

MAJORIZATION BY HEMISPHERES & QUADRATIC ISOPERIMETRIC CONSTANTS

PAUL CREUTZ

ABSTRACT. Let X be a Banach space or more generally a complete metric space admitting a conical geodesic bicombing. We prove that every closed L -Lipschitz curve $\gamma: S^1 \rightarrow X$ may be extended to an L -Lipschitz map defined on the hemisphere $f: H^2 \rightarrow X$. This implies that X satisfies a quadratic isoperimetric inequality (for curves) with constant $\frac{1}{2\pi}$. We discuss how this fact controls the regularity of minimal discs in Finsler manifolds when applied to the work of Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. A Lipschitz Extension Theorem. The famous majorization theorem of Reshetnyak states that for every rectifiable closed curve η in a Hadamard space X there exists a convex domain $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ and a 1-Lipschitz map $f: C \rightarrow X$ such that f restricts to a length preserving parametrization of η on ∂C , see [Res68]. The main result of this paper is the following spherical analog of Reshetnyak's theorem holding on a large class of spaces. This class includes all Hadamard spaces, Banach spaces and complete Busemann spaces.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a metric space admitting a contracting barycenter map. If $\eta: S^1 \rightarrow X$ is L -Lipschitz, then there exists an L -Lipschitz extension $f: H^2 \rightarrow X$ of η where H^2 is a metric hemisphere with boundary circle S^1 .*

If X is a Hadamard space, then Theorem 1.1 is a special case of a well known theorem of Urs Lang and Viktor Schroeder, [LS97, Theorem A]. Other Lipschitz extension theorems for target spaces of nonpositive curvature have been obtained in [LPS00] and [BS01]. Traditionally Lipschitz extensions have been studied in Banach space theory and Theorem 1.1 is especially interesting in the setting that X is a Banach space. There is a powerful method of proving Lipschitz extension results via barycentric constructions designed by James R. Lee and Assaf Naor in [LN05]. Their method was developed further in [Oht09] and [AP19] and the refined variant will play a key role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

For a metric space X denote *Wasserstein 1-space* over X by $\mathcal{P}_1(X)$, see section 2.1. A map b assigning to $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)$ a point $b(\mu) \in X$ is called *barycenter map* if every Dirac measure δ_x one has $b(\delta_x) = x$. The map $b: \mathcal{P}_1(X) \rightarrow X$ is called *contracting* if it is 1-Lipschitz with respect to *Wasserstein 1-distance* d_W .

If X is a Banach space one may define a contracting barycenter map simply via $b(\mu) := \int_X x \, d\mu(x)$ and if X is a Hadamard space by minimizing the functional $q \mapsto \int_X d^2(p, q) \, d\mu(p)$. It turns out that contracting barycenter maps have a

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54C20, 53A10, 28A75, 53C60.

The author was partially supported by the DFG grant SPP 2026.

more geometric equivalent which are conical bicondings introduced by Dominic De-scombes and Urs Lang in [DL15]. A *conical (geodesic) biconbing* σ on X is a map assigning to every tuple of points (x, y) in X a geodesic $\sigma_{x,y}$ such that for any pair of tuples $(x, y), (x', y')$ the distance function between $\sigma_{x,y}$ and $\sigma_{x',y'}$ satisfies a weak convexity condition, see section 2.2. A complete metric space admits a contracting barycenter map iff it admits a conical biconbing, see [Bas18, Theorem 3.4]. Conical biconbings are much easier to construct explicitly than contracting barycenter maps. Spaces admitting conical biconbings include all normed spaces, CAT(0) spaces, Busemann spaces, Wasserstein 1-spaces and injective spaces in the sense of [Lan13].

1.2. Applications. An *area functional* \mathcal{A} is a functional assigning to each Lipschitz map $f : E \rightarrow X$ where $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a Borel set and X is a metric space a number $\mathcal{A}(f) \in [0, \infty]$ such that certain natural axioms are fulfilled, see section 4.1. Most intuitive example to have in mind is the *Busemann area functional* \mathcal{A}^b given by the parametrized 2-dimensional Hausdorff measure of $\text{im}(f)$.

Fix an area functional \mathcal{A} and a metric space X . Let $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ be a Lipschitz curve. We call a Lipschitz map on the closed unit disc $f : D^2 \rightarrow X$ a *filling* of η if it restricts to η on $\partial D^2 = S^1$. Define the *filling area* of η with respect to \mathcal{A} , denoted $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\eta)$, to be the infimum of $\mathcal{A}(f)$ where f ranges over all fillings of η . We say that X satisfies a *C-quadratic isoperimetric inequality* with respect to \mathcal{A} if for all $L \geq 0$ and all Lipschitz curves $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ of length L one has

$$\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\eta) \leq C \cdot L^2.$$

Quadratic isoperimetric inequalities in this sense have been investigated by Alexander Lytchak, Stefan Wenger and Robert Young in [LWYar] and [LW18].

A consequence of Reshetnyak's majorization theorem is that Hadamard spaces satisfy a Euclidean aka $\frac{1}{4\pi}$ -quadratic isoperimetric inequality with respect to every area functional. Similarly from Theorem 1.1 we derive the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let \mathcal{A} be an area functional and X a metric space. If X admits a contracting barycenter map, then X satisfies a $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ -quadratic isoperimetric inequality with respect to \mathcal{A} .*

In general the constant $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ in Theorem 1.2 is optimal even in case X is a Banach space and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^b$ or \mathcal{A} is the Holmes-Thompson area functional \mathcal{A}^{ht} . This is due to a theorem of Sergei Ivanov which implies a lower bound on the filling area of isometrically embedded circles, see [Iva11, Theorem 2].

By local comparison, Reshetnyak's majorization theorem and Theorem 1.2 also imply the following.

Corollary 1.3. *Let M a smooth manifold, \mathcal{A} an area functional and $\delta > 0$.*

1. *If $F : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous Finsler structure on M , then (M, d_F) satisfies a $(\frac{1}{2\pi} + \delta)$ -local quadratic isoperimetric inequality with respect to \mathcal{A} .*
2. *If $g : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous Riemannian structure on M , then (M, d_g) satisfies a $(\frac{1}{4\pi} + \delta)$ -local quadratic isoperimetric inequality with respect to \mathcal{A} .*

In [LW17a] Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger solved the disc type Plateau problem in proper metric spaces X for 'nice' area functionals \mathcal{A} . The arising solutions are Sobolev maps $u : D^2 \rightarrow X$ and will be called *\mathcal{A} -minimal discs*. See

section 5 and the references therein for more precise definitions. Applying Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3 to the regularity theorems of [LW17a] and [LW17b] one obtains results like the following.

Theorem 1.4. *Let M be a smooth manifold and F a continuous Finsler structure on M such that $X := (M, d_F)$ is complete. If u is a bounded \mathcal{A}^b -minimal disc in X , then u admits a representative that is locally α -Hölder continuous in the interior of D^2 for all $\alpha < \frac{\pi}{8}$.*

Theorem 1.4 and similar results will be discussed in section 5. Besides applying to a larger class of spaces Theorem 1.4 improves the results [OvdM14, Theorem 1.2] and [PvdM17, Theorem 1.1] of Patrick Overath, Sven Pistre and Heiko von der Mosel in the sense that it gives a large and universal Hölder constant. As in their work one may generalize Theorem 1.4 to certain nonreversible Finsler structures. These are nonreversible Finsler structures satisfying property (GA2) discussed in [PvdM17].

1.3. The proof. If X admits a conical bicombing, there is an obvious cone construction of a filling of a given Lipschitz curve. This works to prove Theorem 1.2 for the Holmes-Thompson area functional \mathcal{A}^{ht} as I showed in my master thesis. However it fails for \mathcal{A}^b . The fillings we get for the proof of Theorem 1.2 from Theorem 1.1 are way more complicated and do not directly make use of the conical bicombing on X .

Lemma 3.5 in [Oht09] reduces the proof of Theorem 1.1 to the following very special case.

Proposition 1.5. *There exists an isometric embedding $\iota : H^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ such that $\iota(P) = \delta_P$ for all $P \in S^1$.*

The first step in the proof of Proposition 1.5 is to discuss possible isometric extensions of $\delta : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ to one single point $P \in H^2 \setminus S^1$. We obtain the following surprising lemma.

Lemma 1.6. *Let $P \in H^2 \setminus S^1$. There is a natural bijection Φ_P between the set of π -periodic $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ and the set of $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ such that $d_W(\mu, \delta_Q) = d_{S^2}(P, Q)$ for all $Q \in H^2$. It is given by $\Phi_P(\nu) := h_P \cdot \mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1 + (1 - k_P) \cdot \nu$ where $h_P : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous density and $k_P \in [0, 1]$ is a constant.*

To prove Proposition 1.5 we define $\iota : H^2 \rightarrow W^1(S^1)$ via $\iota(P) := \Phi_P(\text{Uni}(S^1))$ where $\text{Uni}(S^1)$ denotes the uniform distribution on S^1 . To prove that ι defines indeed an isometric embedding is a bit technical. A formula for Wasserstein-1-distance on S^1 developed in [CM95] reduces it to some analytic estimates of distances and angles on S^2 . The reason that the proof of Proposition 1.5 gets a bit involved at this point is probably that the embedding ι is highly nonunique and the construction hence not very canonical.

1.4. Outline of the paper. In 2.1 we fix notations for Wasserstein-1-space and contracting barycenter maps. Furthermore we discuss basic properties as well as the reduction of Theorem 1.1 to Proposition 1.5. In 2.2 we discuss the connection of contracting barycenter maps and conical bicombing and give examples. Section 3 is dedicated to the proof of Proposition 1.5. In 3.1 first we prove Lemma 1.6. Then in 3.2 and 3.3 we perform the more technical part of the proof of Proposition 1.5. The topic of section 4 are quadratic isoperimetric constants. In 4.1 we discuss area

functionals and Jacobians. In 4.2 we proof Theorem 1.2 and discuss its optimality. In 4.3 we have a look at continuous Finsler structures and local quadratic isoperimetric inequalities. Finally in section 5 we study \mathcal{A} -minimal discs and give the proof of Theorem 1.4 as well as similar results.

2. WASSERSTEIN SPACE, BARYCENTER MAPS & CONICAL BICOMBINGS

2.1. Wasserstein 1-space and Barycenter maps. Let (X, d) be a metric space and $\mathcal{P}(X)$ the set of separably supported probability measures on the Borel σ -algebra of X . Note that if X is complete, then $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is nothing but the set of Radon probability measures on X by Ulam's theorem, see [Dud89, Theorem 7.1.4]. For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ a measure $K \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X)$ is called *coupling* of μ and ν if $\pi_{1*}(K) = \mu$ and $\pi_{2*}(K) = \nu$. Here $\pi_i : X \times X \rightarrow X$ are the respective coordinate projections and $(-)_*$ indicates push forward of measures. Denote the set of couplings of μ and ν by $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$. The *Wasserstein 1-distance* d_W on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is defined via

$$d_W(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{K \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{X \times X} d(x, y) \, dK(x, y).$$

Besides the fact that it might take infinite values d_W defines a metric on $\mathcal{P}(X)$, see [Kel85]. If $x \in X$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, then $\Pi(\mu, \delta_x) = \{\mu \otimes \delta_x\}$ and hence

$$d_W(\delta_x, \mu) = \int_X d(x, y) \, d\mu(y). \quad (1)$$

By (1) the Dirac map $\delta : X \rightarrow (\mathcal{P}(X), d_W)$ defines an isometric embedding. Denote the subspace of measures at finite Wasserstein-1-distance from $\delta(X)$ by $\mathcal{P}_1(X)$ and call the arising metric space $(\mathcal{P}_1(X), d_W)$ *Wasserstein-1-space* over X . It turns out that $\mathcal{P}_1(X)$ is complete iff X is complete, see [Vil09, Theorem 6.18], and that the construction is functorial in the following sense.

Lemma 2.1 ([Oht09], Lemma 2.1). *Let X, Y be metric spaces and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be L -Lipschitz. Then $f_* : \mathcal{P}_1(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(Y)$ is welldefined and L -Lipschitz.*

If $b : \mathcal{P}_1(X) \rightarrow X$ is a 1-Lipschitz retraction for $\delta : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(X)$, then we call b a *contracting barycenter map* on X .

Example 2.2. 1. *Let X be a Banach space. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)$ set $b(\mu) := \int_X x \, d\mu(x)$. This Bochner integral is welldefined and defines a barycenter map. To check b is contracting let $K \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|b(\mu) - b(\nu)\| &= \left\| \int_{X \times X} x \, dK(x, y) - \int_{X \times X} y \, dK(x, y) \right\| \\ &\leq \int_{X \times X} \|x - y\| \, dK(x, y) \rightarrow d_W(\mu, \nu). \end{aligned}$$

One may show that this is the only barycenter map on X . If $C \subseteq X$ is convex, then restricting b to $\mathcal{P}_1(C)$ gives a contracting barycenter map on C in case either C is closed or X is finitedimensional. See [Bas18, Proposition 3.5] for more details.

2. *Let X be a Hadamard space. For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)$ let $b(\mu) \in X$ be the unique point where $y \mapsto \int_X d^2(x, y) \, d\mu(x)$ attains its minimum. Then $b : \mathcal{P}_1(X) \rightarrow X$ defines a contracting barycenter map, see [Stu03].*

The following reduction is an incarnation of [Oht09, Lemma 3.5]

Proposition 1.5 \Rightarrow *Theorem 1.1*. Let $b : \mathcal{P}_1(X) \rightarrow X$ be a contracting barycenter map on X , $\iota : H^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ an isometric embedding extending δ and $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ an L -Lipschitz curve. Then $f := b \circ \eta_* \circ \iota$ is L -Lipschitz by Lemma 2.1 and for $P \in S^1$

$$f(P) = b(\eta_*(\iota(P))) = b(\eta_*(\delta_P)) = b(\delta_{\eta(P)}) = \eta(P).$$

□

As a byproduct of this proof we get that for Banach spaces X the extension operator $E : \text{Lip}(S^1, X) \rightarrow \text{Lip}(H^2, X)$ given by theorem 1.1 is linear and functorial in X .

2.2. Conical bicombings. Let X be a geodesic metric space. A *conical (geodesic) bicombing* on X is a map $\sigma : X \times X \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$, such that for every $x, y \in X$ the map $\sigma_{x,y} := \sigma(x, y, -)$ is a constant speed shortest path connecting x and y and for all $x, y, x', y' \in X$, $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$d(\sigma_{x,y}(t), \sigma_{x',y'}(t)) \leq (1-t)d(x, x') + td(y, y').$$

Example 2.3. 1. Let X be a normed space. A conical bicombing σ on X is given by $\sigma(x, y, t) := (1-t)x + ty$. This conical bicombing on X is unique, see [GM81, Theorem 1]. Restriction of σ to $C \times C \times [0, 1]$ gives a conical bicombing on any convex subset C of X .

2. Let X be a CAT(0) space in the sense of [BBI01]. Then the unique geodesic bicombing σ on X is conical. More generally uniquely geodesic spaces admitting conical bicombings are called Busemann spaces and have been studied long before the notion of conical bicombings had been invented, see [Pap13] and the references therein.

3. Let X be a metric space. A conical bicombing σ on $\mathcal{P}_1(X)$ is given by $\sigma(\mu, \nu, t) := (1-t) \cdot \mu + t \cdot \nu$. This is actually a special case of 1. as $\mathcal{P}_1(X)$ may be considered a convex subset of the free Banach space $\mathcal{F}(X)$, see [AP19].

4. Let X be an injective metric space as studied by John R. Isbell in [Isb64]. Then a conical bicombing σ on X may be defined applying the universal property of X . See [DL15, Lemma 2.1] and the following remark therein for the details.

I was told about the following equivalence by Giuliano Basso.

Theorem 2.4. Let X be a metric space.

1. If X admits a contracting barycenter map, then X admits a conical bicombing.
2. If X is complete and admits a conical bicombing, then X admits a contracting barycenter map.

Proof. 1. : Let b be a contracting barycenter map on X . Define the conical bicombing on X by $\sigma(x, y, t) := b((1-t)\delta_x + t\delta_y)$.

2. : By [BMar, Proposition 1.3] there exists a reversible conical bicombing on X . So one may apply [Bas18, Theorem 3.4] to obtain the result. □

Note that in general neither conical bicombings nor barycenter maps need to be unique, see [DL15, Example 3.4].

3. EMBEDDING H^2 INTO $\mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$

3.1. Extension to one single point. In this paragraph we prove Lemma 1.6. First we investigate the analytic properties of the distance function $d_P : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $Q \mapsto d_{S^2}(P, Q)$ for a fixed $P \in H^2 \setminus S^1$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $P \in H^2 \setminus S^1$ and $B \in S^1$ such that $d_P(B) = d_{S^2}(B, S^1)$. Parametrize S^1 by $(-\pi, \pi]$ such that 0 corresponds to B . Then d_P is smooth and for $t \in (-\pi, \pi]$*

1. $d'_P(t) \leq 0$ if $t \leq 0$ and $d'_P(t) \geq 0$ if $t \geq 0$.
2. $d''_P(t) \geq 0$ if $|t| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $d''_P(t) \leq 0$ if $|t| \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$.
3. $d'''_P(t) \geq 0$ if $t \leq 0$ and $d'''_P(t) \leq 0$ if $t \geq 0$.
4. $d'_P(t + \pi) = -d'_P(t)$ and $d''_P(t + \pi) = -d''_P(t)$.
5. $d'_P(-t) = -d'_P(t)$ and $d''_P(-t) = d''_P(t)$.

Here and in the following we consider S^1 as boundary circle of the standard Riemannian hemisphere H^2 . Apparently there is a natural \mathbb{R} action on S^1 by orientation preserving isometries that we denote by $+$. When we speak of parametrizations of S^1 , then we always mean orientation preserving unit speed parametrizations. Derivatives of functions defined on S^1 such as d_P are to be understood with respect to such parametrizations. When it does not lead to confusion we identify points of S^1 and in the parametrizing interval of \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Even though most parts of Lemma 3.1 admit geometric arguments for sake of shortness we do the analytic computation. By the spherical cosine theorem $d_P(t) = \arccos(k_P \cos(t))$ where $k_P := \cos(d_{S^2}(P, B))$. So differentiating

$$\begin{aligned} d'_P(t) &= \frac{k_P \sin(t)}{\sqrt{1 - k_P^2 \cos^2(t)}} \\ d''_P(t) &= \frac{(k_P - k_P^3) \cos(t)}{(1 - k_P^2 \cos^2(t))^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ d'''_P(t) &= \frac{(k_P - k_P^3)(-1 - 2k_P^2 \cos^2(t))}{(1 - k_P^2 \cos^2(t))^{\frac{5}{2}}} \sin(t). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

As $k_P - k_P^3 \geq 0$ and $-1 - 2k_P^2 \cos^2(t) \leq 0$ this implies all the claims. \square

We prove the following refined version of Lemma 1.6.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $P \in H^2 \setminus S^1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ and T the antipodal map of S^1 . Then the following are equivalent:*

1. For all $Q \in S^1$ we have $d_W(\mu, \delta_Q) = d_P(Q)$.
2. For all $Q \in S^1$

$$\mu([Q, Q + \pi]) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} d'_P(Q).$$

3. There exists $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ such that $T_* \nu = \nu$ and

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2} (d''_P)^+ \cdot \mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1 + (1 - k_P) \cdot \nu.$$

Lemma 1.6 follows from Lemma 3.2 by setting $h_P := \frac{1}{2} (d''_P)^+$.

Proof. Let $B \in S^1$ such that $d_{S^2}(P, S^1) = d_{S^2}(P, B)$ and parametrize S^1 such that B corresponds to 0. Then by Lemma 3.1.2.

$$(d''_P)^+ = \mathbb{1}_{(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})} d''_P. \quad (3)$$

We take the left derivative of (1), use the dominated convergence theorem and the fact that μ is a probability measure to get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial_- (d_W(\mu, \delta_Q))}{\partial Q} &= \int_{S^1} \frac{\partial_- (d_{S^1}(Q, R))}{\partial Q} d\mu(R) \\ &= \mu([Q - \pi, Q]) - \mu([Q, Q + \pi]) \\ &= 1 - 2\mu([Q, Q + \pi]). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

1. \Rightarrow 2. : By (4) $d'_P(Q) = 1 - 2\mu([Q, Q + \pi])$ for all $Q \in S^1$. Solving this for $\mu([Q, Q + \pi])$ gives 2..

2. \Rightarrow 3.: Set $\bar{\nu} := \mu - \frac{1}{2}(d''_P)^+ \mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1$ which is a priori a finite signed measure on S^1 . First we show that $T_* \bar{\nu} = \bar{\nu}$. The spherical intervals of length $\leq \pi$ form a π -system generating the Borel σ -algebra of S^1 . So by Dynkin's π - λ -theorem it suffices to check $T_* \bar{\nu}([t, s]) = \bar{\nu}([t, s])$ for all intervals $[t, s] \subset \mathbb{R}$ of length $\leq \pi$. As $T_* \bar{\nu}([t, s]) = \bar{\nu}([t + \pi, s + \pi])$ by symmetry we may assume $|t| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} T_* \bar{\nu}([t, s]) - \bar{\nu}([t, s]) &= \bar{\nu}([s, s + \pi]) - \bar{\nu}([t, t + \pi]) \\ &= \underbrace{\mu([s, s + \pi]) - \mu([t, t + \pi])}_{=: (X)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\underbrace{\int_t^{t+\pi} (d''_P(r))^+ dr - \int_s^{s+\pi} (d''_P(r))^+ dr}_{=: (Y)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We calculate (X) and (Y) separately.

$$(X) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} d'_P(s) - \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} d'_P(t) \right) = \frac{1}{2} d'_P(t) - \frac{1}{2} d'_P(s) \quad (6)$$

and

$$(Y) = d'_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) - d'_P(t) - \begin{cases} d'_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) - d'_P(s) & , |s| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \\ d'_P(s + \pi) - d'_P\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}\right) & , |s| > \frac{\pi}{2} \end{cases} = d'_P(s) - d'_P(t) \quad (7)$$

where we used (3) and Lemma 3.1.4.. Plugging (6) and (7) into (5) proves $T_* \bar{\nu} = \bar{\nu}$. So $\bar{\nu}$ is π -periodic and by (3) $\bar{\nu}|_{[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2})} = \mu|_{[\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2})} \geq 0$. Hence $\bar{\nu}$ is a positive measure. Furthermore

$$\bar{\nu}(S^1) = \mu(S^1) - \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d''_P(t) dt = 1 - d'_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) = 1 - k_P$$

where we used that (2) implies $k_P = d'_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$. Setting $\nu := \frac{1}{1-k_P} \bar{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ completes this implication.

3. \Rightarrow 2.: If $t \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu([t, t + \pi]) &= (1 - k_P)\nu([t, t + \pi]) + \frac{1}{2} \int_t^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d''_P(t) dt \\ &= \frac{1 - k_P}{2} + \frac{1}{2} d'_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{2} d'_P(t) && \text{as } T_* \nu = \nu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} d'_P(t) && \text{as } k_P = d'_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Going to complements and using Lemma 3.1.4. provides the case $t \notin \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right]$.

2. + 3. \Rightarrow 1.: (4) and 2. imply that $\frac{\partial}{\partial Q} d_W(\mu, \delta_Q) = d'_P(Q)$ for all $Q \in S^1$. Furthermore the functions d_P and $Q \mapsto d_W(\mu, \delta_Q)$ are 1-Lipschitz functions $S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. So by the fundamental theorem of calculus it suffices to check $d_W(\mu, \delta_B) = d_P(B)$. By (1)

$$d_W(\mu, \delta_B) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} |t| d_P''(t) dt + (1 - k_P) \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(B, R) d\nu(R). \quad (8)$$

We calculate the terms separately

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} |t| d_P''(t) dt &= \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} t d_P''(t) dt = [t d_P'(t)]_{t=0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} - \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d_P'(t) dt \\ &= \frac{\pi}{2} d_P'\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) - d_P\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) + d_P(0) = \frac{\pi}{2} k_P - \frac{\pi}{2} + d_P(B). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(B, R) d\nu(R) &= \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(B, R) dT_*\nu(R) = \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(B, T(R)) d\nu(R) \\ &= \int_{S^1} (\pi - d_{S^1}(B, R)) d\nu(R) = \pi - \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(B, R) d\nu(R). \end{aligned}$$

So $\int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(B, R) d\nu(R) = \frac{\pi}{2}$. Plugging this and (9) into (8) gives the desired equality $d_W(\mu, \delta_B) = d_{S^2}(P, B)$. \square

3.2. Proof of Proposition 1.5. Let X be a metric space. A variant of the Kantorovich-Rubinstein duality states that for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)$ one has

$$d_W(\mu, \nu) = \sup_f \left(\int_X f(x) d\mu(x) - \int_X f(x) d\nu(x) \right). \quad (10)$$

where the supremum in (10) is taken over all 1-Lipschitz functions $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, see [Kel85, Theorem 2].

For $X = \mathbb{R}$ the maximizers in (10) are given in terms of the distribution functions F_μ and F_ν as precisely those 1-Lipschitz $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $f' = \text{sgn}(F_\nu - F_\mu)$ almost everywhere on $\{F_\mu \neq F_\nu\}$ with respect to \mathcal{L}^1 , see [CM95, Corollary 2.2].

For $X = S^1$ the issue is slightly more delicate. Call $C \in S^1$ a *balanced cut point* for (μ, ν) with Borel partition $S^1 = M \cup N$ if $\mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1(M) = \mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1(N) = \pi$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu([C, R)) &\leq \nu([C, R)) && ; \forall R \in M \\ \mu([C, R)) &\geq \nu([C, R)) && ; \forall R \in N. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.3 ([CM95], Propositions 3.2 & 3.6). *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$. Then there exists a balanced cutpoint for (μ, ν) and for every balanced cutpoint C with Borel partition $S^1 = M \cup N$ one has*

$$d_W(\mu, \nu) = \int_{S^1} f(R) d(\mu - \nu)R$$

where $f : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is 1-Lipschitz and such that

$$f' = \mathbb{1}_M - \mathbb{1}_N$$

holds $\mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1$ -almost everywhere.

Proposition 3.3 prepares us to proof proposition 1.5.

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Set $\iota : H^2 \rightarrow P_1(S^1)$ via $\iota(P) := \delta_P$ if $P \in S^1$ and otherwise $\iota(P) := \mu_P$ where μ_P has density

$$h_P := \frac{1}{2}(d_P'')^+ + \frac{1 - k_P}{2\pi}$$

with respect to $\mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1$. By Lemma 1.6 the distances to the boundary points are preserved under ι . So as H^2 is a length space it suffices to show that the restriction of ι to $H^2 \setminus S^1$ is distance preserving along geodesics.

Let l be an oriented minimizing geodesic segment in H^2 with starting point C on S^1 , and let $\gamma \in [0, \pi]$ be the angle enclosed by l and S^1 in C . Let $A, A' \in l$ and without loss of generality $d_{S^2}(A', C) \leq d_{S^2}(A, C)$. Then by Lemma 3.2

$$d_W(\mu_A, \mu_{A'}) \geq d_W(\mu_A, \delta_C) - d_W(\mu_{A'}, \delta_C) = d_{S^2}(A, C) - d_{S^2}(A', C) = d_{S^2}(A, A').$$

and hence ι is distance nondecreasing.

The proof that μ is 1-Lipschitz is more involved. Assume $\gamma \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Parametrize l by $a \in [0, \pi]$ as follows. Set $B_a := C + a \in S^1$ and let $A_a \in H^2$ be the intersection point of l and the geodesic orthogonal to S^1 in B_a . Setting $\mu_a := \mu_{A_a}$ we have to show that for all $a_1, a_2 \in (0, \pi)$.

$$d_W(\mu_{a_1}, \mu_{a_2}) \leq d_{S^2}(A_{a_1}, A_{a_2}). \quad (11)$$

Assume $\gamma < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $a_2, a_1 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Set $\mu_i := \mu_{a_i}$, $A_i := A_{a_i}$, $B_i := B_{a_i}$, $d_i := d_{A_i}$, $k_i := k_{A_i}$ and let $h_i := \frac{1}{2}(d_i'')^+ + \frac{1 - k_i}{2\pi}$ be the density of μ_i with respect to $\mathcal{H}_{S^1}^1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Assume without loss of generality $a_2 < a_1$ and hence $k_2 > k_1$. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let $C_t := C + t \in S^1$. If $C = C_0$ is a balanced cutpoint for (μ_1, μ_2) with Borel partition $S^1 = [C, C_\pi] \cup [C_\pi, C_{2\pi})$, then by Proposition 3.3 d_C is a maximizer for (10) and hence by (1) and Lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(\mu_1, \mu_2) &= \int_{S^1} d_{S^1}(Q, C) d(\mu_1 - \mu_2) Q = d_W(\mu_1, \delta_C) - d_W(\mu_2, \delta_C) \\ &= d_{S^2}(A_1, C) - d_{S^2}(A_2, C) = d_{S^2}(A_1, A_2). \end{aligned}$$

So to get (11) in our special case $\gamma < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $a_1, a_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ it suffices to prove

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1([C, C_t]) &\leq \mu_2([C, C_t]) & \forall t \in [0, \pi] \\ \mu_1([C, C_t]) &\geq \mu_2([C, C_t]) & \forall t \in [\pi, 2\pi]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By Lemma 3.2 and the first variation formula

$$\mu_1([C, C_\pi]) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}d_1'(C) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\cos(\gamma) = \mu_2([C, C_\pi]) \quad (13)$$

and hence as μ_i are probability measures also $\mu_1([C_\pi, C_{2\pi})) = \mu_2([C_\pi, C_{2\pi}))$. Using this facts it follows that the following system of inequalities is equivalent to (12)

$$\mu_1([C, C_t]) \leq \mu_2([C, C_t]) \quad \forall t \in \left[0, a_2 + \frac{\pi}{2}\right] \quad (14)$$

$$\mu_1([C_t, C_\pi]) \geq \mu_2([C_t, C_\pi]) \quad \forall t \in \left[a_2 + \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right] \quad (15)$$

$$\mu_1([C_t, C]) \leq \mu_2([C_t, C]) \quad \forall t \in \left[a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}, 0\right] \quad (16)$$

$$\mu_1([C_{-\pi}, C_t]) \geq \mu_2([C_{-\pi}, C_t]) \quad \forall t \in \left[-\pi, a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}\right]. \quad (17)$$

We prove (14), (15), (16) and (17) one by one.

(14): For all $0 \leq s \leq t$ one has $h_i(C_s) = \frac{1}{2}d_i''(C_s) + \frac{1-k_i}{2\pi}$. Hence by integration and the first variation formula

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_i([C, C_t]) &= \frac{1}{2}d_i'(C_t) - \frac{1}{2}d_i'(C) + t \frac{1-k_i}{2\pi} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\cos(\gamma_{i,t}) + \frac{1}{2}\cos(\gamma) + t \frac{1-\cos(c_i)}{2\pi}.\end{aligned}$$

where $c_i = c_{a_i} := d_{S^2}(A_i, B_i)$ and $\gamma_{i,t} = \gamma_{a_i,t}$ is the angle between the geodesic through A_i and S^1 in C_t .




FIGURE 1. Left: $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq t \leq 0$, Right: $a \leq t \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$

So

$$\mu_2([C, C_t]) - \mu_1([C, C_t]) = \frac{1}{2}g(a_1, t) - \frac{1}{2}g(a_2, t)$$

where $g = g_\gamma : (0, \frac{\pi}{2}] \times [-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$g(a, t) := \cos(\gamma_{a,t}) + \frac{t \cos(c_a)}{\pi}.$$

So (14) is implied by the following technical lemma whose proof we postpone to 3.3.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\gamma < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $g = g_\gamma$ be defined as above. Then*

1. *for $t \in [0, \pi]$ is $g(-, t)$ nondecreasing on $[\max\{0, t - \frac{\pi}{2}\}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.*
2. *for $t \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0]$ is $g(-, t)$ nonincreasing on $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$.*

(15): For $t \leq s \leq \pi$ one has

$$h_2(C_s) = \frac{1-k_2}{2\pi} \leq \frac{1-k_1}{2\pi} \leq h_1(C_s)$$

which by integration immediately implies (15).

(16): By a calculation very analog to the proof of (14)

$$\mu_2([C_t, C]) - \mu_1([C_t, C]) = \frac{1}{2}(g(a_2, t) - g(a_1, t))$$

which is nonnegative by Lemma 3.4.2..

(17): h_1 is constant on $I := [C_{-\pi}, C_{a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}}]$ and by Lemma 3.1.3. h_2 is nondecreasing on I . Furthermore $h_2(C_{-\pi}) = \frac{1-k_2}{2\pi} < \frac{1-k_1}{2\pi} = h_1(C_{-\pi})$.

Assume $\mu_2([C_{-\pi}, C_t]) > \mu_1([C_{-\pi}, C_t])$. Then $h_2(s) > h_1(s)$ for all $s \in [t, a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}]$ which implies

$$\mu_2([C_{-\pi}, C_{a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}}]) > \mu_1([C_{-\pi}, C_{a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}}]).$$

So by (13)

$$\mu_2([C_{a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}}, C]) < \mu_1([C_{a_1 - \frac{\pi}{2}}, C])$$

which contradicts (16).

So far we proved (11) for $\gamma < \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $a_1, a_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. The other cases can be reduced to this one exploiting the fact that if T is an isometry of H^2 and S its restriction to S^1 then S_* is an isometry of $\mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$ and $S_*\mu_A = \mu_{T(A)}$.

For $\gamma > \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $a_1, a_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ reflect in the geodesic passing through C and orthogonal to S^1 and we are in the previous case. For $\gamma \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $a_1, a_2 \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$ reflect in the geodesic passing through $C_{\frac{\pi}{2}}$ and orthogonal to S^1 and we are in a previous case. For $\gamma \neq \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $a_2 \leq \frac{\pi}{2} < a_1$ by previous cases (11) applies for $a_1, \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\frac{\pi}{2}, a_2$ respectively and hence by the triangle inequality also for a_1, a_2 . Case $\gamma = \frac{\pi}{2}$ maybe obtained by observing that it is nongeneric and applying the triangle inequality again. \square

3.3. A technical lemma. In this subsection we perform the proof of Lemma 3.4. We remind the reader of one of Napier's rules stating that for a nondegenerate spherical triangle $\triangle ABC$ with side length a, b, c and angles α, β, γ satisfying $\beta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ one has

$$\cot(\gamma) = \sin(a) \cot(c). \quad (18)$$

(18) may be deduced directly from the spherical sine and cosine theorems.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We need to express $\cos(\gamma_{a,t})$ and $\cos(c_a)$ analytically in terms of a, γ, t . For c_a by (18)

$$\cos(c_a) = \frac{\cot(c_a)}{\sqrt{1 + \cot^2(c_a)}} = \frac{\frac{\cot(\gamma)}{\sin(a)}}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{\cot^2(\gamma)}{\sin^2(a)}}} = \frac{\cot(\gamma)}{\underbrace{\sqrt{\sin^2(a) + \cot^2(\gamma)}}_{=:K(a)}} \quad (19)$$

Applying (18) to $\triangle A_a B_a C$ and $\triangle A_a B_a C_t$

$$\cot^2(\gamma_{a,t}) = \sin^2(a-t) \cot^2(c_a) = \frac{\sin^2(a-t) \cot^2(\gamma)}{\sin^2(a)}.$$

Hence proceeding as in (19) and exploiting that $\text{sgn}(\cos(\gamma_{a,t})) = \text{sgn}(a-t)$

$$\cos(\gamma_{a,t}) = \frac{\sin(a-t) \cot(\gamma)}{\underbrace{\sqrt{\sin^2(a) + \cot^2(\gamma) \sin^2(a-t)}}_{=:N(a,t)}} \quad (20)$$

Careful differentiation of (19) and (20) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \cos(c_a)}{\partial a} &= \frac{-\cot(\gamma) \sin(a) \cos(a)}{K^3} \\ \frac{\partial \cos(\gamma_{a,t})}{\partial a} &= \frac{\cos(a-t) \cot(\gamma) \sin^2(a) - \sin(a) \cos(a) \sin(a-t) \cot(\gamma)}{N^3} \\ &= \frac{\cot(\gamma) \sin(a) \sin(t)}{N^3}. \end{aligned}$$

And hence

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial a}(a, t) = \underbrace{\cot(\gamma) \sin(a)}_{\geq 0} \left(\frac{\sin(t)}{N^3} - \frac{t \cos(a)}{\pi K^3} \right) \quad (21)$$

Case $t \in [0, \pi]$ & $a \in [\max\{0, t - \frac{\pi}{2}\}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$: As $N \leq K$ and $t \cos(a) \geq 0$ we estimate (21) to get

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial a}(a, t) \geq \frac{\cot(\gamma) \sin(a)}{N^3} \left(\sin(t) - \frac{t \cos(a)}{\pi} \right). \quad (22)$$

If $0 \leq t \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ then $\sin(t) - \frac{t \cos(a)}{\pi} \geq \sin(t) - \frac{t}{\pi}$ which is ≥ 0 by concavity of the sine function on $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$. And if $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq t \leq \pi$ then as the cosine function is decreasing on $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$

$$\sin(t) - \frac{t \cos(a)}{\pi} \geq \sin(t) - \frac{t \cos(t - \frac{\pi}{2})}{\pi} = \sin(t) \left(1 - \frac{t}{\pi} \right) \geq 0.$$

Hence by (22) $\frac{\partial g}{\partial a} \geq 0$.

Case $t \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0]$ & $a \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$: Then as $N \leq K$ and $t \leq 0$

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial a}(a, t) \leq \frac{\cot(\gamma) \sin(a)}{N^3} \left(\sin(t) - \frac{t \cos(a)}{\pi} \right)$$

but $\sin(t) - \frac{t \cos(a)}{\pi} \leq \sin(t) - \frac{t}{\pi} \leq 0$. □

4. QUADRATIC ISOPERIMETRIC CONSTANTS

4.1. Volume functionals and Jacobians. In this paragraph we give a short introduction to the topic of volume functionals suited for our later purposes. The interested reader is referred for example to [Iva09] and [LW17b] for a more detailed exposition.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The n -dimensional *Busemann volume functional* \mathcal{V}^b assigns to a Lipschitz function $f : E \rightarrow X$ where $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a Borel set and X a metric space the Hausdorff measure of the image counting multiplicities. Precisely

$$\mathcal{V}^b(f) := \int_X \text{card}(f^{-1}(y)) \, d\mathcal{H}_X^n(y).$$

If X is a Riemannian manifold this seems quite adequate for measuring the n -dimensional volume of the image. However in more general situations the choice of Hausdorff measure on X is less canonical and there exist other reasonable nonequivalent definitions.

Let \mathcal{V} be a functional assigning to every Lipschitz map $f : E \rightarrow X$, where $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is Borel and X a metric space, a number $\mathcal{V}(f) \in [0, \infty]$. \mathcal{V} is called *n -dimensional volume functional* if it satisfies the following properties for every such f :

1. If X is a Riemannian manifold, then $\mathcal{V}(f) = \mathcal{V}^b(f)$. (Normalization)
2. If $g : X \rightarrow Y$ is L -Lipschitz, then $\mathcal{V}(g \circ f) \leq L^n \cdot \mathcal{V}(f)$. (Monotonicity)
3. If $E' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a Borel set and $\phi : E' \rightarrow E$ is bi-Lipschitz, then $\mathcal{V}(f \circ \phi) = \mathcal{V}(f)$. (Coordinate invariance)
4. If $M = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$ where $E_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ are Borel sets, then $\mathcal{V}(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}(f|_{E_i})$. (σ -additivity)

It is not hard to check that \mathcal{V}^b is a volume functional in this sense. 2-dimensional volume functionals will also be called *area functionals* and will be denoted by \mathcal{A} instead of \mathcal{V} .

Let $f : E \rightarrow X$ be a map where $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is Borel and X a metric space. f is called *metrically differentiable* at $p \in E$ if there exists a seminorm s on \mathbb{R}^n such that

$$\lim_{q \in E; q \rightarrow p} \frac{d(f(q), f(p)) - s(q-p)}{|p-q|} = 0. \quad (23)$$

If this is the case such s is called the *metric differential* of f at p and is denoted by $\text{md}_p f$. If one replaces \lim in (23) by the approximate limit aplim then one obtains the notions of *approximate differentiability* and the *approximate metric differential* $\text{apmd}_p f$.

Bernd Kirchheim proved in [Kir94] that if $f : E \rightarrow X$ is Lipschitz, then f is metrically differentiable at almost every $p \in E$ and

$$\mathcal{V}^b(f) = \int_E J^b(\text{md}_p f) d\mathcal{L}^n(p). \quad (24)$$

Here for a seminorm s on \mathbb{R}^n the n -dimensional Busemann Jacobian J^b is defined via $J^b(s) := \frac{\alpha_n}{\mathcal{L}^n(B_s)}$ where $B_s \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unit ball of s and α_n is the volume of the standard n -dimensional Euclidean unit ball. By [Kar07] if $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} E_i \cup S$ where E_i are measurable such that the restrictions $f|_{E_i}$ are Lipschitz and $\mathcal{L}^2(S) = 0$, then f is approximately differentiable almost everywhere on E and the analog of (24) holds with $\text{md}_p f$ replaced by $\text{apmd}_p f$, if furthermore f satisfies Lusin's property (N).

The Busemann Jacobian may be generalized as follows. Let Σ^n be the set of seminorms on \mathbb{R}^n and Σ_0^n the set of norms on \mathbb{R}^n . An *n-dimensional Jacobian* is a map $J : \Sigma^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ fulfilling the following properties:

1. $J(s_e) = J^b(s_e)$ if s_e is an Euclidean norm. (Normalization)
2. $J(s) \geq J(s')$ whenever $s \geq s'$. (Monotonicity)
3. $J(s \circ T) = |\det T| J(s)$ for $T \in M_n(\mathbb{R})$. (Transformation law)

Again one can check that J^b defines a Jacobian in this sense.

If J is an n -dimensional Jacobian then the corresponding n -volume functional \mathcal{V}^J is defined via

$$\mathcal{V}^J(f) := \int_E J(\text{md}_p f) d\mathcal{L}^n(p). \quad (25)$$

Vice versa if \mathcal{V} is an n -dimensional volume functional then one may define a Jacobian $J^{\mathcal{V}}$ by $J^{\mathcal{V}}(s) := 0$ if $s \in \Sigma^n \setminus \Sigma_0^n$ and

$$J^{\mathcal{V}}(s) := \mathcal{V}(\text{id} : (0, 1)^n \rightarrow ((0, 1)^n, s))$$

otherwise. Applying [Kir94, Lemma 4] one can show that the operations J^\bullet and \mathcal{V}^\bullet are mutually inverse. Hence n -Jacobians and n -volume functionals are incarnations of the same class of objects.

It is easy to create other examples of Jacobians than J^b and hence other volume functionals than \mathcal{V}^b . Here are the most important ones.

Example 4.1. Let $s \in \Sigma$. If $s \in \Sigma^n \setminus \Sigma_0^n$ set $J^\bullet(s) := 0$. Otherwise

1. the Holmes-Thompson Jacobian J^{ht} is defined via $J^{ht}(s) := \frac{\mathcal{L}^n(B_s^*)}{\alpha_n}$. Here $B_s^* := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle v, w \rangle \leq 1; \forall w \in B_s\}$ is the dual unit ball of s .
2. the inscribed Riemannian Jacobian J^{ir} is defined via $J^{ir}(s) := \frac{\alpha_n}{\mathcal{L}^n(L_s)}$. Here L_s is the John ellipsoid of B_s . That is the ellipsoid contained in B_s of maximal \mathcal{L}^n measure.

One can obtain the following comparison results for the presented Jacobians.

Theorem 4.2. 1. $J^{ht} \leq J^b$ and for $n = 2$ one has $\inf_{s \in \Sigma_0^2} \frac{J^{ht}(s)}{J^b(s)} = \frac{8}{\pi^2}$.

2. If J is an n -dimensional Jacobian, then $J \leq J^{ir}$ and

$$q_n^J := \inf_{s \in \Sigma_0^n} \frac{J(s)}{J^{ir}(s)} \geq \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n.$$

3. $q_2^b = \frac{\pi}{4}$, $q_2^{ht} = \frac{2}{\pi}$ and $q_2^{ir} = 1$.

Proof. $J^{ht} \leq J^b$ is a formulation of the so called Blaschke-Santaló inequality, see [Sch13, (10.28)] and the references therein. The second part of 1. was proved in [Mah39]. The optimal lower bound of $\frac{J^{ht}}{J^b}$ for general n is subject to a famous conjecture of Kurt Mahler and remains open for $n \geq 4$. For 2. and 3. see [LW17b, Section 2.4]. \square

4.2. Quadratic Isoperimetric Constants. Let \mathcal{A} be an area functional and X a metric space. If $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ is a Lipschitz curve, then we call a Lipschitz map $f : D^2 \rightarrow X$ a *filling* of η if f restricts to η on S^1 . Here and in the following D^2 denotes the standard closed unit disc in \mathbb{R}^2 . Define the *filling area* of η with respect to \mathcal{A} by $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\eta) := \inf_f \mathcal{A}(f)$ where f ranges over all fillings of η . We say that X satisfies a *C-quadratic isoperimetric inequality* with respect to \mathcal{A} if for all $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ Lipschitz one has

$$\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\eta) \leq C \cdot L_{\eta}^2,$$

where L_{η} denotes the length of η . Having set the definitions it is a straight forward consequence of Theorem 1.1 that spaces admitting a contracting barycenter map satisfy a $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ -quadratic isoperimetric inequality.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let \mathcal{A} be an area functional, $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ a Lipschitz curve of length $L_{\eta} = 2\pi v$, $\bar{\eta} : S^1 \rightarrow X$ its constant speed parametrization and $\phi : D^2 \rightarrow H^2$ a diffeomorphism. Then $\bar{\eta}$ is of constant speed v and hence v -Lipschitz. So by Theorem 1.1 there exists an v -Lipschitz extension $f : H^2 \rightarrow X$ of $\bar{\eta}$. Hence

$$\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\eta}) \leq \mathcal{A}(f \circ \phi) \leq v^2 \mathcal{A}(\phi) = v^2 \mathcal{A}^b(\phi) = v^2 \mathcal{H}^2(H^2) = v^2 2\pi = \frac{1}{2\pi} L_{\eta}^2.$$

But by [LWYar, Lemma 3.5] one has $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\eta) = \text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{\eta})$. \square

By a similar calculation invoking Reshetnyak's majorization theorem instead of Theorem 1.1 the constant $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ in Theorem 1.2 may be improved to $\frac{1}{4\pi}$ if X is a Hadamard space. Conversely Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger proved in [LW18] that a proper metric space satisfying a $\frac{1}{4\pi}$ -quadratic isoperimetric inequality with respect to \mathcal{A}^b is a Hadamard space. This does not hold for \mathcal{A}^{ht} as by [Tho96, Theorem 4.4.2] all two dimensional normed spaces satisfy a $\frac{1}{4\pi}$ -quadratic inequality with respect to \mathcal{A}^{ht} . The following theorem of Sergei Ivanov implies that the constant $\frac{1}{2\pi}$ in Theorem 1.2 can in general not be improved even for Banach spaces and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{ht}$.

Theorem 4.3 ([Iva09], Theorem 5.2 & [Iva11], Theorem 2). *Let X be a metric space and $\iota : S^1 \rightarrow X$ an isometric embedding. Then $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}^{ht}}(\iota) \geq 2\pi$*

By Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.2 if a space X admits an isometric embedding of S^1 then Theorem 1.2 cannot be improved for X and $\mathcal{A}^{ht}/\mathcal{A}^b/\mathcal{A}^{ir}$. Examples of such embeddings are Kuratowski embedding $S^1 \rightarrow L^{\infty}(S^1)$ and $\delta : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1(S^1)$.

4.3. Local Quadratic Isoperimetric Inequality Constants. Our setting is the following. Let M be a smooth manifold. A *continuous Finsler/Riemannian structure* on M is a continuous function $F : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that F is continuous and for every $p \in M$ the restriction $F_p := F|_{T_p M} : T_p M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a norm/an Euclidean norm. We call the tuple (M, F) a *continuous Finsler/Riemannian manifold*. For a piecewise differentiable curve $\eta : [a, b] \rightarrow M$ set

$$L_\eta^F := \int_a^b F_{\eta(t)}(\eta'(t)) dt.$$

L^F induces a metric on M which we denote by d_F . For $x, y \in M$ it is given by

$$d_F(x, y) := \inf \{L_\eta^F | \eta \text{ piecewise smooth, } \eta(a) = x, \eta(b) = y\}.$$

Locally (M, d_F) is close to a normed space in the following sense.

Lemma 4.4. *Let (M, F) be a continuous Finsler manifold, $p \in M$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exists a neighborhood $U \subseteq M$ of p , a convex set $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, a norm $s \in \Sigma_0^n$ on \mathbb{R}^n and a diffeomorphism $\phi : V \rightarrow U$ such that $\phi : (V, s) \rightarrow (U, d_F)$ is $(1+\epsilon)$ -bi-Lipschitz. If (M, F) is even a continuous Riemannian manifold, then s is a Euclidean norm.*

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is a bit tedious but essentially straight forward. Compare for example [LY06, Section 3.2].

Let \mathcal{A} be an area functional and X a metric space. We say that X satisfies a *C-local quadratic isoperimetric inequality* with respect to \mathcal{A} if for every $p \in X$ there exists a neighborhood U of p that satisfies a C -quadratic isoperimetric inequality with respect to \mathcal{A} . So by Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 4.4 we get Corollary 1.3.

Proof of Corollary 1.3. We prove 1. The proof of 2. is similar. Let $p \in M$, $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrary and choose U, C, s, ϕ as in Lemma 4.4. Let $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow U$ be a Lipschitz curve. Then by Theorem 1.2

$$\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\eta) \leq (1+\epsilon)^2 \text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}(\phi^{-1} \circ \eta) \leq \frac{(1+\epsilon)^2}{2\pi} L_{\phi^{-1} \circ \eta}^2 \leq \frac{(1+\epsilon)^4}{2\pi} L_\eta^2.$$

As $\epsilon > 0$ was arbitrary this completes the proof. \square

By generalizing all the invoked definitions and theorems in an obvious way one may see that also an adequate variant of Corollary 1.3.1 holds for nonreversible Finsler structures.

5. REGULARITY OF AREA MINIMIZERS

In this section we discuss how our results can be applied to the work of Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger in [LW17a] and [LW17b] to obtain regularity results for minimal discs.

Let X be a complete metric space X and $p > 1$. Essentially following [Res97] the Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{1,p}(D^2, X)$ may be defined as the set of maps $f : D^2 \rightarrow X$ satisfying:

1. There exists $w \in L^p(D^2)$ such that for every $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 1-Lipschitz the composition $g \circ f$ belongs to the classical Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}^{1,p}(D^2, \mathbb{R})$ and $|\nabla(g \circ f)| \leq w$ almost everywhere.
2. f is essentially separably valued. That is there exists $N \subset D^2$, $\mathcal{L}^2(N) = 0$ such that $f(D^2 \setminus N)$ is separable.

Let $u \in \mathcal{W}^{1,p}(D^2, X)$. Then by [Kar07, 2.7.] one may decompose $D^2 = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \cup S$ such that u is Lipschitz restricted to E_i and $\mathcal{L}^2(S) = 0$. So u is approximately metrically differentiable almost everywhere and if J is a Jacobian one may define $\mathcal{A}^J(u)$ as in (25) with $\text{md}_p u$ replaced by $\text{apmd}_p u$. Furthermore as in the situation of the classical Sobolev spaces one may naturally define a trace map $\text{tr}(u) : S^1 \rightarrow X$ representing the boundary of u , see [KS93, Section 1.12].

So there are all the ingredients to define filling areas and quadratic isoperimetric inequality in a Sobolev sense. For $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ Lipschitz we call $u \in W^{1,2}(D^2, X)$ a *Sobolev filling* of η if $\text{tr}(u)$ parametrizes η . Furthermore if \mathcal{A} is an area functional we define the *Sobolev filling area* of η by $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}^S(\eta) := \inf \mathcal{A}(u)$ where u ranges over all Sobolev fillings of η . X is said to satisfy a *C-Sobolev quadratic isoperimetric inequality* w.r.t. \mathcal{A} if for all $\eta : S^1 \rightarrow X$ Lipschitz $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}^S(\eta) \leq C \cdot L_{\eta}^2$.

Lipschitz maps $D^2 \rightarrow X$ are especially contained in $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}(D^2, X)$ and for such the trace is nothing but restriction to the boundary. Hence $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}^S \leq \text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}$. By [LWYar, Proposition 3.1] equality holds if X is Lipschitz 1-connected and hence by Theorem 1.1 especially for spaces admitting a contracting barycenter map. So for such spaces the notions of C -quadratic isoperimetric inequality and C -Sobolev quadratic isoperimetric inequality are equivalent.

In [LW17a] Lytchak and Wenger proved that if X is proper, \mathcal{A} is *quasiconvex* and η is a Jordan curve such that $\text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}^S(\eta) < \infty$, then there exists a Sobolev filling u of η such that $\mathcal{A}(u) = \text{Fill}_{\mathcal{A}}^S(\eta)$. Furthermore u may be chosen minimizing the Reshetnjak energy among all such minimal \mathcal{A} -fillings. We call such u minimizing area and energy *\mathcal{A} -minimal disc* following the terminology of [LW17b]. Quasiconvexity of \mathcal{A} means that flat 2-dimensional discs in finite dimensional normed spaces are minimal fillings of their boundary curves with respect to \mathcal{A} . This holds for all discussed examples of area functionals, see [BI02, Theorem 3], [BI12, Theorem 1], [Iva09, Theorem 6.2] respectively. In [GWar] the existence of \mathcal{A} -minimal discs for quasiconvex area functionals and prescribed Jordan curve was generalized to a larger class of metric spaces including apart proper spaces also Hadamard spaces, dual Banach spaces and injective spaces by Chang-Yu Guo and Stefan Wenger.

Besides other regularity properties of \mathcal{A} -minimal discs Lytchak and Wenger proved a variant of the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be a complete metric space satisfying a C -Sobolev local quadratic isoperimetric inequality, \mathcal{A} an area functional and u an \mathcal{A} -minimal disc. If $u(D^2)$ is precompact in X , then u admits a representative \bar{u} that is locally α -Hölder continuous on the interior of D^2 where $\alpha = \frac{q_2^{\mathcal{A}}}{4\pi C}$. If X satisfies property (ET) this improves to $\alpha = \frac{1}{4\pi C}$.*

Following [LW17a, Section 11] a space is said to satisfy property (ET) if for all $u \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(D^2, X)$ almost all approximate metric differentials $\text{apmd}_p u$ are possibly degenerate Euclidean seminorms. Examples of spaces satisfying property (ET) include continuous Riemannian manifolds and spaces admitting a lower or upper curvature bound in the sense of Alexandrov. The precompactness assumption in Theorem 5.1 e.g. applies automatically in case X is compact, u is continuous or X is proper and u bounded.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. This is a variant of [LW17b, Theorem 4.5]. However unfortunately their formulation does not completely fit to our situation. Instead of a local

quadratic isoperimetric inequality and precompact image, they demand a quadratic isoperimetric inequality at uniform small scales. However the quadratic isoperimetric inequality property of X only comes into play when proving [LW17a, Lemma 8.6]. By Lebesgue covering theorem curves of uniform small scale in $u(D^2) \subseteq X$ satisfy a C -quadratic isoperimetric inequality. This suffices to perform the vary same proof of [LW17a, Lemma 8.6].

The constant q_2^A only comes into play when estimating $\mathcal{A}^{ir}(u|_\Omega)$ by $\frac{1}{q_2^A}\mathcal{A}(u|_\Omega)$ where $\Omega \subseteq D^2$. So due to the normalization property q_2^A may be replaced by 1 if X satisfies property (ET). \square

We may apply Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.3 to calculate concretely Hölder regularity constants of \mathcal{A} -minimal discs via Theorem 5.1.

Let X be a complete metric space, \mathcal{A} an area functional and $u \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}(D^2, X)$ \mathcal{A} -minimal with precompact image. Then u admits a representative that is locally α -Hölder continuous in the interior of D^2 ...

1. ... for $\alpha = \frac{q_2^A}{2}$ if X admits a conical geodesic bicombing. Especially for $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{ht}/\mathcal{A}^b/\mathcal{A}^{ir}$ one may take $\alpha = \frac{1}{\pi}/\frac{\pi}{8}/\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. If X furthermore satisfies (ET), then α improves to $\frac{1}{2}$ for every \mathcal{A} .
2. ... for $\alpha = 1$ if X is a Hadamard space. So in this situation u is locally Lipschitz in the interior. For the Reshetnyak energy replaced by the Korevaar-Schoen-energy this follows also from [KS93].
3. ... for all $\alpha < \frac{q_2^A}{2}$ if X is a continuous Finsler manifold. Especially for $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{ht}/\mathcal{A}^b/\mathcal{A}^{ir}$ for all $\alpha < \frac{1}{\pi}/\frac{\pi}{8}/\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. As a special case this proves Theorem 1.4.
4. ... for all $\alpha < 1$ if X is a continuous Riemannian manifold or a space of nonpositive curvature in the sense of Alexandrov.

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ a not necessarily symmetric norm s is said to satisfy (GA m) if its m -harmonic symmetrization

$$s_{(m)}(v) := \left(\frac{2}{s(v)^{-m} + s(-v)^{-m}} \right)^{1/m}$$

defines a norm. By [PvdM17, Corollary 3.4] one may see that also \mathcal{A}^b -minimal discs in nonreversible Finsler manifolds such that the norms on all tangent spaces satisfy (GA2) are locally α -Hölder continuous for all $\alpha < \frac{\pi}{8}$.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article extends my master thesis "Quadratic Isoperimetric Inequality Constants" handed in at the Universität zu Köln in January 2018. I want to thank my supervisor Alexander Lytchak for stating the topic and really great support during the time of writing the thesis and this article. Furthermore I would like to thank Christian Lange for checking the main proofs calculation and Giuliano Basso for a useful discussion.

Also I would like to thank the anonymous referee for pointing out several typos and giving minor corrections.

REFERENCES

- [AP19] Luigi Ambrosio and Daniele Puglisi. Linear extension operators between spaces of Lipschitz maps and optimal transport. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 2019.
- [Bas18] Giuliano Basso. Fixed point theorems for metric spaces with a conical geodesic bicombing. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 38(5):1642–1657, 2018.
- [BBI01] Dmitri Burago, Yuri Burago, and Sergei V. Ivanov. *A Course in Metric Geometry*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 33. American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [BI02] Dmitri Burago and Sergei Ivanov. On asymptotic volume of finsler tori, minimal surfaces in normed spaces, and symplectic filling volume. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 156(2):891–914, 2002.
- [BI12] Dmitri Burago and Sergei Ivanov. Minimality of planes in normed spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(3):627–638, 2012.
- [BMar] Giuliano Basso and Benjamin Miesch. Conical geodesic bicomblings on subsets of normed vector spaces. *Adv. Geom.*, to appear.
- [BS01] Sergei Buyalo and Viktor Schroeder. Extension of Lipschitz maps into 3-manifolds. *Asian J. Math.*, 5(4):685–704, 2001.
- [CM95] Carlos A. Cabrelli and Ursula M. Molter. The Kantorovich metric for probability measures on the circle. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 57(3):345–361, 1995.
- [DL15] Dominic Descombes and Urs Lang. Convex geodesic bicomblings and hyperbolicity. *Geom. Dedicata*, 177(1):367–384, 2015.
- [Dud89] Richard M. Dudley. *Real Analysis and Probability*. Wadsworth and Brook Cole, Pacific Grove, CA, 1989.
- [GM81] Siegfried Gähler and Grattan Murphy. A Metric Characterization of Normed Linear Spaces. *Math. Nachr.*, 102(1):297–309, 1981.
- [GWar] Chang-Yu Guo and Stefan Wenger. Area minimizing discs in locally non-compact metric spaces. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, to appear. preprint arXiv:1701.06736.
- [Isb64] John R. Isbell. Six theorems about injective metric spaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 39(1):65–76, 1964.
- [Iva09] Sergei V. Ivanov. Volumes and areas of Lipschitz metrics. *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, 20(3):381–405, 2009.
- [Iva11] Sergei V. Ivanov. Filling minimality of Finslerian 2-discs. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, 273(1):176–190, 2011.
- [Kar07] Maria B. Karmanova. Area and co-area formulas for mappings of the Sobolev class with values in a metric space. *Sib. Math. J.*, 48(4):778–788, 2007.
- [Kel85] Hans G. Kellerer. Duality theorems and probability metrics. *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Probability Theory, in: Braşov. 1982, VNU Press, Utrecht*, pages 211–220, 1985.
- [Kir94] Bernd Kirchheim. Rectifiable metric spaces: local structure and regularity of the Hausdorff measure. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 121(1):113–123, 1994.
- [KS93] Nicholas J. Korevaar and Nicholas J. Schoen. Sobolev spaces and harmonic maps for metric space targets. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 1(3-4):561–659, 1993.
- [Lan13] Urs Lang. Injective hulls of certain discrete metric spaces and groups. *J. Topol. Anal.*, 5(3):297–331, 2013.
- [LN05] James R. Lee and Assaf Naor. Extending Lipschitz functions via random metric partitions. *Invent. Math.*, 160(1):59–95, 2005.
- [LPS00] Urs Lang, Branka Pavlović, and Viktor Schroeder. Extensions of Lipschitz maps into Hadamard spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(6):1527–1553, 2000.
- [LS97] Urs Lang and Viktor Schroeder. Kirszbraun’s theorem and metric spaces of bounded curvature. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(3):535–560, 1997.
- [LW17a] Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger. Area Minimizing Discs in Metric Spaces. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 223(3):1123–1182, 2017.
- [LW17b] Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger. Energy and area minimizers in metric spaces. *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 10(4):407–421, 2017.
- [LW18] Alexander Lytchak and Stefan Wenger. Isoperimetric characterization of upper curvature bounds. *Acta Math.*, 221(1):159–202, 2018.

- [LWYar] Alexander Lytchak, Stefan Wenger, and Robert Young. Dehn functions and Hölder extensions in asymptotic cones. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, to appear. preprint arXiv:1608.00082.
- [LY06] Alexander Lytchak and Asli Yaman. On Hölder continuous Riemannian and Finsler metrics. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 358(7):2917–2926, 2006.
- [Mah39] Kurt Mahler. Ein Minimalproblem für konvexe Polygone. *Mathematica (Zutphen)*, B7:118–127, 1939.
- [Oht09] Shin-ichi Ohta. Extending Lipschitz and Hölder maps between metric spaces. *Positivity*, 13(2):407–425, 2009.
- [OvdM14] Patrick Overath and Heiko von der Mosel. Plateau’s problem in Finsler 3-space. *Manuscripta Math.*, 143(3-4):273–316, 2014.
- [Pap13] Athanase Papadopoulos. *Metric Spaces, Convexity and Nonpositive Curvature*. IRMA Lectures in Mathematics & Theoretical Physics. European Mathematical Society, 2nd revised edition edition, 2013.
- [PvdM17] Sven Pistre and Heiko von der Mosel. The Plateau problem for the Busemann-Hausdorff area in arbitrary codimension. *Eur. J. Math.*, 3(4):953–973, 2017.
- [Res68] Yuri G. Reshetnyak. Inextensible mappings in a space of curvature no greater than K . *Sib. Math. J.*, 9(4):918–927, 1968.
- [Res97] Yuri G. Reshetnyak. Sobolev-Type Classes of Functions with Values in a Metric Space. *Sib. Math. J.*, 38(3):567–583, 1997.
- [Sch13] Rolf Schneider. *Convex Bodies: The Brunn–Minkowski Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2013.
- [Stu03] Karl-Theodor Sturm. Probability Measures on Metric Spaces of Nonpositive Curvature. *Heat Kernels and Analysis on Manifolds, Graphs, and Metric Spaces. Contemporary mathematics*, 338:357–390, 2003.
- [Tho96] Anthony C. Thompson. *Minkowski geometry*. Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications 63. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [Vil09] Cédric Villani. *Optimal Transport, Old and New*. in: Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 338, Springer, Berlin, 2009.

PAUL CREUTZ, MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT DER UNIVERSITÄT ZU KÖLN, WEYERTAL 86-90,
50931 KÖLN, GERMANY

E-mail address: pcreutz@math.uni-koeln.de