

EFFECTIVE RIGIDITY AWAY FROM THE BOUNDARY FOR CENTRALLY-SYMMETRIC BILLIARDS

MISHA BIALY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study centrally symmetric Birkhoff billiard tables. We introduce a closed invariant set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ consisting of locally maximizing orbits of the billiard map lying inside the region \mathcal{B} bounded by two invariant curves of 4-periodic orbits. We give an effective bound from above on the measure of this invariant set in terms of the isoperimetric defect of the curve. The equality case occurs if and only if the curve is a circle.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study Birkhoff billiards for centrally symmetric C^2 smooth convex curves in the plane. We introduce the set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ lying in the region \mathcal{B} between two invariant curves $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ in the phase space. The set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$, by definition, consists of orbits that are locally maximizing for the length functional \mathcal{L} corresponding to the billiard table. We assume that $\alpha, \bar{\alpha}$ consist of 4-periodic orbits (of rotation numbers $1/4$ and $3/4$). It is clear that the set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a closed set which is invariant under the billiard map T (see Figure 1). Our goal is to get an upper bound on the measure of the




FIGURE 1. The region \mathcal{B}

set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ which is sharp, i.e. the case when $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ occupies the whole of \mathcal{B} occurs if and only if the billiard table is circular. Thus we show that the measure of the set $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ can be estimated from below in terms of the isoperimetric defect of the billiard domain.

These bounds are of obvious importance for classical dynamics (and probably also for quantum properties), because all "rotational" invariant curves,

Date: 25 September 2022.

MB was partially supported by ISF grant 580/20 and DFG grant MA-2565/7-1 within the Middle East Collaboration Program.

as well as Aubry-Mather sets, are filled by orbits which are locally length maximizing (we refer to the monographs [19][3][18][17] for background material).

This type of estimates were obtained previously in [9] [11], as an effective version of the so called E.Hopf rigidity phenomenon. The estimate presented here is related to the recent progress in the Birkhoff conjecture [7]. We refer here to papers [1][2][14][16][13] for other recent approaches. However, the main novelty of the present paper is that the region \mathcal{B} lies away from the boundary of the phase cylinder.

It is an open question how to remove the restriction of central symmetry of the billiard table. It is also interesting if effective bounds can be found for a region between two arbitrary invariant curves in the phase space. We turn now to the needed background and formulation of the main result.

Let γ be a C^2 -smooth simple closed convex curve of positive curvature in \mathbf{R}^2 . We fix the counterclockwise orientation on γ . We shall use the arclength parametrization s as well as the parametrization by the angle ψ formed by the outer unit normal n to γ with a fixed direction. These two parametrizations are related by $d\psi = kds$, where k is the curvature.

The natural phase space of the Birkhoff billiard inside γ is the space \mathbf{A} of all oriented lines that intersect γ . This space is topologically a cylinder and we shall refer to it as the phase cylinder of T . The billiard map T acts on \mathbf{A} by the reflection law in γ . The phase cylinder carries a natural symplectic structure that can be described as follows.

Each oriented line is identified with the pair $(\cos \delta, s)$, $\delta \in (0, \pi)$, where $\gamma(s)$ is the incoming point and δ is the angle between the line and the tangent $\gamma'(s)$. In these coordinates the symplectic form is $d\lambda$, where $\lambda = \cos \delta ds$, where $\cos \delta$ plays the role of momentum variable. We shall denote by μ the corresponding invariant measure on the phase space \mathbf{A} . The billiard map T is a symplectic map and the chord length $L(s, s_1) = |\gamma(s) - \gamma(s_1)|$ is a generating function of T (see Figure 2) Namely,

$$T^*\lambda - \lambda = \cos \delta_1 ds_1 - \cos \delta ds = dL.$$




FIGURE 2. Generating function L corresponding to the 1-form λ .

Moreover, one can check that T satisfies twist condition:

$$L_{12}(s, s_1) > 0,$$

meaning that T is *negative* twist symplectic map (here and below we use subindex 1 and/or 2 for the partial derivative with respect to the first or the second argument respectively).

For the generating function L we can naturally define the variational principle as follows. For the configuration sequence $\{s_n\}$ we associate the formal sum

$$\mathcal{L}\{s_n\} = \sum_n L(s_n, s_{n+1}).$$

The set of billiard configurations coincide with the set of extremals of this variational principle. We shall consider *locally maximizing* configurations, that is, those configurations which give *local maximum* for the functional between any two end-points. We shall call such configurations, *m-configurations*, and the corresponding orbits on the phase cylinder \mathbf{A} , *m-orbits*. We denote by $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbf{A}$ the set swept by all m-orbits corresponding to the variational principle for the generating function L . We shall also use the following notations

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}} := \mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{B}, \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$$

Let $\gamma \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ be a centrally symmetric strictly convex closed planar curve. We shall assume that the billiard map corresponding to γ has a rotational invariant curve $\alpha \subset \mathbf{A}$ consisting of 4-periodic orbits. We shall denote by $\bar{\alpha}$ the corresponding invariant curve of rotation number $\frac{3}{4}$. This curve consists of the same billiard trajectories but with the reversed orientation of the lines. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that the billiard ball map T of γ has a continuous rotational (=winding once around the cylinder and simple) invariant curve $\alpha \subset \mathbf{A}$ of rotation number $1/4$, consisting of 4-periodic orbits. Let $\bar{\alpha}$ be the corresponding invariant curve of rotation number $\frac{3}{4}$. Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbf{A}$ be the domain between the curves α and $\bar{\alpha}$ (see Figure 1). Then the following estimate holds;*

$$(1) \quad \frac{3\beta}{64}(P^2 - 4\pi A) \leq \mu(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}),$$

where P, A denote the perimeter and the area of γ , and β is the minimal curvature of γ .

Sharp estimates for \mathcal{M} were obtained first in [9] and then in [11] as quantitative version of the so called E.Hopf rigidity phenomenon for billiards discovered in [4] and then [5][20]. In the paper [11] the region between the invariant curve α and the boundary of the phase cylinder was considered, while in the present paper the region \mathcal{B} lies away from the boundary. The significance of the invariant curve of 4-periodic orbits was first understood in [7], and we shall remind the properties of this curve here and use them below.

Here are some useful corollaries of Theorem 1.1:

Corollary 1.2. *Set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ of locally maximizing orbits occupies the whole region \mathcal{B} if and only γ is a circle.*

In fact one can reformulate Corollary 1.2 in a dynamical way:

Corollary 1.3. *Suppose the restriction of billiard map T to \mathcal{B} has an invariant measurable field of non-vertical oriented lines, with the orientation chosen on the lines coherently by the condition $ds > 0$. Then γ is a circle.*

This is especially useful in establishing the following geometric fact.

Corollary 1.4. *If γ is not a circle, there always exist a point $x \in \mathcal{B}$ and a vertical tangent vector $v \in T_x\mathcal{B}$ such that for some positive integer n , the vector $DT^n(v)$ is again vertical (this exactly means that the points x and $T^n x$ are conjugate).*

2. Important tools

2.1. Non-standard generating function. The second way to get the same symplectic form is to fix an origin in \mathbf{R}^2 (we shall fix the origin at the center of γ) and to introduce the coordinates (p, φ) on the space of all oriented lines, so that φ is the angle between the right unit normal to the line and the horizontal and p is the signed distance to the line (see Fig. 3). In this way the space of oriented lines is identified with T^*S^1 . Moreover, the standard symplectic form $d\beta$ with $\beta = pd\varphi$ coincides with the symplectic form described before. In this description p plays the role of momentum variable.

For the second choice of the coordinates (p, φ) , the generating function was found first in [6] for the 2-dimensional case and then in [8] for higher dimensions (see [10] for further applications). This function S is determined by the formulas:

$$T^*\beta - \beta = p_1 d\varphi_1 - p d\varphi = dS, \quad S(\varphi, \varphi_1) = 2h(\psi) \sin \delta,$$

where

$$\psi := \frac{\varphi_1 + \varphi}{2}, \quad \delta := \frac{\varphi_1 - \varphi}{2}.$$

Here and throughout this paper we denote by h the support function of γ with respect to 0:

$$h(\psi) := \max_{\gamma} \langle \gamma, n_{\psi} \rangle,$$

where n_{ψ} is the unit outer normal to γ in the direction ψ . The fact that S is the generating function for T means that the line with coordinates (p, φ) is mapped into the line (p_1, φ_1) (see Figure 3) if and only if

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} p &= -S_1(\varphi, \varphi_1) = h(\psi) \cos \delta - h'(\psi) \sin \delta, \\ p_1 &= S_2(\varphi, \varphi_1) = h(\psi) \cos \delta + h'(\psi) \sin \delta. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the direct computation (see below Proposition 2.4) that the map T satisfies the twist condition with respect to the symplectic coordinates (p, φ) meaning that the cross-derivative $S_{12} = \frac{1}{2}\rho(\psi) \sin \delta > 0$, where $\rho(\psi) = h''(\psi) + h(\psi) > 0$ is the radius of curvature.

2.2. Two variational principles. One can associate variational principle \mathcal{S} also for the function S :

$$\mathcal{S}\{\varphi_n\} = \sum_n S(\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}).$$




FIGURE 3. Generating function S corresponding to the 1-form β

In [11] we gave a criterion for an orbit to be locally maximizing. It then follows from this criterion that the set \mathcal{M} does not depend on which generating function L or S is used for the map T . We shall use the function S in order to prove Theorem 1.1.

Remark It appears that vertical vector in the statement of the Corollary 1.4 can be understood with respect to each of the vertical foliations $\{s = \text{const}\}$ or $\{\varphi = \text{const}\}$. In particular, the existence of conjugate points with respect to the vertical foliation $\{\varphi = \text{const}\}$ implies that one can find a beam of parallel lines such that after n reflections the beam becomes parallel (infinitesimally) again.

2.3. Properties of the invariant curve of 4-periodic orbits. It is well-known (see [12] for several proofs) that all Poncelet 4-gons for an ellipse are parallelograms. This fact can be generalized from the case of an ellipse to any centrally-symmetric billiard table. We turn now to state the results from [7] and refer to [7] for the proofs. The next theorem is illustrated in Figure 4.

Theorem 2.1. *Let γ be a centrally-symmetric billiard table. Assume billiard ball map $T : \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ has a continuous rotational invariant curve $\alpha = \{\delta = d(\psi)\}$ of rotation number $\frac{1}{4}$ consisting of 4-periodic orbits of T . Then the following properties hold:*

- (A) *Function $d(\psi)$ is π -periodic and each billiard quadrilateral corresponding to invariant curve α is a parallelogram.*
- (B) *The tangent lines to γ at the vertices of the parallelogram form a rectangle.*
- (C) $0 < d(\psi) < \pi/2$, $d(\psi + \frac{\pi}{2}) = \frac{\pi}{2} - d(\psi)$.
- (D) *The functions d and h satisfy the identities*

$$\tan d(\psi) = \frac{h(\psi)}{h(\psi + \frac{\pi}{2})} = -\frac{h'(\psi + \frac{\pi}{2})}{h'(\psi)},$$

and

$$h^2(\psi) + h^2\left(\psi + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = R^2 = \text{const.}$$

Remark It follows from Theorem 2.1 item (D), that the orthoptic curve associated with γ is a circle of radius R , like in the case of an ellipse.

Corollary 2.2. *Let γ be a convex centrally-symmetric billiard table. Let $\alpha = \{\delta = d(\psi)\} \subset \mathbf{A}$ be an invariant curve consisting of 4-periodic orbits. It then follows from Theorem 2.1 item (D) that*

$$h(\psi) = R \sin d(\psi), \quad h\left(\psi + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) = R \cos d(\psi),$$

for a positive constant R .

Corollary 2.3. *The explicit formulas of item (D) show that the invariant curve α is necessarily C^2 -smooth, since the support function h is C^2 -smooth by assumption.*




FIGURE 4. Rectangle $Q_0Q_1Q_2Q_3$ corresponding to the 4-periodic orbit forming parallelogram $P_0P_1P_2P_3$.

2.4. Function ω and an inequality. It turns out that one can introduce a measurable bounded function ω on the set \mathcal{M} satisfying the inequality:

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega(p_1, \varphi_1) - \omega(p, \varphi) &\geq \\ &\geq S_{11}(\varphi, \varphi_1) + S_{22}(\varphi, \varphi_1) + 2S_{12}(\varphi, \varphi_1). \end{aligned}$$

The construction of this function (see [4]) was inspired by the celebrated E.Hopf theorem on tori with no conjugate points. Let me sketch this construction. Let $\{(p_n, \varphi_n)\}$ be a locally maximizing orbit of the point $z = (p_0, \varphi_0)$. It then follows that there exists an invariant vector field $\{(\delta p_n, \delta \varphi_n)\}$ along the orbit $\{(p_n, \varphi_n)\}$ such that the corresponding field $\delta \varphi_n$ is a Jacobi field along billiard configuration $\{\varphi_n\}$ (normalized by $\delta \varphi_0 = 1$) is strictly positive. Let me remind, *Jacobi field* along a configuration $\{\varphi_n\}$ is a sequence $\{\delta \varphi_n\}$ satisfying the *discrete Jacobi equation*:

$$(4) \quad b_{n-1} \delta \varphi_{n-1} + a_n \delta \varphi_n + b_n \delta \varphi_{n+1} = 0,$$

where, as before,

$$a_n = S_{22}(\varphi_{n-1}, \varphi_n) + S_{11}(\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}), \quad b_n = S_{12}(\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1}).$$

Then the invariance of the field $\{(p_n, \varphi_n)\}$ along the orbit reads:

$$\delta p_n = -S_{11}(\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1})\delta\varphi_n - S_{12}(\varphi_n, \varphi_{n+1})\delta\varphi_{n+1},$$

or equivalently, due to the Jacobi equation:

$$\delta p_n = S_{22}(\varphi_{n-1}, \varphi_n)\delta\varphi_n + S_{12}(\varphi_{n-1}, \varphi_n)\delta\varphi_{n-1}.$$

Then one defines $\omega(p_n, \varphi_n) := \frac{\delta p_n}{\delta\varphi_n}$. One can prove that ω is measurable function and satisfies the relations:

$$(5) \quad \begin{cases} \omega(T(p, \varphi)) = S_{22}(\varphi, \varphi_1) + S_{12}(\varphi, \varphi_1)\delta\varphi_1(\varphi, p)^{-1}, \\ \omega(p, \varphi) = -S_{11}(\varphi, \varphi_1) - S_{12}(\varphi, \varphi_1)\delta\varphi_1(\varphi, p). \end{cases}$$

Subtracting the second equation from the first one and using $S_{12} > 0$, $\delta\varphi_1 > 0$ we get the inequality (3). Notice that from the formulas (5) and Proposition (2.4) it follows that function ω is bounded on $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$:

$$|\omega| < \max_{\mathcal{B}}\{|S_{11}|, |S_{22}|\} < K(\gamma),$$

where $K(\gamma)$ depends only on γ .

2.5. Derivatives of generating function S . The derivatives of generating function S can be immediately computed:

Proposition 2.4. *The second partial derivatives of S are:*

$$\begin{aligned} S_{11}(\varphi, \varphi_1) &= \frac{1}{2}(h''(\psi) - h(\psi)) \sin \delta - h'(\psi) \cos \delta; \\ S_{22}(\varphi, \varphi_1) &= \frac{1}{2}(h''(\psi) - h(\psi)) \sin \delta + h'(\psi) \cos \delta; \\ S_{12}(\varphi, \varphi_1) &= \frac{1}{2}(h''(\psi) + h(\psi)) \sin \delta, \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi := \frac{\varphi_1 + \varphi}{2}$, $\delta := \frac{\varphi_1 - \varphi}{2}$.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In the sequel we shall work with the coordinates (p, φ) and the function ω constructed above. We start the proof of Theorem 1.1 integrating (3) over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}$ with respect to the invariant measure $d\mu = dpd\varphi$.

In order to perform the integration we compute the invariant measure as follows.

The symplectic form $dp \wedge d\varphi$ can be written using generating function (2):

$$dp \wedge d\varphi = -d(S_1(\varphi, \varphi_1)) \wedge d\varphi = S_{12}d\varphi \wedge d\varphi_1.$$

Since T is symplectic, the measure

$$d\mu = dpd\varphi = S_{12}d\varphi d\varphi_1,$$

is invariant. Using the explicit formula for the second derivative (Proposition 2.4) we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} d\mu &= S_{12}d\varphi d\varphi_1 = \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho(\psi) \sin \delta \right) d\varphi d\varphi_1 = \left(\frac{1}{4}\rho(\psi) \sin \delta \right) d\psi d\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where (see Figure 3 showing all the notations)

$$\rho(\psi) = h''(\psi) + h(\psi), \quad \psi := \frac{\varphi_1 + \varphi}{2}, \quad \delta := \frac{\varphi_1 - \varphi}{2}.$$

Hence, integrating the inequality (3) with respect to the invariant measure $d\mu$ we obtain:

$$0 \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}} [S_{11}(\varphi, \varphi_1) + 2S_{12}(\varphi, \varphi_1) + S_{22}(\varphi, \varphi_1)] S_{12} \, d\varphi d\varphi_1.$$

Substituting the explicit expressions for the derivatives of S , we get after a simplification the inequality:

$$(6) \quad 0 \geq \int_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}}} [(h''(\psi) \sin \delta) d\mu].$$

Since $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{B} \setminus \Delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ we get:

$$(7) \quad \int_{\mathcal{B}} [(h''(\psi) \sin \delta) d\mu] \leq \int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}} [(h''(\psi) \sin \delta) d\mu]$$

Let us denote

$$(8) \quad I := \int_{\mathcal{B}} [(h''(\psi) \sin \delta) d\mu].$$

We shall give an upper bound for the right hand side of (7), and a lower bound on the left hand side, and together we get the required bound. For the right hand side, write:

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}} h''(\psi) \sin \delta d\mu &\leq \left| \int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}} h''(\psi) \sin \delta d\mu \right| \leq \\ &\leq \int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}} |h''(\psi) \sin \delta| d\mu \leq \mu(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}) \max_{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}} |h''|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $h(\psi) + h''(\psi) = \rho(\psi)$, where $\rho(\psi)$ is the radius of curvature, then

$$|h''| \leq \rho + \max h.$$

Since γ is centrally symmetric, we have $\max h \leq D/2$, where D is the diameter. Also, the maximal radius of curvature of γ is $\frac{1}{\beta}$ where β is the minimal curvature of γ . This gives us the estimate

$$(10) \quad I = \int_{\mathcal{B}} [(h''(\psi) \sin \delta) d\mu] \leq \int_{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}} h''(\psi) \sin \delta d\mu \leq \left(\frac{D}{2} + \frac{1}{\beta} \right) \mu(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}) \leq \frac{2}{\beta} \mu(\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}),$$

where we used Blaschke's rolling disk theorem, stating that γ is contained inside a disk with radius equal to the maximal radius of curvature of γ , and this means that $D \leq \frac{2}{\beta}$.

Now we turn to estimate I from below. Namely, we shall prove

Theorem 3.1. *Integral I can be estimated from below:*

$$I \geq \frac{3}{32} (P^2 - 4\pi A).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1 follows immediately from (10) and Theorem 3.1.

4. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Substituting $d\mu$ and integrating first with respect to δ , we get from (8):

$$(11) \quad I = \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{2\pi} d\psi \left[h''(h + h'') \int_{d(\psi)}^{\pi - d(\psi)} d\delta \sin^2 \delta \right].$$

Here we used the fact that in the coordinates (ψ, δ) the domain of integration takes the form

$$\mathcal{B} = \{(\psi, \delta) : \psi \in [0, 2\pi], \delta \in [d(\psi), \pi - d(\psi)]\}.$$

Here and below $d(\psi)$ is the function described in Subsection 2.3

Integrating in (11) with respect to δ we obtain

$$(12) \quad I = \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{2\pi} [h''(\psi)(h''(\psi) + h(\psi))] \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d(\psi) + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d(\psi) \right) d\psi.$$

Now we substitute into (12) the expressions for h, h', h'' via $d(\psi)$ using Corollary 2.2:

$$(13) \quad \begin{cases} h = R \sin d, \\ h' = R \cos d \, d', \\ h'' = R \cos d \, d'' - R \sin d \, (d')^2, \\ d(\psi + \frac{\pi}{2}) = \frac{\pi}{2} - d(\psi). \end{cases}$$

In what follows we usually omit the arguments for the functions h, d and their derivatives.

Thus we get from (10) the following inequality on the function d :

$$(14) \quad I = \frac{R^2}{4} \int_0^{2\pi} (\sin d - \sin d \, d'^2 + \cos d \, d'') (-\sin d \, d'^2 + \cos d \, d'') \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right) d\psi = \frac{R^2}{4} \int_0^{2\pi} U d\psi,$$

where we introduce U by the formula

$$U := (\sin d - \sin d \, d'^2 + \cos d \, d'') (-\sin d \, d'^2 + \cos d \, d'') \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right).$$

The assumption of central symmetry implies that $h(\psi), d(\psi)$ are π -periodic. Hence:

$$\int_0^{2\pi} U(\psi) d\psi = 2 \int_0^{\pi} U(\psi) d\psi.$$

We need to prove now the following

Theorem 4.1.

$$\int_0^{\pi} U(\psi) d\psi \geq \frac{3}{16R^2} (P^2 - 4\pi A).$$

Proof. The idea of the proof is to proceed in three steps, "symmetrization", integration by parts, and Wirtinger inequality in order to pass to a new integrand \tilde{U} such that $\tilde{U} \geq \text{const } h'^2$. Next, the integral of \tilde{U} can be estimated from below by isoperimetric defect.

We write

$$U = U_1 + U_2 + U_3 + U_4 + U_5,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
U_1 &= d''^2 \cos^2 d \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\
U_2 &= -2d'' d''^2 \sin d \cos d \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\
U_3 &= d'' \sin d \cos d \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\
U_4 &= d'^4 \sin^2 d \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\
U_5 &= -d'^2 \sin^2 d \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 1. Symmetrization.

We perform the change of the integration variable by the rule $\psi \rightarrow \psi + \frac{\pi}{2}$. By (13), this intertwines $\sin(d)$ with $\cos(d)$ and changes the sign of d'' . Denote the changed integrand by \hat{U}_j

And denote the "symmetrized" integrand by

$$V_j := U_j + \hat{U}_j.$$

Then we have

$$\int_0^\pi U_j(\psi) d\psi = \int_0^\pi \hat{U}_j(\psi) d\psi = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi V_j(\psi) d\psi,$$

where V_j can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
V_1 &= d''^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\
V_2 &= d'' d'^2 \sin 2d \left(2d - \frac{\pi}{2} \right), \\
V_3 &= d'' \sin 2d \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right), \\
V_4 &= d'^4 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\
V_5 &= -d'^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 2. Integration by parts. We apply integration by parts for V_2, V_3 in order to get rid of the second derivative d'' . Notice that thanks to the π -periodicity of the integrands, the off-integration terms vanish. Thus we get

new integrands $W_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$ where

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 = V_1 &= d'^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\ W_2 &= d'^4 \left(-\frac{4}{3} \cos 2d \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) - \frac{2}{3} \sin 2d \right), \\ W_3 &= d'^2 \left(2 \cos 2d \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) + \sin 2d \right), \\ W_4 = V_4 &= d'^4 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\ W_5 = V_5 &= -d'^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get for the integral of U :

$$(15) \quad \int_0^\pi U d\psi = \int_0^\pi \sum_{i=1}^5 U_i d\psi = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \sum_{i=1}^5 V_i d\psi = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \sum_{i=1}^5 W_i d\psi.$$

Summing $W_2 + W_4$ and $W_3 + W_5$ we get only three summands:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 = W_1 &= d'^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right), \\ X_2 = W_2 + W_4 &= d'^4 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{3} \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d - \frac{1}{6} \sin 2d \right), \\ X_3 = W_3 + W_5 &= d'^2 \left(-\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have:

$$(16) \quad \int_0^\pi U d\psi = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi (X_1 + X_2 + X_3) d\psi.$$

Step 3. Use of the Wirtinger inequality.

Let us introduce the function of d which is the multiplier in X_1

$$f := \frac{\pi}{4} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d.$$

This function is strictly positive since d varies in $(0, \pi/2)$. In fact one can say more precisely

$$f \in \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right).$$

Then we can write

$$X_2 = d'^4 f_2, \quad f_2 := \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{3} \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d - \frac{1}{6} \sin 2d,$$

and one can see that f_2 is positive as well. However,

$$X_3 = d'^2 f_3, \quad f_3 := -\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d = (\sin 2d - f),$$

is not necessarily positive. In order to bypass this difficulty, we shall use Wirtinger inequality, which we apply to the function

$$Y := d' \sqrt{f}.$$

Notice that Y is π -periodic and has zero average since it can be written as a complete derivative, hence

$$\int_0^\pi (Y'^2 - 4Y^2) d\psi \geq 0.$$

We have the following expressions:

$$Y' = \sqrt{f} d'' + \frac{f'}{2\sqrt{f}} d'^2 \Rightarrow Y'^2 = f d''^2 + f' d'' d'^2 + \frac{f'^2}{4f} d'^4.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\pi (Y'^2 - 4Y^2) d\psi &= \int_0^\pi (f d''^2 + f' d'' d'^2 + \frac{f'^2}{4f} d'^4 - 4f d'^2) d\psi = \\ &= \int_0^\pi (f d''^2 - \frac{f''}{3} d'^4 + \frac{f'^2}{4f} d'^4 - 4f d'^2) d\psi := \int_0^\pi g d\psi \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we performed integration by parts again. Finally we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 + X_2 + X_3 &= g + d'^4 \left(f_2 + \frac{f''}{3} - \frac{f'^2}{4f} \right) + (f_3 + 4f) = \\ &= g + d'^4 \left(f_2 + \frac{f''}{3} - \frac{f'^2}{4f} \right) + d'^2 (\sin 2d + 3f). \end{aligned}$$

The following claim is crucial:

Lemma 4.2. *Both expressions $(3f + \sin 2d)$ and $\left(f_2 + \frac{f''}{3} - \frac{f'^2}{4f} \right)$ of the last formula are strictly positive.*

Proof. 1) Since $f \in \left[\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right)$, hence $(3f + \sin 2d) \geq \frac{3}{2} + \frac{3\pi}{4}$. Analyzing the behavior of the function f one can claim more:

$$(17) \quad (3f + \sin 2d) \geq 3f(0) = \frac{3\pi}{2}.$$

2) For the other bracket we need to compute:

$$\begin{aligned} f' &= -2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \sin 2d, \\ f'' &= -4 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + 2 \sin 2d. \end{aligned}$$

We substitute f_2 and the second derivative of f :

$$\begin{aligned} \left(f_2 + \frac{f''}{3} - \frac{f'^2}{4f} \right) &= \frac{f''}{3} - \frac{f'^2}{4f} + \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{3} \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d - \frac{1}{6} \sin 2d = \\ &= -\frac{f'^2}{4f} + \frac{1}{3} \left[-4 \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + 2 \sin 2d \right] + \frac{\pi}{4} - \frac{1}{3} \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d - \frac{1}{6} \sin 2d = \\ &= -\frac{f'^2}{4f} + \frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we need to check the sign of the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} -\left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right)^2 \sin^2 2d + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(\frac{\pi}{4} - d \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right) \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \cos 2d + \frac{1}{2} \sin 2d \right) = \\ = -\left(d - \frac{\pi}{4} \right)^2 + \frac{\pi^2}{4^2} + \frac{1}{4} \sin^2 2d + \frac{\pi}{4} \sin 2d. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that since $d \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ then $|d - \frac{\pi}{4}| < \frac{\pi}{4}$ and hence the last expression is strictly positive. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. \square

We are now in position to finish the proof of Theorem 4.1. Using Lemma 4.2 we can deduce from (16) with the help of (17)

$$(18) \quad \begin{aligned} 2 \int_0^\pi U d\psi &\geq \int_0^\pi d'^2 (\sin 2d + 3f) d\psi \geq \int_0^\pi \frac{3\pi}{2} d'^2 d\psi \geq \\ &\int_0^\pi \frac{3\pi}{2} \cos^2 d d'^2 d\psi \geq \frac{3\pi}{2R^2} \int_0^\pi h'^2 d\psi, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (13) $h' = R \cos d d'$ in the last inequality.

Now consider the isoperimetric defect $P^2 - 4\pi A$ for the curve γ . We have classical formulas:

$$P = \int_0^{2\pi} h d\psi, \quad A = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} (h^2 - h'^2) d\psi.$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we have:

$$P^2 \leq 2\pi \int_0^{2\pi} h^2 d\psi = 2\pi \left(2A + \int_0^{2\pi} h'^2 d\psi \right).$$

Hence using (18) we get:

$$P^2 - 4\pi A \leq 2\pi \int_0^{2\pi} h'^2 d\psi = 4\pi \int_0^\pi h'^2 d\psi \leq \frac{16}{3} R^2 \int_0^\pi U d\psi.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Arnold, M. Bialy. *Nonsmooth convex caustics for Birkhoff billiards*. Pacific J. Math. 295 (2018), no. 2, 257–269.
- [2] A. Avila, V. Kaloshin, J. De Simoi, *An integrable deformation of an ellipse of small eccentricity is an ellipse*, Ann. of Math., Vol. 184 (2016), 527–558.
- [3] V. Bangert. *Mather set for twist maps and geodesics on tori*. Dynamics reported (1988), Vol. 1, 1– 56, Dynam. Report. Ser. Dynam. Systems. Appl., 1, Wiley, Chichester.
- [4] M. Bialy. *Convex billiards and a theorem by E. Hopf*. Math. Z. 214 (1993), no. 1, 147–154.
- [5] M. Bialy. *Hopf rigidity for convex billiards on the hemisphere and hyperbolic plane*. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 33 (2013), no. 9, 3903–3913.
- [6] M. Bialy, A. Mironov. *Angular billiard and algebraic Birkhoff conjecture*. Adv. Math. 313 (2017), 102–126.
- [7] M. Bialy, A.E. Mironov. *The Birkhoff-Poritsky conjecture for centrally-symmetric billiard tables*. Ann. of Math. (2) 196 (2022), no. 1, 389–413.
- [8] M. Bialy. *Gutkin billiard tables in higher dimensions and rigidity*. Nonlinearity **31** (2018), 2281–2293.
- [9] M. Bialy. *Effective bounds in E. Hopf rigidity for billiards and geodesic flows*. Comment. Math. Helv. 90 (2015), no. 1, 139–153.
- [10] M. Bialy, S. Tabachnikov *Dan Reznik identities and more*. arXiv:2001.08469.
- [11] M. Bialy, D. Tsodikovich. *Locally maximizing orbits for the non-standard generating function of convex billiards and applications*. arXiv:2203.15552.
- [12] A. Connes, D. Zagier. *A property of parallelograms inscribed in ellipses*. Amer. Math. Monthly 114 (2007), 909–914.
- [13] A. Glutsyuk. *On polynomially integrable Birkhoff billiards on surfaces of constant curvature*. Journal of the European Mathematical Society, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 23 (2021), no. 3, 995–1049.

- [14] V. Kaloshin, A. Sorrentino. *On the local Birkhoff Conjecture for convex billiards*, Ann. of Math., Vol. 188 (2018), 315–380.
- [15] V. Kaloshin, A. Sorrentino. *On the integrability of Birkhoff billiards.*, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A 376: 2017 0419. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2017.0419>.
- [16] G. Huang, V. Kaloshin, A. Sorrentino. *Nearly circular domains which are integrable close to the boundary are ellipses.*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 28 (2018), no. 2, 334–392.
- [17] V.V.Kozlov, D.V.Treshchëv. *Billiards. A genetic introduction to the dynamics of systems with impacts.* Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 89. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991. viii+171 pp.
- [18] K.F. Siburg, *The principle of least action in geometry and dynamics.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1844. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. xii+128 pp.
- [19] S. Tabachnikov. *Geometry and billiards.* Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [20] M.P. Wojtkowski. *Two applications of Jacobi fields to the billiard ball problem.* J. Differential Geom. 40 (1994), no. 1, 155–164.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, RAYMOND AND BEVERLY SACKLER FACULTY
OF EXACT SCIENCES, TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY, ISRAEL
Email address: `bialy@tauex.tau.ac.il`