

Inverse maximal distance minimizer problem in a finite setup

Danila Cherkashin^{*†} and Yana Teplitskaya^{‡§}

December 6, 2022

Abstract

Consider a compact $M \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$. A maximal distance minimizer problem is to find a connected compact set Σ of the minimal length, such that

$$\max_{y \in M} \text{dist}(y, \Sigma) \leq r.$$

The inverse problem is to determine whether a given compact connected set Σ is a minimizer for some compact M and some positive r .

Let a Steiner tree St with n terminals be unique for its terminal vertices. The first result of the paper is that St is a minimizer for a set M of n points and a small enough positive r . It is known that in the planar case a general Steiner tree (on a finite number of terminals) is unique. It is worth noting that a Steiner tree on n terminal vertices can be not a minimizer for any n point set M starting with $n = 4$; the simplest such example is a Steiner tree for the vertices of a square.

Recall that a planar maximal distance minimizer is a finite union of simple curves. The second result is an example of a minimizer with an infinite number of corner points (points with two tangent rays which do not belong to the same line), which means that this minimizer can not be represented as a finite union of smooth curves.

We also show that every injective $C^{1,1}$ -curve Σ is a minimizer for a small enough $r > 0$ and $M = \overline{B_r(\Sigma)}$ (this follows from the proof of analogous result by Tilli on average distance minimizers).

1 Introduction

The following problem appeared in [2] and later has been studied in [8, 12].

Problem 1.1. For a given compact set $M \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$ to find a connected compact set Σ of the minimal length (one-dimensional Hausdorff measure \mathcal{H}^1) such that

$$\max_{y \in M} \text{dist}(y, \Sigma) \leq r.$$

We call a solution of Problem 1.1 an r -minimizer for M . Here we focus on the following inverse problem.

Problem 1.2. For a given connected compact set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ determine if it is a maximal distance minimizer for some compact M and some $r > 0$.

Let $B_\rho(O)$ stand for the open ball of radius ρ centered at a point O , and let $B_\rho(T)$ be the open ρ -neighborhood of a set T i.e.

$$B_\rho(T) := \bigcup_{x \in T} B_\rho(x)$$

As usual, \overline{T} stands for the closure of a set T . Note that the condition $\max_{y \in M} \text{dist}(y, \Sigma) \leq r$ is equivalent to $M \subset \overline{B_r(\Sigma)}$.

We start with a simple observation.

Observation 1.3. (i) Let Σ be an r -minimizer for some M . Then Σ is an r -minimizer for $\overline{B_r(\Sigma)}$.

(ii) Let Σ be an r -minimizer for $\overline{B_r(\Sigma)}$. Then Σ is an r' -minimizer for $\overline{B_{r'}(\Sigma)}$, for every $0 < r' < r$.

Proof. Assume the contrary to the first item. Then $M \subset \overline{B_r(\Sigma)} \subset \overline{B_{r'}(\Sigma')}$ for some connected compact Σ' such that $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma') < \mathcal{H}(\Sigma)$, which contradicts to the fact that Σ is an r -minimizer for M .

Assume the contrary to the second item. Then $\overline{B_{r'}(\Sigma)} \subset \overline{B_{r'}(\Sigma')}$ for some connected compact Σ' such that $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma') < \mathcal{H}(\Sigma)$. Since $\overline{B_{a+b}(X)} = \overline{B_a(B_b(X))}$ for an arbitrary set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $a, b > 0$,

$$\overline{B_r(\Sigma)} = \overline{B_{r-r'}(B_{r'}(\Sigma))} \subset \overline{B_{r-r'}(B_{r'}(\Sigma'))} = \overline{B_r(\Sigma')}.$$

Thus Σ is not an r -minimizer for $\overline{B_r(\Sigma)}$; a contradiction. □

^{*}Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Sofia

[†]Chebyshev Laboratory, St.Petersburg

[‡]Mathematical Institute, Leiden University, the Netherlands

[§]Chebyshev Laboratory, St.Petersburg

This motivates the following question.

Question 1.4. *Let Σ be an r -minimizer for some M . Is Σ the unique r -minimizer for $\overline{B_r(\Sigma)}$?*

1.1 Steiner trees

We need the following (most popular) form of the Steiner (tree) problem:

Problem 1.5. *For a given finite set $P = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ to find a connected set $St(P)$ with the minimal length (one-dimensional Hausdorff measure) containing P .*

A solution of Problem 1.5 is called *Steiner tree*. It is known that such an $St = St(P)$ always exists (but is not necessarily unique) and that it is a union of a finite set of segments. Moreover, St can be represented as a graph, embedded into the Euclidean space, such that its set of vertices contains P and all its edges are straight line segments. This graph is connected and does not contain cycles, i.e. is a tree, which explains the naming of St . It is known that the maximal degree of the vertices of St is at most 3. Moreover, only vertices x_i can have degree 1 or 2, all the other vertices have degree 3 and are called *Steiner points* while the vertices x_i are called *terminals*. Vertices of the degree 3 are called *branching points*. The angle between any two adjacent edges of St is at least $2\pi/3$. That means that for a branching point the angle between any two segments incident to it is exactly $2\pi/3$, and these three segments belong to the same 2-dimensional plane.

The number of Steiner points in St does not exceed $n - 2$. A Steiner tree with exactly $2n - 2$ vertices is called *full*. Every terminal point of a full Steiner tree has degree one.

For a given finite set P consider a connected acyclic set S containing P . Then S is called a *locally minimal tree* if $\overline{S \cap B_\varepsilon(x)}$ is a Steiner tree for $(\{x\} \cap P) \cup \partial(S \cap B_\varepsilon(x))$ for every point $x \in S$ and small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. Clearly every Steiner tree is locally minimal and not vice versa. Locally minimal trees have all the mentioned properties of Steiner trees except the minimal length condition. So locally minimal trees inherit the definitions of terminals, Steiner points, branching points and fullness. A proof of the listed properties of Steiner and locally minimal trees together with an additional information on them can be found in book [6] and in article [4].

The Steiner problem may have several solutions starting with $n = 4$ (see Fig. 1). It is known [1] that for $n \geq 4$ the set of n -point configurations for which the solution of the planar Steiner problem is not unique has the Hausdorff dimension at most $2n - 1$ (as a subset of \mathbb{R}^{2n}).




Figure 1: An example of nonunique solution. Labelled points form a square.

A *topology* T of a labeled Steiner tree (or a labeled locally minimal tree) St is the corresponding abstract graph with labelled terminals and unlabelled Steiner points. Further, let us call a topology T *realizable* for a set P if there exists such a locally minimal tree $S(P)$ with topology T ; we will denote this tree by $S_T(P)$.

Proposition 1.6 (Melzak, [7]). *If a topology T is realizable for P then the realization $S_T(P)$ is unique.*

Proposition 1.6 shows that $S_T(P)$ is uniquely defined.

1.2 Notation

For given points B, C we use the notation $[BC]$, $[BC)$ and (BC) for the corresponding closed line segment, ray and line respectively. We also use $[BC[$ for the semiopen interval $[BC] \setminus \{C\}$.

2 Results

2.1 Bounds on the length of a minimizer

We start from general lower bounds on the length of an r -minimizer for a given M . Clearly, if a set Σ attains the equality in a lower bound for some M and r , then it is an r -minimizer for M .

The proof of the following folklore inequality can be found, for instance in [9].

Lemma 2.1. *Let γ be a compact connected subset of \mathbb{R}^d with $\mathcal{H}^1(\gamma) < \infty$. Then*

$$\mathcal{H}^d(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{dist}(x, \gamma) \leq t\}) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\gamma)\omega_{d-1}t^{d-1} + \omega_d t^d,$$

where ω_k denotes the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^k .

Corollaries 2.2 and 2.3 are analogues to Tilli's theorem on average distance minimizers [13].

Corollary 2.2. *Let V and r be positive numbers. Then for every set M with $\mathcal{H}^d(M) = V$ a maximal distance r -minimizer has the length at least*

$$\max\left(0, \frac{V - \omega_d r^d}{\omega_{d-1} r^{d-1}}\right).$$

Corollary 2.3. *Let γ be a simple $C^{1,1}$ -curve. Then γ is a solution of Problem 1 for a small enough r .*

It is proved in [3] that for every union of planar piecewise differentiable curves Γ there holds

$$\partial B_r(\Gamma) \leq 2\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma) + 2\pi r. \quad (1)$$

So

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\Gamma) \geq \frac{\partial B_r(\Gamma) - 2\pi r}{2}.$$

Corollary 2.4. *Let M be a convex set and Σ is an r -minimizer for M . Then*

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma) \geq \frac{\mathcal{H}^1(\partial M) - 2\pi r}{2}.$$

Proof. Since $M \subset B_r(\Sigma) \subset \text{conv } B_r(\Sigma)$ and both M and $\text{conv } B_r(\Sigma)$ are convex one may use a well-known application of the Crofton formula to get

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial M) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \text{conv } B_r(\Sigma)).$$

Clearly,

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial \text{conv } B_r(\Sigma)) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial B_r(\Sigma))$$

and by (1)

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial B_r(\Sigma)) \leq 2\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma) + 2\pi r.$$

Summing up

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial M) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial \text{conv } B_r(\Sigma)) \leq \mathcal{H}^1(\partial B_r(\Sigma)) \leq 2\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma) + 2\pi r.$$

□

2.2 Minimizers for n points

Here we analyze whether a set Σ is a minimizer for M consisting of n points. The following observation uses definitions and straightforward local arguments (in fact we may replace $B_r(A_i)$ with a strictly convex C^1 -smooth set).

Observation 2.5. *Let Σ be an r -minimizer for an n -point set $M = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$.*

- (i) *Then Σ is a Steiner tree for $\{B_1, \dots, B_n\}$, where B_i is an arbitrary point from $\overline{B_r(A_i)} \cap \Sigma$.*
- (ii) *Let $B_i \in B_r(A_i) \cap \Sigma$ be a point that does not belong to $\overline{B_r(A_j)}$, $i \neq j$. Then B_i is an inner point of a segment of Σ or a branching point of Σ .*
- (iii) *Let $B_i \in \partial B_r(A_i) \cap \Sigma$ be a point that does not belong to $\overline{B_r(A_j)}$, $i \neq j$.*
 - a) *If B_i has degree 1, then it is an end of a segment of Σ , which is contained in $[A_i B_i]$, i.e. is orthogonal to $\partial B_r(A_i)$.*
 - b) *If B_i has degree 2, it may be an inner point of a segment of Σ or $[A_i B_i]$ contains the bisector of the angle B_i in Σ .*
 - c) *If B_i has degree 3 then it is a branching point of Σ .*
- (iv) *Let $r' < r$ be a positive real. Then Σ is an r' -minimizer for an n -point set M' .*

Let ρ stands for the Chebyshev distance between n -tuples $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$, i.e.

$$\rho(u, v) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \text{dist}(v_i, u_i),$$

where v_i, u_i are points in the space.

Theorem 2.6. *Let St be a Steiner tree for terminals $A = (A_1, \dots, A_n)$, $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that every Steiner tree for an n -tuple in the closed $2r$ -neighbourhood of A (with respect to ρ) has the same topology as St for some positive r . Then St is an r -minimizer for an n -tuple M and such M is unique.*

Proof. Note that the condition on St implies that $B_r(A_i) \cap B_r(A_j)$ is empty for $i \neq j$, otherwise one may shift A_i and A_j into the same point making a tree with a topology different from the topology of St . Also by Proposition 1.6 St is the unique Steiner tree for its terminals.

Construct $M = \{B_1, \dots, B_n\}$ as follows. If A_i has degree 1, i.e. $B_\varepsilon(A_i) \cap St$ is a segment $[A_i t]$ for a small enough ε , then B_i is an intersection of ray $[t A_i]$ with $\partial B_r(A_i)$. If A_i has degree 2, then B_i is the point in the outer bisector of $\angle A_i$ at the distance r from A_i . Terminal A_i can not have degree 3, otherwise any perturbation of A_i preserving other terminals changes the topology, which contradicts the stability condition of the theorem.

Let Σ be an r -minimizer for $\{B_1, \dots, B_n\}$. Note that Σ is a Steiner tree for some points C_1, \dots, C_n , where $C_i \in \overline{B_r(B_i)}$. By the triangle inequality $\text{dist}(A_i, C_i) \leq \text{dist}(A_i, B_i) + \text{dist}(B_i, C_i) = 2r$, so one has $\rho(\{A_i\}, \{C_i\}) \leq 2r$. By the assumption Σ has the same topology as St .

We need the following argument, which uses a convexity of length in the vein of [4] to show that a realization of a topology is unique.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a family of n disjoint strictly convex C^1 -smooth closed sets in \mathbb{R}^d , T be a topology with n terminals. Then all locally minimal trees with the topology T such that for every i the terminal with label i belongs to A_i coincide as a (non-labelled) subsets of \mathbb{R}^d .*

Lemma 2.7 is proved in Section 3.

By the construction St is locally minimal tree connecting sets $\overline{B_r(B_i)}$, so by Lemma 2.7 $A_i = C_i$. □

Proposition 2.8. *Let St be a full Steiner tree for terminals $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and let d be the smallest distance between a terminal A_i and the adjacent branching point. Then $r < d$ implies that $St \setminus B_r(A_i)$ is an r -minimizer for A_1, \dots, A_n .*

Proof. Since St is full every A_i has the degree 1. Note that the intersection of $\partial B_r(A_i)$ and St consists of a unique point because $r < d$ and St is a Steiner tree; call this point B_i . Note that $St_1 := St \setminus B_r(A_i)$ is a connected tree connecting points B_i and

$$\mathcal{H}^1(St_1) = \mathcal{H}^1(St) - nr.$$

If there is a shorter tree St_2 connecting some points $C_i \in \partial B_r(A_i)$, then set $St_3 := St_2 \cup [A_1 C_1] \cup \dots \cup [A_n C_n]$ connects points A_i and

$$\mathcal{H}^1(St_3) = \mathcal{H}^1(St_2) + nr < \mathcal{H}^1(St_1) + nr = \mathcal{H}^1(St)$$

which contradicts to the fact that St is a Steiner tree for A_i . □

We need the following theorem to extend the example of square, mentioned in the abstract.

Theorem 2.9 (Oblakov [10]). *There are no two topologies T_1 and T_2 and a planar configuration P such that locally minimal trees $S_{T_1}(P)$ and $S_{T_2}(P)$ are codirected at terminals.*

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose that St is a full Steiner tree for terminals $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathbb{R}^2$, which is not unique. Then St can not be a minimizer for M being an n -tuple of points.*

It is interesting whether the fullness condition in Corollary 2.10 is necessary.

Proof. Denote by $St' \neq St$ an arbitrary Steiner tree for A_1, \dots, A_n . Assume the contrary, i.e. St is an r -minimizer for some n -tuple $M = \{B_1, \dots, B_n\}$. Then for every i the segment of St ending at A_i belongs to the same line with B_i . Note that if i has degree 1 in St' then St is codirected with St' at A_i . We claim that if i has degree 2 in St' then the angles between St and St' at A_i are $\pi/3$. The claim implies that

$$St \cup \bigcup ([A_i B_i] \cap \overline{B_\varepsilon(A_i)}) \quad \text{and} \quad St' \cup \bigcup ([A_i B_i] \cap \overline{B_\varepsilon(A_i)})$$

are codirected locally minimal trees. By Theorem 2.9 they have the same topology and then by Proposition 1.6 they coincide which implies $St = St'$.

Now let us prove the claim. Let T_1, \dots, T_k be full components of St' ; we call T_i and T_j *adjacent* if they share a terminal. By the construction all segments of full Steiner tree St are parallel to one of lines l_1, l_2, l_3 having all pairwise angles equal to $\pi/3$. Since St' has a terminal of degree 1 (without loss of generality it is contained in T_1), all segments of T_1 are also parallel to one of lines l_1, l_2, l_3 and then the claim holds for every terminal of T_1 . By Observation 2.5 (iii)b if all segments of T_i are parallel to one of lines l_1, l_2, l_3 , then the same holds to every adjacent T_j . We are done, because St' is connected. □

2.3 An example of a minimizer with an infinite number of corner points

It is known that in planar case a maximal distance minimizer is a finite union of simple curves (see [5]). The open question was are these curves C^1 -smooth? Recall that (also in the planar case) we have continuity of one-sided tangents (see [5]) and hence existence of tangent lines implies its continuity. The answer is no: we will provide an explicit example of the maximal distance minimizer having a limit point of the corner points (points with two tangent rays which do not belong to the same line).

Fix positive reals r and R and let N be a large enough integer. Consider a sequence of points $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ belonging to circumference $\partial B_R(0)$ such that $N \cdot |A_2 A_1| = r$,

$$|A_{i+1} A_{i+2}| = \frac{1}{2} |A_i A_{i+1}|$$

and $\angle A_i A_{i+1} A_{i+2} > \frac{\pi}{2}$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Fig. 2). Let A_{∞} be the limit point of $\{A_i\}$. We claim that polyline

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i A_{i+1}$$

is a unique maximal distance minimizer for the following M .

Let $V_0 \in (A_1 A_2]$ be such point that $|V_0 A_1| = r$; say that $A_0 := V_0$. For $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ define V_i as the point satisfying $|V_i A_i| = r$ and $\angle A_{i-1} A_i V_i = \angle A_{i+1} A_i V_i > \pi/2$. Finally, let $V_{\infty+1}$ be such point that $V_{\infty+1} A_{\infty} \perp O A_{\infty}$ and $|V_{\infty+1} A_{\infty}| = r$. Clearly $M := \{V_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty+1}$ is a compact set.




Figure 2: The example of a minimizer with infinite number of corner points

Theorem 2.11. *Let Σ and M be defined above. Then Σ is a unique maximal distance minimizer for M .*

3 Proof of Lemma 2.7

Proof. Assume the contrary. Let n be the smallest possible; it implies that there is no terminal of degree 3. Let $\bar{v} := (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n+k})$, $1 \leq i \leq n+k$, where k is the number of Steiner points in T , is a vector, whose elements v_i are points in \mathbb{R}^d ; connect them by segments according to the topology T (note that it may be not a tree, so we call it *network*) and denote by $L(\bar{v})$ the sum of the lengths of edges. It is widely known that L is a convex function, defined on $\mathbb{R}^{d(n+k)}$.

Now consider the set of local minimums of L with the restriction $v_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let \bar{v} be a local minimum. Then the corresponding network should satisfy items (ii) and (iii) of Observation 2.5 since it is based on local arguments, i.e. does not depend on the absence of cycles.

Consider any two local minimums v_1 and v_2 and let S_1 and S_2 be the corresponding networks with terminals $\{A_i\}$, $\{B_i\}$ such that $A_i, B_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$; denote Steiner points by $\{C_j\}$ and $\{D_j\}$, respectively.

Let us show that S_1 and S_2 have the same length. Consider $E_i(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot A_i + (1 - \alpha) \cdot B_i$ and $F_j(\alpha) = \alpha \cdot C_j + (1 - \alpha) \cdot D_j$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. By the convexity of \mathcal{A}_i , a point $E_i(\alpha)$ belongs to \mathcal{A}_i . Hence, for every α the network $S(\alpha)$ with the topology T on vertices $E_i(\alpha) \cup F_j(\alpha)$ connects \mathcal{A}_i . Recall that the length L is also convex, so every $S(\alpha)$ has the same length with S_1 and S_2 .

Since every two local minimums have the same length, every local minimum is a global minimum, so every $S(\alpha)$ is minimum.

Let i be a terminal with the degree 1 in T . By the minimality of $S(\alpha)$ and Observation 2.5, E_i cannot lie inside \mathcal{A}_i and so $A_i = B_i$ (here we use strict convexity of \mathcal{A}_i).

Suppose that T has a terminal i of degree 1, which is connected with another terminal j . By Observation 2.5 the directions of S_1 and S_2 at A_i coincide. Then the nearest point to $A_i = B_i$ in $S_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_j$ coincides with the nearest point to $A_i = B_i$ in $S_2 \cap \mathcal{A}_j$; call this point A_* . One may reduce the example by deleting $[A_i A_*]$ from S_1 and S_2 , and replacing \mathcal{A}_i and \mathcal{A}_j with $\mathcal{A} := \{A_*\}$. We got a contradiction with the minimality of n .

If T has no adjacent terminals, then T is a full topology and contains a pair of terminals i, j adjacent to the same Steiner point k . The locus of a point P with angle $A_i P A_j = 2\pi/3$ is the boundary of a strictly convex body; from the other hand the locus of $F_k(\alpha)$ is the segment $[C_k(\alpha)D_k(\alpha)]$. Every $S(\alpha)$ is minimum, so $F_k(\alpha)$ belongs to the intersection of loci, and thus $F_k(\alpha)$ does not depend on α . One may reduce the example by deleting $\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_j$ and adding new $\mathcal{A} := \{F_k\}$. The deletion $[A_i F_k[\cap]F_k A_j]$ from both networks leads to a smaller example, contradiction. \square

The following example (see Figure 3) shows that strict convexity is essential. Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ and \mathcal{A}_3 be stadiums which sides are parts of an equilateral triangle \mathcal{B} . It is well-known (see barycentric coordinate system) that the length of every blue tripod orthogonal to \mathcal{B} is the same and coincides with the length of every dashed polyline, orthogonal to \mathcal{B} . It is straightforward to see that all of them are local and global minimizers.




Figure 3: The condition of strict convexity is sufficient in Lemma 2.7

4 Proof of Theorem 2.11

Proof. Let $\xi := \mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma)$. Then ξ tends to 0 and $|V_0 V_{\infty+1}| = 2r + \xi + o(\xi)$ provided by N tend to infinity. Assume that $\Sigma_1 \neq \Sigma$ is a minimizer for $\{V_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty+1}$.

Step 1: Σ_1 has no branching points. By the definition $\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma_1) \leq \xi$ and hence

$$\Sigma_1 \subset \overline{B_{r+\xi}(V_0) \cap B_{r+\xi}(V_{\infty+1})} \subset \overline{B_{\sqrt{r\xi+o(\sqrt{\xi})}}(\Sigma)}.$$

The last inclusion holds as

$$\Sigma \subset B_{o(\xi)}([V_0 V_{\infty+1}] \setminus B_r(V_0) \setminus B_r(V_{\infty+1}))$$

and thus, due to the Pythagorean theorem,

$$\text{diam}(B_{r+\xi}(V_0) \cap B_{r+\xi}(V_{\infty+1})) = \sqrt{(r+\xi)^2 - \left(r + \frac{\xi}{2}\right)^2} + o(\xi) = \sqrt{r\xi} + o(\sqrt{\xi}).$$

But for every point $q \in \overline{B_{\sqrt{r\xi+o(\sqrt{\xi})}}(\Sigma)}$ there exists a cone Q with vertex q and angle $\pi - o_\xi(1)$ such that for every ray $[qp]$ of this cone there holds $\angle V_k q p > \pi/2$ for every k including 0 and $\infty + 1$.

Let N be such that the angle of Q is greater than $2\pi/3$. Thus q can not be a branching point (otherwise one of its three segments could end only by another branching point which implies a contradiction as q is an arbitrary point of Σ_1 and Σ_1 can not contain a limit point of branching points) and hence Σ_1 can not contain any branching points.

Step 2. The order of circles is the same. Now we know that Σ_1 is a simple curve. Let us show that Σ_1 contains such a sequence of different points $\{s_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty} \cup \{s_\infty\} \subset \Sigma_1$ that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds $|V_i s_i| \leq r$ and for every indices $i, j, k \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$ such that $i < j < k$ the path in Σ_1 connecting s_i and s_k contains also s_j .

An index i is called *important* if $B_r(V_i) \cap \Sigma_1 = \emptyset$. Let J be the ordered set of all indices and let $I \subset J$ be the ordered subset of all important indices.




Figure 4: The example of a minimizer with infinite number of corner points

Consider $i, j, k \in I$ and let $i < j < k$. Recall that $B_r(y_l) \cap \Sigma_1 = \emptyset$ and let $x_l \in \overline{B_r(y_l)} \cap \Sigma_1$ for $l \in \{i, j, k\}$. For a large enough N circles $B_r(V_i)$ and $B_r(V_k)$ intersect. Thus the path in Σ_1 from x_i to x_k contains x_j . This means that the order of “important” circles is direct.

It is known [11] that an arbitrary point x of a minimizer Σ_0 is the center of a segment of Σ_0 or the center of a tripod of Σ_0 or there is a point $y \in M$ such that $B_r(y) \cap \Sigma_0 = \emptyset$.

Hence $\Sigma_1 = \bigcup_{i, i' \in I} [\bar{s}_i \bar{s}_{i'}]$ for $\bar{s}_i \in \overline{B_r(V_i)}$ and $\bar{s}_{i'} \in \overline{B_r(V_{i'})}$, and hence points of $B_r(V_i)$ for $i \in I$ should be unique and hence $\Sigma_1 = \bigcup_{i, i' \in I} [s_i s_{i'}]$. Note that $\angle V_i s_i, s_{i'} \geq \pi/2$, $\angle V_{i'} s_{i'}, s_i \geq \pi/2$ and $\angle((V_i s_i), (V_{i'} s_{i'})) = o_\xi(1)$ (tends to 0 when ξ tends to 0) as $s_i, s_{i'} \in \overline{B_{\sqrt{r\xi} + o(\xi)}(\Sigma)}$, hence $|\pi/2 - \angle(V_i s_i)(V_{i'} s_{i'})| = o_\xi(1)$.

Let now $j < k \in I$ be such that for every $j < l < k$ there holds $l \in J \setminus I$. Then $\Sigma_1 \supset [s_j s_k]$. Clearly, as $\Sigma_1 \cap \overline{B_r(V_i)} \neq \emptyset$, $\Sigma_1 \cap \overline{B_r(V_i)} = \emptyset = \Sigma_1 \cap \overline{B_r(V_k)}$ then $\Sigma_1 \cap \overline{B_r(V_i)} \subset [s_j s_k]$. Moreover, let also $i < l + 1 < k$ then there exists such different points $s_l \in \overline{B_r(V_i)} \cap [s_i s_k]$, $s_{l+1} \in \overline{B_r(V_{l+1})} \cap [s_i s_k]$, that $s_l \in [s_i s_{l+1}]$.

Therefore there exists a sequence of different points $\{s_i\}_0^\infty \cup s_\infty \subset \Sigma_1$ that for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds $|V_i s_i| \leq r$ and for every indices $i, j, k \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N} \cup \infty$ such that $i < j < k$ the path in Σ_1 connecting s_i, s_k contains also s_j .

Step 3. The convexity argument. The idea of this step is the same as in Lemma 2.7. Let $\mathcal{V} := \{v_i\}$, $i \in J$ be a set of points such that $v_i \in \overline{B_r(V_i)}$. Consider the length

$$L(\mathcal{V}) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |v_i v_{i+1}|.$$

Analogously to the proof of Lemma 2.7 the set of local minimums of L is convex and thus every local minimal is also a global minimal. In particular, $\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma) = L(\{A_i\})$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma_1) = L(\{s_i\})$, so $\mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma) = \mathcal{H}^1(\Sigma_1)$. Let $v_i(\alpha) = \alpha A_i + (1 - \alpha)s_i$ and $\Sigma(\alpha) := \bigcup [v_i(\alpha)v_{i+1}(\alpha)]$ is a global minimizer for every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Consider the first i for which $A_i \neq s_i$. Consider $\Sigma(1/2)$ in a neighbourhood of $v_i(1/2)$. Then $v_i(1/2) \in B_r(V_i)$ and $\angle v_{i-1}(1/2)v_i(1/2)v_{i+1}(1/2) < \pi$, which is impossible if $\Sigma(1/2)$ is a minimizer. Contradiction. \square

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to Fedor Petrov, Alexandr Polyanskii and Misha Basok for useful discussions. The research is supported by «Native towns», a social investment program of PJSC «Gazprom Neft». The authors condemn the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

References

- [1] Mikhail Basok, Danila Cherkashin, Nikita Rastegaev, and Yana Teplitskaya. On uniqueness in Steiner problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01463*, 2018.
- [2] Giuseppe Buttazzo, Edouard Oudet, and Eugene Stepanov. Optimal transportation problems with free Dirichlet regions. In *Variational methods for discontinuous structures*, pages 41–65. Springer, 2002.
- [3] Sándor P. Fekete and William R. Pulleyblank. Traveling the boundary of Minkowski sums. *Information processing letters*, 66(4):171–174, 1998.
- [4] E. N. Gilbert and H. O. Pollak. Steiner minimal trees. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 16(1):1–29, 1968.
- [5] Alexey Gordeev and Yana Teplitskaya. On regularity of maximal distance minimizers in Euclidean space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.13745*, 2022.
- [6] Frank K. Hwang, Dana S. Richards, and Pawel Winter. *The Steiner tree problem*, volume 53. Elsevier, 1992.
- [7] Z. A. Melzak. On the problem of Steiner. *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, 4(2):143–148, 1961.
- [8] M. Miranda, Jr., E. Paolini, and E. Stepanov. On one-dimensional continua uniformly approximating planar sets. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 27(3):287–309, 2006.

- [9] Sunra J. N. Mosconi and Paolo Tilli. Γ -convergence for the irrigation problem. *J. Convex Anal*, 12(1):145–158, 2005.
- [10] Konstantin I. Oblakov. Non-existence of distinct codirected locally minimal trees on a plane. *Moscow University Mathematics Bulletin*, 64(2):62–66, 2009.
- [11] E. Paolini and E. Stepanov. Qualitative properties of maximum distance minimizers and average distance minimizers in \mathbb{R}^n . *J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.)*, 122(3):3290–3309, 2004. Problems in mathematical analysis.
- [12] Emanuele Paolini and Eugene Stepanov. Qualitative properties of maximum distance minimizers and average distance minimizers in \mathbb{R}^n . *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 122(3):3290–3309, 2004.
- [13] Paolo Tilli. Some explicit examples of minimizers for the irrigation problem. *J. Convex Anal*, 17(2):583–595, 2010.