $y \neq 0$, $d_H(0, 0) = 0$, and $d_H(x, y) = \infty$ otherwise. We note that $d_H(\lambda x, \mu y) = d_H(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in A_+$ and $\lambda, \mu > 0$, so d_H is not a metric on each part. It is, however, a metric between pairs of rays in each part of A_+ , see [28, Proposition 2.1.1].

In the sequel the following fact will be useful. The function $(x, y) \mapsto M(x/y)$ is continuous on $A_+ \times A_+^\circ$, see [27, Lemma 2.2].

2.3 Symmetric cones and Euclidean Jordan algebras

The interior A_+° of a cone A_+ in a finite dimensional real vector space A is called a *symmetric cone* if

- (1) there exists an inner product $(\cdot | \cdot)$ on A such that A_+ is *self-dual*, i.e.,

$$A_+ = A_+^* = \{y \in A : (y | x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in A_+\}.$$

- (2) A_+° is *homogeneous*, i.e., $\text{Aut}(A_+) = \{g \in \text{GL}(A) : g(A_+) = A_+\}$ acts transitively on A_+° .

The Koecher-Vinberg theorem say that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the symmetric cones and the interiors of the cones of squares in finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebras (with unit). Recall that a *real Jordan algebra* is a real vector space A with a commutative bilinear product $(x, y) \in A \times A \mapsto x \bullet y \in A$ satisfying the *Jordan identity*, $x^2 \bullet (x \bullet y) = x \bullet (x^2 \bullet y)$. A Jordan algebra A is said to be *formally real* if $x^2 + y^2 = 0$ implies $x = 0$ and $y = 0$.

Throughout this article we will denote the unit in the Jordan algebra by u . The unit u is an order-unit for the cone $A_+ = \{x^2 : x \in A\}$. We will consider the formally real Jordan algebras A as order-unit spaces (A, A_+, u) , where A_+ is the cone of squares and u is the unit, and equip it with the order-unit norm. These normed spaces are precisely the finite dimensional JB-algebras, see [3, Theorem 1.11].

Throughout we will fix the rank of the Jordan algebra A to be r . In a finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebra A each $x \in A$ has a *spectrum*, $\sigma(x) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda u - x \text{ is not invertible}\}$, and we have that $A_+ = \{x \in V : \sigma(x) \subset [0, \infty)\}$. We write $\Lambda(x) = M(x/u)$ and note that

$$\Lambda(x) = \max\{\lambda : \lambda \in \sigma(x)\},$$

so that

$$\|x\|_u = \max\{\Lambda(x), \Lambda(-x)\} = \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(x)\}$$

for all $x \in A$. We also note that $\Lambda(x + \mu u) = \Lambda(x) + \mu$ for all $x \in A$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, if $x \leq y$, then $\Lambda(x) \leq \Lambda(y)$.

Recall that $p \in A$ is an *idempotent* if $p^2 = p$. If, in addition, p is non-zero and cannot be written as the sum of two non-zero idempotents, then it is said to be a *primitive* idempotent. The set of all primitive idempotent is denoted $\mathcal{J}_1(A)$ and is known to be a compact set [20]. Two idempotents p and q are said to be orthogonal if $p \bullet q = 0$, which is equivalent to $(p|q) = 0$. According to the spectral theorem [17, Theorem III.1.2], each x has a *spectral decomposition*, $x = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i p_i$, where each p_i is a primitive

idempotent, the λ_i 's are the eigenvalues of x (including multiplicities), and p_1, \dots, p_r is a Jordan frame, i.e., the p_i 's are mutually orthogonal and $p_1 + \dots + p_r = u$. Moreover, $\text{tr} x = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i$ and $\det x = \prod_{i=1}^r \lambda_i$.

For $x \in A$ we denote the *quadratic representation* by $U_x: A \rightarrow A$, which is the linear map, $U_x y = 2x \bullet (x \bullet y) - x^2 \bullet y$. If $x \in A$ is invertible, then U_x is invertible and $U_x(A_+) = A_+$, see [17, Proposition III.2.2].

Given a Jordan frame p_1, \dots, p_r in A and $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ nonempty, we write $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ and we let $A(p_I) = U_{p_I}(A)$. Recall [17, Theorem IV.1.1] that $A(p_I)$ is the Peirce 1-space of the idempotent p_I , i.e., $A(p_I) = \{x \in A: p_I \bullet x = x\}$, which is a subalgebra. Given $z \in A(p_I)$, we write $\Lambda_{A(p_I)}(z)$ to denote the maximal eigenvalue of z in the Jordan subalgebra $A(p_I)$ with unit p_I . So $\Lambda_{A(p_I)}(z) = \inf\{\lambda: z \leq \lambda p_I\}$.

3 Thompson distance horofunctions

Let A_+° be a symmetric cone. For $x, y \in A_+^\circ$ we have that $x \leq \lambda y$ if and only if $U_{y^{-1/2}} x \leq \lambda u$. Therefore $\log M(x/y) = \log \max \sigma(U_{y^{-1/2}} x) = \max \sigma(\log U_{y^{-1/2}} x)$. We also have that

$$\inf\{\lambda > 0: y \leq \lambda x\} = (\sup\{\mu > 0: \mu y \leq x\})^{-1} = (\sup\{\mu > 0: \mu u \leq U_{y^{-1/2}} x\})^{-1} = (\min \sigma(U_{y^{-1/2}} x))^{-1},$$

so that $\log M(y/x) = \log(\min \sigma(U_{y^{-1/2}} x))^{-1} = -\min \sigma(\log U_{y^{-1/2}} x)$. So the Thompson distance satisfies

$$d_T(x, y) = \max\{\max \sigma(\log U_{y^{-1/2}} x), -\min \sigma(\log U_{y^{-1/2}} x)\} = \|\log U_{y^{-1/2}} x\|_u.$$

The symmetry at $x \in A_+^\circ$ is given by $S_x(y) = U_x y^{-1}$ for $y \in A_+^\circ$. It can be shown that

$$M(x^{-1}/y^{-1}) = M(y/x) \quad \text{for } x, y \in A_+^\circ, \quad (3.1)$$

see [29, p. 1518]. Thus, for each $x \in A_+^\circ$ the symmetry $S_x: A_+^\circ \rightarrow A_+^\circ$ is a d_T -isometry.

The following observation will be useful when determining the Thompson distance horofunctions for symmetric cones.

Lemma 3.1. *Let p_1, \dots, p_k be orthogonal primitive idempotents in a finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebra A . The restriction of $\exp_u: (A, \|\cdot\|_u) \rightarrow (A_+^\circ, d_T)$ to $\text{Span}(\{p_1, \dots, p_k\})$ is an isometry. Moreover, if $x, w \in \text{Span}(\{p_1, \dots, p_k\})$ with $\|w\|_u = 1$ and $\gamma(t) = tw + x$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\psi: t \mapsto \exp_u(\gamma(t))$ is a geodesic in (A_+°, d_T) .*

Proof. For $y, z \in \text{Span}(\{p_1, \dots, p_k\})$ we have that

$$d_T(\exp_u(y), \exp_u(z)) = d_T(e^y, e^z) = \|\log U_{e^{-z/2}} e^y\|_u = \|\log e^{y-z}\|_u = \|y - z\|_u.$$

The second assertion now easily follows, as $d_T(\exp_u(\gamma(t)), \exp_u(\gamma(s))) = \|(t-s)w\|_u = |t-s|$ for all $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

We now give a complete description of the Thompson distance horofunctions on symmetric cones.

Theorem 3.2. *If A_+° is a symmetric cone, then the horofunctions of (A_+°, d_T) are all the functions of the form*

$$h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\} \quad \text{for } x \in A_+^\circ, \quad (3.2)$$

where $y, z \in A_+$ with $y \bullet z = 0$ and $\max\{\|y\|_u, \|z\|_u\} = 1$. Here we use the convention that if y or z is 0, then the corresponding term is omitted from the maximum. Moreover, each horofunction is a Busemann point.

Proof. We first show that each horofunction is of the form (3.2). Let $(y^n) \in A_+^\circ$ be such that $h_{y^n} \rightarrow h$ where h is a horofunction. By Lemma 2.1 we know that $d_T(y^n, u) \rightarrow \infty$. Let $r_n = e^{d_T(y^n, u)}$ and $z^n = (y^n)^{-1}$ for all n . Then $y^n \leq r_n u$ and $z^n \leq r_n u$. Set $\hat{y}^n = y^n/r_n$ and $\hat{z}^n = z^n/r_n$. By taking a subsequence we may assume that $\hat{y}^n \rightarrow y$ and $\hat{z}^n \rightarrow z$, as $\hat{y}^n, \hat{z}^n \leq u$ for all n . As $\hat{y}^n \bullet \hat{z}^n = u/r_n^2 \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that $y \bullet z = 0$.

Also note that as $\|y^n\|_u = M(y^n/u)$ and $\|z^n\|_u = M(z^n/u) = M(u/y^n)$, we get that

$$r_n = e^{d_T(y^n, u)} = \max\{M(y^n/u), M(u/y^n)\} = \max\{\|y^n\|_u, \|z^n\|_u\},$$

so that $\max\{\|y\|_u, \|z\|_u\} = \max\{\|\hat{y}^n\|_u, \|\hat{z}^n\|_u\} = 1$. Using (3.1) we find for $x \in A_+^\circ$ that

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(y^n/x), \log M(x/y^n)\} - \log r_n \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log(r_n^{-1}M(y^n/x)), \log(r_n^{-1}M(z^n/x^{-1}))\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(\hat{y}^n/x), \log M(\hat{z}^n/x^{-1})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $w^n, v \in A_+^\circ$ with $w^n \rightarrow 0$, then $M(w^n/v) \rightarrow M(0/v) = 0$ by the continuity of the M function ([27, Lemma 2.2]). As $h(x) \geq -d_T(x, u)$ for all $x \in A_+^\circ$, we deduce from the previous equality that $h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\}$, where if $y = 0$ or $z = 0$, the corresponding term is omitted from the maximum.

To show that each function of the form (3.2) is a horofunction, let $y, z \in A_+$ with $\max\{\|y\|_u, \|z\|_u\} = 1$ and $y \bullet z = 0$. We will discuss the case where y and z are both non-zero. The other cases can be proved in the same fashion and are left to the reader.

Using the spectral decomposition we can write

$$y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i \quad \text{and} \quad z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j,$$

where $\min\{\alpha_k : k \in I \cup J\} = 0$, and the p_k 's are mutually orthogonal primitive idempotents. Set $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ and $p_J = \sum_{j \in J} p_j$. So $p_I \bullet p_J = 0$, and hence orthogonal idempotents in A . Let $v = -\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j$ and $w = p_I - p_J$. Note that $w \in \text{Span}(\{p_k : k \in I \cup J\})$. For $t > 0$ let $\gamma(t) = tw + v$.

From Lemma 3.1 we know that $\psi : t \mapsto \exp_u(\gamma(t))$ is a geodesic in A_+° , and for all $t > 0$ sufficiently large we have that

$$d_T(\psi(t), u) = \|\log e^{tw+v}\|_u = \|tw + v\|_u = \max\{|t - \alpha_k| : k \in I \cup J\} = t,$$

as $\min\{\alpha_k : k \in I \cup J\} = 0$. Moreover, $\psi(t)^{-1} = e^{-(tw+v)}$.

Thus,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t} \psi(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i + \sum_{j \in J} e^{-2t+\alpha_j} p_j + e^{-t}(u - p_I - p_J) = y$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t} \psi(t)^{-1} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i \in I} e^{-2t+\alpha_i} p_i + \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j + e^{-t}(u - p_I - p_J) = z.$$

Now using (3.1) we deduce for each $x \in A_+^\circ$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_T(x, \psi(t)) - d_T(\psi(t), u) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(\psi(t)/x), \log M(x/\psi(t))\} - t \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(e^{-t} \psi(t)/x), \log M(e^{-t} \psi(t)^{-1}/x^{-1})\} \\ &= \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x)\}, \end{aligned}$$

as $v \in A_+ \mapsto M(v/w)$ is continuous for all $w \in A_+^\circ$ by [27, Lemma 2.2]. We conclude that the function of the form (3.2) is a horofunction. In fact, it is a Busemann point, as $t \mapsto \psi(t)$ is a geodesic. \square

In the case of $\Pi_n(\mathbb{C})$ we get that the horofunctions are the functions $h : \Pi_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form:

$$h(X) = \max\{\log \max \sigma(X^{-1/2}AX^{-1/2}), \log \max \sigma(X^{1/2}BX^{1/2})\},$$

where A and B are positive semi-definite, with $\max\{\max \sigma(A), \max \sigma(B)\} = 1$ and $1/2(AB + BA) = 0$.

Remark 3.3. We see from the proof of Theorem 3.2 that each horofunction of (A_+°, d_T) is obtained as the limit of a geodesic in the span of a Jordan frame. This is in agreement with [16, Lemma 4.4], which implies that each horofunction of (A_+°, d_T) arises as a limit of a sequence in a flat. In fact, if h is a horofunction given by $h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\}$, where $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$, $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$, then $\psi: t \mapsto \exp_u(\gamma(t))$, with

$$\gamma(t) = t \left(\sum_{i \in I} p_i - \sum_{j \in J} p_j \right) - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j$$

for $t > 0$, is a geodesic A_+° converging to h .

To analyse the parts and the detour distance, the following observation is useful. If (V_i, C_i, u_i) , $i = 1, 2$, are order-unit spaces, then the product space $V_1 \oplus V_2$ is an order unit space with cone $C_1 \times C_2$ and order unit $u = (u_1, u_2)$. Moreover, for $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in C_1 \times C_2$ we have that

$$M(x/y) = \max\{M(x_1/y_1), M(x_2/y_2)\}.$$

Indeed, if $x \leq \lambda y$, then $\lambda y - x \in C_1 \times C_2$, and hence $\lambda y_1 - x_1 \in C_1$ and $\lambda y_2 - x_2 \in C_2$. So $\lambda \geq \max\{M(x_1/y_1), M(x_2/y_2)\}$. On the hand, if $x_1 \leq \mu y_1$ and $x_2 \leq \mu y_2$, then $\mu y - x \in C_1 \times C_2$, so that $\mu \geq M(x/y)$.

Theorem 3.4. Suppose that h and h' are horofunctions in $\overline{A_+^\circ}^h$, where

$$h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\} \text{ and } h'(x) = \max\{\log M(y'/x), \log M(z'/x^{-1})\} \text{ for } x \in A_+^\circ.$$

Let $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$, $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$, and set $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ if $y \neq 0$, and $p_J = \sum_{j \in J} p_j$ if $z \neq 0$. Then h and h' are in the same part if and only if $y \sim y'$ and $z \sim z'$. Moreover, in that case,

$$\delta(h, h') = d_H((y, z), (y', z')), \text{ where } (y, z), (y', z') \in U_{p_I}(A) \oplus U_{p_J}(A)$$

and d_H is the Hilbert distance on the product cone $U_{p_I}(A)_+ \times U_{p_J}(A)_+$. Here, if y or z is 0, we omit the corresponding term in the sum $U_{p_I}(A) \oplus U_{p_J}(A)$.

Proof. We use (2.2) to determine the detour cost $H(h, h')$. Note that as $\|y\|_u = 1$ or $\|z\|_u = 1$, we have that $\min\{\alpha_k: k \in I \cup J\} = 0$. Using the notation as in the proof of Theorem 3.2 we let $v = -\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j$ and $w = p_I - p_J$, so $w \in \text{Span}(\{p_k: k \in I \cup J\})$. For $t > 0$ let $\gamma(t) = tw + v$. From Lemma 3.1 we know that $\psi: t \mapsto \exp_u(\gamma(t))$ is a geodesic in A_+° , and for all $t > 0$ sufficiently large we have that

$$d_T(\psi(t), u) = \|\log e^{tw+v}\|_u = \|tw + v\|_u = \max\{|t - \alpha_k|: k \in I \cup J\} = t,$$

as $\min\{\alpha_k: k \in I \cup J\} = 0$. Moreover, $\psi(t)^{-1} = e^{-(tw+v)}$ and $h_{\psi(t)} \rightarrow h$.

As $e^{-t}\psi(t) = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i + \sum_{j \in J} e^{-2t+\alpha_j} p_j + e^{-t}(u - p_I - p_J)$, we have that $e^{-t}\psi(t) \rightarrow y$ and

$$e^{-t}\psi(t) \leq e^{-s}\psi(s) \text{ for all } 0 \leq s \leq t.$$

Likewise, $e^{-t}\psi(t)^{-1} \rightarrow z$ and $e^{-t}\psi(t)^{-1} \leq e^{-s}\psi(s)^{-1}$ for all $0 \leq s \leq t$.

It follows from [30, Lemma 5.5] that if y dominates y' and z dominates z' , then

$$\begin{aligned} H(h, h') &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_T(\psi(t), u) + h'(\psi(t)) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t + \max\{\log M(y'/\psi(t)), \log M(z'/\psi(t)^{-1})\} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(y'/e^{-t}\psi(t)), \log M(z'/e^{-t}\psi(t)^{-1})\} \\ &= \max\{\log M(y'/y), \log M(z'/z)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and otherwise, $H(h, h') = \infty$. Here, if $y' = 0$ or $z' = 0$, the corresponding term is omitted from the maximum.

Interchanging the roles of h and h' gives

$$\delta(h, h') = \max\{\log M(y'/y), \log M(z'/z)\} + \max\{\log M(y/y'), \log M(z/z')\} = d_H((y, z), (y', z'))$$

if $y \sim y'$ and $z \sim z'$, and $\delta(h, h') = \infty$ otherwise. \square

4 Proof of part (a) of Theorem 1.1

To define the extension of the exponential map we need to recall the description of the horofunctions in \overline{A}^h from [30, Theorem 4.2]. It was shown there that the horofunctions in \overline{A}^h are precisely the functions $g: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form,

$$g(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I}v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i), \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J}v - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j) \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $p_1, \dots, p_r \in A$ is a Jordan frame, $I, J \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ are disjoint and $I \cup J$ is nonempty, $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$, $p_J = \sum_{j \in J} p_j$, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{I \cup J}$ with $\min\{\alpha_k: k \in I \cup J\}$. Here the convention is that if I or J is empty, the corresponding term in the maximum is omitted.

Definition 4.1. The exponential map $\exp_u: \overline{A}^h \rightarrow \overline{A}_+^{\circ h}$ is defined by, $\exp_u(v) = e^v$ for $v \in A$, and for $g \in \partial \overline{A}^h$ given by (4.1) we let $\exp_u(g) = h$, where

$$h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/z), \log M(z/x^{-1})\} \quad \text{for } x \in A_+^{\circ}, \quad (4.2)$$

with $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$.

Note that $y, z \in A_+$, with $\max\{\|y\|_u, \|z\|_u\} = 1$, as $\min\{\alpha_k: k \in I \cup J\} = 0$, and $y \bullet z = 0$. So, $\exp_u(g)$ is a horofunction by Theorem 3.2. Moreover, the extension is well defined. To show this we use the following observation.

Lemma 4.2. Suppose $x, y \in A$ have spectral decompositions $x = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i$ and $y = \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j q_j$. If $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = \sum_{j \in J} q_j$ and $x = y$, then $\sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$.

Proof. Let $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ and $q_J = \sum_{j \in J} q_j$, so $p_I = q_J$. As $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j q_j$, we have that $(u - p_I) + \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = (u - q_J) + \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$, and hence $\sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$. \square

Now to see that the extension is well-defined assume that g in (4.1) is represented differently as

$$g(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i), \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) \right\},$$

It follows from [30, Theorem 4.3] and the fact that $\delta(g, g) = 0$ that $p_I = q_{I'}$, $p_J = q_{J'}$, and

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j,$$

as $\min\{\alpha_m: m \in I \cup J\} = 0 = \min\{\beta_m: m \in I' \cup J'\}$. So,

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = U_{p_I} \left(\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j \right) = U_{q_{I'}} \left(\sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j \right) = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$$

and

$$\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = U_{p_J} \left(\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j \right) = U_{q_{J'}} \left(\sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j \right) = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j.$$

Using Lemma 4.2 we conclude that $\sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $\sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$, and hence the extension is well defined.

We will prove in this section that this extension of the exponential map is a homeomorphism that maps each part in $\partial \overline{A}^h$ onto a part in $\partial \overline{A}_+^{\circ h}$. To start we show that the extension is a bijection.

Lemma 4.3. The map $\exp_u: \overline{A}^h \rightarrow \overline{A}_+^{\circ h}$ is a bijection, which maps A onto A_+° and $\partial \overline{A}^h$ onto $\partial \overline{A}_+^{\circ h}$.

Proof. Clearly \exp_u is a bijection from A onto A_+° . Moreover, it follows from Theorem 3.2 and [30, Theorem 4.2] that \exp_u maps $\partial\bar{A}^h$ onto $\partial\bar{A}_+^\circ$. To show that the extension is injective on $\partial\bar{A}^h$ suppose that $h = \exp_u(g) = \exp_u(g') = h'$, where g is as in (4.1) and

$$g'(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i), \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) \right\}, \quad (4.3)$$

with $q_1, \dots, q_r \in A$ is a Jordan frame, $I', J' \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ are disjoint and $I' \cup J'$ is nonempty, and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{I' \cup J'}$ with $\min\{\beta_k : k \in I' \cup J'\}$.

By definition of the extension, we have that

$$h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\}, \quad \text{with } y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i \text{ and } z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j,$$

and

$$h'(x) = \max\{\log M(y'/x), \log M(z'/x^{-1})\}, \quad \text{with } y' = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i \text{ and } z' = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j.$$

As $h = h'$ we know that $\delta(h, h') = 0$, and hence $y = y'$ and $z = z'$ by Theorem 3.4. It now follows from the spectral theorem [17, Theorems III.1.1 and III.1.2] that $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$ and $\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j$. Moreover, $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$. This implies that $g = g'$, and hence \exp_u is injective, which completes the proof. \square

Clearly \exp_u is continuous on A . To establish the continuity on all of \bar{A}^h we prove two lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *If (w^n) in A converges to $g \in \partial\bar{A}^h$, then $(\exp_u(w^n))$ converges to $\exp_u(g)$.*

Proof. To prove the statement we show that each subsequence of $(\exp_u(w^n))$ has a convergent subsequence with limit $\exp_u(g)$. So let $(\exp_u(w^{n_k}))$ be a subsequence and let g be given by (4.1), so that $h = \exp_u(g)$ is given by (4.2). As g is a horofunction, we know by Lemma 2.1 that $\|w^{n_k}\|_u \rightarrow \infty$. For $k \geq 1$ write $r_{n_k} = \|w^{n_k}\|_u$ and let $w^{n_k} = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^{n_k} q_i^{n_k}$ be the spectral decomposition of w^{n_k} . After taking a subsequence, may assume that

- (1) There exists $s \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $r_{n_k} = |\lambda_s^{n_k}|$ for all $k \geq 1$.
- (2) There exist $I_+ \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that for each $k \geq 1$ we have $\lambda_i^{n_k} > 0$ if and only if $i \in I_+$.
- (3) $q_i^{n_k} \rightarrow q_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.

The third property follows from the fact that the set of primitive idempotents is compact, see [20].

Now let $\beta_i^{n_k} = r_{n_k} - \lambda_i^{n_k}$ for all $i \in I_+$ and $\beta_i^{n_k} = r_{n_k} + \lambda_i^{n_k}$ for all $i \notin I_+$. So $\beta_i^{n_k} \geq 0$ for all i , and $\beta_s^{n_k} = 0$ for all k . By taking a further subsequence we may also assume that $\beta_i^{n_k} \rightarrow \beta_i \in [0, \infty]$ for all i . Let $I' = \{i \in I_+ : \beta_i < \infty\}$ and $J' = \{j \notin I_+ : \beta_j < \infty\}$. Note that $s \in I' \cup J'$ and hence the union is nonempty. Moreover, I' and J' are disjoint. It now follows from [30, Lemma 4.7] that $g_{w^{n_k}} \rightarrow g'$, where

$$g'(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i), \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) \right\},$$

with $q_{I'} = \sum_{i \in I'} q_i$ and $q_{J'} = \sum_{j \in J'} q_j$.

As (w^n) converges to g , we find that $g = g'$, and hence $\delta(g, g') = 0$. It now follows from [30, Theorem 4.3] that $p_I = q_{I'}$, $p_J = q_{J'}$, and

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j,$$

as $\min_{i \in I \cup J} \alpha_i = 0 = \min_{i \in I' \cup J'} \beta_i$. This implies that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = U_{p_I} \left(\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j \right) = U_{q_{I'}} \left(\sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j \right) = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i.$$

Likewise, we have $\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j$. From Lemma 4.2 we now deduce that $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$.

Note that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(w^{n_k}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r e^{-(r_{n_k} - \lambda_i^{n_k})} q_i^{n_k} = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i = y$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(-w^{n_k}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^r e^{-(r_{n_k} + \lambda_i^{n_k})} q_i^{n_k} = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j = z.$$

It now follows from the continuity of the M function, see [27, Lemma 2.2], that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_{\exp_u(w^{n_k})}(x) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_T(x, \exp_u(w^{n_k})) - d_T(u, \exp_u(w^{n_k})) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(\exp_u(w^{n_k})/x), \log M(\exp_u(-w^{n_k})/x^{-1})\} - \log e^{r_{n_k}} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(w^{n_k})/x), \log M(e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(-w^{n_k})/x^{-1})\} \\ &= \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $(\exp_u(w^{n_k}))$ converges to $h = \exp_u(g)$, and hence the proof is complete. \square

Next we show continuity of \exp_u in the horofunction boundary.

Lemma 4.5. *If (g_n) in $\partial \bar{A}^h$ converges to a horofunction g , then $(\exp_u(g_n))$ converges to $\exp_u(g)$.*

Proof. Let (g_n) be a sequence in $\partial \bar{A}^h$ converging to g , where g is given by (4.1). So $\exp_u(g) = h$, where h is given by (4.2). To show the lemma, we prove that each subsequence of $(\exp_u(g_n))$ has a convergent subsequence with limit h . Let $(\exp_u(g_{n_k}))$ be a subsequence. By [30, Theorem 4.2] we can write for $k \geq 1$,

$$g_{n_k}(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(q_{I_k}^k)}(-U_{q_{I_k}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_k} \beta_i^k q_i^k), \Lambda_{A(q_{J_k}^k)}(U_{q_{J_k}^k} v - \sum_{j \in J_k} \beta_j^k q_j^k) \right\},$$

where the q_i^k and q_j^k are orthogonal primitive idempotents, $I_k, J_k \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ are disjoint with $I_k \cup J_k$ nonempty, $\min\{\beta_m^k : m \in I_k \cup J_k\} = 0$, $q_{I_k}^k = \sum_{i \in I_k} q_i^k$ and $q_{J_k}^k = \sum_{j \in J_k} q_j^k$.

The approach will be similar to the one taken in the proof of the previous lemma. After taking subsequences we may assume that:

- (1) There exist $I_0, J_0 \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $I_0 = I_k$ and $J_0 = J_k$ for all k .
- (2) There exists $s \in I_0 \cup J_0$ such that $\beta_s^k = 0$ for all k .
- (3) $\beta_m^k \rightarrow \beta_m \in [0, \infty]$ and $q_m^k \rightarrow q_m$ for all $m \in I_0 \cup J_0$.

Now let $I' = \{i \in I_0 : \beta_i < \infty\}$ and $J' = \{j \in J_0 : \beta_j < \infty\}$, and note that $s \in I' \cup J'$.

Next we show that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_{n_k}(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i), \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) \right\} \quad (4.4)$$

where the term is omitted if the corresponding set I' or J' is empty. Here $q_{I'} = \sum_{i \in I'} q_i$ and $q_{J'} = \sum_{j \in J'} q_j$.

First let us assume that $I_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $I' = \emptyset$. Note that

$$-U_{q_{I_0}^k} v \leq \|v\|_u U_{q_{I_0}^k} u = \|v\|_u q_{I_0}^k,$$

as $-v \leq \|v\|_u u$ and $U_{q_{I_0}^k}(A_+) \subseteq A_+$. It follows that

$$-U_{q_{I_0}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_0} \beta_i^k q_i^k \leq \sum_{i \in I_0} (\|v\|_u - \beta_i^k) q_i^k,$$

so that

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{I_0}^k)}(-U_{q_{I_0}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_0} \beta_i^k q_i^k) \leq \Lambda_{A(q_{I_0}^k)}(\sum_{i \in I_0} (\|v\|_u - \beta_i^k) q_i^k) \leq \max_{i \in I_0} (\|v\|_u - \beta_i^k).$$

The right-hand side diverges to $-\infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, since I' is empty. We also know that for each horofunction \bar{g} in \bar{A}^h we have that $\bar{g}(v) \geq -\|v\|_u$. So, if $I_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $I' = \emptyset$, then $s \in J'$ and for each $v \in A$ we have that

$$g_{n_k}(v) = \Lambda_{A(q_{J_0}^k)}(U_{q_{J_0}^k} v - \sum_{j \in J_0} \beta_j^k q_j^k)$$

for all k large. In the same way we get that if $J_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $J' = \emptyset$, then

$$g_{n_k}(v) = \Lambda_{A(q_{I_0}^k)}(-U_{q_{I_0}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_0} \beta_i^k q_i^k)$$

for all k large.

On the other hand, if $I' \neq \emptyset$, then by [30, Lemma 4.7] we know that

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{I_0}^k)}(-U_{q_{I_0}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_0} \beta_i^k q_i^k) \rightarrow \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i),$$

and, similarly, if $J' \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{J_0}^k)}(U_{q_{J_0}^k} v - \sum_{j \in J_0} \beta_j^k q_j^k) \rightarrow \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j).$$

Note that if $I_0 = \emptyset$, then $s \in J'$. Likewise, if $J_0 = \emptyset$, then $s \in I'$. It follows that in each of the cases (4.4) holds.

Let $g' : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$g'(v) = \max \left\{ \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i), \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) \right\}.$$

Then by [30, Theorem 4.2] we know that $g' \in \partial \bar{A}^h$. As $g_n \rightarrow g$, we find that $g = g'$ and hence $\delta(g, g') = 0$.

It now follows from [30, Theorem 4.3] that $p_I = q_{I'}$, $p_J = q_{J'}$, and

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j,$$

as $\min\{\alpha_m : m \in I \cup J\} = 0 = \min\{\beta_m : m \in I' \cup J'\}$. This implies that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = U_{p_I}(\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j) = U_{q_{I'}}(\sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$$

and

$$\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = U_{p_J}(\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j) = U_{q_{J'}}(\sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i + \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j.$$

Using Lemma 4.2 we conclude that

$$\sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j,$$

So, if we let $\bar{y}^k = \sum_{i \in I_0} e^{-\beta_i^k} q_i^k$ and $\bar{z}^k = \sum_{j \in J_0} e^{-\beta_j^k} q_j^k$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{y}^k = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i = y \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{z}^k = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j = z.$$

Using the continuity of the M function ([27, Lemma 2.2]) we now get that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \exp_u(g_{n_k})(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\log M(\bar{y}^k/x), \log M(\bar{z}^k/x^{-1})\} = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\} = h(x),$$

which completes the proof. \square

To complete the proof Theorem 1.1(a) the following concepts are useful. For $x, z \in A$ we let $[x, z] = \{y \in A: x \leq y \leq z\}$, which is called an *order-interval*. Given $y \in A_+$ we let

$$\text{face}(y) = \{x \in A_+: x \leq \lambda y \text{ for some } \lambda \geq 0\}.$$

Note that $y \sim y'$ if and only if $\text{face}(y) = \text{face}(y')$. In a Euclidean Jordan algebra A every idempotent p satisfies

$$\text{face}(p) \cap [0, u] = [0, p],$$

by [3, Lemma 1.39].

Let us now prove part (a) of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1(a). It follows from Lemma 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5 that $\exp_u: \overline{A}^h \rightarrow \overline{A_+^{\circ h}}$ is a continuous bijection between the compact spaces \overline{A}^h and $\overline{A_+^{\circ h}}$. As $\overline{A_+^{\circ h}}$ is Hausdorff, we conclude that \exp_u is a homeomorphism. We know from Theorem 3.4 that if h and h' are horofunctions in $\overline{A_+^{\circ h}}$, where

$$h(x) = \max\{\log M(y/x), \log M(z/x^{-1})\} \quad \text{and} \quad h'(x) = \max\{\log M(y'/x), \log M(z'/x^{-1})\} \quad \text{for } x \in A_+^{\circ},$$

then h and h' are in the same part if and only if $y \sim y'$ and $z \sim z'$. Consider the spectral decompositions: $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$, $y' = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$, $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$, and $z' = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$. If $y \sim y'$, then $p_I \sim q_{I'}$, where $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ and $q_{I'} = \sum_{i \in I'} q_i$. Note that $p_I \sim q_{I'}$ implies $\text{face}(p_I) = \text{face}(q_{I'})$. As $\text{face}(p_I) \cap [0, u] = [0, p_I]$ by [3, Lemma 1.39], we get that $p_I = q_{I'}$. So $y \sim y'$ implies that $p_I = q_{I'}$. Conversely, if $p_I = q_{I'}$, then $y \sim p_I \sim q_{I'} \sim y'$. Thus, $y \sim y'$ if and only if $p_I = q_{I'}$. Likewise, $z \sim z'$ if and only if $p_J = q_{J'}$. Now using [30, Theorem 4.3], we conclude that \exp_u maps parts onto parts. \square

Remark 4.6. It was shown in [30, Section 4] that there exists a homeomorphism from the horofunction compactification of $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$ onto the closed unit ball in the dual space of $(A, \|\cdot\|_u)$, which maps each part of the horofunction boundary onto a relative open boundary face of the ball. The dual space $(A^*, \|\cdot\|_u^*)$ is a *base-norm space*, see [2, Theorem 1.19]. That is to say, it is an ordered normed vector space with cone $A_+^* = \{\varphi \in A^*: \varphi(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in A_+\}$, $A_+^* - A_+^* = A^*$, and the unit ball of the norm is given by

$$B_1^* = \text{conv}(S(A) \cup -S(A)),$$

where $S(A) = \{\varphi \in A_+^*: \varphi(u) = 1\}$ is the *state space* of A .

If we identify the finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebra A with A^* using the inner-product $(x|y) = \text{tr}(x \bullet y)$, we get that $A_+^* = A_+$, as A_+° is a symmetric cone (see [17, Proposition III.4.1]) and $S(A) = \{w \in A_+: (u|w) = 1\}$. It was shown in [11, Theorem 4.4] that the (closed) boundary faces of the dual ball $B_1^* = \text{conv}(S(A) \cup -S(A)) \subset A$ are precisely the sets of the form,

$$F_{p,q} = \text{conv}((U_p(A) \cap S(A)) \cup (U_q(A) \cap -S(A))), \quad (4.5)$$

where p and q are orthogonal idempotents in A .

5 Variation norm horofunctions

Let A be a finite dimensional formally real Jordan algebra and $T_u = \{w \in A: \text{tr } w = 0\}$, which is the tangent space of $PA_+^{\circ} = \{x \in A_+^{\circ}: \det x = 1\}$ at the unit u . Consider the variation norm,

$$|w|_u = M(w/u) - m(w/u) = \text{diam } \sigma(w)$$

on T_u . In this section we determine the horofunction compactification of the normed space $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)$.

We start by giving the general form of the horofunctions.

Proposition 5.1. *If $g: T_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a horofunction of $\overline{T_u^h}$, then there exist a Jordan frame $p_1, \dots, p_r \in A$, $I, J \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ disjoint and nonempty, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{I \cup J}$ with $\min_{i \in I} \alpha_i = 0 = \min_{j \in J} \alpha_j$ such that*

$$g(v) = \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I}v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J}v - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j) \quad (5.1)$$

for $v \in T_u$, where $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ and $p_J = \sum_{j \in J} p_j$.

Proof. Suppose that (w^n) in T_u is such that $g_{w^n} \rightarrow g \in \partial \overline{T_u^h}$. Then by Lemma 2.1 we know that $|w^n|_u = \text{diam } \sigma(w^n) = \Lambda(w^n) + \Lambda(-w^n) \rightarrow \infty$. Let $z^n = w^n - \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda(w^n) - \Lambda(-w^n))u \in A$. Note that for each $v \in A$ we have that $|v - w^n|_u = |v - z^n|_u$ by (2.3). Moreover, by construction, $\Lambda(z^n) = \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda(w^n) + \Lambda(-w^n)) = \Lambda(-z^n)$. Let $r_n = \Lambda(z^n)$.

Using the spectral decomposition we write $z^n = \sum_{i=1}^r \mu_i^n p_i^n$. After taking subsequences we may assume:

- (1) There exists $I_+ \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that for each $n \geq 1$ we have that $\mu_i^n > 0$ if and only if $i \in I_+$.
- (2) $p_i^n \rightarrow p_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.

For $i \in I_+$ let $\alpha_i^n = r_n - \mu_i^n$, and set $\alpha_i^n = r_n + \mu_i^n$ for $i \notin I_+$. So, $\alpha_i^n \geq 0$ for all i . Taking a further subsequence we may assume that $\alpha_i^n \rightarrow \alpha_i \in [0, \infty]$ for all i . Let $I = \{i \in I_+ : \alpha_i < \infty\}$ and $J = \{j \notin I_+ : \alpha_j < \infty\}$.

As $\Lambda(z^n) = \Lambda(-z^n) = r_n$, we know that

$$\min_{i \in I_+} \alpha_i^n = 0 = \min_{j \notin I_+} \alpha_j^n,$$

and hence I and J are both nonempty.

It now follows from [30, Lemma 4.7] that

$$\Lambda(-v + z^n - r_n u) \rightarrow \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I}v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(v - z^n - r_n u) \rightarrow \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J}v - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_{w^n}(v) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |v - w^n|_u - |w^n|_u \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |v - z^n|_u - |z^n|_u \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(-v + z^n) + \Lambda(v - z^n) - 2r_n \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(-v + z^n - r_n u) + \Lambda(v - z^n - r_n u) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I}v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J}v - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j) \end{aligned}$$

for all $v \in T_u$, which completes the proof. □

The next proposition shows that each function of the form (5.1) is indeed a horofunction. In fact, we shall see that it is a Busemann point in $\partial \overline{T_u^h}$.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that $p_1, \dots, p_r \in A$ is a Jordan frame, $I, J \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ are disjoint and nonempty, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{I \cup J}$ is such that $\min_{i \in I} \alpha_i = 0 = \min_{j \in J} \alpha_j$. If*

$$\zeta = \sum_{i \in I} -\alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j \quad \text{and} \quad \omega = p_I - p_J, \quad (5.2)$$

then for $\xi^t = t\omega + \zeta - \frac{1}{r} \text{tr}(t\omega + \zeta)u \in T_u$ with $t > 0$ we have that $g_{\xi^t} \rightarrow g$, where g is given by (5.1), and hence g is a Busemann point.

Proof. For $t > 0$, $\omega^t = t\omega + \zeta \in A$, and note that $\Lambda(\omega^t) = \Lambda(-\omega^t) = t$ for all $t > 0$ large. Then by [30, Lemma 4.7] we get that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(-v + \omega^t - tu) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda\left(-v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i + \sum_{j \in J} (-2t + \alpha_j) p_j + \sum_{k \notin I \cup J} -t p_k\right) = \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I} v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i).$$

Likewise,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(v - \omega^t - tu) = \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J} v - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j).$$

Thus, for $v \in T_u$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_{\xi^t}(v) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |v - \xi^t|_u - |\xi^t|_u \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |v - \omega^t|_u - |\omega^t|_u \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(-v + \xi^t) + \Lambda(v - \xi^t) - 2t \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(-v + \xi^t - tu) + \Lambda(v - \xi^t - tu) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I} v - \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J} v - \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $g_{\xi^t} \rightarrow g$. As $t \mapsto \xi^t$ is a straight-line geodesic, we find that g is Busemann point. \square

By combining Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 we get the following description of the horofunctions in $\overline{T_u}^h$.

Theorem 5.3. *The horofunctions of $\overline{T_u}^h$ are precisely the functions $g: T_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form (5.1), and each horofunction is a Busemann point.*

Let us now analyse the parts and detour distance for $\overline{T_u}^h$.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $g, g' \in \partial \overline{T_u}^h$ be two horofunctions, where g is given by (5.1) and*

$$g'(v) = \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j) \quad \text{for } v \in T_u. \quad (5.3)$$

If $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$, then g and g' are in the same part and

$$\delta(g, g') = \left(\Lambda_{A(p_I)}(a_I - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(b_{I'} - a_I) \right) + \left(\Lambda_{A(p_J)}(a_J - b_{J'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(b_{J'} - a_J) \right),$$

where $a_I = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i$, $a_J = \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j$, $b_{I'} = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$ and $b_{J'} = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j$.

Proof. Let ζ , ω and ξ^t be as in Proposition 5.2. Then for all $t > 0$ large we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi^t|_u + g'(\xi^t) &= |\xi^t|_u + \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} \xi^t - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} \xi^t - b_{J'}) \\ &= 2t + \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(-U_{p_I} \xi^t - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(U_{p_J} \xi^t - b_{J'}) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(t p_I - U_{p_I} \xi^t - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(t p_J + U_{p_J} \xi^t - b_{J'}) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(p_I)}\left(\frac{1}{r} \text{tr}(t\omega + \zeta) p_I + a_I - b_{I'}\right) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}\left(-\frac{1}{r} \text{tr}(t\omega + \zeta) p_J + a_J - b_{J'}\right) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(a_I - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(a_J - b_{J'}). \end{aligned}$$

So from (2.2) and Proposition 5.2, we conclude that $H(g, g') = \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(a_I - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(a_J - b_{J'})$. Interchanging the roles of g and g' gives $H(g', g) = \Lambda_{A(p_J)}(a_J - b_{J'}) + \Lambda_{A(p_I)}(b_{I'} - a_I)$, which completes the proof. \square

The condition in Proposition 5.4 characterises the parts in the horofunction boundary as the next proposition shows.

Proposition 5.5. *If g and g' are horofunctions in \overline{T}_u^h given by (5.1) and (5.3), respectively, then g and g' are in the same part if and only if $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.4 it remains to show that $\delta(g, g') = \infty$ if $p_I \neq q_{I'}$ or $p_J \neq q_{J'}$. Suppose that $p_I \neq q_{I'}$. Then $p_I \not\leq q_{I'}$ or $q_{I'} \not\leq p_I$. Suppose that $p_I \not\leq q_{I'}$. Let ζ, ω and ξ^t be as in Proposition 5.2. We will show that $H(g, g') = \infty$ in this case.

For all $t > 0$ large we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi^t|_u + g'(\xi^t) &= |\xi^t|_u + \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}\xi^t - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}\xi^t - b_{J'}) \\ &= 2t + \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}\xi^t - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}\xi^t - b_{J'}) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(tq_{I'} - U_{q_{I'}}\xi^t - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(tq_{J'} + U_{q_{J'}}\xi^t - b_{J'}) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(tq_{I'} - U_{q_{I'}}(t\omega + \zeta) - b_{I'}) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(tq_{J'} + U_{q_{J'}}(t\omega + \zeta) - b_{J'}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $t\omega + \zeta \leq tp_I$ for all $t > 0$ large. So, $U_{q_{I'}}(t\omega + \zeta) \leq tU_{q_{I'}}p_I$ for all $t > 0$ large. This implies that

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(tq_{I'} - U_{q_{I'}}(t\omega + \zeta) - b_{I'}) \geq \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(t(q_{I'} - U_{q_{I'}}p_I) - b_{I'}) \rightarrow \infty$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$, since $q_{I'} - U_{q_{I'}}p_I > 0$ by [30, Lemma 4.12].

Also note that for all $t > 0$ large we have that $t\omega + \zeta \geq -tp_J$, and hence $U_{q_{J'}}(t\omega + \zeta) \geq -tU_{q_{J'}}p_J$. As $U_{q_{J'}}p_J \leq U_{q_{J'}}u = q_{J'}$ conclude that $t(q_{J'} - U_{q_{J'}}p_J) \geq 0$ for all $t > 0$ large. It follows that

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(tq_{J'} + U_{q_{J'}}(t\omega + \zeta) - b_{J'}) \geq \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(t(q_{J'} - U_{q_{J'}}p_J) - b_{J'}) \geq \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(-b_{J'}) > -\infty$$

for all $t > 0$ large. Combining this inequality with the previous one and using (2.2), we conclude that $H(g, g') = \infty$.

For the other cases the result can be shown in the same way. \square

6 Proof of part (b) of Theorem 1.1

The proof of part (b) of Theorem 1.1 follows the same steps as the one taken in the proof of part (a). To define the extension we recall the characterisation of the Hilbert distance horofunctions of PA_+° from [30]. The horofunctions of (PA_+°, d_H) are all Busemann points and precisely the functions $h: PA_+^\circ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$h(x) = \log M(y/x) + \log M(z/x^{-1}) \quad \text{for } x \in PA_+^\circ, \quad (6.1)$$

where $y, z \in \partial A_+$ are such that $\|y\|_u = \|z\|_u = 1$ and $y \bullet z = 0$, see [30, Theorem 5.4]. In this case the extension of the exponential map is defined as follows.

Definition 6.1. The *exponential map*, $\exp_u: \overline{T}_u^h \rightarrow \overline{PA_+^\circ}^h$, is defined by $\exp_u(v) = e^v$ for $v \in T_u$, and for $g \in \partial \overline{T}_u^h$ given by (5.1) we let $\exp_u(g) = h$, where h is given by (6.1) with $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$.

Note that the extension is well-defined. Indeed, if g given by (5.1) is represented as

$$g(v) = \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j),$$

then, as $\delta(g, g) = 0$, we get by Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 that $p_I = q_{I'}$, $p_J = q_{J'}$, $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$ and $\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j$. From Lemma 4.2 we deduce that $\sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $\sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$, and hence the extension is well-defined.

We first show that $\exp_u: \overline{T}_u^h \rightarrow \overline{PA_+^\circ}^h$ is a bijection.

Lemma 6.2. $\exp_u: \overline{T}_u^h \rightarrow \overline{PA_+^\circ}^h$ is a bijection which maps T_u onto PA_+° , and $\partial \overline{T}_u^h$ onto $\partial \overline{PA_+^\circ}^h$.

Proof. As $\det \exp_u(x) = e^{\text{tr } x} = 1$ for $x \in T_u$, we see that \exp_u is a bijection from T_u onto PA_+° . It follows from [30, Theorem 5.4] and Theorem 5.3 that \exp_u maps $\partial \overline{T}_u^h$ onto $\partial \overline{PA}_+^{\circ h}$.

To complete the proof it remains to show that if $g, g' \in \partial \overline{T}_u^h$ with $\exp_u(g) = \exp_u(g')$, then $g = g'$. Let g and g' be given by (5.1) and (5.3), respectively. By definition of \exp_u we have that $\exp_u(g) = h$, where

$$h(x) = \log M(y/x) + \log M(z/x^{-1}) \quad \text{for } x \in PA_+^\circ,$$

with $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$. Likewise, $\exp_u(g') = h'$, where $h'(x) = \log M(y'/x) + \log M(z'/x^{-1})$ for $x \in PA_+^\circ$, with $y' = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $z' = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$.

As $h = h'$, we know by $\delta(h, h') = 0$, and hence $y = y'$ and $z = z'$ by [30, Proposition 5.6]. By the spectral theorem [17, Theorems III.1.1 and III.1.2], it follows that $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$ and $\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j$. Moreover, $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$. It now follows that $g = g'$, which completes the proof. \square

The proof of the continuity of the extension of \exp_u is split up into two lemmas.

Lemma 6.3. *If (w^n) in T_u converges to $g \in \partial \overline{T}_u^h$, then $(\exp_u(w^n))$ converges to $\exp_u(g)$.*

Proof. Let (w^n) be a sequence in T_u converging to $g \in \partial \overline{T}_u^h$, where g is given by (5.1). To prove that $(\exp_u(w^n))$ converges to $\exp_u(g) = h$, where h is given by (6.1), we show that each of its subsequences has a subsequence converging to h . So let $(\exp_u(w^{n_k}))$ be a subsequence. As g is a horofunction, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $|w^{n_k}|_u \rightarrow \infty$. Set $z^{n_k} = w^{n_k} - \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda(w^{n_k}) - \Lambda(-w^{n_k}))u$ and let $r_{n_k} = \Lambda(z^{n_k})$. So, $2r_{n_k} = \Lambda(z^{n_k}) + \Lambda(-z^{n_k}) = |z^{n_k}|_u = |w^{n_k}|_u$.

Using the spectral decomposition we write $z^{n_k} = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i^{n_k} q_i^{n_k}$. By taking subsequences we may assume that there exists $I_+ \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that for all k we have that $\lambda_i^{n_k} > 0$ if and only if $i \in I_+$. In addition, we may assume that $q_i^{n_k} \rightarrow q_i$ for all i . Let $\beta_i^{n_k} = r_{n_k} - \lambda_i^{n_k} \geq 0$ for $i \in I_+$, and $\beta_i^{n_k} = r_{n_k} + \lambda_i^{n_k} \geq 0$ for $i \notin I_+$. By taking further subsequences we may assume that $\beta_i^{n_k} \rightarrow \beta_i \in [0, \infty]$ for all i . Let $I' = \{i \in I_+ : \beta_i < \infty\}$ and $J' = \{j \notin I_+ : \beta_j < \infty\}$.

Note that $\min_{i \in I'} \beta_i = 0 = \min_{j \in J'} \beta_j$, as $\min_{i \in I_+} \beta_i^{n_k} = 0 = \min_{i \notin I_+} \beta_i^{n_k}$ for all k , so I' and J' are both nonempty. It follows from [30, Lemma 4.7] and (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_{w^{n_k}}(v) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |v - w^{n_k}|_u - |w^{n_k}|_u \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |v - z^{n_k}|_u - 2r_{n_k} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(-v + z^{n_k} - r_{n_k}u) + \Lambda(v - z^{n_k} - r_{n_k}u) \\ &= \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}}v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}}v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j). \end{aligned}$$

If we denote the righthand side by $g'(v)$, we find that $g' : T_u \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a horofunction by Proposition 5.2.

Since $g_{w^n} \rightarrow g$, we conclude that $g = g'$, and hence $\delta(g, g') = 0$. It now follows from Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 that $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$. Moreover, $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i$ and $\sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j$. So by Lemma 4.2 we get that $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$.

It follows that

$$e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(z^{n_k}) = \sum_{i=1}^r e^{-(r_{n_k} - \lambda_i^{n_k})} q_i^{n_k} \rightarrow \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i = y$$

and

$$e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(-z^{n_k}) = \sum_{i=1}^r e^{-(r_{n_k} + \lambda_i^{n_k})} q_i^{n_k} \rightarrow \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j = z.$$

As $\exp_u(a + \lambda u) = e^\lambda \exp_u(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_{\exp_u(w^{n_k})}(x) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_H(x, \exp_u(w^{n_k})) - d_H(u, \exp_u(w^{n_k})) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_H(x, \exp_u(z^{n_k})) - d_H(u, \exp_u(z^{n_k})) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log M(\exp_u(z^{n_k})/x) + \log M(x/\exp_u(z^{n_k})) - \text{diam } \sigma(z^{n_k}) \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log M(\exp_u(z^{n_k})/x) + \log M(\exp_u(-z^{n_k})/x^{-1}) - 2r_{n_k} \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log M(e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(z^{n_k})/x) + \log M(e^{-r_{n_k}} \exp_u(-z^{n_k})/x^{-1}) \\
&= \log M(y/x) + \log M(z/x^{-1})
\end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in PA_+^\circ$ by continuity of the M functions, see [27, Lemma 2.2]. This shows that $(\exp(w^{n_k}))$ in PA_+° converges h , and hence the proof is complete. \square

Next we establish the continuity in the horofunction boundary.

Lemma 6.4. *If (g_n) in $\partial \overline{T}_u^h$ converges to $g \in \partial \overline{T}_u^h$, then $(\exp_u(g_n))$ converges to $\exp_u(g)$.*

Proof. Let (g_n) be a sequence in $\partial \overline{T}_u^h$ converging to g , where g is given by (5.1). So $\exp_u(g) = h$, where h is given by (6.1). We prove that each subsequence of $(\exp_u(g_n))$ has a convergent subsequence with limit h . Let $(\exp_u(g_{n_k}))$ be a subsequence. By Theorem 5.1 we can write for $k \geq 1$,

$$g_{n_k}(v) = \Lambda_{A(q_{I_k}^k)}(-U_{q_{I_k}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_k} \beta_i^k q_i^k) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J_k}^k)}(U_{q_{J_k}^k} v - \sum_{j \in J_k} \beta_j^k q_j^k),$$

where the q_i^k and q_j^k 's are orthogonal primitive idempotents, $I_k, J_k \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ are nonempty and disjoint, and $\min_{i \in I_k} \beta_i^k = 0 = \min_{j \in J_k} \beta_j^k$.

After taking subsequences we may assume that

- (1) There exist $I_0, J_0 \subseteq \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $I_0 = I_k$ and $J_0 = J_k$ for all k .
- (2) There exist $i_0 \in I_0$ and $j_0 \in J_0$ such that $\beta_{i_0}^k = 0 = \beta_{j_0}^k$ for all k .
- (3) $\beta_m^k \rightarrow \beta_m \in [0, \infty]$ and $q_m^k \rightarrow q_m$ for all $m \in I_0 \cup J_0$.

Now let $I' = \{i \in I_0 : \beta_i < \infty\}$ and $J' = \{j \in J_0 : \beta_j < \infty\}$. So I' and J' are nonempty and $\min_{i \in I'} \beta_i = 0 = \min_{j \in J'} \beta_j$.

As I' is nonempty, it follows from [30, Lemma 4.7] that

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{I_0}^k)}(-U_{q_{I_0}^k} v - \sum_{i \in I_0} \beta_i^k q_i^k) \rightarrow \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i).$$

Likewise, as J' is nonempty, we know that

$$\Lambda_{A(q_{J_0}^k)}(U_{q_{J_0}^k} v - \sum_{j \in J_0} \beta_j^k q_j^k) \rightarrow \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j).$$

Thus,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_{n_k}(v) = \Lambda_{A(q_{I'})}(-U_{q_{I'}} v - \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i) + \Lambda_{A(q_{J'})}(U_{q_{J'}} v - \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j).$$

So, if we denote the righthand side by $g'(v)$, then $g' : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a horofunction by Proposition 5.2. As $g_n \rightarrow g$, we find that $g = g'$ and hence $\delta(g, g') = 0$.

It now follows from Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 that $p_{I'} = q_{I'}$ and $p_{J'} = q_{J'}$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{i \in I'} \alpha_i p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} \beta_i q_i \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in J'} \alpha_j p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} \beta_j q_j,$$

So by Lemma 4.2 we get that $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$.

If we now let $\bar{y}^k = \sum_{i \in I_0} e^{-\beta_i^k} q_i^k$ and $\bar{z}^k = \sum_{j \in J_0} e^{-\beta_j^k} q_j^k$, then

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{y}^k = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i = y \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{z}^k = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j = z.$$

Therefore, by continuity of the M function ([27, Lemma 2.2]),

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \exp_u(g_{n_k})(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \log M(\bar{y}^k/x) + \log M(\bar{z}^k/x^{-1}) = \log M(y/x) + \log M(z/x^{-1}) = h(x),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Collecting the results so far we can now easily proof Theorem 1.1(b).

Proof of Theorem 1.1(b). It follows from Lemmas 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 that $\exp_u: \overline{T}_u^h \rightarrow \overline{PA}_+^{\circ h}$ is a continuous bijection. As \overline{T}_u^h is compact and $\overline{PA}_+^{\circ h}$ is Hausdorff, we conclude that \exp_u is a homeomorphism.

Suppose that g and g' are horofunctions in the same part of \overline{T}_u^h , where g is given by (5.1) and g' is given by (5.3). It follows from Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 that $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$. By definition $\exp_u(g) = h$, where h is given by (6.1) with $y = \sum_{i \in I} e^{-\alpha_i} p_i$ and $z = \sum_{j \in J} e^{-\alpha_j} p_j$. Likewise, $\exp_u(g') = h'$, where h' is given by $h'(x) = \log M(y'/x) + \log M(z'/x^{-1})$, with $y' = \sum_{i \in I'} e^{-\beta_i} q_i$ and $z' = \sum_{j \in J'} e^{-\beta_j} q_j$. As $p_I = q_{I'}$ and $p_J = q_{J'}$, we have that $y \sim p_I \sim q_{I'} \sim y'$ and $z \sim p_J \sim q_{J'} \sim z'$, and hence h and h' are in the same part by [30, Proposition 5.6].

Conversely, if h and h' are in the same part, then $y \sim y'$ and $z \sim z'$ by [30, Proposition 5.6], and hence $p_I \sim q_{I'}$ and $p_J \sim q_{J'}$. This implies that $\text{face}(p_I) = \text{face}(q_{I'})$. As $\text{face}(p_I) \cap [0, u] = [0, p_I]$ by [3, Lemma 1.39], we get that $p_I = q_{I'}$. Likewise we have that $p_J = q_{J'}$. So, if h and h' are in the same part, then g and g' are in the same part. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 6.5. The horofunction compactification is homeomorphic to the closed unit ball of the dual space $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)^*$. Indeed, it was shown in [30, Section 5] that there exists a homeomorphism from the horofunction compactification of (PA_+°, d_H) to the closed unit ball B_1^* of the dual space $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)^*$, which maps parts onto parts. We know from [30, Section 5.3] that the dual space $(T_u, |\cdot|_u)^*$ is given by $(T_u, \frac{1}{2} \|\cdot\|_u^*)$, where we use the inner-product $(x|y) = \text{tr}(x \bullet y)$ to identify T_u^* with T_u . The unit ball B_1^* satisfies

$$B_1^* = 2\text{conv}(S(A) \cup -S(A)) \cap T_u,$$

where $S(A) = \{w \in A_+ : (u|w) = 1\}$ is the state space of A . Its (closed) boundary faces are precisely the nonempty sets of the form,

$$A_{p,q} = 2\text{conv}((U_p(A) \cap S(A) \cup (U_q(A) \cap -S(A))) \cap T_u,$$

where p and q are orthogonal idempotents by [11, Theorem 4.4].

7 Final remarks

Symmetric cones A_+° and their projective cones PA_+° are examples of Riemannian symmetric spaces $X = G/K$ of non-compact type. The Finsler metrics of the Thompson distance and the Hilbert distance are examples of invariant Finsler metrics, which have been characterised by Planche [35]. In [16] it was shown that each generalised Satake compactification of a symmetric space $X = G/K$ of non-compact type can be realised as a horofunction compactification under an invariant Finsler metric, whose restriction to a flat is a norm with polyhedral unit ball. In [16, Examples 5.3 and 5.7] the symmetric space $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})/\text{SU}_n$ is considered for $n = 3$ and $n = 4$. This space corresponds to the projective symmetric cone $P\Pi_n(\mathbb{C})$ consisting of $n \times n$ positive definite Hermitian matrices with determinant 1. If we consider the restriction of the unit ball of the Finsler metric $H(I, \cdot) = |\cdot|_I$ to the flat consisting of diagonal matrices in T_I , then

for $n = 3$ we get a hexagon, and for $n = 4$ we get a rhombic dodecahedron. These unit balls correspond to the invariant Finsler metrics in [16, Examples 5.3 and 5.7], where the generalised Satake compactification is considered for the adjoint representation of $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. So for $n = 3$ and $n = 4$, the Hilbert distance on $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})/\mathrm{SU}_n$ realises the generalised Satake compactification with respect to the adjoint representation. It would be interesting to know if this is true for general n .

For a symmetric cone A_+° a flat in the tangent space at $u \in A_+^\circ$ is given by $\mathrm{Span}(\{p_1, \dots, p_r\})$, where p_1, \dots, p_r is a Jordan frame. The restriction to the flat of the Finsler metric F for the Thompson distance is a polyhedral norm. In fact, if $w \in \mathrm{Span}(\{p_1, \dots, p_r\})$ has spectral decomposition $w = \sum_{i=1}^r \delta_i p_i$, then $F(u, w) = \|w\|_u = \max_i |\delta_i|$. So, the unit ball of F is an r -dimensional hypercube. It would be interesting to investigate if the horofunction compactification of (A_+°, d_T) realises a generalised Satake compactification of the symmetric space $A_+^\circ = \mathrm{Aut}(A_+)/\mathrm{Aut}(A_+)_u$, and if so, to which representation $\tau: \mathrm{Aut}(A_+) \rightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ it corresponds.

In view of Theorem 1.1 it is also natural to ask if, more generally, for a symmetric space $X = G/K$ of non-compact type with an invariant Finsler metric, the exponential map $\exp_u: T_u X \rightarrow X$ extends as a homeomorphism between the horofunction compactification of X under the Finsler distance and the horofunction compactification of the tangent space $T_u X$ under the Finsler norm.

References

- [1] M. Akian, S. Gaubert and C. Walsh, The max-plus Martin boundary, *Doc. Math.* **14**, (2009), 195–240.
- [2] E.M. Alfsen and F.W. Shultz, *State spaces of operator algebras. Basic theory, orientations, and C^* -products*. Mathematics: Theory & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2001.
- [3] E.M. Alfsen and F. W. Shultz, *Geometry of state spaces of operator algebras*. Mathematics: Theory & Applications, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2003.
- [4] D. Bao, S.-S. Chern, and Z. Shen, *An introduction to Riemann-Finsler geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 200. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [5] W. Ballmann, *Lectures on spaces of nonpositive curvature*. DMV Seminar, 25. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995.
- [6] A. Borel and L. Ji, *Compactifications of symmetric and locally symmetric spaces*. Mathematics: Theory & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2006.
- [7] M.R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric Spaces of Non-Positive Curvature*. Grundlehren Math. Wiss. 319, Springer, 1999.
- [8] C. Ciobotaru, L. Kramer and P. Schwer, Polyhedral compactifications, I, [arXiv:2002.12422](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.12422), (2020).
- [9] F. Claassens, The horofunction boundary of the infinite dimensional hyperbolic space, *Geom. Dedicata* **207**, (2020), 255–263.
- [10] P. B. Eberlein, *Geometry of nonpositively curved manifolds*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1996.
- [11] C.M. Edwards and G.T. Rüttimann, On the facial structure of the unit balls in a GL-space and its dual, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **98**(2), (1985), 305–322.
- [12] M. Greenfield and L. Ji, Metrics and compactifications of Teichmüller spaces of flat tori, [arXiv:1903.10655](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.10655), (2019).
- [13] A.W. Gutiérrez, On the metric compactification of infinite dimensional ℓ_p spaces, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **62**(3), (2019), 491–507.
- [14] A. W. Gutiérrez, Characterizing the metric compactification of L_p spaces by random measures, *Ann. Funct. Anal.* **11**(2), (2020), 227–243.
- [15] Y. Guivarch, L. Ji and J. Taylor, *Compactifications of symmetric spaces*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1998.
- [16] T. Haettel, A. Schilling, C. Walsh and A. Wienhard, Horofunction compactifications of symmetric spaces, [arXiv:1705.05026v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.05026v2), (2018).
- [17] J. Faraut and A. Korányi, *Analysis on symmetric cones*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, New York, 1994.
- [18] S. Friedland and P.J. Freitas, p -metrics on $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})/U_n$ and their Busemann compactifications, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **376**, (2004), 1–18.
- [19] S. Friedland and P.J. Freitas. Revisiting the Siegel upper half plane I, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, **376**, (2004), 19–44.
- [20] U. Hirzebruch, Über Jordan-Algebren und kompakte Riemannsche symmetrische Räume vom Rang 1, *Math. Z.* **90**, (1965), 339–354.

- [21] L. Ji, Satake and Martin compactifications of symmetric spaces are topological balls, *Math. Res. Lett.* **4**(1), (1997), 79–89.
- [22] L. Ji and A. Schilling, Polyhedral horofunction compactification as polyhedral ball, [arXiv:1607.00564v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.00564v2), (2016).
- [23] L. Ji and A. Schilling, Toric varieties vs. horofunction compactifications of polyhedral norms, *Enseign. Math.* **63**(3?4), (2017), 375–401.
- [24] M. Kapovich and B. Leeb, Finsler bordifications of symmetric and certain locally symmetric spaces, *Geom. Topol.* **22**(5), (2018), 2533–2646.
- [25] A. Karlsson, V. Metz and G.A. Noskov, Horoballs in simplices and Minkowski spaces, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, (2006), Art. ID 23656, 20 pp.
- [26] G.F. Kusner, Karpelevic’s compactification is homeomorphic to a sphere, *Trudy Sem. Vektor. Tenzor. Anal.* **19**, (1979), 95–111 (In Russian).
- [27] B. Lemmens, B. Lins, R. Nussbaum and M. Wortel, Denjoy-Wolff theorems for Hilbert’s and Thompson’s metric spaces, *J. Anal. Math.* **134**(2), (2018), 671–718.
- [28] B. Lemmens and R. Nussbaum, *Nonlinear Perron-Frobenius theory*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 189. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [29] B. Lemmens, M. Roelands and M. Wortel, Hilbert and Thompson isometries on cones in JB-algebras, *Math. Z.* **292**(3–4), (2019), 1511–1547.
- [30] B. Lemmens and K. Power, Horofunction compactifications and duality, [arXiv:2107.02710](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.02710), (2021).
- [31] B. Lemmens and C. Walsh, Isometries of polyhedral Hilbert geometries, *J. Topol. Anal.* **3**(2), (2011), 213–241.
- [32] Y. Lim, Finsler metrics on symmetric cones, *Math. Ann.* **316**(2), (2000), 379–389.
- [33] J.R. Munkres, *Topology*. 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, N.J., 2000.
- [34] R. D. Nussbaum, Finsler structures for the part metric and Hilbert’s projective metric and applications to ordinary differential equations, *Differential Integral Equations* **7**(5-6), (1994), 1649–1707.
- [35] P. Planche, Structures de Finsler invariantes sur les espaces symétriques, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **321**(11), (1995), 1455–1458.
- [36] M. A. Rieffel, Group C^* -algebras as compact quantum metric spaces, *Doc. Math.* **7**, (2002), 605–651.
- [37] A-S. Schilling, *The Horofunction Compactification of Finite-Dimensional Normed Vector Spaces and of Symmetric Spaces*. PhD thesis, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, 2021.
- [38] C. Walsh, The horofunction boundary of finite-dimensional normed spaces, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **142**(3), (2007), 497–507.
- [39] C. Walsh, The horofunction boundary of the Hilbert geometry, *Adv. Geom.* **8**(4), (2008), 503–529.
- [40] C. Walsh, Gauge-reversing maps on cones, and Hilbert and Thompson isometries, *Geom. Topol.* **22**(1), (2018), 55–104.
- [41] C. Walsh, Hilbert and Thompson geometries isometric to infinite-dimensional Banach spaces, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **68**(5), (2018), 1831–1877.