

# On the concept of non-ultrametric non-Archimedean analysis

Javier Cabello Sánchez, Francisco J. Carmona Fuertes

ABSTRACT. Given some non-Archimedean field  $\mathbb{K}$  and some  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear space  $X$ , the usual way to define a norm over  $X$  involves the *ultrametric inequality*  $\|x + y\| \leq \max\{\|x\|, \|y\|\}$ . In this note we will try to analyse the convenience of considering a wider variety of norms.

The main result of the present note is a characterisation of the isometries between finite-dimensional linear spaces over some valued field endowed with the norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , a result that can be seen as *the closest to a Mazur–Ulam Theorem in non-Archimedean analysis*.

## 1. Introduction

Let  $E = (\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|_E)$  be a real normed plane. If  $\|\cdot\|_E$  comes from an inner product, then its unit sphere  $S_E$  is an ellipse and so, it is determined by six points. This implies that, amongst all the norms that can be defined on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  by means of a scalar product,  $\|\cdot\|_E$  is determined by

$$\|(1, 0)\|_E = \|(-1, 0)\|_E, \quad \|(0, 1)\|_E = \|(0, -1)\|_E, \quad \|(1, 1)\|_E = \|(-1, -1)\|_E.$$

With this in mind, the analysis of 2-dimensional real spaces could be summarized as *all of them are isometrically isomorphic and all of them have a huge amount of isometries*. In spite of this, the analysis of two-dimensional real normed spaces is a very interesting branch of modern mathematics; for example, [11, 10] are dedicated to the geometry of two-dimensional spaces and contain an overwhelming amount of results on these spaces and, moreover, the techniques employed to solve the 2-dimensional Tingley’s Problem in the different cases have nothing in common, see [1, 2]. This is so because  $\mathbb{R}^2$  can be endowed with a huge variety of norms, with very different properties.

In  $p$ -adic analysis, we can find a very similar situation. Take some prime number  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and the usual valuation  $|\cdot| : \mathbb{Q}_p \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  determined by the condition  $|p| = 1/p$ . If we consider the linear space  $\mathbb{Q}_p^2$  endowed with any *ultrametric* norm  $\|\cdot\|$  such that  $\frac{\|(1,0)\|}{\|(0,1)\|} \notin |\mathbb{Q}_p|$ , equivalently,  $\frac{\|(1,0)\|}{\|(0,1)\|} \notin p^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , then  $\|(a, b)\| = \max\{|a|\|(1, 0)\|, |b|\|(0, 1)\|\}$  for every  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Q}_p^2$ .

---

Keywords: Ultrametric distance, Mazur-Ulam property, strictly convex normed spaces, non-Archimedean analysis,  $p$ -adic fields.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 26E30, 11E95.

This is so because of the strong triangular inequality

$$\|(a, b) + (a', b')\| \leq \max\{\|(a, b)\|, \|(a', b')\|\}.$$

If we think about the initial development of the theory of Banach spaces, we can say that this theory flourished because of the necessity of studying the similarities and differences that  $(C(K), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  has with  $(\ell_2, \|\cdot\|_2)$  and, so to say, spaces of the same kind. In some sense, it could be said that these two spaces were the reason for mathematicians to start studying arbitrary norms over infinite dimensional spaces.

In spite of this,  $p$ -adic analysis (and non-Archimedean analysis), seems to lack a good reason to develop a more general metric or normed framework. In [8, Proposition 1.1] it can be seen that, considering ultrametric norms, every finite-dimensional normed space  $(\mathbb{Q}_p^n, \|\cdot\|_X)$  over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  can be endowed with a basis  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  such that

$$(1) \quad \|\lambda_1 x_1 + \dots + \lambda_n x_n\|_X = \max\{|\lambda_1| \|x_1\|_X, \dots, |\lambda_n| \|x_n\|_X\}$$

for every  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ . The reader can find related results in [13, Theorem 50.8] or [18, p. 67].

This result can be understood as follows:

Given some  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  and some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , one may take an  $n$ -tuple of positive real numbers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  and endow  $\mathbb{K}$  with the norms  $\|\cdot\|^1 = \alpha_1 |\cdot|, \dots, \|\cdot\|^n = \alpha_n |\cdot|$ . Now we may consider  $(X, \|\cdot\|) = \oplus_\infty (\mathbb{K}, \|\cdot\|^i)$ , i.e.,  $X = \mathbb{K}^n$  and  $\|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\| = \max\{\alpha_1 |\lambda_1|, \dots, \alpha_n |\lambda_n|\}$ . What [8, Proposition 1.1] says is that this is all in ultrametric analysis. Every  $n$ -dimensional normed space over a  $p$ -adic field is isometrically isomorphic to this construction. So to say, the only things that can vary are  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ .

### 1.1. Definitions and preliminary results.

DEFINITION 1.1. A valued field is a field  $\mathbb{K}$  equipped with a function  $|\cdot| : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , called a valuation, such that

- i)  $|\lambda| = 0$  if and only if  $\lambda = 0$ ,
- ii)  $|\lambda\mu| = |\lambda||\mu|$ ,
- iii)  $|\lambda + \mu| \leq |\lambda| + |\mu|$  for all  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{K}$ .

DEFINITION 1.2. A non-Archimedean valued field is a valued field  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  such that, for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$ , the map  $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined as  $n \mapsto |n\alpha|$  is bounded.

DEFINITION 1.3. An ultrametric valued field is a valued field  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  such that

- iii')  $|\lambda + \mu| \leq \max\{|\lambda|, |\mu|\}$  for all  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{K}$ .

The following result, Ostrowski's Theorem, implies that every non-Archimedean valuation is actually ultrametric.

THEOREM 1.4 ([13], 10.1). Each non-trivial valuation on the field of the rational numbers is equivalent either to the absolute value function or to some  $p$ -adic valuation.

So, the analysis of non-Archimedean fields reduces to that of ultrametric fields. But the situation does not need to be the same with non-Archimedean normed spaces.

There may be something wrong about trying to develop *non-ultrametric non-Archimedean* analysis, but we have never found a reason to avoid the following definition of norm on non-Archimedean linear spaces.

DEFINITION 1.5. Let  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  be a valued field and  $X$  a  $\mathbb{K}$ -linear space. A map  $\|\cdot\| : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is a norm if, for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$  and  $x, y \in X$ , it fulfils the following:

- (1)  $\|x\| = 0$  if and only if  $x = 0$ .
- (2)  $\|\lambda x\| = |\lambda| \|x\|$ .
- (3)  $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$ .

Actually, Definition 1.5 appears in [3, page EVT I.3], where the author(s) do(es) not distinguish Archimedean from non-Archimedean fields. Moreover, they call *ultranorm* what is usually called *norm* in non-Archimedean analysis, see EVT I.26, Exercise 12 in [3]. Maybe now, when  $p$ -adic differential geometry is undergoing such a rapid development (see, e.g, [7, 14]), we can begin considering a less restrictive normed structure over non-Archimedean fields.

EXAMPLE 1.6 (Usual norm). Given any valued field  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  and any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the map  $\|\cdot\|_\infty : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined as

$$(2) \quad \|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)\|_\infty = \max\{|\lambda_1|, \dots, |\lambda_n|\}$$

is a norm. Actually,  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  not only fulfils the condition  $\|x + y\|_\infty \leq \|x\|_\infty + \|y\|_\infty$ , but also the strong triangle inequality  $\|x + y\|_\infty \leq \max\{\|x\|_\infty, \|y\|_\infty\}$ .

EXAMPLE 1.7. Consider any valued field  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  and the map  $\|\cdot\|_1 : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined as  $\|(a_1, \dots, a_n)\|_1 = |a_1| + \dots + |a_n|$ . Then,  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is a norm in the sense of Definition 1.5.

REMARK 1.8. From (1) it is clear that every *ultranorm*  $\|\cdot\|$  defined over  $\mathbb{Q}_p^n$ , fulfils the following property:

$\mathbb{Q}_p^n$  can be endowed with a basis  $\mathcal{B} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  such that, taking coordinates with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$  one has that

$$(3) \quad |\alpha_1| = |\beta_1|, \dots, |\alpha_n| = |\beta_n| \text{ implies } \|(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)\| = \|(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)\|.$$

In Archimedean analysis, a norm that fulfils (3) with respect to the usual basis is called absolute, see [17], we will say that  $\|\cdot\|$  is absolute with respect to  $\mathcal{B}$  when (3) holds.

QUESTION 1.9. Is every non-Archimedean norm absolute with respect to some basis?

## 2. The main result

2.1. In the sequel, we will use the word *isometry* with the meaning of *bijective map that preserves the distance*.

Also,  $\mathbb{K}$  will be a valued field and  $|\cdot|$  will denote its valuation.

We will need the following result in the proof of Proposition 2.3.

LEMMA 2.2. Let  $x = (x_1, x_2)$ ,  $y = (y_1, y_2)$ ,  $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{K}^2$ , all of them different. Then,

$$\|x - y\|_1 = \|x - z\|_1 + \|y - z\|_1$$

if and only if  $z$  shares one coordinate with  $x$  and the other one with  $y$ , i.e., if and only if  $x_1 - z_1 = y_2 - z_2 = 0$  or  $y_1 - z_1 = x_2 - z_2 = 0$ .

PROOF. As  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is translation invariant, we may suppose  $z = (0, 0)$  and denote  $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2)$ . For  $(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{K}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$  we have the following:

$$(4) \quad \|(x_1, x_2) - (y_1, y_2)\|_1 = |x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2| \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \max\{|x_1|, |y_1|\} + \max\{|x_2|, |y_2|\} \\ \stackrel{(2)}{\leq} |x_1| + |y_1| + |x_2| + |y_2| = \|(x_1, x_2)\|_1 + \|(y_1, y_2)\|_1.$$

The inequality  $\stackrel{(1)}{\leq}$  holds because the valuation  $|\cdot|$  fulfils the ultrametric inequality. Besides, the inequality  $\stackrel{(2)}{\leq}$  is strict unless either  $x_1 = y_2 = 0$  or  $y_1 = x_2 = 0$ , observe that any of these pairs of equalities imply that

$$\|(x_1, x_2) - (y_1, y_2)\|_1 = \|(x_1, x_2)\|_1 + \|(y_1, y_2)\|_1.$$

So, the result holds.  $\square$

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  be a valued field and consider  $\mathbb{K}^2$  endowed with  $\|\cdot\|_1$ . Given  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{K}^2$  and isometries  $\tau_1, \tau_2 : (\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|) \rightarrow (\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$ , the maps  $\varphi, \psi : (\mathbb{K}^2, \|\cdot\|_1) \rightarrow (\mathbb{K}^2, \|\cdot\|_1)$  defined as*

$$\varphi(a, b) = (\alpha, \beta) + (\tau_1(a), \tau_2(b)) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(a, b) = (\alpha, \beta) + (\tau_2(a), \tau_1(b))$$

are isometries and every isometry arises one of these ways.

PROOF. Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  and  $(\alpha, \beta)$  be as in the statement. We need to show that for every  $(a, b), (a', b') \in \mathbb{K}^2$  the maps  $\varphi, \psi$  fulfil

$$(5) \quad \|\varphi(a, b) - \varphi(a', b')\|_1 = \|(a, b) - (a', b')\|_1 = \|\psi(a, b) - \psi(a', b')\|_1.$$

On the one hand, the value of  $(\alpha, \beta)$  does not affect any of the values that appear in (5), so we may suppose that  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 0)$ . So, one has:

$$(6) \quad \|\varphi(a, b) - \varphi(a', b')\|_1 = \|(\tau_1(a), \tau_2(b)) - (\tau_1(a'), \tau_2(b'))\|_1 = \\ \|(\tau_1(a) - \tau_1(a'), \tau_2(b) - \tau_2(b'))\|_1 = \\ |\tau_1(a) - \tau_1(a')| + |\tau_2(b) - \tau_2(b')| \stackrel{*}{=} \\ |a - a'| + |b - b'| = \|(a, b) - (a', b')\|_1,$$

where the equality  $\stackrel{*}{=}$  holds because  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are isometries. With an analogous argument we see that  $\psi$  is also an isometry.

Suppose, on the other hand, that  $\phi : \mathbb{K}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^2$  is an isometry such that  $\phi(0, 0) = (0, 0)$ . This readily implies that  $\|\phi(a, b)\|_1 = \|(a, b)\|_1$  for every  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Q}_2^p$ .

Given  $(a, 0), (0, b')$ , as  $\phi$  preserves norms and distances, we have

$$\|\phi(a, 0) - \phi(0, b')\|_1 = \|\phi(a, 0)\|_1 + \|\phi(0, b')\|_1.$$

If we denote  $(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \phi(a, 0)$  and  $(\bar{a}', \bar{b}') = \phi(0, b')$ , Lemma 2.2 implies that either  $\bar{a} = \bar{b}' = 0$  or  $\bar{a}' = \bar{b} = 0$  hold. This means that  $\phi$  preserves the *horizontal* and *vertical* axes, in the sense that  $\phi(\{(a, b) : a = 0\}) \subseteq \{(a, b) : a = 0\}$  or  $\phi(\{(a, b) : a = 0\}) \subseteq \{(a, b) : b = 0\}$ .

As  $\phi^{-1}$  is also an isometry, we obtain that either  $\phi(\{(a, b) : a = 0\}) = \{(a, b) : a = 0\}$  or  $\phi(\{(a, b) : a = 0\}) = \{(a, b) : b = 0\}$ . It is obvious that the map  $(a, b) \mapsto (b, a)$  is an isometry, composing if necessary with this map we may suppose that  $\phi$  maps each axis onto itself. So, there are  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  such that

$$\phi(a, 0) = (\tau_1(a), 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(0, b) = (0, \tau_2(b)).$$

It is clear that both  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  must be isometries, so we only need to show that  $\phi(a, b) = (\tau_1(a), \tau_2(b))$  for every  $(a, b)$ . This is immediate from Lemma 2.2 because  $(0, 0)$  and  $(\tau_1(a), \tau_2(b))$  are the only points that share one coordinate with  $(\tau_1(a), 0)$  and the other one with  $(0, \tau_2(b))$ , so we have finished the case  $\phi(0, 0) = (0, 0)$ .

The general case is straightforward now, we only need to apply the previous case to the isometry given by the composition

$$(a, b) \mapsto \phi(a, b) \mapsto (\phi(a, b) - \phi(0, 0)).$$

□

We will heavily use this Lemma in the proof Theorem 2.5.

LEMMA 2.4. *Let  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  be a valued field and consider  $(\mathbb{K}^n, \|\cdot\|_1)$ ,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ ,  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{K}^n$ . Then,*

$$(7) \quad \|x - y\|_1 = \|x - z\|_1 + \|y - z\|_1$$

*if and only if  $z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\}$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .*

PROOF. We may suppose  $y = 0$ , so (7) is equivalent to

$$(8) \quad \|x\|_1 = \|x - z\|_1 + \|z\|_1$$

and we need to show that (8) holds if and only if  $z_i \in \{0, x_i\}$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

Suppose that there is some  $j$  for which  $z_j \notin \{0, x_j\}$ . Then, one has

$$|x_j| \leq \max\{|x_j - z_j|, |z_j|\} < |x_j - z_j| + |z_j|.$$

Taking into account that  $\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_1 = |x_1| + \dots + |x_n|$  we readily obtain that  $\|x\|_1 < \|x - z\|_1 + \|z\|_1$ .

On the other hand, if every  $z_i$  equals either 0 or  $x_i$  then it is clear that  $\|x\|_1 = \|x - z\|_1 + \|z\|_1$  because at each coordinate one has either  $|x_i| = |x_i - x_i| + |x_i|$  or  $|x_i| = |x_i - 0| + |0|$ . □

THEOREM 2.5. *Let  $(\mathbb{K}, |\cdot|)$  be a valued field and consider  $(\mathbb{K}^n, \|\cdot\|_1)$ . If  $\sigma \in S_n$  is a permutation and  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  are isometries, then  $\phi : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$ , defined as*

$$(9) \quad \phi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (\tau_1(a_{\sigma(1)}), \dots, \tau_n(a_{\sigma(n)}))$$

*is a centred isometry and every centred isometry arises this way.*

PROOF. It is clear that for every  $\sigma \in S_n$  the map  $\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(n)})$  is an isometry and repeating the computations (6) we obtain that  $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (\tau_1(a_1), \dots, \tau_n(a_n))$  is also an onto isometry provided that  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n$  are isometries too. As the map  $\phi$  given by (9) is the composition of two isometries, it must be an isometry too.

On the other hand, let  $\phi : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^n$  be an isometry. We will denote  $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  the usual basis of  $\mathbb{K}^n$ . Consider  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ ,  $x = (a, 0, \dots, 0) = ae_1$  and  $\tau(x)$ . Applying Lemma 2.4 to

$x$  and  $y = 0$  implies that the only  $z$  that fulfil  $\|x\|_1 = \|x - z\|_1 + \|z\|_1$  are  $z = 0$  and  $z = x$ . As  $\phi$  is an isometry, the only  $z'$  that fulfil  $\|\tau(x)\|_1 = \|\tau(x) - z'\|_1 + \|z'\|_1$  are  $z' = \tau(0) = 0$  and  $z' = \tau(x)$ . Now, Lemma 2.4 implies that  $n - 1$  coordinates of  $\tau(x)$  are 0. So, we have again that  $\phi$  preserves the union of all the axes. For  $b \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0, a\}$  and  $y = (b, 0, \dots, 0)$  we may apply again Lemma 2.4 to obtain that  $\tau(x)$  and  $\tau(y)$  share exactly  $n - 1$  coordinates, so they must agree in the  $n - 1$  null coordinates that each of them has. This means that  $\phi$  maps each axis into another axis: for every  $i$  there exists  $j$  such that

$$(10) \quad \{\phi(\lambda e_i) : \lambda \in \mathbb{K}\} \subset \{\lambda e_j : \lambda \in \mathbb{K}\}.$$

By symmetry, all of these inclusions are equalities, so there exists  $\sigma \in S_n$  such that

$$(11) \quad \{\phi(\lambda e_i) : \lambda \in \mathbb{K}\} = \{\lambda e_{\sigma(i)} : \lambda \in \mathbb{K}\} \text{ for every } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Composing if necessary with  $\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$  we may suppose that  $\sigma = \text{Id}$ , i.e., that every axis is invariant for  $\phi$ . This means that there exist isometries  $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_n : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$  such that  $\phi(ae_i) = \tau_i(a)e_i$  for every  $a \in \mathbb{K}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We need to show that (9) holds; as we are assuming that  $\sigma = \text{Id}$  we need to prove that

$$(12) \quad \phi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (\tau_1(a_1), \dots, \tau_n(a_n)) \text{ for every } a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{K}.$$

In order to prove this we will use an inductive reasoning, take  $x = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{K}^n$  and let  $k$  denote the number of nonzero coordinates of  $x$ . We have already seen that (12) holds when  $k = 1$ , so suppose  $1 < k \leq n$  and that (12) is true for every vector with less than  $k$  nonzero coordinates.

As in (8), applying Lemma 2.4 with  $y = 0$  we have

$$(13) \quad \|x\|_1 = \|x - z\|_1 + \|z\|_1$$

if and only if  $z_i \in \{0, x_i\}$  for every  $i$ . As  $n - k$  coordinates of  $x$  are 0, there exist exactly  $2^k$  vectors in  $\mathbb{K}^n$  that fulfil (13), it is clear that this implies that  $\tau(x)$  has  $k$  nonzero coordinates, too. Except for  $x$ , all the points that fulfil (13) have at most  $k - 1$  nonzero coordinates, so each of them fulfils (12). Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $a_i \neq 0$ . In particular, if we consider

$$z = a_i e_i \text{ and } z' = x - z = \sum_{j \neq i} a_j e_j,$$

then we have

$$\tau(z) = \tau_i(a_i)e_i, \quad \tau(z') = \sum_{j \neq i} \tau_j(a_j)e_j.$$

As  $\phi$  is a centred isometry and  $z, z'$  fulfil (13) one has

$$(14) \quad \|\tau(x)\|_1 = \|\tau(x) - \tau(z)\|_1 + \|\tau(z)\|_1; \quad \|\tau(x)\|_1 = \|\tau(x) - \tau(z')\|_1 + \|\tau(z')\|_1.$$

Applying again Lemma 2.4 we obtain that every nonzero coordinate of  $\tau(z)$  or  $\tau(z')$  agrees with the same coordinate of  $\tau(x)$ . Denoting  $\tau(x) = b_1 e_1 + \dots + b_n e_n$  we obtain  $b_j = \tau_j(a_j)$  whenever  $a_j \neq 0$ . As we have noted before, the amount of nonzero coordinates of  $\tau(x)$  must be  $k$ , so we are done.  $\square$

### 3. Concluding remarks

REMARK 3.1. There is a clear analogy between strict convexity of a normed real linear space and something that happens with  $\|\cdot\|_1$  in  $\mathbb{K}^2$ . If three points  $a, b, c$  in a real, strictly convex, normed space fulfil  $\|c - a\| = \|c - b\| + \|b - a\|$  then  $b$  belongs to the segment whose endpoints are  $a$  and  $c$ . Moreover, the distances  $\|c - b\|, \|b - a\|$  determine  $b$ .

If  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{K}^2$  fulfil  $\|c - a\|_1 = \|c - b\|_1 + \|b - a\|_1$  then  $b$  shares some coordinate with  $a$  and the other one with  $c$ . Moreover, if  $|a_1 - c_1| \neq |a_2 - c_2|$  then  $b$  is uniquely determined by  $\|c - b\|_1, \|b - a\|_1$ . Besides,  $b$  is the point where the map  $\mathbb{K}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, x \mapsto \|c - x\|_1 + \|x - a\|_1$  attains its minimum, this may have some interest in non-Archimedean optimization, the interested reader may see [15, 16].

Also, in [12] one can find a definition of non-Archimedean strictly convex space at the beginning of page 3406. Unfortunately, the conditions in that definition were too restrictive, as can be seen in [6]. It could be interesting to try another approach to strict convexity in non-Archimedean spaces based in this analogy.

REMARK 3.2. There is no way to adapt Proposition 2.3 to ultrametric normed spaces. Indeed, if  $(E, \|\cdot\|_E)$  is ultrametric and  $\|e_0\| < \|v_0\|$  for some  $e_0, v_0 \in E$ , then the map  $T : E \rightarrow E$  defined as  $T(v) = v$  if  $\|v\| \neq \|v_0\|$ ,  $T(v) = v + e_0$  if  $\|v\| = \|v_0\|$  is an isometry and  $T$  does not preserve axis or anything related. The fact that  $T$  is an isometry can be seen in the proof of Proposition 1 in [9]. A more detailed description of isometries between ultranormed spaces can be found in [5].

REMARK 3.3. There is no way to improve Proposition 2.3, at least in spaces endowed with absolute norms. It is clear that any norm that fulfils (3) is going to have at least the *axial isometries* described in Proposition 2.3. Anyway, this is not endemic to non-Archimedean spaces. It is true that every isometry between real Banach spaces is affine, but it is so because every isometry  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is affine, too. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that  $\mathbb{R}$ -linear isometries between complex Banach spaces do not need to be  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear. Moreover, there exist isometric  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear spaces that are nor even  $\mathbb{C}$ -isomorphic ([4]).

### Acknowledgements

The first author has been partially supported by DGICYT project PID2019-103961GB-C21 (Spain).

The first author wants to express his gratitude to José Navarro Garmendia and Juan B. Sancho de Salas for many fruitful discussions on this topic.

### References

- [1] T. Banach. Every 2-dimensional Banach space has the Mazur–Ulam property. *Preprint*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.09268>, 2021.
- [2] T. Banach and J. Cabello Sánchez. Every non-smooth 2-dimensional Banach space has the Mazur–Ulam property. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 625:1–19, 2021.
- [3] N. Bourbaki. *Espaces vectoriels topologiques sur un corps valué*, pages 1–29. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007.
- [4] J. Bourgain. Real isomorphic complex Banach spaces need not be complex isomorphic. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 96(2):221–226, 1986.

- [5] J. Cabello Sánchez and J. Navarro Garmendia. Isometries of ultrametric normed spaces. *Annals of Functional Analysis*, to appear, 2021.
- [6] J. Cabello Sánchez and J. Navarro Garmendia. A precision on the concept of strict convexity in non-Archimedean analysis. *Nonlinear Analysis*, 207:112304, 2021.
- [7] K. Fujiwara and F. Kato. *Foundations of rigid geometry*. European Mathematical Society, 2018.
- [8] O. Goldman and N. Iwahori. The space of  $p$ -adic norms. *Acta Math*, 109:137–177, 1963.
- [9] A. Kubzdela. Isometries, Mazur–Ulam theorem and Aleksandrov problem for non-Archimedean normed spaces. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 75(4):2060–2068, 2012.
- [10] H. Martini and K. J. Swanepoel. The geometry of Minkowski spaces - A survey. Part II. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 22(2):93–144, 2004.
- [11] H. Martini, K. J. Swanepoel, and G. Weiss. The geometry of Minkowski spaces - A survey. Part I. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 19(2):97–142, 2001.
- [12] M. S. Moslehian and G. Sadeghi. A Mazur–Ulam theorem in non-Archimedean normed spaces. *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 69(10):3405–3408, 2008.
- [13] W. Schikhoff. *Ultrametric Calculus, an introduction to  $p$ -adic analysis*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 1984.
- [14] P. Scholze. On the  $p$ -adic cohomology of the Lubin-Tate tower. In *Annales Scientifiques De L'Ecole Normale Supérieure*, volume 51, pages 811–863, 2018.
- [15] K. Shamseddine and V. Zeidant. One-dimensional optimization on non-Archimedean fields. *Journal of Nonlinear and Convex Analysis*, 2(3):351–361, 2001.
- [16] K. Shamseddine and V. Zeidant. Constrained second order optimization on non-Archimedean fields. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 14(1):81–101, 2003.
- [17] R. Tanaka. Tingley’s problem on symmetric absolute normalized norms on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series*, 30(8):1324–1340, 2014.
- [18] A. Van Rooij. *Non-Archimedean functional analysis*. Dekker, 1978.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS AND INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS. UNIVERSIDAD DE EXTREMADURA,  
AVDA. DE ELVAS S/N, 06006 BADAJOZ. SPAIN  
Email address: coco@unex.es, fjcf121@gmail.com