

# Separation of plane sets by equidistant simple closed curves

Aleksei Volkov\*, Mikhail Patrakeev†

April 1, 2024

## Abstract

We prove that if two subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of the plane are connected,  $A$  is bounded, and the Euclidean distance  $\rho(A, B)$  between  $A$  and  $B$  is greater than zero, then for every positive  $\varepsilon < \rho(A, B)$ , the sets  $A$  and  $B$  can be separated by a simple closed curve (also known as a Jordan curve) whose points all lie at distance  $\varepsilon$  from the set  $A$ . We also prove that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a connected bounded subset  $A$  of the plane contains a simple closed curve bounding the domain containing the open  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood of  $A$ . It is shown that in both statements the connectivity condition can be significantly weakened. We also show that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a nonempty bounded subset of the plane contains a simple closed curve. This result complements Morton Brown's statement that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a nonempty compact subset of the plane is contained in the union of a finite number of simple closed curves.

**Keywords**— simple closed curve; Jordan curve; equidistant curve;  $\varepsilon$ -boundary; level set; distant sphere

## 1 Introduction

The separation of sets by simple closed curves, also called Jordan curves, has been used by people for several millennia: for example, the city wall around the ancient city of Uruk was built in the 4th millennium BC. Mathematical methods allowing to solve such problems appeared a bit later. In particular, in the 20th century it was proved that two disjoint continuums in the plane can be separated by a simple closed curve [6, Chap. 10, § 61.II, Theorem 5'].

---

\*Krasovskii Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics of UB RAS, 620108, Yekaterinburg, Russia; *e-mail*: volkov@imm.uran.ru; orcid.org/0009-0001-7337-2695

†Krasovskii Institute of Mathematics and Mechanics of UB RAS, 620108, Yekaterinburg, Russia; *e-mail*: p17533@gmail.com; orcid.org/0000-0001-7654-5208

Separation of sets by an equidistant (with respect to one of them) simple closed curve is used in engineering, but the algorithms for constructing such a curve are either based on heuristics or assume some smoothness of the boundary of the set with respect to which the equidistance is constructed [5; 7]. Similarly, the equidistant line of the boundary of territorial waters is drawn heuristically [3].

We prove that if two sets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  are connected,  $A$  is bounded, and the Euclidean distance  $\rho(A, B)$  between them is greater than zero, then for every positive  $\varepsilon < \rho(A, B)$ , the sets  $A$  and  $B$  can be separated by a simple closed curve whose points all lie at distance  $\varepsilon$  from the set  $A$ ; see Corollary 5.2 and Remark 2.2(1). In the proof, we specify such a curve explicitly: its example is the boundary of that component of the subspace  $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho(p, A) > \varepsilon\}$  which contains the set  $B$ .

We also prove that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary  $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho(p, A) = \varepsilon\}$  of a connected bounded set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  contains a simple closed curve bounding the region containing the  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood of the set  $A$ ; see Corollary 5.1.

The latter result admits the following mechanical interpretation: on such a set  $A$  one can put a wheel of radius  $\varepsilon$  lying in the same plane and “roll it along the boundary of  $A$ ” in such a way that at every moment the wheel touches the set  $A$ , does not intersect  $A$ , and the center of the wheel eventually describes a simple closed curve bounding the region containing  $A$ . However, we do not know whether it is always possible to “roll” that wheel without slipping.

Sometimes there is a need to maximise the Euclidean distance from a simple closed curve to the sets it separates. We prove that if two sets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  are connected,  $A$  is bounded, and  $\rho(A, B) > 0$ , then  $A$  and  $B$  can be separated by a simple closed curve lying at distance  $\rho(A, B)/2$  from  $A \cup B$ ; see Corollary 5.3 and Remark 2.2(1). Thus, among the simple closed curves separating  $A$  and  $B$ , there is a curve maximally distant from  $A \cup B$ . The curve we construct in the proof is equidistant to the set  $A$ : all its points lie at distance  $\rho(A, B)/2$  from  $A$ .

Unexpectedly, there exist two sets  $A$  and  $B$  that can be separated by a simple closed curve, but the supremum of the distances from such curves to  $A \cup B$  is not reached; see Section 6.5 for an example.

In all the above statements, the connectivity condition can be relaxed to the  $\delta$ -chainedness condition for some  $\delta > 0$  (a set  $A$  is  $\delta$ -*chained* iff any two points of  $A$  can be connected by a polygonal chain whose vertices belong to  $A$  and whose segment lengths less than  $\delta$ ). Specific values of the parameter  $\delta$  are given in Theorem 4.1 and its corollaries.

Finally, we prove that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a nonempty bounded subset of the plane contains a simple closed curve, see Corollary 5.5. This result complements Brown’s statement [1] that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a nonempty compact subset of the plane is contained in the union of a finite number of simple closed curves.

Almost none of the conditions in Theorem 4.1 and Corollaries 5.1–5.5 can be relaxed. Furthermore, most of these results cannot be transferred to the three-dimensional case. We discuss these issues in Sections 6 and 7, respectively. But

we do not know whether it is always possible to separate two disjoint continua  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$  by a two-dimensional manifold lying at distance  $\rho(A, B)/2$  from  $A \cup B$ ; see Question 7.3.

## 2 Terminology and notation

We use terminology from the book [4]. A *simple closed curve* (also called *Jordan curve*) is a set homeomorphic to a circle (i.e., a one-dimensional sphere). In metric spaces, simple closed curves are precisely the images of a circle under continuous injective mappings. According to the Jordan curve theorem, if  $C$  is a simple closed curve in the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , then its complement  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus C$  has exactly two components, the bounded and the unbounded, which we denote by  $C^-$  and  $C^+$ , respectively. We say that a simple closed curve  $C$  *separates* sets  $A$  and  $B$  iff the sets  $A$  and  $B$  are contained in different components of the subspace  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus C$ . We denote the range of a mapping  $f$  by  $\text{ran}(f)$ . A *path* is a continuous mapping whose domain equals the segment  $[0, 1]$ . A path  $f$  *connects* points  $u$  and  $v$  in a space  $X$  iff  $f(0) = u$ ,  $f(1) = v$ , and  $\text{ran}(f) \subseteq X$ . A space  $X$  is *pathwise connected* if any two of its points are connected by a path in  $X$ .

We define the distance between two sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as the infimum of pairwise Euclidean distances between points of these sets. The distance between a point  $p$  and a set  $A$  is the distance between sets  $\{p\}$  and  $A$ . We denote all three distances by the symbol  $\rho$ . For  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , the *open  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood* of the set  $A$ ,  $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho(p, A) < \varepsilon\}$ , is denoted by  $O_\varepsilon(A)$ ; similarly the *closed  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood*  $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho(p, A) \leq \varepsilon\}$  and the  *$\varepsilon$ -boundary*  $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho(p, A) = \varepsilon\}$  of the set  $A$  are denoted by  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  and  $S_\varepsilon(A)$ , respectively. If  $p$  is a point in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , then  $O_\varepsilon(p) := O_\varepsilon(\{p\})$ ,  $B_\varepsilon(p) := B_\varepsilon(\{p\})$ , and  $S_\varepsilon(p) := S_\varepsilon(\{p\})$  are the open and the closed disks and the circle of center  $p$  and radius  $\varepsilon$ , respectively. We denote the closure and boundary of a set  $A$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  by  $\bar{A}$  and  $\partial A$ , respectively; we denote the boundary of a set  $B$  in a space  $X$  by  $\partial_X B$ .

**Remark 2.1.** Suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\emptyset \neq B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , and  $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Then:

1.  $\partial B_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq \partial O_\varepsilon(A) = S_\varepsilon(A)$ .
2.  $\rho(p, A) = \rho(p, \bar{A})$  and  $\rho(A, B) = \rho(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ .
3.  $O_\varepsilon(A) = O_\varepsilon(\bar{A})$ ,  $B_\varepsilon(A) = B_\varepsilon(\bar{A})$ , and  $S_\varepsilon(A) = S_\varepsilon(\bar{A})$ . ■

For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we say that two points  $p, q \in A$  are  *$\varepsilon$ -chained in  $A$*  iff there exists a finite sequence of points  $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_n$  in  $A$  such that  $r_0 = p$ ,  $r_n = q$ , and  $\rho(r_i, r_{i+1}) < \varepsilon$  for all  $i < n$ . A set  $A$  is called  *$\varepsilon$ -chained* iff any two of its points are  $\varepsilon$ -chained in it [8, page 60, Definition 4.15]. For  $p \in A$ , the  *$\varepsilon$ -chained component of a point  $p$  in a set  $A$*  is the set

$$\{q \in A : p \text{ and } q \text{ are } \varepsilon\text{-chained in } A\}.$$

We say that a set  $B$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -chained component of a set  $A$  iff  $B$  equals the  $\varepsilon$ -chained component of point  $p$  in  $A$  for some  $p \in A$ .

**Remark 2.2.** Suppose that  $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then:

1. [8, Exercice 4.23(a)] If  $A$  is connected, then it is  $\varepsilon$ -chained.
2. If  $A$  is  $2\varepsilon$ -chained, then its open  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood  $O_\varepsilon(A)$  is pathwise connected.
3. If  $A$  is  $\varepsilon$ -chained and  $\delta > \varepsilon$ , then  $A$  is  $\delta$ -chained. ■

Note that in the second clause of Remark 2.2 the reverse implication is also true. Thus, a nonempty subset of the plane is  $2\varepsilon$ -chained if and only if its open  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood is pathwise connected.

### 3 Auxiliary lemmas

To prove the main theorem, we need the following auxiliary statements.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose that  $E$  is a connected metric space,  $U \subseteq E$  is open,  $p \in U$ , and  $U \setminus \{p\}$  is connected. Then  $E \setminus \{p\}$  is also connected.*

*Proof.* Suppose on the contrary that  $E \setminus \{p\}$  equals the union of two nonempty disjoint sets  $A$  and  $B$  closed in  $E \setminus \{p\}$ . Then there exist two sets  $C$  and  $D$  closed in  $E$  such that

$$A = C \cap (E \setminus \{p\}) = C \setminus \{p\} \quad \text{and} \quad B = D \cap (E \setminus \{p\}) = D \setminus \{p\}.$$

Clearly,  $C = A$  or  $C = A \cup \{p\}$ , and, similarly,  $D = B$  or  $D = B \cup \{p\}$ .

*Case 1.*  $C = A$  or  $D = B$ . Let, without loss of generality,  $C = A$ . Note that  $D \cup \{p\}$  is closed in  $E$ , so  $E$  equals the union of two nonempty disjoint closed sets  $C$  and  $D \cup \{p\}$ . This contradicts the connectedness of  $E$ .

*Case 2.*  $C = A \cup \{p\}$  and  $D = B \cup \{p\}$ . Note that in this case the sets  $A$  and  $B$  are open in  $E$  as the complements of closed sets  $D$  and  $C$ , respectively.

Consider the sets

$$A' := A \cap (U \setminus \{p\}) \quad \text{and} \quad B' := B \cap (U \setminus \{p\}).$$

These sets are disjoint and open in  $U \setminus \{p\}$  (because the sets  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint and open in  $E$ ) and  $U \setminus \{p\}$  equals their union. And since, by assumption,  $U \setminus \{p\}$  is connected, one of these sets is empty. Let, without loss of generality,  $A'$  be empty. Then  $U \subseteq B \cup \{p\}$ , and therefore  $B \cup \{p\} = B \cup U$ , since  $p \in U$ . Thus, the set  $B \cup \{p\}$  is open in  $E$  as the union of open sets. Hence, the space  $E$  equals the union of two nonempty disjoint open sets  $A$  and  $B \cup \{p\}$ , which contradicts its connectedness. ■

**Lemma 3.2.** *Every open connected set is a component of the complement of its boundary.*

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be an open connected set in a topological space  $X$  and  $C$  be the boundary of  $U$ . We need to show that  $U$  is a  $\subseteq$ -maximal connected set in the subspace  $X \setminus C$ . Consider a nonempty set  $V \subseteq X \setminus (U \cup C)$ . It suffices to show that  $U \cup V$  is not connected. Since  $U$  is open in  $X$ , then  $U$  is also open in  $U \cup V$ . The set  $V$  is also open in  $U \cup V$  because it equals the trace on  $U \cup V$  of the open set  $X \setminus (U \cup C) = X \setminus \bar{U}$ . Thus,  $U \cup V$  equals the union of two nonempty disjoint open sets. ■

## 4 The main result

Recall that a *neighbourhood of a point* is a set whose interior contains the given point. A space is *locally connected* iff every neighbourhood of every point contains a connected neighbourhood of the same point. A *continuum* is a connected compact set, and a *semi-continuum* is a space whose any two points are contained in some continuum. A point is a *cut point* of a space iff the complement of this point is not a semi-continuum.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a nonempty set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is bounded and  $2\varepsilon$ -chained, and  $D$  is a component of subspace  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A)$ . Then in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  the boundary  $\partial D$  of the set  $D$  is a simple closed curve, which is contained in the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of the set  $A$ , and also*

- if  $D$  is bounded, then  $D = (\partial D)^-$ ;
- if  $D$  is unbounded, then  $D = (\partial D)^+$ .

*Proof.* Let us show that  $\partial D \subseteq \mathbf{S}_\varepsilon(A)$ . Let  $q \in \partial D$ . If  $\rho(q, A) < \varepsilon$ , then  $\mathbf{O}_\delta(q) \subseteq \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , which contradicts the fact that  $q \in \partial D$ . If  $\rho(q, A) > \varepsilon$ , then  $\mathbf{O}_\delta(q) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A)$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . Thus, the open neighbourhood  $\mathbf{O}_\delta(q)$  is a connected subset of the subspace  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A)$  and intersects the component  $D$  of this subspace, so it is contained in  $D$  (a connected set is either disjoint with or contained in a component). Again we get a contradiction with the fact that  $q \in \partial D$ .

Let us add a new point  $\mathbf{p}$  (the pole) to the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$  so that the new space  $\mathbb{S} := \mathbb{R}^2 \cup \{\mathbf{p}\}$  is homeomorphic to the two-dimensional sphere. Being connected, the set  $D$  is contained in some component  $E$  of the subspace  $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A)$ .

Let us show that

$$\mathbf{p} \notin \partial_{\mathbb{S}} E \text{ and } E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\} \text{ is connected.}$$

There exists a connected open neighbourhood  $U$  of the point  $\mathbf{p}$  in  $\mathbb{S}$  such that  $U \cap \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A) = \emptyset$  and  $U \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\}$  is connected. If the connected subset  $U$  of subspace  $\mathbb{S} \setminus \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon(A)$  intersects the component  $E$  of that subspace, then  $U \subseteq E$ . In this case

$\mathbf{p} \notin \partial_{\mathbb{S}}E$  and, by virtue of Lemma 3.1,  $E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\}$  is connected. If  $U$  does not intersect  $E$ , then  $\mathbf{p} \notin \partial_{\mathbb{S}}E$  and  $E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\} = E$ , so  $E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\}$  is connected.

We have

$$D \subseteq E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A),$$

that is, the component  $D$  of the subspace  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$  is contained in the connected subset  $E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\}$  of this subspace. Therefore,  $D = E \setminus \{\mathbf{p}\}$ , and hence  $D \subseteq E \subseteq D \cup \{\mathbf{p}\}$ . Hence,

$$\text{either } E = D \text{ or } E = D \cup \{\mathbf{p}\}.$$

Let us prove that  $\partial D = \partial_{\mathbb{S}}E$ . It suffices to show that an arbitrary point  $q \in \mathbb{S}$  either belongs or does not belong to both sets at the same time. If  $q = \mathbf{p}$ , then  $q$  belongs neither to  $\partial D$  nor to  $\partial_{\mathbb{S}}E$ . If  $q \neq \mathbf{p}$ , then the point  $q$  has a neighbourhood  $U$  that does not contain  $\mathbf{p}$ . Since the sets  $E$  and  $D$  can differ by only one point  $\mathbf{p}$ , every neighbourhood  $V \subseteq U$  of point  $q$  either intersects both sets  $E$  and  $D$ , or intersects neither  $E$  nor  $D$ . Therefore, point  $q$  belongs to  $\partial D$  if and only if it belongs to  $\partial_{\mathbb{S}}E$ .

On the two-dimensional sphere  $\mathbb{S}$ , according to Theorem 4 in [6, Chap.10, §61.II, p.512], the following statement is true: if a locally connected continuum has no cut points, then the boundary of each component of its complement is a simple closed curve. Thus, if we show that  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$  is a locally connected continuum without cut points, then it follows that  $\partial_{\mathbb{S}}E = \partial D$  is a simple closed curve. It is not difficult to show that the set  $D$ , being a component of an open subset of the plane, is open. Then, according to Lemma 3.2,  $D$  is a component in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \partial D$ . Hence, if  $D$  is bounded, then  $D = (\partial D)^-$ , and if  $D$  is unbounded, then  $D = (\partial D)^+$ . Thus, it remains to prove that  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$  is a locally connected continuum without cut points.

Let us show that  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$  is a locally connected compact. For every nonempty compact  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  of diameter smaller than  $\varepsilon$ , its closed  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(K)$  is homeomorphic [1, Lemma 1, (ii)-(iii)] to a closed disk in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , so it is a locally connected continuum. Since the set  $A$  is bounded, it can be represented as the union  $A = \bigcup_{i \leq n} A_i$  of a finite number of nonempty sets of diameter less than  $\varepsilon$ . For all  $i \leq n$ , the closure  $\bar{A}_i$  is a nonempty compact of diameter less than  $\varepsilon$ . Then  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(\bar{A}_i)$  is a locally connected continuum. Hence,  $\bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(\bar{A}_i)$  is a locally connected compact [6, Chap.6, §49.II, p.230, Theorem 1]. Using Remark 2.1(3) and the definition of a closed  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood we have

$$\bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(\bar{A}_i) = \bigcup_{i \leq n} \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A_i) = \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A).$$

Let us show that  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$  is connected and has no cut points. To do this, it suffices to show that for any point  $r$  in  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$ , the set  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A) \setminus \{r\}$  is pathwise connected. In this case, the set  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A)$  is also pathwise connected. Let  $t$  and  $s$  be two different points in  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A) \setminus \{r\}$ ; we will find a path connecting these points in  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon}(A) \setminus \{r\}$ .

Let  $t'$  and  $s'$  be points in  $\bar{A}$  nearest, respectively, to  $t$  and  $s$ . Since  $r$  is different from  $t$  and  $s$ , there are points  $u$  and  $v$  in the segments  $[t, t']$  and  $[s, s']$ , respectively,

such that  $\rho(u, A) < \varepsilon$  and  $\rho(v, A) < \varepsilon$ . According to Remark 2.2(2), the open  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood  $O_\varepsilon(A)$  is pathwise connected, so there exists a path  $f$  connecting the points  $u$  and  $v$  in  $O_\varepsilon(A)$ . It is easy to show that then there exists a path  $f'$  connecting points  $t$  and  $s$  in  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  such that  $\text{ran}(f') \setminus \{t, s\}$  is contained in  $O_\varepsilon(A)$ .

If  $r \notin \text{ran}(f')$ , then  $f'$  is the path connecting  $t$  and  $s$  in  $B_\varepsilon(A) \setminus \{r\}$ , so we are done. If  $r \in \text{ran}(f')$ , then, since  $r$  is distinct from  $t$  and  $s$ , we have  $r \in \text{ran}(f') \setminus \{t, s\} \subseteq O_\varepsilon(A)$ . Then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$B_\delta(r) \subseteq O_\varepsilon(A) \setminus \{t, s\}.$$

Let  $\tilde{t}$  and  $\tilde{s}$  be the «first» and «last» points in the compact set  $B_\delta(r) \cap \text{ran}(f')$  «on the path  $f'$  from  $t$  to  $s$ ». Then if we replace the segment of path  $f'$  between points  $\tilde{t}$  and  $\tilde{s}$  with one of the arcs of the circle  $S_\delta(r)$  connecting  $\tilde{t}$  and  $\tilde{s}$ , then we get a new path connecting  $t$  and  $s$ , but now in  $B_\varepsilon(A) \setminus \{r\}$ . ■

## 5 Corollaries of the theorem

**Corollary 5.1.** *Suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$  and a nonempty set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is bounded and  $2\varepsilon$ -chained. Then the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of the set  $A$  contains a simple closed curve  $C$  such that*

$$O_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq C^- \quad \text{and} \quad B_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq C^- \cup C.$$

*Moreover, if the closed  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  is simply connected, then its boundary  $E$  is a simple closed curve and  $B_\varepsilon(A) = E^- \cup E$ .*

Note that the formula  $O_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq C^-$  does not turn into the equality even if the set  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  is simply connected. For example, in the case  $A = S_\varepsilon(p)$ ,  $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .

*Proof.* The number  $\varepsilon$  and the set  $A$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.1. Let  $D$  be an unbounded component of the subspace  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\varepsilon(A)$ . By Theorem 4.1,  $C := \partial D$  is a simple closed curve,  $C \subseteq S_\varepsilon(A)$ , and  $D = C^+$ .

Let us show that  $O_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq C^-$  and  $B_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq C^- \cup C$ . It is true that  $C^+ = D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\varepsilon(A)$ , so  $B_\varepsilon(A) \cap C^+ = \emptyset$ , hence

$$O_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq B_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq C^- \cup C \subseteq C^- \cup S_\varepsilon(A).$$

The only thing left to recall is that  $O_\varepsilon(A) \cap S_\varepsilon(A) = \emptyset$ .

Let  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  be simply connected. We show that  $D = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\varepsilon(A)$ . If not, then there exists a component  $F$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_\varepsilon(A)$  different from  $D$ ; in particular,  $F \cap D = \emptyset$ . Then

$$F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus C^+ = C^- \cup C.$$

Hence, the component  $F$  is bounded. According to Theorem 4.1, the boundary  $\partial F \subseteq S_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq B_\varepsilon(A)$  is a simple closed curve and  $(\partial F)^- \cap B_\varepsilon(A) = F \cap B_\varepsilon(A) = \emptyset$ . Thus,  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  contains a simple closed curve  $\partial F$  such that  $(\partial F)^-$  is disjoint with  $B_\varepsilon(A)$  — a contradiction with simple connectedness of  $B_\varepsilon(A)$ .

Thus,  $D$  and  $\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A)$  are disjoint and their union equals  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Consequently,  $\partial D = \partial(\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A))$ , i.e.,  $C = E$ , and hence  $E$  is a simple closed curve. It remains to be note that

$$\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A) = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D = \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus C^+ = C^- \cup C = E^- \cup E.$$

■

**Corollary 5.2.** *Suppose that the sets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  are nonempty,  $\rho(A, B) > \varepsilon > 0$ ,  $A$  is bounded and  $2\varepsilon$ -chained, and  $B$  is  $2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon)$ -chained. Then the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of  $A$  contains a simple closed curve separating  $A$  and  $B$ .*

Note that for some  $B$  (for example, a straight line) no  $\delta$ -boundary of  $B$  contains a simple closed curve.

*Proof.* Put  $\delta := \rho(A, B) - \varepsilon > 0$ . Note that for every  $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$\rho(p, A) + \rho(p, B) \geq \rho(A, B) = \varepsilon + \delta,$$

therefore  $\mathbb{O}_\delta(B) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A)$ . The set  $B$  is  $2\delta$ -chained, hence, according to Remark 2.2(2),  $\mathbb{O}_\delta(B)$  is pathwise connected. Consider the component  $D$  of subspace  $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A)$  that contains  $\mathbb{O}_\delta(B)$ . The number  $\varepsilon$  and the sets  $A$  and  $D$  satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.1, so  $C := \partial D$  is a simple closed curve,  $C \subseteq \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon(A)$ , and  $D \in \{C^+, C^-\}$ . By construction,

$$A \subseteq \mathbb{O}_\varepsilon(A) = \mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A) \setminus \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq \mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(A) \setminus C \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D) \setminus C = (\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus C) \setminus D = (C^+ \cup C^-) \setminus D.$$

Thus, either  $A \subseteq C^-$  or  $A \subseteq C^+$ , so  $C$  separates  $A$  and  $D$ . Then  $C$  separates  $A$  and  $B$  because  $B \subseteq D$ . ■

The following two statements follow from Corollary 5.2.

**Corollary 5.3.** *Suppose that the sets  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  are nonempty,  $\rho(A, B) > 0$ ,  $A$  is bounded, and both  $A$  and  $B$  are  $\rho(A, B)$ -chained. Then there exists a simple closed curve  $C$  that separates  $A$  and  $B$  and such that  $\rho(C, A \cup B) = \rho(C, A) = \rho(C, B) = \rho(A, B)/2$ .*

*In particular, among the simple closed curves separating  $A$  and  $B$ , there is a curve maximally distant from  $A \cup B$ .*

Note that the simple closed curve  $C$  constructed in the proof of Corollary 5.3 is contained in the  $(\rho(A, B)/2)$ -boundary of the set  $A$ .

*Proof.* The sets  $A$  and  $B$  and the number  $\varepsilon := \rho(A, B)/2$  satisfy the conditions of Corollary 5.2. Hence  $\mathbb{S}_\varepsilon(A)$  contains a simple closed curve  $C$  separating  $A$  and  $B$ . In particular,  $\rho(C, A) = \varepsilon$ .

Let us show that  $\rho(C, B) \geq \varepsilon$ . If this is not true, then there are points  $p \in C$ ,  $q \in B$  and a number  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\rho(p, q) < \varepsilon - \delta$ . Since  $p \in C \subseteq \mathbb{S}_\varepsilon(A)$ , there exists a point  $r \in A$  such that  $\rho(r, p) < \varepsilon + \delta/2$ . But then

$$2\varepsilon = \rho(A, B) \leq \rho(r, q) \leq \rho(r, p) + \rho(p, q) < 2\varepsilon - \delta/2,$$



a contradiction.

Now we show that  $\rho(C, B) \leq \varepsilon$ . Since  $\rho(C, A) > 0$  and  $\rho(C, B) > 0$ , the simple closed curve  $C$  separates  $\bar{A}$  and  $\bar{B}$ . The set  $\bar{A}$  is compact, so there are points  $s \in \bar{A}$  and  $t \in \bar{B}$  such that  $\rho(s, t) = \rho(A, B) = 2\varepsilon$ . Thus the segment  $[s, t]$  intersects both components of the complement of  $C$ , and so it intersects  $C$  as well. Let  $u \in C \cap [s, t]$ . Since  $u \in C \subseteq S_\varepsilon(A)$ , then  $\rho(u, s) \geq \varepsilon$ . Then  $\rho(u, t) \leq \rho(s, t) - \varepsilon = \varepsilon$ . Therefore,  $\rho(C, B) = \rho(C, \bar{B}) \leq \rho(u, t) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Thus,  $\rho(C, A \cup B) = \rho(C, A) = \rho(C, B) = \rho(A, B)/2$ . It remains to show that  $\rho(C, A \cup B) = \max\{\rho(C', A \cup B) : C' \text{ is a simple closed curve separating } A \text{ and } B\}$ . Suppose that a simple closed curve  $C'$  separates  $A$  and  $B$ . Let  $u' \in C' \cap [s, t]$ . Then

$$\rho(u', \{s, t\}) \leq \rho(s, t)/2 = \rho(A, B)/2 = \rho(C, A \cup B).$$

Thus,

$$\rho(C, A \cup B) \geq \rho(u', \{s, t\}) \geq \rho(C', \overline{A \cup B}) = \rho(C', A \cup B).$$

■

**Corollary 5.4.** *Suppose that  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $M \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  is a nonempty bounded set. Then each pair of different  $2\varepsilon$ -chained components of  $M$  are separated by some simple closed curve contained in the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two different  $2\varepsilon$ -chained components of  $M$ . Note that  $\rho(A, B) \geq 2\varepsilon$ . Then  $2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon) \geq 2\varepsilon$ , and therefore, by Remark 2.2(3),  $B$  is  $2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon)$ -chained. Thus, the number  $\varepsilon$  and the sets  $A$  and  $B$  satisfy the conditions of Corollary 5.2, so  $S_\varepsilon(A)$  contains a simple closed curve separating  $A$  and  $B$ . It remains to note that  $S_\varepsilon(A) \subseteq S_\varepsilon(M)$ . ■

From Corollaries 5.1 and 5.4 the following curious result follows, which complements Morton Brown's claim [1] that the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a compact subset of the plane is contained in the union of a finite number of simple closed curves:

**Corollary 5.5.** *The  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a nonempty bounded subset of the plane contains a simple closed curve for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ .* ■

## 6 Necessity of conditions in the theorem and its corollaries

What if  $\varepsilon = 0$ ? Note that in this case the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of a set coincides with its closure. Therefore, questions about what simple closed curves the 0-boundary of a set contains are far from the topic of this article. Also note that the example of Lakes of Wada [2; 9] shows that even if  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint simply connected domains and  $\rho(A, B) = 0$ , there may not exist a simple closed curve separating them.

The following examples show the necessity of the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 and its corollaries.

## 6.1 Boundedness of the set $A$

The boundedness condition in Theorem 4.1 and Corollaries 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, and 5.5 is essential. Indeed, if the set  $A$  is a straight line, then its  $\varepsilon$ -boundary does not contain a simple closed curve. In Corollary 5.3, the boundedness condition is also essential, since two unbounded subsets of the plane cannot be separated by a simple closed curve.

## 6.2 $2\varepsilon$ -chainedness of the set $A$

The  $2\varepsilon$ -chainedness condition cannot be weakened to the  $(2\varepsilon + \delta)$ -chainedness condition in neither Theorem 4.1 nor in Corollaries 5.1 and 5.2, for no  $\delta > 0$ . Indeed, if the set  $A$  consists of two points at distance  $2\varepsilon$ , then its  $\varepsilon$ -boundary does not contain a simple closed curve  $C$  such that  $A \subseteq C^-$  or  $A \subseteq C^+$ .

## 6.3 Simply connectedness of the closed $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood of the set $A$

The simply connectedness condition in Corollary 5.1 is essential. Indeed, if the set  $A$  is a circle of radius greater than  $\varepsilon$ , then its closed  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood is not simply connected. And the boundary of that  $\varepsilon$ -neighbourhood is not a simple closed curve.

## 6.4 $2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon)$ -chainedness of the set $B$

The  $2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon)$ -chainedness condition of the set  $B$  in Corollary 5.2 cannot be relaxed to the  $(2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon) + \delta)$ -chainedness for no  $\delta > 0$ . Indeed, consider a circle of radius  $2\varepsilon$ . Choose points  $p$  and  $q$  on it such that  $\rho(p, q) = 2\varepsilon$ . Let  $A$  be the closed arc of the circle between  $p$  and  $q$  whose length is greater than half the length of the circle. Let  $B$  consists of two different points of the perpendicular bisector of the line segment  $[p, q]$ , which are at distance  $\min\{\delta/2, \varepsilon\}$  from the segment  $[p, q]$ . The set  $B$  is  $(2(\rho(A, B) - \varepsilon) + \delta)$ -chained, but  $S_\varepsilon(A)$  does not contain a simple closed curve separating  $A$  and  $B$ .

## 6.5 $\rho(A, B)$ -chainedness of the sets $A$ and $B$

The  $\rho(A, B)$ -chainedness condition of  $A$  in Corollary 5.3 is essential. Indeed, let  $B$  be the closed longer arc of a circle with ends at points  $p$  and  $q$  such that  $\rho(p, q)$  equals the radius of the circle. Let  $A$  be the set consisting of two points, the first of which is the center of the circle and the second of which is symmetric to the first with respect to the segment  $[p, q]$ . There exists no simple closed curve  $C$  separating the sets  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $\rho(C, A \cup B) = \rho(A, B)/2$ . Also, among the simple closed curves separating  $A$  and  $B$ , there is no curve maximally distant from  $A \cup B$ .

If we swap the sets  $A$  and  $B$  in this example, we get an example showing that the  $\rho(A, B)$ -chainedness condition of the set  $B$  in Corollary 5.3 is also essential.

## 7 Similar questions in $\mathbb{R}^3$

A subset of the plane is homeomorphic to a circle if and only if it is a compact connected one-dimensional manifold. Thus, in three-dimensional Euclidean space there are two different analogs of the concept of a simple closed curve, the “spherical” and the “topological”:

- *a set homeomorphic to a two-dimensional sphere and*
- *a compact connected two-dimensional manifold.*

The following example shows that for both variants the three-dimensional analogues of Theorem 4.1 and Corollaries 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, and 5.5 do not hold.

**Example 7.1.** Consider two linked circles, each with a small open arc removed:

$$A := \{(x, y, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 = 1 \text{ and } x \geq -1 + \delta\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$B := \{(x, 0, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (x - 1)^2 + z^2 = 1 \text{ and } x \leq 1 - \delta\},$$

where  $0 < \delta \ll 1$ . Let  $\varepsilon := \rho(p, q)/2$ , where  $p$  and  $q$  are the ends of the closed arc  $A$ .

It can be shown that neither the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of the set  $A$  nor the  $\varepsilon$ -boundary of the set  $B$  (the  $\varepsilon$ -boundaries of  $A$  and  $B$  look like the surface of a “sausage” bent so that its ends touch each other) do not contain any compact connected two-dimensional manifold (in particular, they do not contain any set homeomorphic to a two-dimensional sphere).

The following example shows that the “spherical” analog of Corollary 5.3 also fails.

**Example 7.2.** Consider two linked circles

$$A' := \{(x, y, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 = 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad B' := \{(x, 0, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (x - 1)^2 + z^2 = 1\}.$$

The sets  $A'$  and  $B'$  cannot be separated by a set  $C$  homeomorphic to a 2-dimensional sphere and such that  $\rho(C, A' \cup B') = \rho(A', B')/2$ .

This example does not refute the “topological” analog of Corollary 5.3: the sets  $A'$  and  $B'$  can be separated by a compact connected two-dimensional manifold  $C'$  such that  $\rho(C', A' \cup B') = \rho(C', A') = \rho(C', B') = \rho(C', B') = \rho(A', B')/2$ . So the question of the validity of the “topological” analog of Corollary 5.3 remains open:

**Question 7.3.** Let  $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$  be two disjoint (simply connected) continua. Is there a (compact, connected) two-dimensional manifold  $C$  such that  $A$  and  $B$  lie in different components of  $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus C$  and  $\rho(C, A \cup B) = \rho(A, B)/2$  ?

## References

1. Brown M. Sets of constant distance from a planar set // Michigan Mathematical Journal. — 1972. — Vol. 19, no. 4. — P. 321–323. — DOI: 10.1307/mmj/1029000941.
2. Charatonik J. J., Krupski P., Pyrih P. Examples in Continuum Theory. — 2001. — <https://matematika.cuni.cz/dl/pyrih/examples/index.html>.
3. Charney J. I. Progress in International Maritime Boundary Delimitation Law // American Journal of International Law. — 1994. — Vol. 88, no. 2. — P. 227–256. — DOI: 10.2307/2204098.
4. Engelking R. General topology. — Rev. and completed ed. — Berlin : Heldermann, 1989. — 529 p. — (Sigma series in pure mathematics ; 6). — ISBN 3-88538-006-4. — Literaturverz. S. [469] - 507.
5. Filimonov O. Y., Egunov V. A., Nesterenko E. N. Constructing Equidistant Curve for Planar Composite Curve in CAD Systems // Communications in Computer and Information Science. — Springer International Publishing, 2021. — P. 296–309. — DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-87034-8\_22.
6. Kuratowski K. Topology : Volume II. — Burlington : Elsevier Science, 2014. — 623 p. — ISBN 9780124292024. — Description based upon print version of record.
7. MathPages.com. Equidistant Curves. — <https://www.mathpages.com/home/kmath724/kmat>
8. Nadler S. B. Continuum Theory: An Introduction. — New York : CRC Press, 1992. — 320 p. — ISBN 0-8247-8659-9.
9. Yoneyama K. Theory of Continuous Set of Points // The Tôhoku Mathematical Journal. — 1917. — Vol. 12. — P. 43–158.