

Conformal Geodesics Cannot Spiral

Peter Cameron*, Maciej Dunajski†

*Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics
University of Cambridge
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK.*

Paul Tod‡

*Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford
Andrew Wiles Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter,
Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK.*

May 18, 2022

Abstract

We show that conformal geodesics on a Riemannian manifold cannot spiral: there does not exist a conformal geodesic which becomes trapped in every neighbourhood of a point.

1 Introduction

A pseudo-Riemannian manifold, (M, g) defines a distinguished set of curves which are metric geodesics of g . These curves are solutions to a set of 2nd order ODEs and are uniquely specified locally by an initial point and an initial tangent direction. However, with the exception of null geodesics in the Lorentzian case, there is in general no relation between the metric geodesics of two conformally related metrics. By analogy with metric geodesics, conformal geodesics can be thought of as a distinguished set of curves defined on a conformal manifold $(M, [g])$. These curves are solutions to a system of conformally invariant 3rd order ODEs and are uniquely specified locally by an initial position, unit tangent direction and perpendicular acceleration [11, 1, 2, 10]. Although metric geodesics have been studied extensively, relatively little is known about conformal geodesics.

*pjc96@cam.ac.uk

†m.dunajski@damtp.cam.ac.uk

‡paul.tod@sjc.ox.ac.uk

Conformal geodesics were systematically introduced into general relativity by Friedrich and Schmidt [6]. Their motivation was to construct good coordinate systems for the local study of conformal boundaries, as introduced in Penrose’s process of conformal compactification. Normal or Gaussian coordinates based on timelike geodesics cannot be expected to behave well near such conformal boundaries - recall for example how, in compactified Minkowski space, timelike geodesics do not pass through null infinity but instead all focus at timelike infinity. It was shown in [6] (following an earlier suggestion in [9]) that one could instead define conformal normal or conformal Gaussian coordinates constructed from conformal geodesics. These would provide good coordinates near the conformal boundaries of asymptotically Minkowskian, asymptotically de Sitter or anti-de Sitter spacetimes.

An unresolved issue stemming from this earlier work, which was also known as an unsolved problem in Riemannian-signature conformal geometry, was the question of spiralling for conformal geodesics. A curve can be said to spiral at a point p_* if it enters and remains in every neighbourhood of p_* but does not pass through p_* itself. It is a classical result, based on the existence of geodesically-convex neighbourhoods [5], that metric geodesics cannot spiral, although until now this has not been shown for conformal geodesics. It is a question of interest both abstractly and because spiralling raises the possibility of a new kind of coordinate singularity to guard against.

In [10], spiralling was ruled out in some special cases using 1st integrals, and integrability (see also [3] for integrable, non-spiralling examples on four-manifolds). For example, it was shown that conformal geodesics defined on a Riemannian Einstein manifold cannot spiral. The conformal geodesic equations were also integrated for some example geometries and it was observed that the solutions did not spiral.

In this paper we will prove a general no-spiralling theorem for conformal geodesics (Theorem 2.3). We begin by considering the analogous result for metric geodesics. The standard proof that metric geodesics cannot spiral relies on the existence of a geodesically convex neighbourhood at each point [5, Proposition 4.2]. Such a proof will not work for conformal geodesics since, despite their variational origins [4], these are not local length minimisers. With this in mind, we begin by constructing a proof of the no-spiralling theorem for metric geodesics which does not rely on length minimisation arguments. This will then form the basis of our proof in the conformal geodesic case.

Acknowledgements

MD has been partially supported by STFC grants ST/P000681/1, and ST/T000694/1.

2 The Conformal Geodesic Equations

Conformal geodesics are curves defined on a conformal manifold $(M, [g])$, which we assume to be Riemannian. Given any choice of metric $g \in [g]$, these curves can be defined by the following set of

conformally invariant third order differential equations [10]:

$$\nabla_u a = -(|a|^2 + L(u, u))u + L^\# u \quad (2.1)$$

where u is the unit tangent vector to the curve (i.e $g(u, u) = 1$), $a := \nabla_u u$ is the perpendicular acceleration (i.e $g(u, a) = 0$) and $|a| := \sqrt{g(a, a)}$. The Schouten tensor $L : T_p M \times T_p M \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$L = \frac{1}{d-2} \left(Ric - \frac{R}{2(d-1)}g \right) \quad (2.2)$$

in terms of the Ricci tensor Ric , the Ricci scalar R and the dimension of the manifold d . We denote by $L^\# : T_p M \mapsto T_p M$ the corresponding endomorphism defined by $g(L^\# u, v) = L(u, v)$ for all vector fields u, v .

Changing the metric to $\hat{g} = \Omega^2 g$, where $\Omega : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ results in changes to the Schouten tensor, the Levi-Civita connection, unit tangent vector and the acceleration

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L} &= L - \nabla \Upsilon + \Upsilon \otimes \Upsilon - \frac{1}{2} |\Upsilon|^2 g, \\ \hat{\nabla}_v w &= \nabla_v w + \Upsilon(w)v + \Upsilon(v)w - g(v, w)\Upsilon^\#, \\ \hat{u} &= \Omega^{-1}u, \\ \hat{a} &= \Omega^{-2}(a - \Upsilon^\# + \Upsilon(u)u), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Upsilon \equiv \Omega^{-1}d\Omega$, and $\Upsilon^\#$ is a vector field defined by $\Upsilon(w) = g(\Upsilon^\#, w)$. It is now a matter of explicit calculation to verify that the conformal geodesic equations (2.1) are conformally invariant.

In the rest of the paper we shall fix a metric g in the conformal class, and consider (2.1) for this choice of metric. We will denote the set of unit vectors in $T_p M$ by $S(T_p M)$ and $S(TM)$ will denote the corresponding unit tangent bundle over M .

Picard's theorem applied to equation (2.1) shows that, locally, a conformal geodesic is uniquely specified by an initial point $p \in M$, an initial unit tangent, u_0 , at p and an initial acceleration, a_0 , at p which is perpendicular to u_0 [10, Theorem 1.1]. We will denote the conformal geodesic with these initial conditions and arc length parameter t by $\gamma_{p, u_0, a_0}(t)$.

Definition 2.1. A curve, γ , with arc length parameter t , spirals towards a point $p_* \in M$ if for any neighbourhood N containing p_* , there exists some T such that $\gamma(t) \in N$ for all $t > T$.

We demand that the conformal geodesic has a well defined unit tangent vector and thus exclude the trivial case where it consists only of a single point.

Throughout this paper we will refer to balls in (M, g) and in various tangent spaces. We make the following definitions

$$B(q, r) := \{q' \in M : d(q, q') < r\}, \quad \bar{B}(q, r) := \{p' \in M : d(q, q') \leq r\} \quad (2.3)$$

where $d : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ denotes the Riemannian distance function induced by the metric g .

We will also refer to balls in the tangent space $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$, where $u_0 \in S(T_p M)$. We identify $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ with $T_p M$ and these balls are defined using the metric g , which in turn defines a notion of length on the vector space $T_p M$.

2.1 Outline of Proof for Metric Geodesics

Theorem 2.2. Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Then geodesics on (M, g) cannot spiral.

Sketch of proof (without using length minimisation arguments):

- **Step 1:** Define the exponential map and geodesic ball at $p \in M$ and establish that all metric geodesics through p reach the boundary of this geodesic ball.

The exponential map, \exp_p at a point $p \in M$ [8, Definition 1.10] is a diffeomorphism from some neighbourhood of $U \subset T_p M$ containing 0 to a neighbourhood $V \subset M$ containing p . A *geodesic ball* is any open ball centred on p and contained in V . The exponential map at p allows us to construct a co-ordinate system on any geodesic ball. Geodesic segments foliate the geodesic ball with the point p removed. For the purposes of this proof, the important property of the geodesic ball is that all metric geodesics through p must reach its boundary.

- **Step 2:** Show that for any compact $U \subset M$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $p \in U$, $B(p, \epsilon)$ is a geodesic ball.

We define a function on M which maps each point $p \in M$ to the supremum of the set $\{r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : B(p, r) \text{ is a geodesic ball}\}$ (capped at 1 to avoid any complications involving infinite sizes). Since the exponential map defined at any $p \in M$ is a local bijection, this function is always strictly positive. It can also be shown that this function is continuous. The result follows from the fact that this continuous function restricted to the compact set U is bounded from below by some $\epsilon > 0$.

- **Step 3:** Use the fact that metric geodesics intersect the boundary of the geodesic ball to deduce that they cannot spiral.

Suppose the metric geodesic γ spirals towards some $p_* \in M$. Then for any $R < d(p_*, \gamma(0))$ there is a unique $T > 0$ such that $d(p_*, \gamma(T)) = R$ and $d(p_*, \gamma(t)) < R$ for all $t > T$. Denote the point $\gamma(T)$ by p . This is the point at which γ enters $B(p_*, R)$ for the final time.

Let $U \subset M$ containing p_* be compact. Choose $R = \epsilon/2$ (where ϵ is as in Step 2) and find the corresponding p (reducing ϵ if necessary so that $R < d(p_*, \gamma(0))$). By reducing ϵ further if necessary, we can assume that $p \in U$. Then, using the results of Step 2, $B(p, \epsilon)$ is a geodesic ball. From Step 1 we know that γ must leave this geodesic ball at some later parameter value. In doing so, it must once again reach a distance of at least $R = \epsilon/2$ from p_* . This is a contradiction since we assumed that $d(p_*, \gamma(t)) < R$ for all $t > T$. This argument is illustrated in Figure 1. \square

2.2 Outline of Proof for Conformal Geodesics

The exponential map at $p \in M$ was useful because it allowed us to identify a subset of M which was foliated by segments of metric geodesics through p . Inspired by this, we will define an exponential




Figure 1: We find $T \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that there is a geodesic ball of radius ϵ centred at $p := \gamma(T)$, where $d(p_*, \gamma(T)) = \epsilon/2$ and $d(p_*, \gamma(t)) < \epsilon/2$ for all $t > T$. However, we have also shown that γ must leave this geodesic ball and hence reach a distance of $\epsilon/2$ from p_* at some $t > T$. This is our contradiction. We show geodesic balls as circles for ease of illustration.

map adapted to conformal manifolds which allows us to see how conformal geodesics foliate some subset of M .

Despite some additional complexities in the conformal geodesic case, we are able to prove a no-spiralling theorem by following three steps analogous to those used in the proof of Theorem 2.2. These three steps correspond to the three main sections of this paper.

Theorem 2.3. Let $(M, [g])$ be a conformal manifold such that the Schouten tensor is of class C^2 . Then conformal geodesics on $(M, [g])$ cannot spiral.

Outline of Proof (see Section 5 for the complete proof using results derived in Sections 3 and 4):

- **Step 1:** Define an exponential map adapted to conformal geodesics and identify a domain and range on which it is a homeomorphism.

In Section 3, we define a conformal geodesic analogue of the exponential map at some $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$. Unlike for metric geodesics, there is no subset of the domain of this exponential map on which it is a homeomorphism onto some ball centred at p . Instead, in Section 3.3 we find that it is a homeomorphism onto some set which we call a *heart* p . We say that this heart has *direction* u_0 . Crucially, in Section 3.4 we are able to show that conformal geodesics re-intersect the boundary of this heart. This is analogous to the fact that metric geodesics through some point re-intersect the boundary of a geodesic ball centred at that point.

Result of Step 1 (Theorem 3.7): For any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, any conformal geodesic with unit tangent u_0 at p re-intersects the boundary of a heart at p with direction u_0 .

- **Step 2:** Define a notion of size for a heart and show that given any compact $U \subset M$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that there is a heart at p with direction u_0 which has size at least ϵ , for any $p \in U$ and any $u_0 \in S(T_p M)$.

In the metric geodesic case we considered geodesic balls in M since these had an obvious size associated to them. In the conformal geodesic setting it is simpler to consider certain half balls in $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ which are mapped to hearts in M . The size of a heart is defined by considering the radii of balls in M which have u_0 tangent to their boundary and are contained inside this heart. Note that this size has units of length, regardless of the dimension of the conformal manifold. We show that as we vary p and u_0 (as well as the radius of the domain ball¹) in $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ we are able to find a lower bound for this size which is strictly positive and varies continuously with p and u_0 (provided the Schouten tensor is of class C^2). The result follows from the fact that a continuous function on a compact set is bounded and attains its bound.

Result of Step 2 (Theorem 4.2): Let $(M, [g])$ be a conformal manifold such that the Schouten tensor is of class C^2 and let U be a compact subset of $S(TM)$. Then there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that at any $(p, u_0) \in S(TU)$ there is a heart H_{p, u_0} at p with direction u_0 which has size at least ϵ .

- **Step 3:** Using the fact that a conformal geodesic with unit tangent u_0 at p must re-intersect the boundary of H_{p, u_0} , deduce that conformal geodesics cannot spiral.

Suppose γ is a conformal geodesic which spirals towards some $p_* \in M$. We consider a metric geodesic ball centred on p_* (i.e. a set $B(p_*, r)$ for some r) which is entered by γ for the final time at some point p where it has unit tangent u_0 (i.e. γ enters the ball at p and never re-intersects its boundary). Using steps 1 and 2, we show that it is possible to choose this ball (and the corresponding p and u_0) such that it is contained inside some heart H_{p, u_0} with position p and direction u_0 (see Definition 3.6). By Theorems 3.7 and 4.2, γ must re-intersect the boundary of this heart, so we deduce that it must also re-intersect the boundary of the ball. This is our contradiction. \square

Result of Step 3 (Theorem 2.3): Let $(M, [g])$ be a conformal manifold such that the Schouten tensor is of class C^2 . Then conformal geodesics on $(M, [g])$ cannot spiral.

3 The Exponential Map for Conformal Geodesics

In this section we will complete Step 1 of the proof of Theorem 2.3 as outlined in Section 2.1.

Step 1: Define an exponential map adapted to conformal geodesics and identify a domain and range on which it is a homeomorphism.

For any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, we define the following analogue of the exponential map appropriate

¹This is important since we need to rule out making the heart have zero size by simply choosing the domain to be trivial. To avoid this, we choose the domain to be the ball in $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ with u_0 perpendicular to its boundary and radius equal to

$1/2 \times \sup\{r : \text{the exponential map is a homeomorphism on the ball of radius } r \text{ with } u_0 \text{ perpendicular to its boundary}\}.$

to conformal geodesics (see [8, Definition 1.10] for a definition of the exponential map for metric geodesics):

Definition 3.1 (The Exponential Map).

$$\begin{aligned} \exp_{p,u_0} : T_{u_0}(S(T_p M)) &\rightarrow M \\ A &\mapsto \begin{cases} \gamma_{p,u_0,A_\perp/|A|^2}(2\pi|A|) & \text{if } A \neq 0 \\ p & \text{if } A = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where $A_\perp := A - g(A, u_0)u_0$ denotes the component of A which is perpendicular to the $u_0 \in S(T_p M)$. This map is continuous as a function of A , as we will see in the next section.

3.1 The Directional Derivative of The Exponential Map

The exponential map for metric geodesics is usually analysed by considering its directional derivatives. We will do the same thing for the conformal geodesic exponential map in Definition 3.1. Calculating these directional derivatives at $A = 0$ will allow us to understand this map in neighbourhoods of p .

The directional derivative at 0 is

$$\begin{aligned} D(\exp_{p,u_0})_0 : T_0(T_{u_0}(S(T_p M))) &\rightarrow T_p M \\ A &\mapsto \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda} \exp_{p,u_0}(\lambda A) \right|_{\lambda=0} \\ &= \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda} \gamma_{p,u_0,A_\perp/\lambda|A|^2}(2\pi\lambda|A|) \right|_{\lambda=0}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

To calculate this, we use a power series expansion:

$$\gamma_{p,u_0,a_0}(t) = p + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} t^{n+1} \nabla_u^{(n)} u|_{t=0} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\nabla_u^{(n)}$ denotes the directional derivative ∇_u applied n times and we recall that $a = \nabla_u u$ (so in particular we set $\nabla_u u|_{t=0} = a_0$). This expression (and subsequent similar expressions) should be understood in terms of co-ordinates.

Using repeated applications of the conformal geodesic equation (2.1), we can express the power series (3.6) in terms of u_0 and a_0 (as well as the Schouten tensor and its derivatives evaluated at p). From equation (2.1), if the initial acceleration is $a_0 = A_\perp / (\lambda|A|^2)$, then at $t = 0$ we have

$$\nabla_u a|_{t=0} = -\frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{|A_\perp|^2}{|A|^4} u_0 + O(1) \quad (3.7)$$

where u_0 denotes the initial unit tangent velocity and by $O(1)$ we mean terms which are bounded in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. From this we see that for a conformal geodesic with initial data $(p, u_0, A_\perp / (\lambda|A|^2))$, we have

$$\nabla_u^{(n)} u|_{t=0} = O(\lambda^{-n}) \quad (3.8)$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. In particular all terms involving the Schouten tensor L and its derivatives are $O(\lambda^{2-n})$ (i.e. they are sub-leading in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$). To calculate the directional derivative (3.5) we must evaluate the power series (3.6) at $t = 2\pi\lambda|A| = O(\lambda)$. We see that the terms in this power series which are first order in λ are exactly those that arise in Euclidean space, where $L \equiv 0$. For the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^n , conformal geodesics with initial data (p, u_0, a_0) are circles with equations of the form

$$x(t) = p + u_0|a_0|^{-1} \sin(|a_0|t) + a_0|a_0|^{-2} (1 - \cos(|a_0|t)). \quad (3.9)$$

The directional derivative of the exponential map at 0 is therefore

$$D(\exp_{p,u_0})_0 : A \mapsto u_0 \frac{|A|^2}{|A_\perp|} \sin\left(2\pi \frac{|A_\perp|}{|A|}\right) + A_\perp \frac{|A|^2}{|A_\perp|^2} \left(1 - \cos\left(2\pi \frac{|A_\perp|}{|A|}\right)\right). \quad (3.10)$$

Note that this expression is finite in the limit $A_\perp \rightarrow 0$.

It is clear from the definition of the exponential map that if A and A' are related by a reflection in a plane perpendicular to u_0 (i.e. $A_\perp = A'_\perp$ and $|A| = |A'|$), then $\exp_{p,u_0}(A) = \exp_{p,u_0}(A')$. Since our aim is to find a region on which the exponential map is a homeomorphism, we restrict our attention to the half space $g(A, u_0) \geq 0$. Based on equation (3.10), we define the following quantities related to $A_\perp, A \in S(T_p M)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sin \theta &:= \frac{|A_\perp|}{|A|}, \quad \theta \in [0, \pi/2] \\ \hat{a}_0 &:= \frac{A_\perp}{|A_\perp|}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

We have assumed that $A_\perp \neq 0$ and $A \neq 0$ since this will simplify expressions later on, although these cases can be obtained from the results below by taking the limits $A_\perp \rightarrow 0$ and $A \rightarrow 0$ respectively.

We see that a vector A in the half space $g(u_0, A) \geq 0$ is uniquely defined by θ , \hat{a}_0 and $|A|$. The vector \hat{a}_0 defines a ‘‘quarter space’’ in $T_p M$ by $g(A, \hat{a}_0) \geq 0$ and $g(A, u_0) \geq 0$. The variable θ is the angle between A and the vector² u_0 .

In terms of $|A|$, θ and \hat{a}_0 , we can re-write the directional derivative (3.10) as

$$D(\exp_{p,u_0})_0 : A \mapsto u_0 \frac{|A|}{\sin \theta} \sin(2\pi \sin \theta) + \hat{a}_0 \frac{|A|}{\sin \theta} (1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)). \quad (3.12)$$

We therefore have the following leading order expression for the exponential map

$$\exp_{p,u_0}(|A|, \theta, \hat{a}_0) = p + u_0 \frac{|A|}{\sin \theta} \sin(2\pi \sin \theta) + \hat{a}_0 \frac{|A|}{\sin \theta} (1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)) + O(|A|^3). \quad (3.13)$$

If we hold \hat{a}_0 and $\sin \theta/|A|$ fixed while varying $|A|$, we see from Definition 3.1 that the image of this curve under the exponential map describes a conformal geodesic parameterised by $|A|$. Suppose we

²For fixed (u_0, \hat{a}_0) we will draw sketches in the $u_0 - \hat{a}_0$ half space defined by $g(A, u_0) \geq 0$. This actually corresponds to considering $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ for both \hat{a}_0 and $-\hat{a}_0$.

extend u_0, \hat{a}_0 to obtain an orthonormal basis of $T_p M$. Using the metric geodesic exponential map, this basis corresponds to a set of geodesic normal co-ordinates for a neighbourhood of $p \in M$. This co-ordinate expression for the conformal geodesic is the same as the co-ordinate expression for a circle in \mathbb{R}^n to first order in $|A|$, with the $O(|A|^2)$ terms vanishing. Recall that conformal geodesics in Euclidean space are exactly circles (all higher order terms in $|A|$ vanish). By analogy, if we do a power series expansion of metric geodesics in these same co-ordinates we also find that the 2nd order term in the expansion parameter vanishes. Recall that metric geodesics in Euclidean space are exactly straight lines (i.e. there exist co-ordinates in which all non-linear terms in the expansion parameter vanish).

3.2 The Image of a Ray Under the Exponential Map

In this section we will study the image of a ray in the half space $g(u_0, A) \geq 0$ originating from $A = 0$. Such a ray is defined by fixing θ and \hat{a}_0 . As in Section 3.1, \hat{a}_0 defines a quarter space in $T_p M$ via the conditions $g(u_0, A) \geq 0$, $g(\hat{a}_0, A) \geq 0$ and θ denotes the angle between A and u_0 .

Lemma 3.2. Let $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$. Under the exponential map at (p, u_0) , a ray from $A = 0$ defined by \hat{a}_0 and $\theta = \theta_0$ is mapped to a curve in M whose tangent at p lies in the half space of $\text{span}\{u_0, \hat{a}_0\}$ defined by $g(u_0, \hat{a}_0) \geq 0$ and makes an angle of $\theta = \pi \sin \theta_0$ with u_0 (see Figure 2).

Proof: The directional derivative at 0 in the direction tangent to a particular ray is given by equation (3.12) and is non-zero provided $A \neq 0$ and $\theta \neq \pi/2$ (i.e. $A_\perp \neq A$). This directional derivative gives the tangent direction at p of the curve which is the image of this ray under the exponential map. We see that this image curve lies in the same quarter space as A and that the angle, θ , between the directional derivative and the vector u_0 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \tan \theta &= \frac{1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta_0)}{\sin(2\pi \sin \theta_0)} \\ &= \tan(\pi \sin \theta_0) \\ \implies \theta &= \pi \sin \theta_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

□

3.3 The Exponential Map is a Homeomorphism onto a Heart

Lemma 3.2 tells us that the exponential map takes distinct rays through the origin in $T_p M$ to curves with distinct tangent directions at p . We will show that for rays confined to a wedge in $T_p M$, we can find a lower bound on the arc length parameter (equivalently a lower bound on $|A|$ in Definition 3.4) at which their image curves can re-intersect. This tells us that the exponential map is a homeomorphism on this wedge. We will then consider a union of such wedges. We find that as we increase the opening angle of the wedge towards π , the lower bound on the arc length parameter we obtain decreases to 0. We conclude that the exponential map is a homeomorphism on some region in the half space $g(A, u_0) \geq 0$ with cross-sections like the one shown on the right of Figure 3.




Figure 2: The directional derivative in some direction in the $u_0 - \hat{a}_0$ plane which makes an angle of θ with the positive u_0 axis is a vector in the same plane making an angle of $\pi \sin \theta$ with the positive u_0 axis.




Figure 3: The exponential map is a homeomorphism on a series of wedges whose radii decrease to 0 as their opening angle increases towards π . Taking the union of such sets gives a set like the one shown on the right of this figure.




Figure 4: The exponential map is a homeomorphism on a ball in $T_p M$ with u_0 perpendicular and inward pointing on its boundary.

Definition 3.3. For any $u_0 \in S(T_p M)$, let $C(u_0, r)$ denote the open ball in $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ of radius r (defined using the metric g , where we identify $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ with $T_p M$) which has u_0 inward pointing and perpendicular to its boundary at p .

Theorem 3.4. Let $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$. Then the exponential map at (p, u_0) is a homeomorphism on some open ball $C(u_0, r)$.

Proof: As described above, a ray in the half space $g(u_0, A) \geq 0$ is specified by fixing \hat{a}_0 and θ . The variable $|A|$ then acts as a parameter along this ray. There are therefore two types of variation we can make to obtain neighbouring rays. Firstly, we can vary θ . To obtain the deviation vector connecting the image of such infinitesimally separated rays, we differentiate equation (3.13) with respect to θ , keeping \hat{a}_0 constant. The other variation we can consider is varying \hat{a}_0 (while keeping \hat{a}_0 perpendicular to u_0). In this case, we obtain a deviation vector which points in some other direction, perpendicular to both u_0 and \hat{a}_0 , which we denote \hat{a}'_0 (defined to have unit length). Considering both of these variations together, we obtain a deviation vector:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S = u_0 |A| \left(\frac{2\pi \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta} - \frac{\sin(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin^2 \theta} \right) + \hat{a}_0 |A| \left(\frac{2\pi \sin(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta} - \frac{1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin^2 \theta} \right) \\
 + \hat{a}'_0 \frac{|A|}{\sin \theta} (1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)) + O(|A|^3).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Note that this deviation vector is finite at $\theta = 0$. We also consider the tangent vector, T , to the image of a ray in $T_p M$. This is obtained by differentiating equation (3.13) with respect to $|A|$ while holding θ constant:

$$T = u_0 \frac{1}{\sin \theta} \sin(2\pi \sin \theta) + \hat{a}_0 \frac{1}{\sin \theta} (1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)) + O(|A|^2). \tag{3.16}$$

What we are actually interested in is the component of S which is perpendicular to T . We therefore define

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\perp} &:= S - g(\hat{T}, S)\hat{T} \\
&= |A| \left(\frac{2\pi \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta} - \frac{\pi \sin^2(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta(1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta))} \right) u_0 \\
&\quad + \frac{|A|\pi \sin(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta} \hat{a}_0 + \frac{|A|}{\sin \theta} (1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)) \hat{a}'_0 + O(|A|^3)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where \hat{T} denotes the unit vector $T/|T|$.

Since we are interested in the values of $|A|$ at which this might vanish, we differentiate with respect to $|A|$, holding θ and \hat{a}_0 constant:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|} &= \left(\frac{2\pi \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta} - \frac{\pi \sin^2(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta(1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta))} \right) u_0 + \frac{\pi \sin(2\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin \theta} \hat{a}_0 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sin \theta} (1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta)) \hat{a}'_0 + O(|A|^2) \\
\implies \frac{\partial^2 S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|^2} &= O(|A|).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Note that $S_{\perp}(|A| = 0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|}(|A| = 0) \neq 0$. This reflects the fact that the images of rays from $0 \in T_p M$ all start from the same point p (at which $|A| = 0$) but have different tangent directions at this point.

From the above, we derive the following formula

$$\left| \frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|} \right| \Big|_{|A|=0} = \frac{4\pi^2 \sin^2(\pi \sin \theta)}{\sin^2 \theta} + \frac{(1 - \cos(2\pi \sin \theta))^2}{\sin^2 \theta}. \tag{3.19}$$

This function is shown in Figure 5. If we restrict to a wedge in $T_p M$ defined by $\theta \in [\theta_0, \theta_1]$ for some $0 < \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \pi/2$, then $\left| \frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|} \right|$ is bounded away from 0 by some constant $c_0 > 0$ (which depends on θ_0 and θ_1). Furthermore, if we consider only points in the wedge with $|A| \leq r$ (i.e. a compact subset of the wedge which we will refer to as a wedge of radius r), then $\left| \frac{\partial^2 S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|^2} \right|$ is bounded above by some constant $c_1 > 0$ (since all terms in the power series expansion (3.17) will be bounded on this




Figure 5: Figure showing how $\left|\frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|}\right|^2$ varies with θ .

compact set). We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left|\frac{\partial^2 S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|^2}\right| < c_1 \\
\implies & \left|\frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|}\right| > \left|\frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|}\right|_{|A|=0} - c_1 |A| \\
& > c_0 - c_1 |A| \\
\implies & \left|\frac{\partial S_{\perp}}{\partial |A|}\right| > 0 \text{ for } |A| \leq \frac{c_0}{c_1} \\
\implies & |S_{\perp}| > 0 \text{ for } 0 < |A| \leq \frac{c_0}{c_1}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where in the last line we have used the fact that $|S_{\perp}|_{|A|=0} = 0$.

From this we see that the exponential map is a homeomorphism on the set of points in $T_p M$ with $\theta \in [\theta_0, \theta_1]$ and $|A| \leq c_0/c_1$.

We can repeat this argument for any choice of θ_0 and θ_1 with $0 < \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \pi/2$. However, if we let $\theta_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $\theta_1 \rightarrow \pi/2$, it is clear from Figure 5 that $c_0 \rightarrow 0$. Hence the radius of the wedge on which we can guarantee that the exponential map is a homeomorphism shrinks to 0. This shows that the exponential map is a homeomorphism on each of a series of wedges with radii shrinking to 0 as their opening angles increase to π . This is illustrated in Figure 3.

By taking the union of these wedges, we conclude that the exponential map is a homeomorphism on some set with cross-sections which have boundary perpendicular to u_0 at p (see Figure 3). Such a set contains an open ball in $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ which has u_0 inward pointing and perpendicular to its boundary. \square




Figure 6: \mathbb{R}^2 can be foliated by circles which are tangent to u_0 at p .

As the radius of a wedge shrinks to 0, so too must the size of the smallest ball which contains its image under the exponential map. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.2 we see that as the opening angle of this wedge increases to π , the opening angle of the image set at p must increase to 2π (consider two rays defined by $\pm\hat{a}_0$ and let $\theta_0 \rightarrow \pi$). In particular, the images of these two rays are both tangent to $-u_0$ at p . Consequently, the image of a ball with u_0 inward pointing and perpendicular to its boundary is a set with cross sections which feature a cusp at p (shown on the right of Figure 4). We refer to such a set as a *heart* due to the shape of these cross sections.

Note that if we choose $|A| = |A_\perp| = \epsilon$, then the vector A will be mapped to a point on a conformal geodesic which has perpendicular acceleration of size $1/\epsilon$ at p . This can be made arbitrarily large by choosing ϵ to be arbitrarily small. As a result, given any $r > 0$, the image set $\exp_{p,u_0}(C(u_0, r))$ will always contain at least some portion of every conformal geodesic with unit tangent vector u_0 at p , even those with arbitrarily large perpendicular acceleration at this point. This is crucial for the lemma below and for our proof of the no-spiralling theorem (Theorem 2.3) in Section 5.

Example (the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^n): In the case where g is the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^n , the $O(|A|^3)$ terms in equation (3.13) are identically 0 and conformal geodesics are circles. The images of distinct rays from 0 in the half space $g(u_0, A) > 0$ are also rays. These do not re-intersect, so the exponential map is a homeomorphism (in fact a diffeomorphism) from this half space onto \mathbb{R}^n with the ray from 0 in the direction of $-u_0$ removed. This is essentially the familiar result that we can foliate \mathbb{R}^n by circles tangent to u_0 at p (shown for $n = 2$ in Figure 6). Since we have insisted that the conformal geodesic has initial direction u_0 (rather than $-u_0$) we cannot reach points on the $-u_0$ axis. These points correspond to the circle through infinity with initial direction u_0 at p .

If the Schouten tensor is not indentially zero then the higher order terms in equation (3.13) become important as $|A|$ increases. These terms may cause the images of the rays to intersect. This would reduce the size of the domain on which the exponential map is a homeomorphism.

3.4 Conformal geodesics re-intersect the heart boundary

Given any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, we would like to consider the largest open ball $C(u_0, r)$ (see Definition 3.3) on which \exp_{p, u_0} is a homeomorphism. It is of course possible this map is a homeomorphism on $C(u_0, r)$ for all $r > 0$, as is the case in Euclidean space (see Section 3.3). Our proof of the no-spiralling theorem in Section 5 will be simpler if we work with a finite sized domain with boundary. With this in mind, we make the following definition

Definition 3.5. Given any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, define

$$r_{(p, u_0)} := \frac{1}{2} \times \min\{1, \sup\{r : \exp_{p, u_0} \text{ is a homeomorphism on } C(u_0, r)\}\}. \quad (3.21)$$

The factor of $1/2$ is included since it will be convenient in the proof of Theorem 4.2 that the exponential map is a homeomorphism onto the heart and its boundary.

Definition 3.6. The heart which is the image of the set $C(u_0, r_{(p, u_0)})$ under the exponential map at (p, u_0) is denoted

$$H_{p, u_0} := \exp_{p, u_0}(C(u_0, r_{(p, u_0)})). \quad (3.22)$$

For the proof of the no-spiralling theorem (Theorem 2.3), we will require the following property of the heart H_{p, u_0} .

Theorem 3.7. For any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, any conformal geodesic with unit tangent u_0 at p re-intersects the boundary of the heart H_{p, u_0} .

Proof: As discussed in Section 3.1, a conformal geodesic is the image under the exponential map of a curve in T_pM defined by holding \hat{a}_0 and $\sin \theta/|A|$ constant while varying $|A|$. Therefore, a conformal geodesic intersects the boundary of H_{p, u_0} when this curve reaches the boundary of $C(u_0, r_{(p, u_0)}) \subset T_pM$. \square

In fact, the curve in T_pM defined by holding \hat{a}_0 and $\sin \theta/|A|$ constant reaches the boundary of $C(u_0, r_{(p, u_0)})$ at some $|A| \leq r_{(p, u_0)}$. Hence from the definition of the exponential map (Definition 3.1) we see that the arc length parameter distance travelled along the conformal geodesic before it reaches the boundary of H_{p, u_0} is at most $2\pi r_{(p, u_0)}$.

4 Size of the Heart

The aim of this section is to follow Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 2.3 as outlined in Section 2.1.

Step 2: Define a notion of size for a heart and show that given any compact $U \subset M$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that there is a heart at p with direction u_0 which has size at least ϵ , for any $p \in U$ and any $u_0 \in S(T_pM)$.




Figure 7: This figure shows a sample of balls in the set $k(p, u_0, r)$. We have chosen $r < R(p, u_0)$ which means that all of these balls are contained in the heart H_{p, u_0} .

Consider the heart H_{p, u_0} and let $k(p, u_0, r)$ denote the set of all closed balls in M of radius r with p on their boundary and u_0 pointing into or tangent to the ball. If r is sufficiently small, then all balls in $k(p, u_0, r)$ will be contained inside the closure of H_{p, u_0} , which we denote \bar{H}_{p, u_0} (see Figure 7).

Definition 4.1. At any point $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, we define the size of the heart H_{p, u_0} by

$$R : S(TM) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0} \quad (4.23)$$

$$(p, u_0) \mapsto \sup\{r : \bar{B} \subset \bar{H}_{p, u_0} \forall \bar{B} \in k(p, u_0, r)\}.$$

Theorem 4.2. Let $(M, [g])$ be a conformal manifold such that the Schouten tensor is of class C^2 and let U be a compact subset of $S(TM)$. Then there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that $R(p, u_0) \geq \epsilon$ for any $(p, u_0) \in U$.

To prove this theorem, we begin by considering the following ODE with an initial condition

$$y'(t) = f(t, y) \text{ and } y(0) = y_0. \quad (4.24)$$

Theorem 4.3 ([7] Section V.3 Corollary 3.3 and Section V.4 Corollary 4.1). Suppose $f(t, y)$ is of class C^m , $m \geq 1$, on an open (t, y) -set. Then (4.24) has unique solution $y = \eta(t, y_0)$ which is of class C^m on its domain of existence.

Corollary 4.4. Suppose the Christoffel symbols, $\Gamma_{\gamma\delta}^\beta$ and the Schouten tensor, L , are both C^2 . Then the heart boundary is a C^2 surface away from the cusp.

Proof: We will parameterise conformal geodesics $x^\alpha(t)$ by their arc length, t . The conformal

geodesic equation can then be written as three separate 1st order ODEs on some co-ordinate patch

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dx^\beta}{dt} &= u^\beta \\ \frac{du^\beta}{dt} &= a^\beta - \Gamma_{\gamma\delta}^\beta u^\gamma u^\delta \\ \frac{da^\beta}{dt} &= -\Gamma_{\gamma\delta}^\beta u^\gamma a^\delta - (g_{\gamma\delta} a^\gamma a^\delta + L_{\gamma\delta} a^\gamma a^\delta) u^\beta + L_\gamma^\beta u^\gamma.\end{aligned}\tag{4.25}$$

Since the Christoffel symbols $\Gamma_{\gamma\delta}^\beta$ and Schouten tensor are both C^2 , Theorem 4.3 implies that the solution $x^\alpha = \eta^\alpha(t, x_0, u_0, a_0)$ is also C^2 . This tells us that, away from $A = 0$, the exponential map considered as a function of (p, u_0, A) is C^2 . We conclude that the heart boundary is C^2 away from the cusp. \square

Next we define the following function.

Definition 4.5.

$$R_1(p, u_0) := \sup\{r : \text{any open ball in } M \text{ of radius } r \text{ with } u_0 \text{ tangent to its boundary is contained in } H_{p, u_0}\}\tag{4.26}$$

Lemma 4.6. For any compact $U \subset S(TM)$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $R_1(p, u_0) \geq \epsilon$ for any $(p, u_0) \in U$.

Proof: Let $U \subset S(TM)$ be compact and let $(p, u_0) \in U$. This specifies a value $r_{(p, u_0)}$ such that the exponential map at (p, u_0) is a homeomorphism from the open ball $C(u_0, r_{(p, u_0)})$ to the heart H_{p, u_0} . Next we choose a unit vector \hat{a}_0 which is perpendicular to u_0 . By restricting to elements of $T_p M$ in $\text{span}\{u_0, \hat{a}_0\}$, we obtain a curve through p on the boundary of the ball $C(u_0, r_{(p, u_0)}) \subset T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ which we call a circle of radius $r_{(p, u_0)}$. This circle is mapped by the exponential map to a curve $\lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}$ on the heart boundary. Finally, we choose some value $x \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$. This corresponds uniquely to a point on this circle (by considering the angle between A and u_0). The exponential map takes this point to a point on the curve $\lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}$. Note that by choosing $x \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ we do not include the problem point at 0 which is mapped to the cusp.

By Corollary 4.4, $\lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}$ is an endless C^2 curve. This allows us to consider its curvature. For any $x \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ we define the following real-valued function

$$F(p, u_0, \hat{a}_0, x) \mapsto \left| \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}(x) \right|.\tag{4.27}$$

From Corollary 4.4, we see that F is a continuous function.

There is a subtlety at the point p , where the boundary of the heart contains a cusp and directional derivatives have discontinuities. However, if we approach p along the curve $\lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}$ in two different directions then the function F tends to a finite limit (note that these two limits may not be equal). If we join the two ends of $\lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}$ at p , then these two limits correspond to the two values we get for the magnitude of the curvature of $\lambda_{p, u_0, \hat{a}_0}$ at p if we use one-sided derivatives in either direction.




Figure 8: If the every sectional curvature at every point on the heart boundary is bounded above by $\epsilon > 0$, then any ball of radius $1/\epsilon$ with u_0 tangent to its boundary at p is contained inside the heart.

This means that, for fixed (p, u_0, \hat{a}_0) , the function $F(p, u_0, \hat{a}_0, x)$ is bounded. Moreover, this bound is itself a continuous function of (p, u_0, \hat{a}_0) . We conclude that if we consider $(p, u_0) \in U \subset S(TM)$ and any choice of \hat{a}_0 and $x \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$, then $F(p, u_0, \hat{a}_0, x)$ is bounded.

In short, given any $(p, u_0) \in U$ and any circle of radius $r_{(p, u_0)}$ in $T_{u_0}(T_p M)$ with u_0 perpendicular to its boundary, the magnitude of the sectional curvature at a point on the image of this circle, taken in the direction of the circle's image, is bounded by $1/\epsilon > 0$, for some $\epsilon > 0$, where we understand that at p itself we consider two different sectional curvatures corresponding to the different directions along the image of the circle.

As a result, for any $(p, u_0) \in U$, the heart H_{p, u_0} must contain every open ball in M of radius ϵ which has u_0 tangent to its boundary at p , i.e. $R_1(p, u_0) \geq \epsilon$ (see Figure 8). \square

Next we consider balls in M with u_0 pointing inwards on the boundary. We make the following definitions.

Definition 4.7.

$$B_{1/2}(r, p, u_0) := B(r, p) \cap \{q : g(\exp_p^{-1}(q), u_0) \geq 0.\} \quad (4.28)$$

Here \exp_p denotes the metric geodesic map at p (we can restrict ourselves to sufficiently small r so that this map is invertible on $B(p, r)$ for all $(p, u_0) \in W$). The set we have defined consists of points in the half ball with boundary perpendicular to u_0 at p which have non-negative u_0 co-ordinate, where these co-ordinates are defined using the metric geodesic map applied to an orthonormal basis of $T_p M$ (see Figure 9).

Definition 4.8.

$$R_2(p, u_0) := \sup\{r : B_{1/2}(r, p, u_0) \subset H_{p, u_0}.\} \quad (4.29)$$

Lemma 4.9. For any compact $U \subset S(TM)$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $R_2(p, u_0) > \epsilon$ for any $(p, u_0) \in U$.




Figure 9: $B_{1/2}(r, p, u_0)$ is the half ball in M of radius r centred on p consisting of points q such that $g(\exp_p^{-1}(q), u_0) \geq 0$.




Figure 10: If $R_1(p, u_0) > r$ and $R_2(p, u_0) > 2r$ then $R(p, u_0) > r$.

Proof: Let $U \subset S(TM)$ be compact. From Corollary 4.4, $\exp_{p,u_0}(A)$ regarded as a function of (p, u_0, A) is continuous (in fact C^2) away from the cusp. We also saw in Section 3.5 that the boundary of H_{p,u_0} is continuous (including at p). We conclude that the boundary of H_{p,u_0} varies continuously with (p, u_0) and hence $R_2(p, u_0)$ is also continuous. The result follows since $R_2(p, u_0)$ is strictly positive and a continuous function on a compact set is bounded and attains its bounds. \square

Combining these two lemmas, we are able to prove Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.2: By Lemmas 4.6 and 4.9, for any compact $U \subset S(TM)$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $R_1(p, u_0) > \epsilon$ and $R_2(p, u_0) > 2\epsilon$.

The result follows by observing that $R(p, u_0) > R_1(p, u_0)$ and $R(p, u_0) > R_2(p, u_0)$ (Figure 10). \square

5 No-Spiralling Theorem

The aim of this section is to follow Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 2.3 as outlined in Section 2.1.

Step 3: Using the fact that a conformal geodesic with unit tangent u_0 at p must re-intersect the boundary of H_{p,u_0} , deduce that conformal geodesics cannot spiral.

Theorem 2.3 Let $(M, [g])$ be a conformal manifold with C^2 Schouten tensor. Then conformal geodesics on $(M, [g])$ cannot spiral.

Proof: Suppose there is a conformal geodesic, γ , which spirals towards some point $p_* \in M$. We will show that there exists $r > 0$ such that $B(p_*, r) \subset H_{p,u_0}$, where p and u_0 are the point and unit tangent at which γ enters $\bar{B}(p_*, r)$ for the final time. This would then contradict Theorem 3.7 since if γ does not leave $B(p_*, r)$ then it cannot re-intersect the boundary of H_{p,u_0} . This is illustrated in Figure 11.

Define a compact subset of $S(TM)$ by $W := \{(p, u_0) \in S(TM) : p \in \bar{B}(p_*, 1)\}$. Invoking Theorem 4.2, we can then define:

$$R_W := \inf_{(p,u_0) \in W} \{R(p, u_0)\} > 0. \quad (5.30)$$

So for any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$ with $d(p, p_*) \leq 1$, any closed ball in M of radius at most R_W and u_0 inward pointing or tangent to its boundary at p is contained inside \bar{H}_{p,u_0} .

Let p denote the point at which γ enters $\bar{B}(p_*, R_W)$ for the final time and let u_0 denote its unit tangent at this point (so u_0 is either inward pointing or tangent to the boundary of $\bar{B}(p_*, R_W)$ at p). By construction we then have $\bar{B}(p_*, R_W) \subset H_{p,u_0}$. But since γ remains trapped in $B(p_*, R_W)$, it cannot re-intersect the boundary of H_{p,u_0} . This contradicts Theorem 3.7. \square




Figure 11: If γ enters $B(p_*, R_W) \subset H_{p, u_0}$, then in order to reach the boundary of H_{p, u_0} it must first leave $B(p_*, R_W)$.

6 Summary

We have shown that conformal geodesics defined on a Riemannian conformal manifold cannot spiral. This proof was inspired by a proof of the no-spiralling theorem for metric geodesics which did not rely on length minimisation arguments, instead focusing on properties of the exponential map. However, in the conformal geodesic version there were some additional complications. The most striking of these was that the exponential map we defined for conformal geodesics was not a homeomorphism onto any ball centred at $p \in M$. Instead we found that given any $(p, u_0) \in S(TM)$, conformal geodesics with unit velocity u_0 at p foliate some set with cross-sections which resemble a heart.

In this paper we have only considered Riemannian conformal manifolds. In the Lorentzian case, our proof fails from the very beginning. In particular, the exponential map (Definition (3.1)) is not well defined since it is now possible to have $|A| = 0$ for $A \neq 0$.

References

- [1] T N Bailey, M G Eastwood: *Conformal Circles and Parametrizations of Curves in Conformal Manifolds*
Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **108** 215–221.
- [2] T N Bailey, M G Eastwood, A R Gover: *Thomas's structure bundle for conformal, projective and related structures*
Rocky Mountain J. Math. **24**, 1191–1217 (1994).

- [3] M Dunajski, P Tod: *Conformal Geodesics on Gravitational Instantons*
Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 1-32 (2021)
arXiv:1906.08375
- [4] M Dunajski, W Kryński: *Variational Principles for Conformal Geodesics*
Lett Math Phys **111**, 127 (2021).
arXiv:2104.13105
- [5] M do Carmo: *Riemannian Geometry*
Birkhäuser Basel, (1992).
- [6] H Friedrich, B G Schmidt: *Conformal geodesics in general relativity*
Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **414**: 171–195 (1987).
- [7] P Hartman: *Ordinary Differential Equations*
Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (2002).
- [8] R Penrose: *Techniques of Differential Topology in General Relativity*
Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (1972).
- [9] B G Schmidt: *Conformal geodesics*
Conformal groups and related symmetries: physical results and mathematical background
(Clausthal-Zellerfeld, 1985), 135–137, Lecture Notes in Phys., **261**, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [10] P Tod: *Some examples of the behaviour of conformal geodesics*
Journal of Geometry and Physics **62** (2012), 1778-1792.
- [11] K Yano: *The theory of Lie derivatives and its applications*. North-Holland Publishing Co.,
Amsterdam.