

# RIGIDITY OF CONVEX HYPERSURFACES IN MULTIDIMENSIONAL SPACES OF CONSTANT CURVATURE

ALEXANDER A. BORISENKO

**ABSTRACT.** In 1972, E. P. Senkin generalized the celebrated theorem of A. V. Pogorelov on unique determination of compact convex surfaces by their intrinsic metrics in the Euclidean 3-space  $E^3$  to higher dimensional Euclidean spaces  $E^{n+1}$  under a mild assumption on the smoothness of the hypersurface. In this paper, we remove this assumption and thus establish this rigidity result for arbitrary compact, convex hypersurfaces in  $E^{n+1}$ ,  $n \geq 3$ . We also prove the corresponding results in other model spaces of constant curvature.

**Keywords:** rigidity; convex hypersurface; space of constant curvature.

**MSC2020:** 52A10, 52A55, 51M10, 53C22.

In 1950, A. V. Pogorelov proved the following rigidity result for compact convex surfaces in Euclidean space  $E^3$ .

**Theorem A** ([Pog]). *Let  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  be a pair of compact, convex surfaces in  $E^3$  isometric with respect to their intrinsic metrics. Then there exists an isometry of the ambient Euclidean space  $E^3$  that maps the surface  $F_1$  onto the surface  $F_2$ .*

There are no regularity assumptions on the surfaces in the theorem above. Only the convexity of surfaces must be assumed. Under stronger assumptions on regularity of surfaces, Theorem A was proven by S. Cohn-Vossen in 1924 [CV] and G. Herglotz in 1943 [Her]. A. V. Pogorelov generalized Theorem A for general convex surfaces in the spherical space  $S^3$ . Using Pogorelov's, A. D. Alexandrov's, and E. P. Senkin's results, A. D. Milka proved the result analogous to Theorem A in the hyperbolic (Lobachevsky) space  $H^3$ . E. P. Senkin generalized Pogorelov's theorem for Euclidean spaces of arbitrary dimension [Sen] but with additional assumptions on regularity of hypersurfaces.

**Theorem 1** ([Sen]). *Let  $F_1, F_2$  be a pair of compact, convex,  $C^1$ -smooth hypersurfaces in a multidimensional Euclidean space  $E^{n+1}$ . If  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are isometric with respect to their intrinsic metrics, then there exists an isometry of the ambient space  $E^{n+1}$  that maps one hypersurface onto the other.*

In this paper, we will prove Theorem 1 without the assumption on regularity of hypersurfaces. More precisely, our goal is to establish the following result:

---

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank Kostiantyn Drach for the help in preparation of the manuscript and for several useful remarks.

**Theorem 1'.** *Let  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  be a pair of compact, convex hypersurfaces in Euclidean space  $E^{n+1}$ ,  $n \geq 3$ . If  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are isometric with respect to their intrinsic metrics, then there exists a motion of  $E^{n+1}$  that maps  $F_1$  onto  $F_2$ .*

This theorem is proven in a sequence of steps based on the following lemmas. We say that a hypersurface  $F \subset E^{n+1}$  is *visible from a point*  $Q \in E^{n+1} \setminus F$  if for every point  $P \in F$  the ray  $QP$  intersect  $F$  only at  $P$ . We will further say that a point  $P$  is visible from *inside* if the ray  $QP$  makes the acute angle with the outer normal to the supporting hyperplane to  $F$  at  $P$ .

We will also say that a pair of hypersurfaces is congruent if there exists a motion of  $E^{n+1}$  that maps one hypersurface to the other.

**Lemma 1** ([Sen]). *Let  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  be a pair of isometric convex hypersurfaces in  $E^{n+1}$ . Suppose that they are visible from the points  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ , respectively. Let  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  be the boundaries of  $F_1$ , respectively  $F_2$  (if the hypersurfaces are compact, then the boundaries are the points  $X_1 \in F_1$  and  $X_2 \in F_2$  that correspond each other under the isometry). Assume that there exist hyperplanes  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  passing through  $Q_1$ , respectively  $Q_2$ , such that for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , the hypersurface  $F_i$  lies in one half-space with respect to the hyperplane  $P_i$ . If the distances from the points  $Q_1, Q_2$  to the corresponding under the isometry points of the boundaries  $L_1$ , respectively  $L_2$ , are equal, then either the hypersurfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are congruent, or there exists a motion  $\phi$  of  $E^{n+1}$  such that:*

- (1)  $\phi(X_1) = X_2$  for some pair of points  $X_1 \in F_1$  and  $X_2 \in F_2$  that correspond each other under the isometry of the hypersurfaces; we keep the notation  $F_1$  for  $\phi(F_1)$ ;
- (2) there exists a point  $Q \in E^{n+1}$  and a pair of neighborhoods  $U_i$  of  $X_i$  in  $F_i$  such that these neighborhoods are visible from  $Q$  from inside; let  $r_i$  denote the distance function from  $Q$  to the points in  $U_i$ ;
- (3) for every corresponding under the isometry points  $X \in U_1$  and  $X \in U_2$ , we have

$$r_1(X) < r_2(X).$$

□

For a general (not necessarily smooth) surface  $F \subset E^3$ , we say that  $F$  has *non-positive curvature* if for every point on  $F$  there exists its neighborhood that is impossible to cut a cup.

**Lemma 2** ([Pog], Ch. IV, §2, p.213). *Let  $F$  be a 2-dimensional convex surface in  $E^3$  given in an explicit form*

$$z = z(x, y),$$

where  $x, y, z$  are some orthogonal Cartesian coordinates in  $E^3$ . Denote by  $\xi(x, y)$  the  $z$ -coordinate of the infinitesimal bending field of the surface  $F$ , and define the surface  $\Phi$  given by the equation

$$z = \xi(x, y).$$

If  $\Phi$  does not contain flat regions, then it has non-positive curvature everywhere. If  $\Phi$  contains flat regions, then the curvature of  $\Phi$  is non-positive everywhere except those flat regions. □

Let  $F$  be the hypersurface given by the radius vector

$$(1) \quad R = \frac{1}{2}(r_1 + r_2),$$

where  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are the radius vectors of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  as in Lemma 1. By that lemma, for every  $X$ ,  $r_1(X) = P_1 \in F_1$  and  $r_2(X) = P_2 \in F_2$  are the pair of the corresponding under the isometry points of  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ , and  $r_1(X_0) = r_2(X_0) = P_0$  for some point  $P_0$  that satisfies Lemma 1.

Under the additional assumption that the hypersurfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are  $C^1$ -smooth, the following lemma was proven:

**Lemma 3.** *The hypersurface  $F$  with radius vector (1) is a convex hypersurface in the neighborhood of the point  $P_0$ . For this hypersurface, the vector field  $\sigma := r_1 - r_2$  is an infinitesimal bending field on the hypersurface  $F$ . It is Lipschitz and satisfies the equation*

$$\langle dR, d\sigma \rangle = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in the neighborhood of } P_0.$$

Let us define

$$E^3 := \text{span}(e_1, e_2, n),$$

where  $e_1, e_2$  are tangent vectors to  $F$  at  $P_0$ , and  $n$  is the normal vector at this point. The intersection  $F \cap E^3 =: F^2$  is a compact convex surface in  $E^3$ . We will now work in the subspace  $E^3$ . In the neighborhood of the point  $P_0$  the surface  $F^2$  is given in the explicit form  $z = z(x, y)$  and  $z = \xi(x, y)$  is the  $z$ -coordinate of the infinitesimal bending field along the surface  $F^2$ . At  $P_0$ , the function  $z = \xi(x, y)$  assumes its minimum. The plane  $z = \varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , cuts from the surface  $z = \xi(x, y)$  a cap for small  $|\varepsilon|$ . It contradicts Pogorelov's Lemma 2. Therefore,  $r_1 = r_2$  and the hypersurfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  coincide.

Now we prove Lemma 3 without additional assumption of  $C^1$  regularity of the hypersurfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . We will require only that  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are compact, isometric, convex hypersurfaces.

## 1. CONVEX COMBINATION OF ISOMETRIC HYPERSURFACES

In this section, we discuss some facts about convex combinations of convex hypersurfaces in  $E^4$ .

At every point of a convex hypersurface in  $E^4$  there exists the tangent cone. Such a cone is a convex hypersurface as well. Let  $V^n$  be a strongly convex cone in the Euclidean space  $E^{n+1}$ , where a convex cone is called *strongly convex* if at the vertex  $O$  of the cone there exists a supporting hyperplane that intersects the cone only at  $O$ .

It is well-known that tangent cones  $V^3$  at points of a convex hypersurface  $F^3 \subset E^4$  have one of the following forms:

- (1)  $V^3$  is a strongly convex cone in  $E^4$ ;
- (2)  $V^3 = V^2 \times E^1$  is a metric product of a strongly convex cone  $V^2$  in  $E^3$  and a Euclidean line  $E^1$ ;
- (3)  $V^3 = V^1 \times E^2$  is a metric product of a strongly convex cone  $V^1$  in  $E^2$  and a Euclidean plane  $E^2$ ;

(4)  $V^3 = E^3$  is a Euclidean space  $E^3$ .

If  $P_1 \in F_1$ ,  $P_2 \in F_2$  are the corresponding points in the convex isometric hypersurfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ , then the tangent cones these points are isometric too.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  be a pair of convex isometric hypersurfaces in  $E^4$ .*

*I. Suppose that the tangent cone  $K(P_1)$  at a point  $P_1 \in F_1$  has the form (1). Then for the corresponding under the isometry point  $P_2 \in K_2$  the tangent cone  $K(P_2)$  also has the form (1) and the cones  $K(P_1)$ ,  $K(P_2)$  are congruent.*

*II. If the cone  $K(P_1)$  has the form (2), i.e.,  $K(P_1) = V_1^2 \times E_1^1$ , then  $K(P_2)$  has the same form  $K(P_2) = V_2^2 \times E_2^1$  and the cones  $V_1^2, V_2^2$  are congruent. The edges  $E_1^1, E_2^1$  correspond under the isometry of  $K(P_1)$  and  $K(P_2)$ .*

*Proof.* I. Suppose  $K(P_2)$  has one of the forms (2), (3), (4). In each of these cases we can choose a straight segment  $\gamma_2 \subset K(P_2)$  such that  $P_2$  lies in the interior of  $\gamma_2$ . Since  $K(P_1)$  and  $K(P_2)$  are isometric, for  $K(P_1)$  there exists a corresponding shortest line  $\gamma_1 \subset K(P_1)$  through  $P_1$ ; the curve  $\gamma_1$  is isometric to  $\gamma_2$ . The point  $P_1$  breaks  $\gamma_1$  into two straight segments  $\gamma_1^+$  and  $\gamma_1^-$  with  $P_1$  being their common boundary point.

Let  $E^3 = \text{span}(\gamma_1^+, \gamma_1^-, \ell)$ , where  $\ell$  is a ray inside the cone  $K(P_1)$  and does not belong to the plane  $\text{span}(\gamma_1^+, \gamma_1^-)$ . The intersection  $K(P_1) \cap E^3$  is a strongly convex cone in  $E^3$ ; for this cone,  $\gamma_1$  is the shortest line in this cone, this line passes through  $P_1$  and this point lies in the interior of  $\gamma_1$ . This is a contradiction with the fact that on a strongly convex cone in  $E^3$  a shortest line cannot go through the vertex of the cone.

Let us now show that  $K(P_1)$  and  $K(P_2)$  are congruent, i.e., there exists a motion of the Euclidean space  $E^4$  that maps one cone onto the other. Let  $S_i^2$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , be the unit spheres with the centers at the points  $P_1, P_2$ . Then  $\tilde{F}_i^2 = K(P_i) \cap S_i^2$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , are compact convex isometric surfaces in open hemispheres of  $S_1^3, S_2^3$ . By moving the spheres, we can assume that  $\tilde{F}_1^2$  and  $\tilde{F}_2^2$  belong to the same spherical space. For them, we can apply the following theorem due to Pogorelov

**Theorem B** ([Pog]). *Compact isometric convex surfaces in the spherical space  $S^3$  are congruent.*

This finishes the proof of Part I of Lemma 4.

II. The proof of Part II is similar to the proof of Part I. □

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  be a pair of convex isometric hypersurfaces in  $E^4$ . Suppose that at the point  $P_1 \in F_1$  the tangent cone has the form either (3) or (4) from above. Then the tangent cone  $K(P_2)$  at the corresponding under the isometry point  $P_2 \in F_2$  has the form (3) or (4). The following 3 possibilities can occur:*

- a) *both cones are dihedral angles  $K(P_1) = V_1^1 \times E_1^2$ ,  $K(P_2) = V_2^1 \times E_2^2$ ;*
- b) *one tangent cone is a hyperplane, and the other is a dihedral angle;*
- c) *both tangent cones are hyperplanes.*

Let  $G_1, G_2$  be small neighborhoods of the points  $P_1 \in F_1$  and  $P_2 \in F_2$ ,  $P_1 = P_2 = P_0$ , which satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 1. Consider the cones  $K(P_1)$  and  $K(P_2)$ . The following cases can occur:

- I)  $K(P_1) = V^3$ . Then the cones  $K(P_1)$  and  $K(P_2)$  coincide.
- II)  $K(P_1) = V_1^2 \times E_1^1$ . Then the cones  $K(P_1)$  and  $K(P_2)$  coincide too. By Lemma 1,  $V_1^2 \subseteq V_2^2$ . By isometry of  $V_1^2$  and  $V_2^2$ , we obtain that  $V_1^2 = V_2^2$  and the lines  $E_1^1$  and  $E_2^1$  coincide.
- III) a) If both tangent cones are dihedral angles, then from Lemma 1 it follows that the edges  $E_1^2, E_2^2$  are corresponding under the isometry and coincide, and one dihedral angle lies inside the other.
- b) If both tangent cones are hyperplanes, then they coincide.
- c) If one cone is a hyperplane and the other cone is a dihedral angle, then the argument is similar to case a).

In all cases a)-c) above, the linear combination of the cones at the point  $P_0$  is a convex dihedral angle.

Let us treat the cases separately.

**I.**  $K(P_1) = K(P_2) = V^3$ .

**II.** Let  $(X_1^n) \subset F_1$  and  $(X_2^n) \subset F_2$  be a pair of sequences of corresponding under the isometry cone points, such that  $X_1^n \rightarrow P_0$  and  $X_2^n \rightarrow P_0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Denote the limiting cones of the cones  $K_1(X_1^n)$  and  $K_2(X_2^n)$  as  $K_1^0$  and  $K_2^0$  respectively. By construction,  $K_1^0, K_2^0$  are isometric supporting cones at  $P_0$  to  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  respectively.

By Lemma 4, for each  $n$ ,

$$K_1(X_1^n) = A_n K_2(X_2^n) + a_n,$$

where  $a_n$  is a vector and  $A_n$  is an orthogonal matrix. As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $a_n \rightarrow 0$  and  $A_n \rightarrow A_0$ , where  $A_0$  is some orthogonal matrix. Since  $K_1^0 = K_2^0$ , we obtain  $K_1^0 = A_0 K_2^0$ , and thus  $A_0 = I$  is the identity matrix. For large  $n$ , the matrices  $I + A_n$  are non-degenerate and the convex combination of cones  $K_1(X_1^n)$  and  $K_2(X_2^n)$  is the cone  $K(X^n) = (I + A_n) \cdot K_2(X_2^n) + a_n$ . We obtain that  $K(X^n)$  is a non-degenerate affine image of  $K(X_2^n)$ , and hence is convex.

**II.** Let  $K_1(X_1^n) = V_1^2(n) + E_1^1(n)$ ,  $K_2(X_2^n) = V_2^2(n) + E_2^1(n)$ . If  $K_1^0 = V_1^2 \times E_1^1$  and  $K_2^0 = V_2^2 \times E_2^1$ , then the isometric directions  $\ell_1^0 \in V_1^2, \ell_2^0 \in V_2^2$  belong to the tangent cones  $K(P_1) = K(P_2)$ . It follows that  $K_1^0 = K_2^0, V_1^2 = V_2^2, E_1^1 = E_2^1$ . The curvature of  $V_1^2$  is greater than some  $\alpha_0 > 0$ . We obtained that the angles between any pair of isometric directions in the cones  $V_1^2(n), V_2^2(n)$  is less than  $\epsilon(n)$ , where  $\epsilon(n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the curvature at the vertices are at least  $\theta_0 > 0$ , and the ball  $\omega$  belongs to the both cones. We will now show that for sufficiently big  $n$  the convex combination of cones  $K_1(X_1^n)$  and  $K_2(X_2^n)$  is again a convex cone. It is enough to prove that the cone

$$K(X^n) = K_1(X_1^n) + K_2(X_2^n)$$

is locally convex. For this we need to show that through every 2-dimensional generator  $t_0$  of  $K(X^n)$  it is possible to draw a hyperplane such that all generators close to  $t_0$  lies in the halfspace that contains the ball  $\omega$ . Assume the contrary, i.e., for each  $n$  there exists a generator  $t_0^n$  that does not satisfy the locally convex condition. Let  $t_1^n \in K_1(X_1^n)$  be the corresponding generator of  $K_1(X_1^n)$ . The sequence of generators  $t_1^n$  converges to the

generator  $t_1^0$  of the convex cone  $K_1^0$ . Each generator  $t_1^n$  is a metric product of generators  $\ell_1^n \in V_1^2(n)$  and  $E_1^1(n)$ . Let  $A_1^n$  be the point on  $\ell_1^n$  at distance 1 from the vertex of the cone  $V_1^2(n)$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}_1^n$  be the tangent dihedral angle at the point  $A_1^n$  for the cone  $K_1(X_1^n)$ . We define the same objects  $t_2^n, \ell_2^n, A_2^n, \mathcal{D}_2^n$  for the cone  $K_2(X_2^n)$ . The 2-dimensional edges of  $\mathcal{D}_1^n$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2^n$  are corresponding under the isometry. The convex combination of  $\mathcal{D}_1^n$  and  $\mathcal{D}_2^n$  for sufficiently big  $n$  is a dihedral angle  $\mathcal{D}^n$ . By construction, the ball  $\omega$  is inside  $\mathcal{D}^n$ . There exists a supporting hyperplane to  $\mathcal{D}^n$ , which we call  $\Pi$ , that passes through the edge of  $\mathcal{D}^n$ . Now, we follow Pogorelov's proof [Pog, Lemma 1, pp.137-136].

Let  $\bar{n}$  be the normal to  $\Pi$ . When moved to a point  $A_i^n, i \in \{1, 2\}$ , the vector  $\bar{n}$  points inside the cone  $K_i(X_i^n)$ . Connect the point  $A_1^n$  with the shortest line  $\gamma_1^n$  to a point  $B_1^n \in V_1^2(n)$  near  $A_1^n$ . Let  $r_1(s)$  be the radius-vector of  $\gamma_1^n$ , where  $s$  is the arc-length parameter on  $\gamma_1^n$  chosen so that  $s = 0$  corresponds to the point  $A_1^n$ . And let  $r_2(s)$  be the radius vector of the corresponding under the isometry shortest line  $\gamma_2^n \subset V_2^2(n)$ . If  $s = 0$ ,

$$(2) \quad \frac{d}{ds} \langle r_1 + r_2, \bar{n} \rangle \geq 0.$$

By Liberman's theorem [Pog, p. 58], the inequality 2 is true for all  $s$  along the shortest line  $\gamma_1^n$ . Integrating this inequality, we obtain that all points of the cone  $K(X^n)$  close to the image the point  $A_1^n$  lie from one side with respect to the supporting hyperplane with the inner normal  $\bar{n}$ . This implies that the cone  $K(X^n)$  is locally convex.

We take a small neighborhood of the point  $P_0 = P_1 = P_2$  in the hypersurfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Let  $F$  be the convex combination of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . The radius-vector of  $F$  is  $r = (r_1 + r_2)/2$ , where  $r_i$  is the radius vector of  $F_i$ . From above it follows that there exists a neighbourhood of the point  $P_0 \in F$  such that  $F$  is a convex hypersurface. The vector field  $\sigma = r_1 - r_2$  is an infinitesimal bending vector field of  $F$ , i.e.,  $\langle dr, d\sigma \rangle = 0$ . After this we follow Senkin's original proof. This proves the uniqueness theorem for compact convex hypersurfaces in the Euclidean space  $E^4$ .

**I3.** Let

- a)  $K_1(X_1^n) = V_1^1(n) \times E_1^2(n), K_2(X_2^n) = V_2^1(n) \times E_1^2(n)$ .
- b)  $K_1(X_1^n) = V_1^1(n) \times E_1^2(n), K_2(X_2^n) = E^3(n)$ .
- c)  $K_1(X_1^n) = E_1^3(n), K_2(X_2^n) = E_2^3(n)$ .

At these, the dihedral angles or support hyperplanes are equal. The convex combination of the cones  $K_1(X_1^n), K_2(X_2^n)$  are, correspondingly,

- a) a hyperplane;
- b) a dihedral angle;
- c) a convex cone.

We proved that there exist neighborhoods of the point  $P_0$  in  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  such that the convex combination of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  within those neighborhoods is a convex hypersurface  $F$ .

**II.**  $K_1(P_1) = K_2(P_2) = V_2 \times E^1$ .

**III.** a) If  $K_1(P_1) = E^3, K_2(P_2) = E^3$ , then  $K_1^0$  and  $K_2^0$  coincide the tangent hyperplane.

b) If  $K_1(P_1) = V_1^1 \times E_1^2$ ,  $K_2(P_2) = V_2^1 \times E_2^2$ , then the edges  $E_1^2$ ,  $E_2^2$  coincide and correspond under the isometry of the cones, and one dihedral angle lies inside another. In this case, the cones  $K_1^0$  and  $K_2^0$  are contained inside the cones  $K_1(P_1)$  and  $K_2(P_2)$ . Similar to case **I**, we can prove that there exist neighborhoods of the points  $P_1 \in F_1$  and  $P_2 \in F_2$  such that the convex combination of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  is the convex surface  $F$ .

## 2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1'

In this section we will prove the uniqueness of compact convex isometric hypersurfaces in  $E^4$  without assumption on regularity (Theorem 1').

We will need a concept of *Pogorelov map* [Pog]. Let  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  be compact isometric convex hypersurfaces in the open hemisphere of the spherical space  $S^n \subset E^{n+1}$ . Let  $x^0, x^1, \dots, x^n$  be the Cartesian orthogonal coordinates in  $E^{n+1}$  and  $S^n$  is a sphere centered at the origin. We assume that  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  have the same orientation and belong to the hemisphere  $x^0 > 0$ . Let  $r_1, r_2$  be the radius vectors of  $F_1, F_2$  with the same parameters at the isometric points. Finally, let  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$  be the hypersurfaces in  $E^n$  defined by the radius-vectors

$$R_1 := \frac{r_1 - e_0 \langle r_1, e_0 \rangle}{\langle e_0, r_1 + r_2 \rangle}, \quad R_2 := \frac{r_2 - e_0 \langle r_2, e_0 \rangle}{\langle e_0, r_1 + r_2 \rangle},$$

where  $e_0$  is the unit coordinate vector corresponding to  $x^0$ . For  $n = 4$ , A. V. Pogorelov proved that  $\Phi_1, \Phi_2$  are compact convex isometric hypersurfaces in  $E^4$ . This result is true for any  $n$  and the proof is similar to that of Pogorelov's for  $n = 4$ . For  $n = 4$ , the uniqueness theorem in  $S^4$  follows from the uniqueness theorem in  $E^4$ .

Now we prove Theorem 1' in the hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{H}^n$ ,  $n = 4$ . In 1980, A. D. Milka proved Theorem 1' in  $\mathbb{H}^3$  [Mil]. He used E. P. Senkin's idea of the proof of Theorem 1. It is possible to move the surfaces  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  in such a way that they satisfy Lemma 1. This means that from some point  $O$  one can see  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  from the same side and do Carmo and Warner proved uniqueness of compact regular convex hypersurfaces in  $S^n$  [dCW]. Gorsij generalized this theorem to compact convex isometric  $C^1$ -smooth hypersurfaces in  $S^n$  [Gor]. It was also proven that the images of convex isometric hypersurfaces in  $S^n$  under the Pogorelov map are convex hypersurfaces in the Euclidean space  $E^n$  is the hypersurfaces in the sphere can be seen from the convexity side [Pog]. Milka proved an analogous result for convex isometric hypersurfaces in the hyperbolic space under the condition that it is possible to see convex isometric hypersurfaces from different convexity sides.

*Proof of Theorem 1'*. The proof is by induction on the dimension  $n$ . Suppose we have proven the result for  $E^n, S^n, \mathbb{H}^n$ . Let us show how to prove it for  $E^{n+1}, S^{n+1}, \mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ .

For the convex hypersurfaces  $F_s \subset E^{n+1}$ ,  $s \in \{1, 2\}$ , the tangent convex cones are of the form

$$K = V^{n-i} \times E^i, \quad i \in \{0, \dots, n\},$$

where  $V^{n-i}$  is a strongly convex cone in  $E^{n-i+1}$ .

1) Let  $K_1 = V_1^{n-i} \times E_1^i$  ( $i \leq n-3$ ) be a convex cone in  $E^{n+1}$ ,  $K_2$  be an isometric convex cone in  $E^{n+1}$ . Then  $K_2 = V_2^{n-i} \times E_2^i$  is congruent to  $K_1$ . The proof follows the

same way as we proved Lemma 4 and we use the uniqueness of compact isometric convex hypersurfaces in  $E^{n-1}$ ,  $S^{n-1}$ .

2) Let  $K_1 = V_1^2 \times E_1^{n-2}$ , and  $K_2$  be an isometric convex cone in  $E^{n+1}$ . Then  $K_2 = V_2^2 \times E_2^{n-2}$ . The cones  $K_1, K_2 \subset E^3$  are convex isometric cones.

3) Let  $K_1 = V_1^1 \times E_1^{n-1}$ , then  $K_2 = V_2^1 \times E_2^{n-1}$  or  $K_2 = E^n$ .

We prove Theorem 1' similarly to the proof for  $E^4, S^4, \mathbb{H}^4$  by induction.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [Pog] A.V. Pogorelov, *Extrinsic Geometry of Convex Surfaces*. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 35, AMS, 1973.
- [CV] S. Cohn-Vossen, *Zwei Sätze über die Starheit der Eiflächen*. Göttinger Nachrichten (1927) 125-134.
- [Her] G. Herglotz, *Über die Starheit der Eiflächen*. Abh. math. Semin. Hansische Univ. **15** (1943) 127-129.
- [Mil] A.D. Milka, *Uniqueness of general compact convex at Lobachevsky space* (in Russian). Ukr. Geom. Sb. **23** (1980) 99-106.
- [Sen] E.P. Senkin, *Uniqueness of compact hypersurfaces* (in Russian). Ukr. Geom. Sb. **12** (1972) 131-152.
- [dCW] M.P. Do Carmo, F.W. Warner, *Rigidity and convexity of hypersurfaces in sphere*. J. Diff. Geom. **4** (1970), no. 2, 133-144.
- [Gor] T.A. Gorsij, *Uniqueness of smooth convex hypersurfaces in spherical space* (in Russian). Ukr. Geom. Sb. **15** (1974) 36-42.

B. VERKIN INSTITUTE FOR LOW TEMPERATURE PHYSICS AND ENGINEERING OF THE NATIONAL, 47  
NAUKY AVE., KHARKIV, 61103, UKRAINE

BROWN UNIVERSITY – ICERM, 121 SOUTH MAIN STREET, BOX E 11TH FLOOR, PROVIDENCE, RI  
02903, USA

*Email address:* aborisenk@gmail.com