

On a Complete Riemannian Metric on the Space of Embedded Curves

Elias Döhrer¹, Philipp Reiter¹, and Henrik Schumacher^{1,2}

¹Chemnitz University of Technology, Chemnitz, Germany

²University of Georgia, Athens GA, USA

January 29, 2025

Abstract

We propose a new strong Riemannian metric on the manifold of (parametrized) embedded curves of regularity H^s , $s \in (3/2, 2)$. We highlight its close relationship to the (generalized) tangent-point energies and employ it to show that this metric is *complete* in the following senses: (i) bounded sets are relatively compact with respect to the weak H^s topology; (ii) every Cauchy sequence with respect to the induced geodesic distance converges; (iii) solutions of the geodesic initial-value problem exist for all times; and (iv) there are length-minimizing geodesics between every pair of curves in the same path component (i.e., in the same knot class). As a by-product, we show C^∞ -smoothness of the tangent-point energies in the Hilbert case.

MSC-2020 classification: 58B20; 58D10; 58E10

1 Introduction

Maintaining the topology of objects under the influence of certain forces or deformations is a crucial aspect in modeling that occurs in all fields of engineering science and in particular in computer graphics. For instance, in elasticity theory it is essential to avoid interpenetration of matter [3, 36]. This can be realized via regularization by nonlocal self-repulsive terms, see for example [37]. Similar approaches have been proposed in [38] and [28]; these operate on already discretized domains and surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 and their barrier functions are based on logarithmized distances between mesh elements.

These approaches are aimed at obtaining static equilibrium configurations or at simulating the dynamics of elastic bodies. In the present work we are more interested in finding continuous families of deformations that are in some sense “optimal”. One motivation for this is key frame animation, where one seeks a smooth interpolation between several given poses. For aesthetic reasons and for the sake of plausibility it is desirable to avoid “singular” phenomena such as pinching, breaking, and self-intersection. Moreover, this type of motion should appear “natural”




Figure 1: A shortest path between a figure-eight knot (outmost left) and its mirror image (outmost right) with respect to the metric G for $s = 7/4$. This illustrates that this knot is *amphichiral*, i.e., it is isotopic to its mirror image. The color coding indicates the parameterization; the markings are equidistant in the coordinate domain.

in the sense that it avoids any detour while connecting the two configurations in an appealing and plausible way.

In order to illustrate this idea, we consider a curve belonging to the figure-eight knot class (see Fig. 1). It is well-known that it is ambient isotopic to its mirror image, i.e., both curves can be continuously deformed into each other without self-intersections or pulling-tight of knotted loops. However, it is not quite obvious a priori how this could be done, let alone in an “cost efficient” way. It is not even clear what “cost” should actually mean in this context.

The purpose of this paper is to provide such a concept of “cost” and “natural motions” by proposing a suitable Riemannian metric G on the (infinite dimensional) manifold \mathcal{M} of embeddings into the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m . Throughout this paper, the term *embedding* will denote an immersion that is also a homeomorphism onto its image. Requiring embeddedness is our operationalization of impermeability of the parameterized geometric objects.

For the sake of simplicity we limit ourselves to one-dimensional submanifolds without boundary, i.e., closed curves embedded in \mathbb{R}^m . These can be represented by parametrizations $\gamma: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, where $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. The metric G assigns a “cost” to any path in the space \mathcal{M} ; the so-called *path length*. Among other properties, we will show that there is a path of minimal path length between any two given configurations within the same isotopy class. Finite element discretization and numerical optimization of the variational problem yield a motion as shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 3.

In order to realize shortest distances, we study paths Γ mapping an interval $[0, T)$ to the space \mathcal{M} of closed embedded curves. Generally speaking, there are plenty of failure modes for extending Γ to $[0, T]$: As $t \nearrow T$ the curves $\Gamma(t)$ could (i) lose regularity and fail to be tame (e.g., develop kinks); (ii) blow up locally, i.e., $|\partial_x \Gamma(t)(x)| \rightarrow \infty$; (iii) collapse locally, eventually failing to be immersed, i.e., $|\partial_x \Gamma(t)(x)| \rightarrow 0$; (iv) travel wildly through the ambient space \mathbb{R}^m , e.g., the center of mass of $\Gamma(t)$ might diverge; (v) develop pull-tights (a small knotted arc shrinking to a point, see Fig. 2); or (vi) develop self-intersections. In particular, in \mathbb{R}^3 the last two failure modes may cause the isotopy type of $\Gamma(t)$ to change as t varies.




Figure 2: Pull-tight of the trefoil knot. The limiting curve is an unknot. As we will show, this cannot happen for a path of finite length with respect to the metric G .




Figure 3: A shortest path between a $(-3, 2)$ torus knot (outmost left) and a $(2, -3)$ torus knot (outmost right) with respect to the metric G for $s = 7/4$. The color coding indicates the parameterization; the markings are equidistant in the coordinate domain.

According to an impressive series of papers authored by Bauer, Bruveris, Harms, Heslin, Kolev, Maor, Michor, Mumford, and Preston in different collaborations (see [8, 12, 13, 21, 40] and references therein) all of these failor modes except the last one (formation of self-intersections) can be addressed by choosing a Riemannian metric that builds on geometrified versions of inner products on the Sobolev space H^s , $s > 3/2$. They investigate the space $\text{Imm}(\mathbb{S}^1; \mathbb{R}^m)$ of immersions which actually includes all embeddings by the above definition. It also contains the group of diffeomorphisms of the circle $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{S}^1)$, which in some sense serves as a model case for $\text{Imm}(\mathbb{S}^1; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Especially, L^2 - and H^1 -metrics on the aforementioned spaces have been studied intensively, see [7, 14, 15, 23, 26, 27, 34].

The H^1 -metrics are also referred to as “elastic metrics”; they are particularly appealing for applications because their geodesics can be written in closed form via their *square-root velocity representation*, see [10, 41, 47].

Higher-order Sobolev metrics and their geodesic properties have also been studied for immersed manifolds, see [12, 11]. In [32] a metric G_{bend} of flavor H^2 on the space of immersed surfaces is deduced from membrane and bending energies of thin elastic shells. The associated path length is the integral over the elastic strain rates. So this path energy is akin to the amount of work one has to invest to plastically deform the surface as prescribed by the path. As a result, geodesics with respect to this metric look particularly plausible and efficient.

However, dealing with paths of immersed submanifolds is not sufficient for modeling impermeability of physical objects. Instead, one has to guarantee that each submanifold along such a path stays embedded. To our knowledge, there is only one construction for this so far: In [45] the elastic shell metric G_{bend} from [32] is augmented by a rank-one modification $G_{\text{rep}} = G_{\text{bend}} + DE \otimes DE$, where E is the so-called *tangent-point energy* of surfaces. The tangent-point energy is repulsive in the sense that self-intersections cannot happen as long as the energy is bounded; see Section 1.3 below for details. The metric G_{rep} makes E globally Lipschitz-continuous, so a path of finite length with respect to G_{rep} cannot exhibit failure mode (vi) above.

The metric G that we will investigate here also involves the tangent-point energy E , albeit in a more subtle way. While G_{bend} has fairly little to do with E , the metric G is specifically tailored to be a good preconditioner for E by resembling the essential features of the Hessian of E . In particular, G metricizes the energy space of E . In fact, the idea for G is inspired by experiences made with numerical optimization of self-avoiding energies, see [35, 44, 52, 53]. We would like to stress that the feature of self-avoidance automatically leads us to working with fractional Sobolev spaces.

Before we go into further detail on the tangent-point energy E and the Riemannian metric G , some general words on infinite-dimensional manifolds are in order.

1.1 Complete Riemannian metrics in infinite dimensions

In finite dimensions, the *Hopf–Rinow theorem* states that the following three properties of a finite-dimensional smooth Riemannian manifold M are equivalent:

- (i) *Heine–Borel property*: Bounded subsets of M are relatively compact.
- (ii) *Metric completeness*: The metric space M equipped with the geodesic distance is complete.
- (iii) *Geodesic completeness*: For any point $p \in M$ and any direction $v \in T_p M$ there is a long-time solution Γ to the geodesic flow with initial conditions $\Gamma(0) = p$ and $\dot{\Gamma}(0) = v$.

Moreover, the theorem states that any of these three conditions implies that the following statement is true:

- (iv) *Minimal geodesics*: Every pair of points in the same path component of M is connected by at least one length-minimizing geodesic.

The situation of infinite-dimensional manifolds differs quite a lot from this classical setting. For instance, Riesz’s lemma applied to an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space demonstrates that a ball of positive radius cannot be relatively compact anymore. So the Heine–Borel property cannot hold true without modifications. The failure of the Hopf–Rinow theorem in infinite dimensions has also been illustrated by Grossman’s ellipsoid; see McAlpin [39], Grossman [30], and Schmeding [46, Example 4.43]. Further counterexamples have been provided, e.g., by Atkin [1, 2]. In certain instances, H^1 metrics on immersions may fail to be metrically complete, in fact, their metric completion turns out to be in $W^{1,1}$ instead, see [10].

Consequently, the best we can hope for in infinite dimensions—and what we actually achieve in this paper—is showing all the four statements of the Hopf–Rinow theorem separately: a relaxed version of the Heine–Borel property (which we call the *Banach–Alaoglu property*), metric completeness, geodesic completeness, and existence of minimal geodesics.

1.2 Regularity

The results on metrics on the space of immersions that have been cited above reveal the crucial role of regularity. In fact, counter-intuitive phenomena may occur if the metric employed is too weak, see [40] for L^2 -metrics. Sobolev metrics of higher order have been found suitable to establish (metric and geodesic) completeness [20, 21]. Recently also fractional Sobolev H^s -metrics have been studied [8, 12, 13]. These are defined in terms of Fourier series and conjugation of Fourier multipliers with reparametrization operators. Effectively, this corresponds to fractional powers $(-\Delta_\gamma)^s$ of the geometric Laplace–Beltrami operator $-\Delta_\gamma$, $\gamma \in \text{Imm}(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{R}^m)$. A full picture of the current knowledge about $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ and $\text{Imm}(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathbb{R}^m)$ is provided in Bauer et al. [13, Table 1]. Here the threshold $s = 3/2$ plays a special role; it can be




Figure 4: Numerical simulations of the initial value problem for geodesics. *Top row:* A few snapshots of an H^1 -geodesic starting at a $(3, 2)$ -torus knot. The current velocity fields along the curves are indicated by arrows. After finite time, a collision arises and the knot type changes to the unknot's. *Bottom row:* Snapshots of the G -geodesic for $s = 7/4$ with the same initial state and initial velocities. Note that the velocities on the strands in the center are more and more reduced as the strands approach each other. Consequently, the movement in this region stops and a collision is prevented.

traced back to a heuristic argument for diffeomorphism groups by Ebin and Marsden [25]. In this light, it is no surprise that we will also require regularity H^s with $s > 3/2$.

We circumvent using fractional powers of $-\Delta_\gamma$ by employing integro-differential or Gagliardo-like inner products for several reasons: Firstly, our metric is inspired by the tangent-point energies whose energy spaces are much closer related to Gagliardo norms “with variable coefficients” than to Fourier multipliers; details can be found below. Secondly, we prefer a situation that does not involve reparametrization operators (while still being reparametrization invariant). This results in a conceptionally less involved and more flexible setting at the expense of being analytically more intricate. Thirdly, avoiding fractional powers of $-\Delta_\gamma$ is crucial for numerical applications because forming fractional powers of a positive-definite matrix is very expensive: Our inner products of Gagliardo type can be seen as compact perturbations of the operator $(-\Delta_\gamma)^s$. They are non-local and thus their discretized Gram matrices are dense, even though the finite-element discretization of the Laplacian $-\Delta_\gamma$ is sparse. Fortunately, the *action* of these matrices can be approximated efficiently with so-called *tree codes* like the Barnes–Hut method or the Fast Multipole Method; and the attendant linear equations can be solved quickly by iterative methods and sophisticated preconditioning strategies; see [52, 53]. So our results here are not only of purely theoretical relevance; they can also be implemented and simulated, see Fig. 1, Fig. 3, Fig. 4, and Fig. 5.

1.3 Tangent-point energies

Before we present our metric G , we should first familiarize ourselves with the notion of the *generalized tangent-point energies*, as this is paramount for our construction of G . From the perspective of applications, the main feature of the tangent-point energies is that they can be used to model impermeability, see [4, 5, 6, 45, 52, 53].




Figure 5: A nontrivial geodesic loop in the space of embedded Borromean rings, illustrating that the fundamental group of this embedding space is nontrivial. We thank Jason Cantarella for bringing this fact to our attention. For more details on the homotopy type of this space see [31], in particular, Corollary 5.4 therein (the Borromean link is hyperbolic). The Borromean rings form a multiple-component link. So, strictly speaking, this is not within the realm of the present paper. However, with some ample modifications, our theory can be extended to cover this more general case as well.

The classical tangent-point energy was defined by Gonzalez and Maddocks [29] in an attempt to construct functionals on the space of knots that blow up when a knot approaches the boundary of its path component. The special case $q = 2$ already appears in an earlier paper by Buck and Orloff [22]. Let

$$\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{S}^1$$

denote a unit length periodic interval or, equivalently, the circle of arc length one. The tangent-point energy with parameter $q \in [1, \infty)$ of an absolutely continuous embedding $\gamma: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is given by the q -th power of the (natural) L^q -norm of the so-called inverse *tangent-point radius* R_{TP} , more precisely,

$$\text{TP}^q(\gamma) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{R_{\text{TP}}(x, y)^q} |\gamma'(y)| \, d\lambda(y) |\gamma'(x)| \, d\lambda(x),$$

where λ denotes the Lebesgue measure. Here $R_{\text{TP}}(x, y)$ is defined as the radius of the smallest sphere that passes through $\gamma(x)$ and $\gamma(y)$ and that is tangent to $\gamma'(x)$ at $\gamma(x)$. In particular, the energy does not depend on the parametrization of the curve. It is often convenient to express the inverse tangent-point radius in terms of the normal projector $P_\gamma(x) := \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^m} - \frac{\gamma'(x) \gamma'(x)^\top}{\langle \gamma'(x), \gamma'(x) \rangle}$:

$$\frac{1}{R_{\text{TP}}(x, y)} = 2 \frac{|P_\gamma(x) (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^2}.$$

Abbreviating also the line element by $d\omega_\gamma(x) := |\gamma'(x)| \, d\lambda(x)$, the tangent-point energy takes the form

$$\text{TP}^q(\gamma) = 2^q \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|P_\gamma(x) (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|^q}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^{2q}} d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x).$$

Indeed, one can show for $q > 2$ that every closed rectifiable curve with finite length and finite tangent-point energy needs to be embedded, see [49, Theorem 1.1]. Moreover, its reparametrization by arc length is continuously differentiable, see [49, Theorem 1.3]. Generalizations of TP^q

for n -dimensional submanifolds, $n > 1$, can also be defined; then this self-avoiding property holds for $q > 2n$; see [50].

However, the requirement $q > 2$ is somewhat unfortunate as will become clear soon. In fact, it disallows us to work in Hilbert spaces and thus to work with strong Riemannian metrics. With this very problem in mind, Blatt and the second author [18] introduced the *generalized tangent-point energy* with two decoupled parameters $q \in [1, \infty)$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$:

$$\text{TP}^{q,p}(\gamma) := 2^q \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|P_\gamma(x)(\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|^q}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^p} d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x).$$

For $q > 1$ and $q + 2 < p < 2q + 1$, this energy still features the self-avoidance property: The *distortion* (i.e., the worst-case ratio between intrinsic and extrinsic length; for a precise definition see (23) below) of every embedded absolutely continuous curve γ can be bounded in terms of $\text{TP}^{q,p}(\gamma)$. For $q + 2 = p$ the energy $\text{TP}^{q,p}$ is scale-invariant, which involves some further subtleties. In particular, questions of existence and regularity of minimizers require more sophisticated techniques (see [19]) than we are willing to invest here.

The energies of $\text{TP}^{q,p}$ have also regularizing properties: When reparametrized by constant speed, finite-energy curves belong to the Sobolev–Slobodeckij space $W^{s,q}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$, where $s = (p - 1)/q$ (see [17] for the classical case $p = 2q$ and [18] for the generalized case). Note that for s, q, p as above there is a continuous Morrey embedding $W^{s,q}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \hookrightarrow C^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$, where $\alpha = s - 1/q = (p - 2)/q > 0$. In particular, every $\gamma \in W^{s,q}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is also of class $C^{1,\alpha}$.

By means of the additional parameter we may work in Hilbert spaces while maintaining the self-avoidance property. As observed by Blatt and the second author [18], this also turns the Euler–Lagrange equations for problems involving $\text{TP}^{q,p}$ for $q = 2$ into quasi-elliptic equations. This allows for elliptic bootstrapping to show that critical points of $\text{TP}^{q,p}$ (subject to suitable constraints) are smooth. Subsequently, Steenebrügge and Vorderobermeier [48] improved the latter result by proving that critical points are even real analytic.

Moreover, it has been shown in [18] that the tangent-point energies are continuously differentiable functionals; as a byproduct of our analysis we will strengthen this result and show that the energies $\text{TP}^{2,p}$ are smooth (see Theorem 4.6).

1.4 Definition of the metric

In order to define the Riemannian metric, we first introduce the following γ -dependent operator that maps a C^1 -mapping $u: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ to a measurable mapping $\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u: \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y) := \frac{u(y) - u(x) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x)(\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s}, \quad (1)$$

where the differential operator \mathcal{D}_γ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) := du(x) d\gamma(x)^\dagger = \frac{u'(x) \gamma'(x)^\dagger}{|\gamma'(x)| |\gamma'(x)|}. \quad (2)$$




Figure 6: Various downward gradients of the tangent-point energy E for $s = 7/4$ plotted as arrows along the same four-tangle. (a) The L^2 -gradient is very sensitive to local changes, which makes explicit gradient descent methods unstable unless tiny step sizes are used. It has particularly high magnitude in tight or highly curved spots. (b) The H^1 -gradient and (c) the H^s -gradient; these lead to slightly more stable gradient steps since they smooth out the L^2 -gradient. Nonetheless, the magnitude can still be large in tight spots such as the left-hand twisting. (d) The G -gradient adapts to local features, as the terms B^2 and B^3 (see (8) and (9)) add some penalty for variations that have unfavorable behavior where the tangent-point energy density is high.

Here \dagger denotes the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse which takes the form $A^\dagger = (A^\top A)^{-1} A^\top$ if A is injective (and has closed range). It happens so that

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y) = \frac{(\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^m} - \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x)) (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s} = \frac{P_\gamma(x) (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s}.$$

Hence, we may rewrite

$$\text{TP}^{q,p}(\gamma) = 2^q \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^q \frac{d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|}.$$

In order to keep notation brief, we also introduce the γ -dependent measure μ_γ

$$d\mu_\gamma(x, y) := \frac{d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|}. \quad (3)$$

From here on we restrict our attention to $q = 2$ and fix an $s \in (3/2, 2)$. Omitting the factor of 2^q in the energy, we define

$$E(\gamma) := \frac{1}{4} \text{TP}^{2,p}(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^2 d\mu_\gamma(x, y). \quad (4)$$

Now we are finally in the position to define our Riemannian metric on the smooth manifold

$$\mathcal{M} := \left\{ \gamma \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \mid \gamma \text{ is an embedding} \right\}. \quad (5)$$

Because H^s embeds continuously to C^1 and because the set of embeddings is open in C^1 , (see, e.g. [33, Thm. 2.1.4]), the set \mathcal{M} is an open subset of H^s . At $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and for tangent vectors $u, v \in T_\gamma \mathcal{M} = H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ we define the metric G in terms of five bilinear forms whose precise definitions will be detailed out next:

$$G_\gamma(u, v) := 2B_\gamma^1(u, v) + (2s + 1)B_\gamma^2(u, v) + B_\gamma^3(u, v) + \langle u, v \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)} + \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\gamma)}. \quad (6)$$

The main ingredients here are the following three bilinear forms:

$$B_\gamma^1(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y), \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s v(x, y) \rangle d\mu_\gamma(x, y), \quad (7)$$

$$B_\gamma^2(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^2 \left\langle \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|}, \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\rangle d\mu_\gamma(x, y), \quad (8)$$

$$B_\gamma^3(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^2 \left(\langle D_\gamma u(x), D_\gamma v(x) \rangle + \langle D_\gamma u(y), D_\gamma v(y) \rangle \right) d\mu_\gamma(x, y). \quad (9)$$

Here and in the following, $|\cdot|$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ refer to the Euclidean norm and the Euclidean inner product for vectors—or to the Frobenius norm and the Frobenius inner product for tensors.

As we will see later in [Theorem 4.6](#), all the terms B_γ^1 , B_γ^2 and B_γ^3 appear very naturally in the first variation of E . Among these, the term B_γ^1 is the one that topologizes $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$, so it is responsible for making this a *strong* Riemannian metric (see [Theorem 4.1](#)). Moreover, one can show that $B_\gamma^1(u, v)$ is the weak formulation of a compact perturbation of the fractional Laplacian $(-\Delta_\gamma)^s = (-\mathcal{D}_\gamma^* \mathcal{D}_\gamma)^s$ (see [[18](#), Proposition 4.1]).

The terms B_γ^2 and B_γ^3 have the responsibility to push curves with self-intersections “towards infinity”. Metrics very similar to $B_\gamma^1 + B_\gamma^2$ have been used as preconditioners for numerical optimization via gradient descent for the Möbius energy of curves [[44](#)], for the tangent-point energy of curves [[53](#)], and for the tangent-point energy of surfaces [[52](#)]. In fact, these numerical works are the main motivation for considering this particular metric G : Not only do we know that G is an excellent preconditioner for E (and compact perturbations of it); we also observed in these experiments that including the term B_γ^2 made collision detection during the line search almost obsolete when we used (a second order approximation of) the Riemannian exponential map as update routine. In a nutshell: In which direction you ever go; you never bounce into the boundary of \mathcal{M} . This boundary is of course the set of curves with self-intersections (or some other singularities like kinks or cusps). This observation lead us to wonder whether the employed metric (or some minor modification thereof) could be geodesically complete. The present paper is the affirmative answer to this.

Alas, the three B -terms are not enough: Note that $B_\gamma^1(u, u) + B_\gamma^2(u, u) + B_\gamma^3(u, u)$ vanishes if u is a constant function, hence $B_\gamma^1 + B_\gamma^2 + B_\gamma^3$ is not positive-definite. This can be coped with in various way, but the easiest one is to add also the geometric L^2 -term

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\gamma)} := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle u(x), v(x) \rangle d\omega_\gamma(x). \quad (10)$$

This assigns a non-vanishing “cost” to constant vectors fields which generate the translations in \mathbb{R}^m . Finally, we also add the geometric H^1 term

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)} := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle D_\gamma u(x), D_\gamma v(x) \rangle d\omega_\gamma(x), \quad \text{where} \quad D_\gamma u(x) := \frac{u'(x)}{|\gamma'(x)|} \quad (11)$$

is the derivative of u with respect to arc length. Adding $\langle u, v \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)}$ to the metric grants some good control over the arc length functional (see [Lemma 4.9](#)). In principle, Sobolev inequalities allow for bounding $\langle u, u \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)}$ in terms of $B_\gamma^1(u, u) + B_\gamma^2(u, u) + B_\gamma^3(u, u)$ (and actually in

terms of $B_\gamma^1(u, u)$ alone). However, the constants in these inequalities depend on γ in such an unfavorable way that this prevents us from using Grönwall inequalities for showing geodesic completeness unless we introduce some artificial control over the arc length functional (e.g., by a hard constraint).

1.5 Main results and outline of the paper

We strive to make the exposition as self-contained as possible. To this end, we require some thorough preparation before we can prove the main results in [Section 5–Section 8](#). Thus, this paper is organized as follows.

In [Section 2](#) we first introduce the Sobolev–Slobodeckij spaces which form the domains for the generalized tangent-point energies. We limit our attention to the Hilbert case. We also define γ -dependent Sobolev–Slobodeckij spaces along with corresponding inner products based on certain geometric quantities. Later on it will become apparent that these γ -dependent spaces fit very well to the tangent-point energies and to the geodesic equation. The induced norms turn out to be equivalent to the classical γ -independent notion (see [Lemma 2.1](#)). Finally we prove a geometric Morrey inequality (see [Theorem 2.4](#)) and quote the uniform distortion estimate (see [Theorem 2.5](#)) from [18], which will play a central role in all of our analysis.

The next section is devoted to studying the family of operators \mathcal{R}^s that has been introduced in (1). It constitutes the main building block of our metric G . We start by proving some elementary results on reparametrizations. These demonstrate that our metric G is actually a *geometric* entity (see [Theorem 3.2](#)). Subsequently, we derive bounds on \mathcal{R}^s in terms of Sobolev–Slobodeckij norms and distortion (see [Lemma 3.4](#)). Paying particular attention to deriving quantitative bounds is fundamental for later applications, e.g., for proving that \mathcal{R}^s is uniformly bounded on small H^s -balls and later on for establishing completeness properties of G . In the third part of the section we show that \mathcal{R}^s is actually a smooth operator (see [Theorem 3.10](#)).

In [Section 4](#) we derive several foundational properties of the metric G : First we prove that G is a *strong* metric (see [Theorem 4.1](#)), i.e., it is a Riemannian metric such that the induced norm $\|u\|_{G_\gamma} := \sqrt{G_\gamma(u, u)}$ for $u \in T_\gamma\mathcal{M}$ generates the right topology on the tangent space $T_\gamma\mathcal{M}$. Subsequently, we show that the functionals (7)–(9) depend smoothly on γ . Consequently, both the metric G and the tangent-point energy E are smooth operators (see [Theorem 4.5](#) and [Theorem 4.6](#)).

Afterwards we introduce the geodesic distance ϱ_G and the path energy functional \mathcal{E} . We prove that both the square root of the tangent-point energies and the square root of the length functional are globally Lipschitz continuous with respect to ϱ_G (see [Theorem 4.8](#) and [Lemma 4.9](#)). In particular, this shows that they are bounded on G -bounded sets. Furthermore, we establish a lower bound on the geodesic distance in terms of the H^s distance (see [Lemma 4.18](#)). This has several consequences. In particular, it implies that the metric G is in fact definite. An opposite bound is not feasible in general, but at least on sufficiently small sets (see [Lemma 4.23](#)).

By then we will have laid the ground for proving our main results, namely the three Hopf–Rinow properties and the existence of minimal geodesics. These proofs constitute the remainder of the paper: [Section 5](#) contains our proof of the Banach–Alaoglu property (see [Theorem 5.1](#)) and in [Section 6](#) we present the short proof of metric completeness (see [Theorem 6.1](#)).

[Section 7](#) on geodesic completeness begins with the derivation of the geodesic equation (59). Rewriting it as a system of first-order ordinary differential equations with a locally Lipschitz continuous vector field yields short-time existence of its solutions (see [Theorem 7.1](#)). The same line of reasoning also applies to geodesics in a constraint manifold $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$. This way we could, e.g., constrain the curves to be parameterized by arc length or to be contained in the unit sphere $S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. (The latter was frequently asked in our discussions with topologists.) Afterwards we establish long-time existence (see [Theorem 7.3](#)), which implies geodesic completeness.

Finally, [Section 8](#) on length-minimizing geodesics features the existence proof (see [Theorem 8.1](#)), which relies on the weak sequential lower semicontinuity of the path energy functional \mathcal{E} (see [Theorem 8.3](#)).

2 Preliminaries

To start on solid ground, let us briefly pin down a couple of definitions and some notation that we are going to use throughout this paper.

2.1 Sobolev–Slobodeckij spaces

Here we introduce the Sobolev–Slobodeckij space $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ for $3/2 < s < 2$ and fix a norm that topologizes it.

First we define the following bilinear forms for measurable mappings $u, v: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2} := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle u(x), v(x) \rangle d\lambda(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle u, v \rangle_{H^1} := \langle u', v' \rangle_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle u'(x), v'(x) \rangle d\lambda(x).$$

On top of that, we denote the distance function in \mathbb{T} by $\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}: \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ and for $\sigma \in [0, 1]$ define the operator D^σ and the measure μ on $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$ by

$$D^\sigma u(x, y) := \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \quad \text{and} \quad d\mu(x, y) := \frac{d\lambda(y) d\lambda(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}. \quad (12)$$

We denote the L^2 -inner product with respect to μ by $\langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}$. This notation allows us to write down the *Gagliardo product* of order $s - 1$ in the following way:

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^{s-1}} := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left\langle \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^{s-1}}, \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^{s-1}} \right\rangle \frac{d\lambda(y) d\lambda(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} = \langle D^{s-1}u, D^{s-1}v \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}$$

We obtain the *Gagliardo product* of order s by chaining the above with the classical weak derivative D :

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^s} := \langle u', v' \rangle_{H^{s-1}} = \langle D^{s-1}Du, D^{s-1}Dv \rangle_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Let us denote the corresponding (semi)norms by

$$\|u\|_{L^2} := \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{L^2}}, \quad [u]_{H^1} := \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{H^1}}, \quad [u]_{H^{s-1}} := \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{H^{s-1}}}, \quad \text{and} \quad [u]_{H^s} := \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{H^s}}.$$

Finally, we define the inner product and norm

$$\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{H^s} := \langle u, u \rangle_{L^2} + \langle u, u \rangle_{H^1} + \langle u, u \rangle_{H^s} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{H^s} := \sqrt{\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{H^s}}$$

and the Sobolev–Slobodeckij space

$$H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) := \{u: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|u\|_{H^s} < \infty\}.$$

As it is well-known, $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ together with $\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{H^s}$ is a separable Hilbert space in which $C^\infty(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is a dense subset. The Morrey inequality [Theorem A.3](#) implies that $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \subset C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

2.2 Geometric operators and norms

In the context of the geometry of the space \mathcal{M} of H^s -embeddings it will often be convenient to work with *geometric* operators and norms that depend on a particular point $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. For example, we have seen already the operators \mathcal{D}_γ , D_γ , and the measure μ_γ (cf. (2), (11), and (3)). Now we introduce for $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$ the *arc length distance* $\varrho_\gamma(x, y)$, the arc length of the shorter arc of $\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ between $\gamma(x)$ and $\gamma(y)$. Assuming that x and y are represented by $0 \leq \tilde{x} \leq \tilde{y} < 1$, we have

$$\varrho_\gamma(x, y) = \min \left\{ \int_{\tilde{x}}^{\tilde{y}} |\gamma'(z)| dz, \int_{\tilde{y}}^{\tilde{x}+1} |\gamma'(z)| dz \right\}.$$

Moreover, we introduce the γ -dependent measure ν_γ and the fractional difference operator D_γ^σ :

$$d\nu_\gamma(x, y) := \frac{d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \quad \text{and} \quad D_\gamma^\sigma u(x, y) := \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)^\sigma} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in [0, 1]. \quad (13)$$

For measurable maps $U, V: \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ the measure ν_γ generates the following L^2 -inner product:

$$\langle U, V \rangle_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)} := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle U(x, y), V(x, y) \rangle d\nu_\gamma(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \|U\|_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)} := \sqrt{\langle U, U \rangle_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)}}.$$

For $1 < s < 2$, we define the γ -dependent bilinear form and seminorm:

$$\langle u, v \rangle_{H^s(\gamma)} := \langle D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u, D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma v \rangle_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad [u]_{H^s(\gamma)} := \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{H^s(\gamma)}}. \quad (14)$$

This gives rise to the γ -dependent inner product and norm

$$\langle\langle u, v \rangle\rangle_{H^s(\gamma)} := \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\gamma)} + \langle u, v \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)} + \langle u, v \rangle_{H^s(\gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} := \sqrt{\langle\langle u, u \rangle\rangle_{H^s(\gamma)}}. \quad (15)$$

The point of introducing these γ -dependent quantities is that they are *covariant* or *geometric*, i.e., they transform “in the right way” under reparametrizations. This will frequently allow us to change the parameterization and assume that γ is in *arc length parameterization*, i.e., that $|\gamma'(x)| = 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$.

Let us make this more precise and briefly analyze how these entities transform under a H^s -diffeomorphism $\varphi: \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$, $\mathbb{S} := \mathbb{R}/(\ell\mathbb{Z})$ for $\ell > 0$. Since $d\varphi(x): T_x\mathbb{S} \rightarrow T_{\varphi(x)}\mathbb{T}$ is invertible and $d\gamma(x): T_x\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is injective, we have for $u: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(u \circ \varphi)(x) &= (d(u \circ \varphi)(x)) (d(\gamma \circ \varphi)(x))^\dagger \\ &= du(\varphi(x)) d\varphi(x) (d\varphi(x))^{-1} d\gamma(\varphi(x))^\dagger = \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(\varphi(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

or in short: $\mathcal{D}_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(u \circ \varphi) = (\mathcal{D}_\gamma u) \circ \varphi$. In the same way one checks that $D_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(u \circ \varphi) = \pm(D_\gamma u) \circ \varphi$:

$$D_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(u \circ \varphi)(x) = \frac{u'(\varphi(x)) \varphi'(x)}{|\gamma'(\varphi(x)) \varphi'(x)|} = \text{sgn}(\varphi'(x)) D_\gamma u(\varphi(x)). \quad (17)$$

The sign flip will not be of concern, because φ will usually be orientation-preserving. (Besides, the terms involving D_γ will always come in pairs.) Also the fractional difference operator is covariant and satisfies $D_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}^\sigma(u \circ \varphi) = D_\gamma^\sigma u \circ (\varphi \times \varphi)$:

$$D_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}^\sigma(u \circ \varphi)(x, y) = \frac{u(\varphi(y)) - u(\varphi(x))}{\varrho_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(\varphi(y), \varphi(x))^\sigma} = D_\gamma^\sigma u(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)). \quad (18)$$

The norms and inner products of mappings are defined in terms of integrals. By the chain rule we have $d\omega_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(x) = |\gamma'(\varphi(x))| |\varphi'(x)| d\lambda(x)$. Hence, we may use the transformation formula for the Lebesgue integral to compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u \circ \varphi, v \circ \varphi \rangle_{L^2(\gamma \circ \varphi)} &= \int_{\mathbb{S}} \langle u(\varphi(x)), v(\varphi(x)) \rangle d\omega_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(x) \\ &= \int_{\varphi(\mathbb{T})} \langle u(\varphi(x)), v(\varphi(x)) \rangle |\gamma'(\varphi(x))| |\varphi'(x)| d\lambda(x) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle u(\xi), v(\xi) \rangle |\gamma'(\xi)| d\lambda(\xi) = \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\gamma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Together with (16) this immediately implies that the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)}$ from (11) is invariant under reparametrization, too. In the same vein one derives the following:

$$\langle U \circ (\varphi \times \varphi), V \circ (\varphi \times \varphi) \rangle_{L^2(\nu_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)})} = \langle U, V \rangle_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)} \quad \text{and} \quad (20)$$

$$\langle U \circ (\varphi \times \varphi), V \circ (\varphi \times \varphi) \rangle_{L^2(\mu_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)})} = \langle U, V \rangle_{L^2(\mu_\gamma)}. \quad (21)$$

Combined with (18), this shows us that the bilinear form $\gamma \mapsto \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H^s(\gamma)}$, the seminorm $\gamma \mapsto [\cdot]_{H^s(\gamma)}$ and the norm $\gamma \mapsto \|\cdot\|_{H^s(\gamma)}$ are covariant in the following sense:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u \circ \varphi, v \circ \varphi \rangle_{H^s(\gamma \circ \varphi)} &= \langle u, v \rangle_{H^s(\gamma)}, \\ [u \circ \varphi]_{H^s(\gamma \circ \varphi)} &= [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}, \\ \|u \circ \varphi\|_{H^s(\gamma \circ \varphi)} &= \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Although the covariant norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^s(\gamma)}$ are very compelling, at some point we have (i) to show that they generate the correct topology on $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and (ii) to quantify their deviation from $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$. We decided that this point should be here. A central ingredient in these proofs are the following notions of *bi-Lipschitz constant* and *distortion* of a curve $\gamma: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\text{BiLip}(\gamma) := \text{ess sup}_{x, y \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{distor}(\gamma) := \text{ess sup}_{x, y \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|}, \quad (23)$$

We would like to emphasize that $\text{distor}(\gamma)$ and $\text{BiLip}(\gamma)$ coincide if γ is parameterized by arc length. In general they differ: $\text{distor}(\gamma)$ is a purely geometric quantity of $\gamma(\mathbb{T})$ (i.e., invariant under reparametrizations), whereas $\text{BiLip}(\gamma)$ is a rather analytic quantity of the map $\gamma: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$.

The following norm equivalence will be pivotal for our analysis of the metric G . In [Lemma 4.14](#) we will make these estimates uniform on sets that are bounded with respect to the geodesic distance induced by G . This is why we keep precise track of the equivalence constants.

Lemma 2.1 *There are continuous functions $f_{H^s}, F_{H^s} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that the following chain of inequalities holds true:*

$$f_{H^s}(\gamma) \|u\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq F_{H^s}(\gamma) \|u\|_{H^s} \quad \text{for all } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Proof. We abbreviate $\sigma := s - 1$ and define $h_\gamma(x) := |\gamma'(x)|$ and $H_\gamma(x) := 1/|\gamma'(x)|$. In order to bound $[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}$ from above, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} |D_\gamma^\sigma D_\gamma u(x, y)| &= \left| \frac{H_\gamma(y) u'(y) - H_\gamma(x) u'(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^\sigma} \right| \\ &\leq \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^\sigma \left| \frac{H_\gamma(y) u'(y) - H_\gamma(x) u'(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \right| \\ &\leq \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^\sigma \left(H_\gamma(y) \left| \frac{u'(y) - u'(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \right| + \left| \frac{H_\gamma(y) - H_\gamma(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \right| |u'(x)| \right) \\ &= \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^\sigma \left(H_\gamma(y) |D^\sigma u'(x, y)| + |D^\sigma H_\gamma(x, y)| |u'(x)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Together with $\mu_\gamma \leq \text{BiLip}(\gamma) \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 \mu$ and $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$, this leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 &= \|D_\gamma^\sigma D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\mu_\gamma)}^2 \leq \text{BiLip}(\gamma) \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|D_\gamma^\sigma D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^{2\sigma+1} \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left(\|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 [u]_{H^s}^2 + [H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2 \|u'\|_{L^\infty}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the Morrey inequality [Theorem A.3](#) we obtain

$$[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 \leq 2 \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^{2s-1} \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left(\|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C_{M,\sigma} [H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right) [u]_{H^s}^2. \quad (24)$$

For the lower order terms, we can find the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 |\gamma'| \, d\lambda \leq \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2}^2 \quad \text{and} \\ \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|u'|^2}{|\gamma'|^2} |\gamma'| \, d\lambda \leq \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|u'\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (24), this implies $\|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 \leq F_{H^s}(\gamma)^2 \|u\|_{H^s}^2$, where

$$F_{H^s}(\gamma)^2 = \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + 2 \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^{2s-1} \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left(\|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C_{M,s-1} [H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right). \quad (25)$$

Now we move on to the reverse inequality. For the higher order terms, we observe $\varrho_\gamma(y, x) \leq \|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty} \varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)$, which implies

$$\frac{1}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} \leq \frac{\|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty}}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)}.$$

Furthermore, we find the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} |D^\sigma u'(x, y)| &= \left| \frac{|\gamma'(y)| D_\gamma u(y) - |\gamma'(x)| D_\gamma u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \right| \\ &\leq |\gamma'(y)| \left| \frac{D_\gamma u(y) - D_\gamma u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \right| + \left| \frac{|\gamma'(y)| - |\gamma'(x)|}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^\sigma} \right| |D_\gamma u(x)| \\ &\leq \|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty}^\sigma |\gamma'(y)| |D_\gamma^\sigma D_\gamma u(x, y)| + |D^\sigma h_\gamma(x, y)| |D_\gamma u(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

Together with $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ and the Morrey inequality [Lemma 2.3](#), this leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
[u]_{H^s}^2 &\leq 2 \|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\gamma'(y)|^2 |D_\gamma^\sigma D_\gamma u(x, y)|^2 d\mu(x, y) + 2 \|D^\sigma h_\gamma\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
&= 2 \|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\gamma'(y)| |H_\gamma(x)| \frac{\varrho_\gamma(x, y)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(x, y)} |D_\gamma^\sigma D_\gamma u(x, y)|^2 dv_\gamma(x, y) + 2 [h_\gamma]_{H^\sigma}^2 \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
&\leq 2 \|\gamma'\|_{L^\infty}^{2\sigma+2} \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} [u']_{H^\sigma(\gamma)}^2 + 2 [h_\gamma]_{H^\sigma}^2 \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\
&\leq \left(2 \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{2s} \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + 2 C_{M, s-1}^2 L(\gamma)^{2s-5} [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right) [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

For the lower order terms, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 H_\gamma |\gamma'| d\lambda \leq \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2 \quad \text{and} \\
\|u'\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} |D_\gamma u|^2 |\gamma'|^2 d\lambda \leq \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Combined, we obtain $\|u\|_{H^s}^2 \leq f_{H^s}(\gamma)^{-2} \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}^2$, where

$$f_{H^s}(\gamma)^{-2} = \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + (1 + 2 \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{2s}) \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + 2 C_{M, s-1}^2 L(\gamma)^{2s-5} [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2. \quad (26)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

As side effect, the techniques from the previous proof reveal that all the measures μ , ν_γ and μ_γ give rise to the same Lebesgue spaces:

Corollary 2.2 *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. For $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
c_\nu(\gamma) \|U\|_{L^p(\mu)} &\leq \|U\|_{L^p(\nu_\gamma)} \leq C_\nu(\gamma) \|U\|_{L^p(\mu)} \\
c_\mu(\gamma) \|U\|_{L^p(\mu)} &\leq \|U\|_{L^p(\mu_\gamma)} \leq C_\mu(\gamma) \|U\|_{L^p(\mu)}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $U \in L_\mu^p(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. The constants are $c_\nu(\gamma) = c_\mu(\gamma) := \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{-1/p} \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{-2/p}$, $C_\nu(\gamma) := \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{2/p} \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{1/p}$, and $C_\mu(\gamma) := \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{2/p} \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^{1/p}$.

2.3 Geometric inequalities

These covariant quantities allow us to geometrify some well-known inequalities that were original derived only in special choices of coordinates. The inequalities have to be adjusted if one has more components, i.e. if one wants to work with links.

Lemma 2.3 (Morrey inequality)

Let $s \in (3/2, 2)$ and $\alpha := s - 3/2$. Then there is a $C_{M, s-1} > 0$ such that

$$\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{M, s-1} L(\gamma)^{\alpha-1} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)} \quad \text{holds true for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{M}, u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Proof. First we rescale the curve $\eta(x) := L(\gamma)^{-1} \gamma(x)$. This is a curve of arc length $L(\eta) = 1$. Now we reparametrize η by an appropriate, orientation preserving H^s -diffeomorphism $\varphi: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ to obtain an curve $\xi := \eta \circ \varphi^{-1}$ in parametrization by arc length. With $v := u \circ \varphi^{-1}$ we have

$$L(\gamma) D_\gamma u(x) = \frac{u'(x)}{|\gamma'(x)|/L(\gamma)} = \frac{u'(x)}{|\eta'(x)|} = D_\eta u(x) = D_\xi v(\varphi(x)) = v'(\varphi(x)).$$

Now the classical Morrey embedding [Theorem A.3](#) implies

$$\|v'\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{M,\sigma} [v']_{H^{s-1}}.$$

By the transformation behavior of the embedding-dependent H^s seminorms (see [\(22\)](#)), we have

$$[v']_{H^{s-1}} = [v]_{H^s} = [v]_{H^s(\xi)} = [u]_{H^s(\eta)}.$$

Because of $D_\eta u = L(\gamma) D_\gamma u$ and $d\omega_\eta = L(\gamma)^{-1} d\omega_\gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u]_{H^s(\eta)}^2 &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{D_\eta u(y) - D_\eta u(x)}{\varrho_\eta(y,x)^{s-1}} \right|^2 \frac{d\omega_\eta(y) d\omega_\eta(x)}{\varrho_\eta(y,x)} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(L(\gamma)^{2s-3} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{D_\gamma u(y) - D_\gamma u(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y,x)^{s-1}} \right|^2 \frac{d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y,x)} \right)^{1/2} = L(\gamma)^\alpha [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} = L(\gamma)^{-1} \|v'\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{M,s-1} L(\gamma)^{\alpha-1} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}. \quad \square$$

In the proof of [\[18, Proposition 2.5\]](#) a geometric Morrey inequality was sketched for curves in arc length parametrization. It translates into our covariant setting as follows:

Theorem 2.4 (Geometric Morrey inequality)

Let $s \in (3/2, 2)$. Then there is a constant $C_{\text{Morrey}} \geq 0$ such that the following holds true for each injective curve $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$:

$$|D_\gamma \gamma(y) - D_\gamma \gamma(x)| \leq C_{\text{Morrey}} \sqrt{E(\gamma)} \varrho_\gamma(y,x)^\alpha \quad \text{where } \alpha := s - 3/2.$$

Proof. We reuse the rescaling η and the reparametrized curve ξ from [Lemma 2.3](#). Note that $D_\gamma \gamma, D_\eta \eta$ and ξ' are all unit tangent vectors. In particular, we have

$$|D_\gamma \gamma(y) - D_\gamma \gamma(x)| = |D_\eta \eta(y) - D_\eta \eta(x)| = |\xi'(\varphi(y)) - \xi'(\varphi(x))|.$$

Now we apply [\[18, \(2.7\)\]](#) to ξ to get

$$|\xi'(\varphi(y)) - \xi'(\varphi(x))| \leq C_{\text{Morrey}} \sqrt{E(\xi)} \varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(\varphi(y), \varphi(x))^\alpha = C_{\text{Morrey}} \sqrt{E(\xi)} \varrho_\eta(y,x)^\alpha.$$

Recall that E is invariant under reparametrization, thus $E(\xi) = E(\eta) = L(\gamma)^{2s-3} E(\gamma) = L(\gamma)^{2\alpha} E(\gamma)$. Moreover, we have $\varrho_\eta = L(\gamma)^{-1} \varrho_\gamma$. Plugged into the above, we get

$$|D_\gamma \gamma(y) - D_\gamma \gamma(x)| \leq C_{\text{Morrey}} L(\gamma)^\alpha \sqrt{E(\gamma)} L(\gamma)^{-\alpha} \varrho_\gamma(y,x)^\alpha. \quad \square$$

Translating [18, Proposition 2.7] into our covariant language, we get the following theorem:

Theorem 2.5 (Uniform distortion estimate)

Let $s \in (3/2, 2)$. Then there is a constant $0 < C_{\text{distor}} < \infty$ such that the following holds true for each injective curve $\gamma \in C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$:

$$\text{distor}(\gamma) := \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \leq C_{\text{distor}} L(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/\alpha} E(\gamma)^\beta \quad \text{for } \alpha := s - \frac{3}{2}, \beta := \frac{\alpha + 1}{2\alpha^2}.$$

Proof. Once more, we reuse the rescaling η and the reparametrized curve ξ from Lemma 2.3. Note that the rescaling does not affect the distortion, hence we have $\text{distor}(\eta) = \text{distor}(\gamma)$. Since L , distor , and E are invariant under parameterization, we have

$$L(\xi) = L(\eta) = 1, \quad \text{distor}(\xi) = \text{distor}(\eta) = \text{distor}(\gamma), \quad \text{and} \quad E(\xi) = E(\eta) = L(\gamma)^{2\alpha} E(\gamma).$$

Now we can apply [18, Proposition 2.7], which implies (if one meticulously collects the powers from the proof) that there is a constant $0 < C_{\text{distor}} < \infty$ such that

$$\text{distor}(\xi) = \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{|\xi(y) - \xi(x)|} \leq C_{\text{distor}} E(\xi)^\beta.$$

Thus, we have

$$\text{distor}(\gamma) = \text{distor}(\xi) = \sup_{x, y \in \mathbb{T}} \frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \leq C_{\text{distor}} E(\xi)^\beta = C_{\text{distor}} L(\gamma)^{2\alpha\beta} E(\gamma)^\beta. \quad \square$$

We briefly state an immediate consequence of the previous result:

Corollary 2.6 Let $s \in (3/2, 2)$ and $\alpha := s - 3/2$. Then for $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ we have

$$\left\| (x, y) \mapsto \frac{|u(y) - u(x)|}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{\text{distor}} C_{\mathcal{M}, s-1} L(\gamma)^{\alpha+1/\alpha} E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/(2\alpha^2)} \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}.$$

Proof. By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have $|u(y) - u(x)| \leq \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \varrho_\gamma(y, x)$. Now the statement follows from combining Lemma 2.3 with Theorem 2.5. \square

3 The operator \mathcal{R}^s

From now on we assume that

$$s \in \left(\frac{3}{2}, 2\right).$$

An essential ingredient for our metric G is the family of operators

$$\mathcal{R}^s : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m), L_\mu^2(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)), \quad \mathcal{R}^s(\gamma) := \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s.$$

Many properties of G relate to properties of \mathcal{R}^s . The fact that \mathcal{R}_γ^s is always a *bounded* linear operator (and thus that \mathcal{R}^s is well-defined) will be an essential ingredient when we show that G is a *strong* Riemannian metric (see Theorem 4.1). As we will see soon, this is already a quite

involved task (see [Lemma 3.3](#)). Later we will show that G is a smooth Riemannian metric (see [Theorem 4.5](#)). That will require us to show that \mathcal{R}^s is a smooth map (see [Section 3.3](#)). Ironically, we will be able to reduce its Fréchet differentiability on the slightly stronger fact [Lemma 3.4](#): that \mathcal{R}^s is *uniformly* bounded on small H^s -balls. This is why we—maybe to the dismay of the reader—put quite some effort in quantifying the bounds. Precise knowledge on these bounds will also be required when we discuss the completeness properties of the metric G .

But before we dive deeper into these technical aspects, we first analyze how \mathcal{R}^s transforms under reparametrizations.

3.1 Covariance

The considerations below show that the operator \mathcal{R}^s and the metric G are *geometric* objects, i.e., that they transform geometrically meaningfully under reparameterizations.

Lemma 3.1 *Let M and N be two one-dimensional smooth manifolds. Let $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ be a diffeomorphism of class H^s , let $u \in H^s(N; \mathbb{R}^m)$, and let $\gamma \in H^s(N; \mathbb{R}^m)$ be an embedding. Then we have:*

$$\mathcal{R}_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}^s(u \circ \varphi) = (\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u) \circ (\varphi \times \varphi).$$

Proof. We merely write down the definition of \mathcal{R}^s and employ (16):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}^s(u \circ \varphi)(x, y) &= \frac{u(\varphi(y)) - u(\varphi(x)) - \mathcal{D}_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(u \circ \varphi)(x) (\gamma(\varphi(y)) - \gamma(\varphi(x)))}{|\gamma(\varphi(y)) - \gamma(\varphi(x))|^s} \quad (27) \\ &= \frac{u(\varphi(y)) - u(\varphi(x)) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(\varphi(x)) (\gamma(\varphi(y)) - \gamma(\varphi(x)))}{|\gamma(\varphi(y)) - \gamma(\varphi(x))|^s} = \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We can combine this with our observations in [Section 2.2](#) to see that also B_γ^1 , B_γ^2 , and B_γ^3 are invariant under reparametrization. Thus, we have shown that G is geometric:

Theorem 3.2 *Let M and N be two one-dimensional closed smooth manifolds. Let $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ be a diffeomorphism of class H^s and let $\gamma \in H^s(N; \mathbb{R}^m)$ be an embedding. Then we have:*

$$G_{(\gamma \circ \varphi)}(u \circ \varphi, v \circ \varphi) = G_\gamma(u, v) \quad \text{for all } u, v \in H^s(N; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

3.2 Boundedness

The next lemma is required for the norm bounds like [Lemma 3.4](#) and [Lemma 4.4](#). The precise form of the bound becomes also important when we have to bound DG in [Theorem 7.3](#).

Lemma 3.3 *There is a continuous function $C_s: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)} \leq C_s(\gamma) [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}.$$

More precisely, we have

$$C_s(\gamma) \leq C_{\text{distor}}^s s^{-1/2} L(\gamma)^{s(\alpha+1)/\alpha} E(\gamma)^{s\beta} \left(1 + C_{M,s-1}^2 L(\gamma)^{2s-5} [\gamma]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Since all entities involved are covariant (see also (27)), we may put $\ell := L(\gamma)$ and $\mathbb{S} := \mathbb{R}/(\ell\mathbb{Z})$ and assume that $\gamma: \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is parameterized by arc length. Moreover, we pull all functions on $\mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S} = (\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R})/(\ell\mathbb{Z} \times \ell\mathbb{Z})$ back to the fundamental domain

$$\Sigma := \{(x, y) \mid 0 \leq x \leq \ell \text{ and } x - \ell/2 \leq y \leq x + \ell/2\}. \quad (28)$$

For $x, y \in \Sigma$ we have $\varrho_\gamma(y, x) = |y - x|$, $D_\gamma u = u'$, and $d\omega_\gamma(x) = dx$, hence

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)}^2 = \iint_\Sigma \left(\frac{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right)^{2s} \left| \frac{u(y) - u(x) - u'(x) \langle \gamma'(x), \gamma(y) - \gamma(x) \rangle}{|y - x|^s} \right|^2 \frac{dx dy}{|y - x|}.$$

We can bound the first factor of the integrand by $\text{distor}(\gamma)^{2s}$. To bound the second factor, we exploit that we can work in $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ now:

$$\begin{aligned} & u(y) - u(x) - u'(x) \langle \gamma'(x), \gamma(y) - \gamma(x) \rangle \\ &= (u(y) - u(x) - u'(x)(y - x)) + u'(x) \langle \gamma'(x), \gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \gamma'(x)(y - x) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Together with the inequality $|a + b|^2 \leq 2|a|^2 + 2|b|^2$ we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)}^2 \leq 2 \text{distor}(\gamma)^{2s} B(u, u) + 2 \text{distor}(\gamma)^{2s} \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2 B(\gamma, \gamma), \quad (29)$$

where

$$B(u, u) := \iint_\Sigma \left| \frac{u(y) - u(x) - u'(x)(y - x)}{|y - x|^s} \right|^2 \frac{dy dx}{|y - x|}.$$

In order to bound $B(u, u)$ in terms of $[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2$, we employ a technique established by Blatt in [17, Section 2]. First we use the fundamental theorem of calculus:

$$u(y) - u(x) - u'(x)(y - x) = (y - x) \int_0^1 (u'(x + \theta(y - x)) - u'(x)) d\theta.$$

Next we substitute $X = y - x$ and use Jensen's inequality and Fubini's Theorem to obtain

$$B(u, u) = \int_0^\ell \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} \left| \frac{\int_0^1 (u'(x + \theta X) - u'(x)) d\theta}{|X|^{s-1}} \right|^2 \frac{dX dx}{|X|} \leq \int_0^\ell \int_0^\ell \int_{-\ell/2}^{\ell/2} \left| \frac{u'(x + \theta X) - u'(x)}{|X|^{s-1}} \right|^2 \frac{dy dx}{|X|} d\theta.$$

Now we substitute $z = x + \theta X$, leading to $X = \theta^{-1}(z - x)$ and $dX = \theta^{-1} dz$:

$$\begin{aligned} B(u, u) &\leq \int_0^1 \int_0^\ell \int_{x - \theta\ell/2}^{x + \theta\ell/2} \left| \frac{u'(z) - u'(x)}{\theta^{1-s} |z - x|^{s-1}} \right|^2 \frac{dz dx}{\theta^{-1} |z - x|} d\theta \leq \int_0^1 \iint_\Sigma \theta^{2s-1} \left| \frac{u'(z) - u'(x)}{|z - x|^{s-1}} \right|^2 \frac{dz dx}{|z - x|} d\theta \\ &= \left(\int_0^1 \theta^{2s-1} d\theta \right) \|D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2 = \frac{1}{2s} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this bound for $B(u, u)$ and $B(\gamma, \gamma)$ back into (29) leads us to

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{s} \text{distor}(\gamma)^{2s} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 + \frac{1}{s} \text{distor}(\gamma)^{2s} \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2 [\gamma]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2.$$

The proof is concluded by employing the Morrey inequality Lemma 2.3 to bound $\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}$ and Theorem 2.5 to bound $\text{distor}(\gamma)$. \square

Finally, combining [Lemma 3.3](#) with (24) leads us immediately to the following bound.

Lemma 3.4 *There is a continuous function $F_{\mathcal{R}^s}: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\nu_\gamma)} \leq F_{\mathcal{R}^s}(\gamma) \|u\|_{H^s}.$$

More precisely, we have

$$F_{\mathcal{R}^s}(\gamma) = C_s(\gamma) \left(2 \operatorname{BiLip}(\gamma)^{2\sigma+1} \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 (\|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C_{\mathcal{M},s-1} \|H_\gamma\|_{H^{s-1}}^2) \right)^{1/2},$$

where $h_\gamma(x) := |\gamma'(x)|$, $H_\gamma(x) := 1/|\gamma'(x)|$ and $C_s(\gamma)$ is the function from [Lemma 3.3](#).

3.3 Smoothness

In this section we show that $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s$ is smooth. More precisely, our main goal is [Theorem 3.10](#) below. But before we come to that, we first establish smoothness of a couple of auxiliary mappings.

Lemma 3.5 *For $s > 3/2$ the following maps are smooth:*

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}), \quad \gamma \mapsto h_\gamma = |\gamma'|, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}), \quad \gamma \mapsto H_\gamma = 1/|\gamma'|, \quad (31)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m); H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)), \quad \gamma \mapsto D_\gamma, \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m); H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; L(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^m))), \quad \gamma \mapsto \mathcal{D}_\gamma. \quad (33)$$

Proof. Note that $s > 3/2$ implies that $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \hookrightarrow C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ embeds continuously (see [Theorem A.3](#)). Thus, for each $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ we find a neighborhood $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and $0 < r \leq R < \infty$ such that the derivative ξ' of each $\xi \in \mathcal{U}$ maps \mathbb{T} into the open set $V := B_R(0) \setminus B_r(0)$. The maps $\Phi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\Phi(X) := |X|$ and $\Psi: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\Psi(X) := 1/|X|$ are smooth and all their derivatives $D^k \Phi$ and $D^k \Psi$, $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ are bounded. Thus, the chain rule in H^{s-1} implies that $\gamma \mapsto |\gamma'| = \Phi \circ \gamma'$ and $\gamma \mapsto 1/|\gamma'| = \Psi \circ \gamma'$ are smooth as maps into $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. This shows the smoothness of (30) and (31). Now the identities

$$D_\gamma u = H_\gamma \cdot u' \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_\gamma u = (D_\gamma u) \cdot (D_\gamma \gamma)^\top \quad \text{for } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$$

and the fact that $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ is a Banach algebra imply the smoothness of (32) and (33). \square

Remark 3.6 The derivatives of the the maps in the previous lemma are now readily computed by the chain rule and product rule. We just state them here for reference:

$$D(\gamma \mapsto h_\gamma)(\gamma) v = H_\gamma \langle \gamma', v' \rangle = h_\gamma \langle D_\gamma \gamma, D_\gamma v \rangle, \quad (34)$$

$$D(\gamma \mapsto H_\gamma)(\gamma) v = -H_\gamma^3 \langle \gamma', v' \rangle = -H_\gamma \langle D_\gamma \gamma, D_\gamma v \rangle, \quad (35)$$

$$D(\gamma \mapsto D_\gamma u)(\gamma) v = -H_\gamma^3 \langle \gamma', v' \rangle u' = -\langle D_\gamma \gamma, D_\gamma v \rangle D_\gamma u, \quad (36)$$

$$D(\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{D}_\gamma u)(\gamma) v = (D_\gamma u) (D_\gamma v)^\top (\operatorname{id}_{\mathbb{R}^m} - D_\gamma \gamma) - (D_\gamma u) (D_\gamma v), \quad (37)$$

for all $u, v \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. \diamond

Lemma 3.7 For $s > 3/2$ and for every $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ the following function is smooth:

$$\Lambda^\beta: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m), \quad \Lambda^\beta(\gamma)(x, y) := \left(\frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right)^\beta.$$

Proof. First we observe that $\Lambda^1(\gamma)$ and $\Lambda^{-1}(\gamma)$ are bounded because γ is an embedding of class C^1 . Let γ and η be two curves in \mathcal{M} . For $x \in \mathbb{T}$, $y \in \mathbb{T}$, $x \neq y$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda^{-1}(\gamma)(x, y) - \Lambda^{-1}(\eta)(x, y)| &= \left| \frac{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| - |\eta(y) - \eta(x)|}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{(\gamma(y) - \eta(y)) - (\gamma(x) - \eta(x))}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} \right| \leq \|\gamma' - \eta'\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the essential supremum over $(x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$ yields $\|\Lambda^{-1}(\gamma) - \Lambda^{-1}(\eta)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|\gamma' - \eta'\|_{L^\infty}$, hence Λ^{-1} is continuous. To show that Λ is continuous, we start with

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda^1(\gamma) - \Lambda^1(\eta)\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\Lambda^1(\gamma) \Lambda^1(\eta) (\Lambda^{-1}(\eta) - \Lambda^{-1}(\gamma))\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\leq \|\Lambda^1(\gamma)\|_{L^\infty} \|\Lambda^1(\eta)\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma' - \eta'\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that $\|\Lambda^1(\eta)\|_{L^\infty}$ stays bounded for $\eta \rightarrow \gamma$ in H^s . Indeed, for η sufficiently close to γ in H^s , we may assume that $u := \eta - \gamma$ satisfies $\text{Lip}(u) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{BiLip}(\gamma)^{-1}$. Then for $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$, $x \neq y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta(y) - \eta(x)| &\geq \left| |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| - |u(y) - u(x)| \right| \geq |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| - \text{Lip}(u) \varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x) \\ &\geq |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| - |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| \text{Lip}(u) \frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \\ &\geq |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| - |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| \text{Lip}(u) \text{BiLip}(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{2} |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\|\Lambda^1(\eta)\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2 \|\Lambda^1(\gamma)\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$ stays bounded as $\eta \rightarrow \gamma$, and that Λ^1 is continuous. So both Λ^1 and Λ^{-1} are continuous, and we may raise each of them to an arbitrary nonnegative power without breaking continuity. Thus, Λ^β is continuous for each $\beta \geq 0$.

The Gateaux derivative of Λ^β in direction $v \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is given by

$$D\Lambda^\beta(\gamma) v = -\beta \Lambda^{\beta+2}(\gamma) \left\langle \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}, \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} \right\rangle. \quad (38)$$

Since both γ and v are of class C^1 , we have $D\Lambda^\beta(\gamma) v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. The mappings $\gamma \mapsto \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}$ and $v \mapsto \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}$ are smooth as mappings into $L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ since they are linear and bounded. Together with the continuity of $\Lambda^{\beta+2}$, this implies that $D\Lambda^\beta: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(H^s, L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m))$ is continuous. Hence, Λ^β is Fréchet differentiable. Finally, arbitrarily high Fréchet derivatives of Λ^β can be computed recursively using (38) and the product rule. \square

Remark 3.8 As a byproduct, we have shown that $\gamma \mapsto \text{BiLip}(\gamma) = \|\Lambda^1(\gamma)\|_{L^\infty}$ is continuous and that $\mathcal{M} \subset H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is indeed an open set. \diamond

Corollary 3.9 For $s > 3/2$ the following map is smooth:

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m); L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)), \quad \gamma \mapsto \left(u \mapsto \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} = \Lambda^1(\gamma) \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} \right).$$

Finally, we have aggregated all requirements for showing the main theorem in this section.

Theorem 3.10 For $s \in (3/2, 2)$ the map $\mathcal{R}^s: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m), L_\mu^2(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m))$ is smooth.

Proof. Let $\eta: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be the standard embedding of the round circle (or any other fixed $\eta \in \mathcal{M}$) and let $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. First we show that we can write

$$\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u = \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} (\mathcal{R}_\eta^s u - (\mathcal{D}_\gamma u \circ \text{pr}_1) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma). \quad (39)$$

The crucial observation here is that $d\gamma(x)^\dagger d\gamma(x) = \text{id}_{(T_x \mathbb{T})}$. Hence, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_\eta u(x) = du(x) d\eta(x)^\dagger = du(x) d\gamma(x)^\dagger d\gamma(x) d\eta(x)^\dagger = \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) \mathcal{D}_\eta \gamma(x).$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y) &= u(y) - u(x) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)) \\ &= u(y) - u(x) - \mathcal{D}_\eta u(x) (\eta(x) - \eta(y)) \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) \mathcal{D}_\eta \gamma(x) (\eta(x) - \eta(y)) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))) \\ &= |\eta(y) - \eta(x)|^s (\mathcal{R}_\eta^s u(x, y) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma(x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (39) follows from dividing this by $|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s$ and observing that

$$\frac{|\eta(y) - \eta(x)|^s}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s} = \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)}.$$

Now formula (39) makes it now easy to show the smoothness of \mathcal{R}^s : By Lemma 3.4, the operator $\mathcal{R}_\eta^s: H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow L_\mu^2(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is bounded, so $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma$ is smooth as a map to $L_\mu^2(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. From Lemma 3.5 we know that $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{D}_\gamma u \circ \text{pr}_1$ is smooth as a map into $L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \text{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^m))$. And Lemma 3.7 shows that $\gamma \mapsto \Lambda^s(\gamma)$ is smooth as a map into $L^\infty(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. So the smoothness of $\gamma \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u$ follows from the product rule in L^∞ and L_μ^2 . \square

Remark 3.11 With (39) we can readily compute the derivative of \mathcal{R}^s . This will be useful later, e.g., when we compute the derivative of the tangent-point energy (see Theorem 4.6). Let $u, v \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and abbreviate $U(\gamma) := \mathcal{D}_\gamma u \circ \text{pr}_1$, $V(\gamma) := \mathcal{D}_\gamma v \circ \text{pr}_1$, $\Delta\gamma = \gamma(y) - \gamma(x)$, $\Delta v = v(y) - v(x)$, and $W(\gamma) := \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma \circ \text{pr}_1$. Now the product rule implies

$$\begin{aligned} (D\mathcal{R}^s(\gamma) v) u &= D(\xi \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\xi^s u)(\gamma) v \\ &= \frac{(D\Lambda^s(\gamma) v)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} (\mathcal{R}_\eta^s u - U(\gamma) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma) - \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} U(\gamma) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s v - \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} (DU(\gamma) v) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging in (38) and (37), which takes the form

$$DU(\gamma) v = -U(\gamma) V(\gamma) + U(\gamma) V(\gamma)^\top (\text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^m} - W(\gamma)),$$

and rearranging terms leads to

$$\begin{aligned} (D\mathcal{R}^s(\gamma) v) u &= -s \left\langle \frac{\Delta\gamma}{|\Delta\gamma|}, \frac{\Delta v}{|\Delta\gamma|} \right\rangle \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} (\mathcal{R}_\eta^s u - U(\gamma) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma) \\ &\quad - \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} U(\gamma) (\mathcal{R}_\eta^s v - V(\gamma) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma) - \frac{\Lambda^s(\gamma)}{\Lambda^s(\eta)} U(\gamma) V(\gamma)^\top (\mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma - W(\gamma) \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using (39) in reverse shows that

$$(D\mathcal{R}^s(\gamma) v) u = -s \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u \left\langle \frac{\Delta\gamma}{|\Delta\gamma|}, \frac{\Delta v}{|\Delta\gamma|} \right\rangle - (\mathcal{D}_\gamma u \circ \text{pr}_1) \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s v - (\mathcal{D}_\gamma u \circ \text{pr}_1) (\mathcal{D}_\gamma v \circ \text{pr}_1)^\top \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma. \quad (40) \quad \diamond$$

4 The metric

We have introduced the metric G on \mathcal{M} already in Equation (6) in the introduction. In this section we collect several important properties of the metric.

In Section 4.1 we show that G is a *strong Riemannian metric* on \mathcal{M} , i.e., it is positive-definite and its induced norm generates the topology of $T_\gamma\mathcal{M} = H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. In Section 4.2 we show that G_γ depends smoothly on γ . Afterwards, we introduce the geodesic distance function ϱ_G of G (see Section 4.3) and show that it makes several important functionals *globally* Lipschitz continuous. Most importantly, this applies to the tangent-point energy E (see Theorem 4.8) and to the arc length functional L (see Lemma 4.9). We then show that quantities like E , $|\gamma'|$, and $1/|\gamma'|$ are bounded on G -bounded sets (see Lemma 4.16).

Consequently, the Riemannian metric G has sufficient control to keep curves away from various modes of degeneration. We will use this particular feature later when we discuss compactness properties of bounded sets (see Section 5) and geodesic completeness (see Section 7).

Furthermore, we compare our distance to the normal H^s -distance, quantify their relation, and show that the identity map $\text{id}: (\mathcal{M}, \varrho_G) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}, \varrho_{H^s})$ is locally bi-Lipschitz continuous (see Lemma 4.18, Lemma 4.23, and Corollary 4.24). This will be crucial for establishing metric completeness in Section 6.

4.1 The metric is strong

Our aim here is to show the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1 *The metric G defined in (6) is a strong Riemannian metric on \mathcal{M} . In particular, the Riesz isomorphism*

$$J_\gamma: T_\gamma\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T'_\gamma\mathcal{M}, \quad \langle J_\gamma u, v \rangle := G_\gamma(u, v)$$

is an isomorphism between the tangent space $T_\gamma\mathcal{M} = H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and the continuous cotangent space $T'_\gamma\mathcal{M} := (H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m))' = H^{-s}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$.

Proof. To this end we have to show that the induced norm $\|u\|_{G_\gamma} := \sqrt{G_\gamma(u, u)}$ for $u \in T_\gamma\mathcal{M}$ generates the right topology on $T_\gamma\mathcal{M} = H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. By Lemma 2.1 we already know that $\|\cdot\|_{H^s(\gamma)}$ generates this topology. So it suffices to show that the norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^s(\gamma)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{G_\gamma}$ are equivalent for fixed γ . As this is very technical and because we will later need also some detailed information on the proportionality factors in this norm estimates, we delegate this task to Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 below.

The norm bounds imply that G_γ is a bounded and coercive symmetric bilinear form on $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. So the Lax–Milgram theorem shows that $J_\gamma: H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow (H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m))'$ is indeed an isomorphism of Hilbert spaces. \square

We spend the remainder of this section on showing Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4. To this end we heavily rely on the techniques established in [18, Theorem 2.5]. The following is a preparation for Lemma 4.3.

Lemma 4.2 Let $s \in (3/2, 2)$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. Put $\delta(\gamma) := (2 C_{\text{Morrey}} \sqrt{E(\gamma)})^{-1/\alpha}$. Then for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$ satisfying $\varrho_\gamma(y, x) < \delta(\gamma)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle D_\gamma \gamma(x), \gamma(y) - \gamma(x) \rangle| &\geq \frac{1}{2} |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| \quad \text{and} \\ |\langle D_\gamma \gamma(y), \gamma(y) - \gamma(x) \rangle| &\geq \frac{1}{2} |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{T}$ be two distinct points. We denote by $I \subset \mathbb{T}$ the shorter arc with respect to ω_γ . By swapping x and y if necessary, we may assume that x is the left end point and that y is the right end point of I with respect to the orientation chosen on \mathbb{T} . Let $\eta \in I$. (In particular, η could be x or y .) Now we exploit $|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)| \leq \varrho_\gamma(y, x)$ (the chord length is less or equal to the arc length), $|D_\gamma \gamma(\eta)| = 1$ for any $\eta \in I$, and the inverse triangle inequality:

$$\left| \left\langle D_\gamma \gamma(\eta), \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\rangle \right| \geq \left| \left\langle D_\gamma \gamma(\eta), \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \right\rangle \right| \geq 1 - \left| \left\langle D_\gamma \gamma(\eta), D_\gamma \gamma(\eta) - \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \right\rangle \right|.$$

By construction of I , we have $\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) = \int_I D_\gamma \gamma(z) d\omega_\gamma(z)$ and $\varrho_\gamma(y, x) = \int_I d\omega_\gamma(z)$. Now the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the Jensen inequality, and the geometric Morrey inequality [Theorem 2.4](#) imply:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \left\langle D_\gamma \gamma(\eta), D_\gamma \gamma(\eta) - \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \right\rangle \right| \leq \left| D_\gamma \gamma(\eta) - \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \right| \\ &= \left| \int_I (D_\gamma \gamma(\eta) - D_\gamma \gamma(z)) d\omega_\gamma(z) \right| \leq \int_I |D_\gamma \gamma(\eta) - D_\gamma \gamma(z)| d\omega_\gamma(z) \\ &\leq \int_I C_{\text{Morrey}} \sqrt{E(\gamma)} \varrho_\gamma(y, x)^\alpha d\omega_\gamma(z) \leq C_{\text{Morrey}} \sqrt{E(\gamma)} \delta(\gamma)^\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this into the above leads to

$$\left| \left\langle D_\gamma \gamma(\eta), \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\rangle \right| \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.3 There is a constant $0 < C < \infty$ depending on $s \in (3/2, 2)$ such that the following holds true for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$:

$$[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 \leq 32 B_\gamma^1(u, u) + 128 B_\gamma^2(u, u) + C L(\gamma) E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/\alpha} [u]_{H^1(\gamma)}^2. \quad (42)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{32 + C L(\gamma) E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/\alpha}} \|u\|_{G_\gamma}. \quad (43)$$

Proof. Let $\delta := \delta(\gamma)$ as in [Lemma 4.2](#) and define

$$U := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \mid \varrho_\gamma(y, x) < \delta\} \quad \text{and} \quad U^c := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \mid \varrho_\gamma(y, x) \geq \delta\}$$

and split $[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2$ as follows:

$$[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 = \iint_U |D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u|^2 dv_\gamma + \iint_{U^c} |D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u|^2 dv_\gamma.$$

Using $(a - b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ and the definition of U^c , we can bound the integral over U^c by

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{U^c} |D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u|^2 d\nu_\gamma &= \iint_{U^c} \frac{|D_\gamma u(y) - D_\gamma u(x)|^2 d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)^{2(s-1)} \varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\delta^{2s-1}} \iint_{U^c} (|D_\gamma u(x)|^2 + |D_\gamma u(y)|^2) d\omega_\gamma(y) d\omega_\gamma(x) \quad (44) \\ &\leq \frac{4L(\gamma)}{\delta^{2s-1}} \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2 = CL(\gamma) E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/\alpha} [u]_{H^1(\gamma)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Next we deal with the integral over U . Let $(x, y) \in U$ and abbreviate $\tau := D_\gamma \gamma$, $\Delta\gamma := \gamma(y) - \gamma(x)$, and $\Delta u := u(y) - u(x)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_\gamma u(y) - D_\gamma u(x)| \\ &\leq \left| D_\gamma u(y) - \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle} \right| + \left| \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle} - \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle} \right| + \left| \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle} - D_\gamma u(x) \right|. \quad (45) \end{aligned}$$

Using $D_\gamma u(x) \langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle = \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) \Delta\gamma$, we get for the last summand:

$$\left| \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle} - D_\gamma u(x) \right| = \left| \frac{\Delta u - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) \Delta\gamma}{\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle} \right| = \frac{|u(y) - u(x) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma u(x) (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))|}{|\langle D_\gamma \gamma(x), \gamma(y) - \gamma(x) \rangle|}.$$

Now (41) implies

$$\left| \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle} - D_\gamma u(x) \right| \leq 2 |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^{s-1} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(y, x)|.$$

Likewise we obtain for the first summand in (45):

$$\left| D_\gamma u(y) - \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle} \right| \leq 2 |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^{s-1} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y)|.$$

For the center term in (45) we use (41) once more:

$$\left| \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle} - \frac{\Delta u}{\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle} \right| = \frac{|\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle - \langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle|}{|\langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle| |\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle|} |\Delta u| \leq 4 \frac{|\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle - \langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle|}{|\Delta\gamma|} \frac{|\Delta u|}{|\Delta\gamma|}.$$

Because of $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma = \tau(x) \tau(x)^\top$, we may proceed with the numerator as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \tau(x), \Delta\gamma \rangle - \langle \tau(y), \Delta\gamma \rangle| &= \left| |\mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x) \Delta\gamma| - |\mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(y) \Delta\gamma| \right| \\ &\leq \left| \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x) \Delta\gamma - \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(y) \Delta\gamma \right| = \left| (\Delta\gamma - \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(y) \Delta\gamma) - (\Delta\gamma - \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x) \Delta\gamma) \right| \\ &\leq |\gamma(x) - \gamma(y) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(y) (\gamma(x) - \gamma(y))| + |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x) - \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x) (\gamma(y) - \gamma(x))| \\ &= |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(y, x)| + |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^s |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|. \end{aligned}$$

Now we insert all this into (45) and divide by $\varrho_\gamma(y, x)^{s-1} \geq |\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|^{s-1}$:

$$|D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u(x, y)| \leq 2 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(y, x)| + 4 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(y, x)| \frac{|\Delta u|}{|\Delta\gamma|} + 4 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)| \frac{|\Delta u|}{|\Delta\gamma|} + 2 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y)|.$$

Squaring and the inequality $(a + b + c + d)^2 \leq 4(a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2)$ lead us to

$$\begin{aligned} |D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u(x, y)|^2 &\leq 16 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(y, x)|^2 + 64 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(y, x)|^2 \frac{|\Delta u|^2}{|\Delta \gamma|^2} \\ &\quad + 64 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^2 \frac{|\Delta u|^2}{|\Delta \gamma|^2} + 16 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we integrate against $dv_\gamma \leq d\mu_\gamma$ and exploit that U is symmetric w.r.t. $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_U |D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u|^2 dv_\gamma &\leq \iint_U |D_\gamma^{s-1} D_\gamma u|^2 d\mu_\gamma \\ &\leq 32 \iint_U |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u|^2 d\mu_\gamma + 128 \iint_U |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma|^2 \left| \frac{\Delta u}{|\Delta \gamma|} \right|^2 d\mu_\gamma \leq 32 B_\gamma^1(u, u) + 128 B_\gamma^2(u, u). \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (44), this shows (42). Recalling the definition (15) of $\|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}$, we have

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}^2 \leq 32 B_\gamma^1(u, u) + \frac{128}{(2s+1)} (2s+1) B_\gamma^2(u, u) + (1+C L(\gamma) E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/\alpha}) [u]_{H^1(\gamma)}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2.$$

Recalling also the definition (6) of $\|u\|_{G_\gamma}^2 = G_\gamma(u, u)$, Equation (43) follows by $(2s+1) \geq 4$. \square

Lemma 4.4 *Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ be an embedding. Then there exists a $F_G(\gamma) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{G_\gamma} \leq F_G(\gamma) \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \quad \text{holds true for all } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Proof. Both $\|u\|_{G_\gamma}^2$ and $\|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}^2$ have the summands $[u]_{H^1(\gamma)}^2 + \|u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2$ in common. Hence, the proof boils down to bounding $B_\gamma^k(u, u)$, $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ in terms of $[u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2$. Fortunately, we have done the most difficult part of this already: in Lemma 3.3 in we found $C_s(\gamma)$ such that

$$B_\gamma^1(u, u) = \|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\gamma)}^2 \leq C_s(\gamma) [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2.$$

Because of $|u(y) - u(x)| \leq \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \varrho_\gamma(y, x)$, we may bound B_γ^2 as follows:

$$B_\gamma^2(u, u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left(\frac{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right)^2 |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma|^2 \left| \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_\gamma(y, x)} \right|^2 d\mu_\gamma(x, y) \leq \text{distor}(\gamma)^2 E(\gamma) \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2.$$

Closer inspection of the definition of B_γ^3 reveals that $B_\gamma^3(u, u) \leq 2 E(\gamma) \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}^2$. Finally we apply the Morrey inequality Lemma 2.3 to bound $\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty}$ and Theorem 2.5 to bound $\text{distor}(\gamma)$:

$$B_\gamma^2(u, u) + B_\gamma^3(u, u) \leq C_{M,s-1}^2 E(\gamma) L(\gamma)^{2s-5} (2 + C_{\text{distor}}^2 L(\gamma)^{\frac{2\alpha+2}{\alpha}} E(\gamma)^{2\beta}) [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}^2.$$

Recalling the definition of $C_s(\gamma)$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} F_G(\gamma)^2 &= C_{M,s-1}^2 E(\gamma) L(\gamma)^{2s-5} (2 + C_{\text{distor}}^2 L(\gamma)^{\frac{2\alpha+2}{\alpha}} E(\gamma)^{2\beta}) \\ &\quad + C_{\text{distor}}^{2s} \frac{1}{s} L(\gamma)^{\frac{2s(\alpha+1)}{\alpha}} E(\gamma)^{2s\beta} (1 + C_{M,s-1}^2 L(\gamma)^{2s-5} [\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4.2 Smoothness

We are now ready to collect the fruits from the previous sections. Next we prove smoothness of the metric. *Some* amount of regularity of the metric is crucial for the existence of geodesics, since the argument relies on the Picard–Lindelöf theorem. Since proving smoothness does not pose any extra problems, we prove the stronger statement. As a byproduct, we also prove the smoothness of E .

Theorem 4.5 *The metric G in \mathcal{M} is smooth.*

Proof. We can write $B_\gamma^i(u, v) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} b_\gamma^i(u, v)(x, y) \, d\mu(x, y)$ with the densities

$$\begin{aligned} b_\gamma^1(u, v)(x, y) &= 2 \langle \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u(x, y), \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s v(x, y) \rangle \Lambda(\gamma)(x, y) |\gamma'(x)| |\gamma'(y)|, \\ b_\gamma^2(u, v)(x, y) &= (2s + 1) |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^2 \left\langle \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}, \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)} \right\rangle \Lambda^3(\gamma)(x, y) |\gamma'(x)| |\gamma'(y)|, \\ b_\gamma^3(u, v)(x, y) &= |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma|^2 (\langle D_\gamma u(x), D_\gamma v(x) \rangle + \langle D_\gamma u(y), D_\gamma v(y) \rangle) \Lambda^1(\gamma) |\gamma'(x)| |\gamma'(y)|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining [Lemma 3.5](#), [Lemma 3.7](#), [Corollary 3.9](#), and [Theorem 3.10](#) with the well-known rules of differentiation and the Hölder inequalities, it becomes now apparent that each of the maps $(\gamma, u, v) \mapsto b_\gamma^i(u, v)$ is a smooth map with values in $L_\mu^1(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$. \square

As a consequence of this, we can reproduce the following result about the first derivative of the energy E . Fréchet differentiability and the formula for the derivative have of course been shown before (see [\[18\]](#)). However, the formula that we obtain involves the terms B_γ^1 , B_γ^2 , B_γ^3 , and this is a major reason why we included them into the metric:

Theorem 4.6 *The tangent-point energy $E: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is smooth. Its first derivative is given by*

$$DE(\gamma)u = 2B_\gamma^1(\gamma, u) - pB_\gamma^2(\gamma, u) + B_\gamma^3(\gamma, u) \quad \text{with} \quad p = 2s + 1.$$

Proof. Smoothness follows from

$$E(\gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s(x, y)|^2 \Lambda(\gamma)(x, y) |\gamma'(y)| |\gamma'(x)| \, d\mu(x, y).$$

To compute the derivative, we notice that the product rule implies

$$DE(\gamma)u = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} 2 \langle \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma, D(\eta \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \eta)(\gamma)u \rangle \, d\mu_\gamma + \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s|^2 D(\eta \mapsto d\mu_\eta)(\gamma)u.$$

Once again, we abbreviate $\Delta\gamma = \gamma(y) - \gamma(x)$ and $\Delta u = u(y) - u(x)$. It is straightforward to check that

$$D(\eta \mapsto d\mu_\eta)(\gamma)u = - \left\langle \frac{\Delta\gamma}{|\Delta\gamma|}, \frac{\Delta u}{|\Delta\gamma|} \right\rangle d\mu_\gamma + (\langle \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma, \mathcal{D}_\gamma u \rangle \circ \text{pr}_1 + \langle \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma, \mathcal{D}_\gamma u \rangle \circ \text{pr}_2) \, d\mu_\gamma.$$

Using [\(40\)](#) with $v = \gamma$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &D(\eta \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \eta)(\gamma)u \\ &= \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u - (\mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma \circ \text{pr}_1) \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u - (\mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma \circ \text{pr}_1) (\mathcal{D}_\gamma u \circ \text{pr}_1)^\top \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma - s \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma \left\langle \frac{\Delta\gamma}{|\Delta\gamma|}, \frac{\Delta u}{|\Delta\gamma|} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that $\mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x)$ is tangent to $\gamma'(x)$, and that $\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)$ is perpendicular to $\gamma'(x)$. Hence,

$$2 \langle \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma, D(\eta \mapsto \mathcal{R}_\eta^s \eta)(\gamma) u \rangle = 2 \langle \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma, \mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u \rangle - 2s |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma|^2 \left\langle \frac{\Delta \gamma}{|\Delta \gamma|}, \frac{\Delta u}{|\Delta \gamma|} \right\rangle.$$

Combining all this leads directly to the stated formula for $DE(\gamma)u$. \square

Remark 4.7 The same techniques can be applied to the other tangent-point energies $TP^{q,p}$, since they take the form

$$TP^{q,p}(\gamma) = 2^q \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma(x, y)|^q \Lambda(\gamma)(x, y) |\gamma'(y)| |\gamma'(x)| d\mu(x, y), \quad s = \frac{p-1}{q}.$$

If q is an even integer, then $TP^{q,p}$ is smooth. Otherwise, it has at least $\lceil q-1 \rceil$ continuous derivatives. We leave the details to the reader. \diamond

4.3 Geodesic distance

With a strong Riemannian metric at disposal, we may introduce the *geodesic distance*

$$\varrho_G : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty].$$

To this end, let γ_0 and γ_1 be two points in \mathcal{M} . Suppose there is a *path* Γ connecting them, i.e., a map $\Gamma \in C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M})$ such that $\Gamma(0) = \gamma_0$ and $\Gamma(1) = \gamma_1$. Note that \mathcal{M} only contains curves of class C^1 , hence *tame* knots. Moreover, these paths themselves are also of class C^1 . Thus, by definition, a path is always an isotopy.

For a “time” $t \in [0, 1]$ we denote the *velocity* by $\dot{\Gamma}(t) := \frac{d}{dt} \Gamma(t)$. We define the *path length* \mathcal{L} of the path Γ by

$$\mathcal{L}(\Gamma) := \int_0^1 \sqrt{G(\Gamma(t))(\dot{\Gamma}(t), \dot{\Gamma}(t))} dt. \quad (46)$$

Then the *geodesic distance* between γ_0 and γ_1 is defined as the infimum over the lengths of all paths connecting γ_0 and γ_1 :

$$\varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) = \inf \left\{ \mathcal{L}(\Gamma) \mid \Gamma \in C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M}), \Gamma(0) = \gamma_0, \Gamma(1) = \gamma_1 \right\}. \quad (47)$$

Of course, if no such path exists, the geodesic distance is ∞ .

Clearly $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1$ implies $\varrho_G(\gamma, \gamma) = 0$. Moreover, we have $\varrho_G(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) = \varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0)$ because we can just reverse every path from γ_0 to γ_1 to get a path from γ_1 to γ_0 . One can also show that ϱ_G satisfies the triangle inequality $\varrho_G(\gamma_2, \gamma_0) \leq \varrho_G(\gamma_2, \gamma_1) + \varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0)$: one merely has to concatenate two C^1 -paths from γ_0 to γ_1 and from γ_1 to γ_2 and to smooth them ever so slightly around the junction. Thus, $\varrho_G : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is what is sometimes called an *extended pseudometric* or *extended semimetric*. “Extended” because the value ∞ may indeed be attained when γ_0 and γ_1 lie in distinct path components or knot classes. And “pseudo” or “semi” because we have not yet shown that ϱ_G is definite, i.e., that $\varrho_G(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) = 0$ implies $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1$. In [Corollary 4.20](#) we will obtain definiteness of ϱ_G as a byproduct of our analysis.

In what follows we will frequently talk about subsets of $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ that are *bounded with respect to* ϱ_G , i.e., sets \mathcal{U} for which there is a $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and $0 < r < \infty$ such that

$$\mathcal{U} \subset \{ \eta \in \mathcal{M} \mid \varrho_G(\eta, \gamma) < r \}.$$

For the sake of brevity we will call such sets *G-bounded*.

4.4 Lipschitz continuity

As we mentioned in the introduction, we chose the constituents of G carefully to allow the metric G to control the tangent-point energy E and the arc length functional L . We make this more precise now.

Theorem 4.8 *The function $\sqrt{E}: (\mathcal{M}, \varrho_G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is globally Lipschitz-continuous:*

$$|\sqrt{E(\gamma_1)} - \sqrt{E(\gamma_0)}| \leq \sqrt{1 + p/4} \varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0), \quad p = 2s + 1, \quad \text{for all } \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in \mathcal{M}.$$

In particular we learn: E is bounded on G -bounded sets.

Proof. Let Γ be an arbitrary path. Using the fundamental theorem of calculus, the chain rule, and the well-known formula for the derivative of L , we obtain

$$|\sqrt{E(\gamma_1)} - \sqrt{E(\gamma_0)}| = \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \sqrt{E(\Gamma(t))} dt \right| \leq \int_0^1 \frac{|DE(\Gamma(t)) \dot{\Gamma}(t)|}{2\sqrt{E(\Gamma(t))}} dt. \quad (48)$$

We now bound the integrand. To this end, let us fix some t for the moment and abbreviate $\gamma := \Gamma(t)$ and $u := \dot{\Gamma}(t)$. From [Theorem 4.6](#) we know that

$$DE(\gamma)u = 2B_\gamma^1(\gamma, u) - pB_\gamma^2(\gamma, u) + B_\gamma^3(\gamma, u).$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality first for each of the B_γ^i and then for the Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^3 , and the definition (6) of G , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |DE(\gamma)u| &\leq |2B_\gamma^1(\gamma, u)| + |pB_\gamma^2(\gamma, u)| + |B_\gamma^3(\gamma, u)| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2B_\gamma^1(\gamma, \gamma)}\sqrt{2B_\gamma^1(u, u)} + \sqrt{pB_\gamma^2(\gamma, \gamma)}\sqrt{pB_\gamma^2(u, u)} + \sqrt{B_\gamma^3(\gamma, \gamma)}\sqrt{B_\gamma^3(u, u)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2B_\gamma^1(\gamma, \gamma) + pB_\gamma^2(\gamma, \gamma) + B_\gamma^3(\gamma, \gamma)}\sqrt{2B_\gamma^1(u, u) + pB_\gamma^2(u, u) + B_\gamma^3(u, u)}. \end{aligned}$$

Most curiously, each of the terms $B_\gamma^i(\gamma, \gamma)$ is tightly connected to the energy $E(\gamma)$. Indeed, when we insert the identities

$$\left\langle \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|}, \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\rangle = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x), \mathcal{D}_\gamma \gamma(x) \rangle = 1,$$

into the definitions (7), (8), and (9), then we can make the following observations:

$$B_\gamma^1(\gamma, \gamma) = E(\gamma), \quad B_\gamma^2(\gamma, \gamma) = E(\gamma), \quad \text{and} \quad B_\gamma^3(\gamma, \gamma) = 2E(\gamma). \quad (49)$$

Hence, it turns out that

$$\begin{aligned} |DE(\gamma)u| &\leq \sqrt{4 + p} \sqrt{E(\gamma)} \sqrt{2B_\gamma^1(u, u) + pB_\gamma^2(u, u) + B_\gamma^3(u, u)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{4 + p} \sqrt{E(\gamma)} \sqrt{G_\gamma(u, u)}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

When we substitute this back into (48), the square root of the energy cancels and we get

$$|\sqrt{E(\gamma_1)} - \sqrt{E(\gamma_0)}| \leq \sqrt{1 + p/4} \int_0^1 \sqrt{G_{\Gamma(t)}(\dot{\Gamma}(t), \dot{\Gamma}(t))} dt = \sqrt{1 + p/4} \mathcal{L}(\Gamma).$$

Finally, taking the infimum over all such paths leads to the statement of the theorem. \square

Note that this theorem holds true for every Riemannian metric that includes at least the terms B_γ^1 , B_γ^2 , and B_γ^3 . Neither the L^2 -term nor the H^1 -term are needed for this.

This theorem's proof is very much in spirit as the following result's. The latter is of course well-known for metrics that contain the H^1 -term, see for example [9, Section 7.4]. It is also the reason why we included the H^1 -term in our metric. We include a short proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 4.9 *The function $\sqrt{L}: (\mathcal{M}, \varrho_G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is globally Lipschitz-continuous:*

$$|\sqrt{L(\gamma_1)} - \sqrt{L(\gamma_0)}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) \quad \text{for all } \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in \mathcal{M}.$$

In particular we learn: L is bounded on G -bounded sets.

Proof. Let Γ be a path from γ_0 to γ_1 . In the same way as in the previous proof one shows:

$$|\sqrt{L(\gamma_1)} - \sqrt{L(\gamma_0)}| \leq \int_0^1 \frac{|DL(\Gamma(t)) \dot{\Gamma}(t)|}{2\sqrt{L(\Gamma(t))}} dt.$$

Now we have:

$$\begin{aligned} DL(\gamma) u &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle D_\gamma \gamma(x), D_\gamma u(x) \rangle d\omega_\gamma(x) \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |D_\gamma \gamma|^2 d\omega_\gamma(x) \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |D_\gamma u|^2 d\omega_\gamma(x) \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} 1 d\omega_\gamma(x) \right)^{1/2} \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)}} \leq \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^s(\gamma)}^2 \sqrt{L(\gamma)} \sqrt{\langle u, u \rangle_{H^1(\gamma)}} \leq \sqrt{L(\gamma)} \sqrt{G_\gamma(u, u)}. \end{aligned}$$

So we get $\sqrt{L(\gamma_1)} - \sqrt{L(\gamma_0)} \leq \int_0^1 \sqrt{G_\gamma(u, u)} dt$, and the lemma follows from taking the infimum over all such paths. \square

4.5 Norm equivalences

[Theorem 4.8](#) and [Lemma 4.9](#) show that the metric G has good control on L and E . Both these quantities appear in the norm bounds [Lemma 4.3](#) and [Lemma 4.4](#). Our next aim is to make the resulting norm equivalence uniform on G -bounded sets (see [Lemma 4.13](#)). However, closer inspection of the constants in [Lemma 4.4](#) reveals that also *negative* powers of L appear there. Hence, we first need to find a way to control $1/L$. To this end, we employ a result by Volkmann (see [51, Corollary 5.12]) for curves of length 1 and exploit the scaling behavior of the tangent-point energy E : If we scale the curve γ by a factor $\lambda > 0$, then the energy is scaled by λ^{3-2s} , i.e., $E(\lambda \cdot \gamma) = \lambda^{3-2s} E(\gamma)$.

Lemma 4.10 *For $s \in (3/2, 2)$ every embedding $\gamma \in H^s(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfies $\pi^2 \leq E(\gamma) L(\gamma)^{2s-3}$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and rescale it to $\eta := \gamma/L(\gamma)$. This is a curve of length 1. Its tangent-point energy is given by $E(\eta) = E(\gamma) L(\gamma)^{2s-3}$. From [51, Corollary 5.12] we know that

$$4\pi^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{1}{R_{\text{TP}}(\eta)(x, y)^2} d\omega_\eta(y) d\omega_\eta(x) = 4 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|P_\eta(x)(\eta(y) - \eta(x))|^2}{|\eta(y) - \eta(x)|^4} d\omega_\eta(y) d\omega_\eta(x).$$

Because of $|\eta(x) - \eta(y)| \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\pi^2 \leq \iint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|P_\eta(x)(\eta(y) - \eta(x))|^2}{|\eta(y) - \eta(x)|^{2s}} |\eta(y) - \eta(x)|^{2s-3} d\mu_\eta(x, y) \leq E(\eta) = E(\gamma) L(\gamma)^{2s-3}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 4.11 *The function $\gamma \mapsto 1/L(\gamma)$ is bounded on G -bounded sets.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be G -bounded. By [Theorem 4.8](#) and [Lemma 4.9](#), there is $0 < E_{\max} < \infty$ such that

$$E(\gamma) \leq E_{\max} \quad \text{holds true for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Now [Lemma 4.10](#) and $2s - 3 > 0$ imply

$$L(\gamma) \geq \pi^{2/(2s-3)} E(\gamma)^{-1/(2s-3)} \geq L_{\min} := \pi^{2/(2s-3)} E_{\max}^{-1/(2s-3)}. \quad \square$$

Note that this approach for bounding $1/L$ fails in the scale-invariant case $s = 3/2$. Indeed, for $s = 3/2$ the tangent-point energy does not penalize scaling down and therefore does not prevent the embedding from shrinking to a single point. Note also that it is crucial here that all the curves in \mathcal{M} are *closed*. In particular, the tangent-point energy vanishes on straight line segments.

Remark 4.12 In the same vein one may show, relying on $E(\gamma) \geq \pi^2 L(\gamma)^{3-2s}$, that the function $\gamma \mapsto 1/E(\gamma)$ is bounded on G -bounded sets. This fact might be of interest on its own. However, in what follows we only require upper bounds on E , no lower bounds. \diamond

Now we are in the position of making the norm equivalence from [Lemma 4.4](#) uniform on G -bounded sets:

Lemma 4.13 *For each G -bounded set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ there are $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ such that*

$$c \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \leq \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq C \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \quad \text{hold true for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and all } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Proof. From [Lemma 4.3](#) and [Lemma 4.4](#) we know that there are continuous functions $F_1, F_2: (0, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq F_1(L(\gamma), E(\gamma)) \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \leq F_2(L(\gamma), E(\gamma)) \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)}.$$

By [Theorem 4.8](#), [Corollary 4.11](#), and [Lemma 4.9](#) there are $0 < L_{\min} \leq L_{\max} < \infty$ and $0 < E_{\max} < \infty$ such that $L(\gamma) \in [L_{\min}, L_{\max}]$ and $E(\gamma) \in [0, E_{\max}]$ hold true for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}$. The set $[L_{\min}, L_{\max}] \times [0, E_{\max}] \subset (0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$ is compact; hence the continuous functions F_1 and F_2 are bounded on this set. This completes the proof. \square

Our next aim is to make also the norm equivalence [Lemma 2.1](#) uniform on G -bounded sets.

Lemma 4.14 *For each G -bounded set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ there are $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ such that*

$$c \|u\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} \quad \text{hold true for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and all } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Proof. From [Lemma 2.1](#) we know that $f_{H^s}(\gamma) \|u\|_{H^s} \leq \|u\|_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq F_{H^s}(\gamma) \|u\|_{H^s}$. Closer inspection of $f_{H^s}(\gamma)$ and $F_{H^s}(\gamma)$ reveals that we also need control over $\|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}$, $[h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$, $\|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}$, and $[H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$. This will be provided in [Lemma 4.16](#) and [Lemma 4.17](#) below. \square

The remainder of this subsection will be devoted to completing the proof of [Lemma 4.14](#). We start with the following auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 4.15 For each G -bounded set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ there is $0 < K < \infty$ such that

$$\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \leq K \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \quad \text{holds true for all } \gamma \in \mathcal{U} \text{ and all } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Proof. From combining the above arguments with the Morrey inequality (Lemma 2.3), we infer

$$\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{M,s-1} L(\gamma)^{s-5/2} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq C_{M,s-1} \left(\inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{U}} L(\eta) \right)^{s-5/2} C \|u\|_{G_\gamma}. \quad \square$$

The second statement of the following lemma reveals why G prevents immersions from degenerating into curves with vanishing velocity.

Lemma 4.16 The maps $\gamma \mapsto \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\gamma \mapsto \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}$ are bounded on G -bounded sets.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a G -bounded set. Then there are $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $0 < R < \infty$ such that $\mathcal{U} \subset B_R^G(\gamma_0)$. For $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, we may pick a path $\Gamma \in C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M})$ of length $\leq 2R$ that connects γ_0 with γ_1 . Note that $\Gamma([0, 1]) \subset B_{2R}^G(\gamma_0)$. We define the functions $f, g: [0, 1] \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(t, x) := h_{\Gamma(t)}(x) = |\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)| \quad \text{and} \quad g(t, x) := H_{\Gamma(t)}(x) = 1/|\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)|.$$

We intend to apply a Grönwall argument to bound f and g . From (34) and (35) we infer

$$|\partial_t f(t, x)| \leq g(t, x) \|D_{\Gamma(t)} \dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_t g(t, x)| \leq g(t, x) \|D_{\Gamma(t)} \dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Employing Lemma 4.15 on the bounded set $B_{2R}^G(\gamma_0)$ with $\gamma = \Gamma(t)$, and $u = \dot{\Gamma}(t)$ yields a $0 < K < \infty$ such that

$$|\partial_t f(t, x)| \leq K f(t, x) \|D_{\Gamma(t)} \dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \quad \text{and} \quad |\partial_t g(t, x)| \leq K g(t, x) \|D_{\Gamma(t)} \dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}.$$

Now the Grönwall inequality (Theorem A.1) leads us to

$$f(1, x) \leq f(0, x) \exp\left(K \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}\|_{G_\Gamma} dt\right) \quad \text{and} \quad g(1, x) \leq g(0, x) \exp\left(K \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}\|_{G_\Gamma} dt\right).$$

Substituting the definitions of f and g and recalling that the path length of Γ in \mathcal{M} is bounded by $2R$, we obtain

$$h_{\gamma_1}(x) \leq e^{2KR} h_{\gamma_0}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\gamma_1}(x) \leq e^{2KR} H_{\gamma_0}(x).$$

Passing to the suprema over $x \in \mathbb{T}$ proves the claim. \square

Lemma 4.17 The maps $\gamma \mapsto [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$ and $\gamma \mapsto [H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$ are bounded on G -bounded sets.

Proof. We start by proving that $\gamma \mapsto [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$ is bounded on G -bounded sets. Let $\mathcal{U}, R, \gamma_0, \gamma_1$, and Γ be as in the previous proof. Due to the reverse triangle inequality, we have

$$[h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{||\gamma'(y)| - |\gamma'(x)||^2}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^{2s-2}} d\mu(x, y) \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{|\gamma'(y) - \gamma'(x)|^2}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)^{2s-2}} d\mu(x, y) = [\gamma]_{H^s}^2,$$

hence it suffices to bound the latter. In order to apply another Grönwall argument, we define $f(t) := [\Gamma(t)]_{H^s}$. Note that $\gamma \mapsto [\gamma]_{H^s}$ is 1-Lipschitz with respect to the seminorm $[\cdot]_{H^s}$, hence f is weakly differentiable and we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(t) \leq [\dot{\Gamma}(t)]_{H^s}. \quad (51)$$

Using [Lemma 4.13](#) on the bounded set $B_{2R}^G(\gamma_0)$, there exists a uniform $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s(\Gamma)} \leq C \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

Next we use [Lemma 2.1](#) to bound the stationary norm by the covariant norm:

$$\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s} \leq F_{H^s}(\Gamma(t)) \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s(\Gamma(t))} \leq C F_{H^s}(\Gamma(t)) \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$F_{H^s}(\gamma) = \left(\|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + (1 + 2 \|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^{2s}) \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty} + 2 C_{M,s-1}^2 L(\gamma)^{2s-5} [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

With our knowledge from [Lemma 4.16](#), we can bound $\|h_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}$ uniformly in $\gamma \in B_{2R}^G(\gamma_0)$. Moreover, we can also bound $L(\gamma)$ uniformly on $B_{2R}^G(\gamma_0)$ from above and below. Thus, we can find $0 < k_1, k_2, K_1, K_2 < \infty$ such that

$$F_{H^s}(\Gamma(t)) \leq (k_1 + k_2 [h_{\Gamma(t)}]_{H^{s-1}}^2)^{1/2} \leq K_1 + K_2 [\dot{\Gamma}(t)]_{H^s} = K_1 + K_2 f(t).$$

Inserting this into (51) we obtain

$$|\dot{f}(t)| \leq C K_1 \|\Gamma'(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} + C K_2 \|\Gamma'(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} f(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

Hence, the fundamental theorem of calculus implies

$$\begin{aligned} f(t) &\leq f(0) + \int_0^t |\dot{f}(s)| \, ds \\ &\leq f(0) + C K_1 \int_0^t \|\dot{\Gamma}(s)\|_{G_{\Gamma(s)}} \, ds + \int_0^t C K_2 \|\dot{\Gamma}(s)\|_{G_{\Gamma(s)}} \varphi(s) \, ds \\ &\leq \underbrace{f(0) + 2 C K_1 R}_{\alpha(t)} + \int_0^t \underbrace{C K_2 \|\Gamma'(s)\|_{G_{\Gamma(s)}}}_{\beta(t)} f(s) \, ds \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to use the integral version of the famous Grönwall inequality (see [Theorem A.2](#)):

$$f(1) \leq \alpha(1) \exp\left(\int_0^1 \beta(s) \, ds\right) \leq (f(0) + 2 C K_1 R) e^{C K_2 R}.$$

This proves the first claim. Now we show that $\gamma \mapsto [H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$ is bounded on G -bounded sets. From

$$|H_\gamma(y) - H_\gamma(x)| = \left| \frac{|\gamma'(x)| - |\gamma'(y)|}{|\gamma'(y)| |\gamma'(x)|} \right| = H_\gamma(x) H_\gamma(y) |h_\gamma(x) - h_\gamma(y)|,$$

we obtain

$$[H_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{H_\gamma(y) - H_\gamma(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y,x)^{s-1}} \right|^2 \, d\mu(x,y) \right)^{1/2} \leq 2 \|H_\gamma\|_{L^\infty}^2 [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}. \quad (52)$$

By the previous claim, $\gamma \mapsto [h_\gamma]_{H^{s-1}}$ is bounded on G -bounded sets. Applying [Lemma 4.16](#) once more completes the proof. \square

4.6 Distance bounds

The uniform norm equivalences [Lemma 4.13](#) and [Lemma 4.14](#) (uniform on G -bounded subsets) finally allow us to derive estimates between the H^s -Sobolev–Slobodeckij distance on the one hand and the geodesic distance ϱ_G on the other hand.

Lemma 4.18 *For each G -bounded subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{M}$ there is $0 < K < \infty$ such that*

$$\varrho_{H^s}(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) := \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_0\|_{H^s} \leq K \varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) \quad \text{for all } \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and $0 < R < \infty$ such that $\mathcal{U} \subset B_R^G(\gamma)$. Clearly, we have $\varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) \leq \varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma) + \varrho_G(\gamma, \gamma_0) < 2R$. Let $\Gamma \in C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M})$ be an arbitrary path from γ_0 to γ_1 with path length $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma) \leq 2R$. Note that we have $\varrho_G(\Gamma(t), \gamma) \leq \varrho_G(\Gamma(t), \gamma_0) + \varrho_G(\gamma_0, \gamma) < 3R$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, so the image of the path lies in $B_{3R}^G(\gamma)$, which is of course a bounded set. By [Lemma 4.13](#) and [Lemma 4.14](#) we find a $0 < K < \infty$ such that $\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s} \leq \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}$ holds for all $t \in [0, 1]$. The Jensen inequality yields

$$\|\gamma_1 - \gamma_0\|_{H^s} = \left\| \int_0^1 \dot{\Gamma}(t) \, dt \right\|_{H^s} \leq \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s} \, dt \leq K \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \, dt = K \mathcal{L}(\Gamma).$$

Taking the infimum on the right-hand side over all paths with $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma) \leq 2R$ (which is equal to the infimum over *all* such paths), yields the claim. \square

As direct consequences, we can state the following corollaries.

Corollary 4.19 *Let $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in \mathcal{M} that converges to $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ with respect to the geodesic distance, i.e., $\varrho_G(\gamma_k, \gamma) \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Then $(\gamma_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to γ also in $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$.*

Corollary 4.20 *The geodesic distance ϱ_G is definite, i.e., $\varrho_G(\gamma_0, \gamma_1) = 0$ implies $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1$.*

Corollary 4.21 *Every G -bounded set is also bounded in H^s .*

Remark 4.22 Beware that the reverse statement does not hold true in general: Not every $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$ -bounded set is G -bounded. To see this, consider some $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ and some $\eta \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ that is not an embedding. Define $R := 2\|\eta - \gamma\|_{H^s}$. Then the R -ball with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$ centered at γ cannot be bounded with respect to ϱ_G . Assume it were. Then there would be a path of finite length ℓ with respect to G connecting γ and η . [Theorem 4.8](#) would lead to $E(\eta) \leq E(\gamma) + \sqrt{1+p/4}\ell < \infty$, which would imply that η is an embedding. *Contradiction.* \diamond

Nonetheless, we can show that ϱ_{H^s} can dominate ϱ_G on sufficiently small sets. This will be relevant for our proof of metric completeness (see [Theorem 6.1](#)).

Lemma 4.23 *For every $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$ there is an $r = r(\gamma) > 0$ and a $C > 0$ such that*

$$\varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) \leq C \varrho_{H^s}(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) \quad \text{for all } \gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in B_r(\gamma),$$

where $B_r(\gamma)$ denotes the open r -ball with respect to the H^s -distance ϱ_{H^s} .

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. Since $\mathcal{M} \subset H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is open, there is a radius $r > 0$ such $B_r(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$. Because of continuity, we may shrink r such that the following holds true for every $\eta \in B_r(\gamma)$:

$$|\eta'(x)| \in \left[\frac{1}{2} \inf |\gamma'|, 2 \sup |\gamma'| \right], \quad \|\eta\|_{H^s} \in \left[\frac{1}{2} \|\gamma\|_{H^s}, 2 \|\gamma\|_{H^s} \right], \quad \text{and} \quad E(\eta) \in \left[\frac{1}{2} E(\gamma), 2E(\gamma) \right].$$

In particular, this also implies that each $\eta \in B_r(\gamma)$ has arc length $L(\eta) \in \left[\frac{1}{2} L(\gamma), 2L(\gamma) \right]$. By [Lemma 4.4](#) and [Lemma 2.1](#), there are nonnegative functions F_G and F_{H^s} such that

$$\|u\|_{G_\eta} \leq F_G(\eta) \|u\|_{H^s(\eta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|_{H^s(\eta)} \leq F_{H^s}(\eta) \|u\|_{H^s}$$

hold true for all $\eta \in B_r(\gamma)$ and all $u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Next we show that F_G and F_{H^s} are bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$. Recall the F_G was explicitly stated in (14). Now, a closer inspection of $F_G(\eta)$ reveals that it depends continuously on $L(\eta)$, $1/L(\eta)$, $E(\eta)$, and $[\eta]_{H^s(\eta)}$. The functions L , $1/L$, and E are bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$ by choice of r . From

$$[\eta]_{H^s(\eta)} \leq \|\eta\|_{H^s(\eta)} \leq F_{H^s}(\eta) \|\eta\|_{H^s} \leq F_{H^s}(\eta) (\|\gamma\|_{H^s} + r)$$

we infer that F_G is bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$ if F_{H^s} is. By (25), the latter is given by

$$F_{H^s}(\eta)^2 = \|h_\eta\|_{L^\infty} + \|H_\eta\|_{L^\infty} + 2 \text{BiLip}(\eta)^{2s-1} \|h_\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 \left(\|H_\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 + C_{M,s-1} [H_\eta]_{H^{s-1}}^2 \right).$$

Again, by choice of r , the functions $\eta \mapsto \|h_\eta\|_{L^\infty}$ and $\eta \mapsto \|H_\eta\|_{L^\infty}$ are bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$. Because of [Theorem 2.5](#) and since L and E are bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$, the function BiLip is also bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$. Moreover, with (52) we may bound

$$[H_\eta]_{H^{s-1}} \leq 2 \|H_\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 [h_\eta]_{H^{s-1}} \leq 2 \|H_\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 [\eta]_{H^s} \leq 2 \|H_\eta\|_{L^\infty}^2 (\|\gamma\|_{H^s} + r).$$

This shows that both F_G and F_{H^s} are bounded on $B_r(\gamma)$. Hence, we may find a $C > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{G_\eta} \leq C \|u\|_{H^s} \quad \text{holds true for all } \eta \in B_r(\gamma) \text{ and all } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

This uniform norm bound allows us to tackle the distance bound: Let $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in B_r(\gamma)$. Since $B_r(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \subset H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is convex, the path $\Gamma(t) := (1-t)\gamma_0 + t\gamma_1$ is a path in $B_r(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$. By construction, Γ is the shortest path from γ_0 to γ_1 with respect to ϱ_{H^s} . Thus, we get

$$\varrho_G(\gamma_1, \gamma_0) \leq \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}\|_{G_\Gamma} dt \leq C \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}\|_{H^s} dt = C \|\gamma_1 - \gamma_0\|_{H^s}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 4.24 *The identity map $\text{id} : (\mathcal{M}, \varrho_G) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}, \varrho_{H^s})$ is locally bi-Lipschitz continuous.*

We would like to close this section with the following observation on the quotient metric with respect to the action of the reparametrization group. In view of [40], it is by no means obvious that the quotient metric is definite.

This is why we deem the following affirmative result noteworthy. However, we will deal solely with *parametrized* embeddings in the remainder of the paper; so this result is not required for the forthcoming sections.

Proposition 4.25 Denote by \mathcal{G} the group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms $\mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ of class H^s and by $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{M}/\mathcal{G}$ the shape space of oriented unparameterized embeddings. Then the quotient metric $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}$ given by

$$\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}([\gamma], [\eta]) := \inf_{\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{G}} \varrho_G(\gamma \circ \psi, \eta \circ \varphi) = \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{G}} \varrho_G(\gamma, \eta \circ \varphi) \quad \text{for } \gamma, \eta \in \mathcal{M}$$

is definite.

Proof. Let $\gamma, \eta \in \mathcal{M}$ be two curves satisfying $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}([\gamma], [\eta]) = 0$. Choose an arbitrarily $0 < R < \infty$. Let $\mathcal{U} = B_R^G(\gamma)$ and let $0 < K < \infty$ as in Lemma 4.18. Because of $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}([\gamma], [\eta]) = 0$, the set $\mathcal{G}_R := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{G} \mid \varrho_G(\gamma, \eta \circ \varphi) < R\}$ must be nonempty. By $\varrho_{\mathcal{H}}$ we denote the Hausdorff distance between compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^m . With Theorem A.3 and Lemma 4.18 we obtain

$$\varrho_{\mathcal{H}}(\gamma(\mathbb{T}), \eta(\mathbb{T})) \leq \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\gamma - \eta \circ \varphi\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_M \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_R} \|\gamma - \eta \circ \varphi\|_{H^s} \leq C_M K \inf_{\varphi \in \mathcal{G}_R} \varrho_G(\gamma, \eta \circ \varphi).$$

By the construction of \mathcal{G}_R , the infimum on the right-hand side is equal to $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}([\gamma], [\eta]) = 0$. This implies that $\varrho_{\mathcal{H}}(\gamma(\mathbb{T}), \eta(\mathbb{T})) = 0$ and thus that $\gamma(\mathbb{T}) = \eta(\mathbb{T})$. Hence, the map $\varphi := \eta^{-1} \circ \gamma$ is a well-defined diffeomorphism and of class H^s . Thus, $[\eta] = [\gamma]$, showing that $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}$ is definite. \square

We do not investigate the quotient metric $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}$ any further here. In particular, we do not attempt to answer the very interesting question whether $\varrho_{\mathcal{B}}([\gamma], [\eta])$ is realized by a particular reparametrization φ , nor do we try to give a characterization for such φ .

5 Banach–Alaoglu property

As we have mentioned in the introduction, Riesz’s lemma tells us that we cannot expect the Heine–Borel property to hold true in our infinite-dimension Riemannian manifold (\mathcal{M}, G) . The best we can hope for is some form of *weak* compactness. And indeed, our goal in this section is to show the Banach–Alaoglu property which is the infinite dimensional analogue of the Heine–Borel property.

We would like to emphasize that only the weak closure of bounded sets is weakly compact, not the ordinary closure. One can see this in the following counterexample: Let H be a separable, infinite-dimensional Hilbert space and let $S \subset H$ be the unit sphere. The sphere S is closed in the metric topology. Let e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots be a complete orthogonal system. Then $e_n \in S$ and we have $e_n \rightarrow 0$, but $0 \notin S$. So S is not weakly compact. Its weak closure is the closed unit ball B —which is weakly compact.

Now, we state our theorem.

Theorem 5.1 (Banach–Alaoglu property) *Bounded sets in (\mathcal{M}, ϱ_G) are relatively compact with respect to the weak topology in $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$.*

Proof. We actually proof the following, equivalent statement: Every net $(\gamma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ in \mathcal{M} that is bounded with respect to ϱ_G has a weakly convergent subnet with limit point $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. Here bounded means that there is a point $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and a radius $r > 0$ such that each γ_i of the net

satisfies $\varrho_G(\gamma_i, \gamma_0) \leq r$. By [Corollary 4.21](#), the net $(\gamma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ is bounded also in $\|\cdot\|_{H^s}$. Hence, the Banach–Alaoglu theorem implies that there is a weakly convergent subnet with limit point $\gamma \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. We are left to show that γ is indeed in \mathcal{M} , and for this we have to show two things: γ is an immersion, and γ is an embedding. To this end, we extract a convergent subsequence $\gamma_n := \gamma_{i_n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ from $(\gamma_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ such that γ_n converges weakly to γ .

Claim 1. γ is an immersion. The sequence $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is G -bounded. By [Lemma 4.16](#) and [Lemma 4.17](#), the sequence $(H_{\gamma_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $H_{\gamma_n}(x) := 1/|\gamma'_n(x)|$ is bounded in $\|\cdot\|_{H^{s-1}}$. By the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, there is a subsequence that weakly converges to H_γ . Because the embedding $H^{s-1}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow C^0(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$ is compact, this subsequence is mapped to a sequence that converges in C^0 to H_γ . Hence, H_γ must be a bounded function, showing that γ is indeed an immersion.

Claim 2. γ is an embedding. We prove this by showing that $E(\gamma) < \infty$. We can write $E(\gamma_n) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f_n(x, y) \, d\lambda(y) \, d\lambda(x)$ with integrand

$$f_n(x, y) := \frac{|\gamma_n(y) - \gamma_n(x) - |\gamma'_n(x)|^{-2} \gamma'_n(x) \langle \gamma'_n(x), \gamma_n(y) - \gamma_n(x) \rangle|^2}{|\gamma_n(y) - \gamma_n(x)|^{2s+1}} |\gamma'_n(x)| |\gamma'_n(y)| \geq 0.$$

We chose $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be weakly convergent to γ in $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Since the Morrey embedding $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \hookrightarrow C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is compact, this sequence also converges strongly to γ in C^1 . In particular, this means that γ_n and γ'_n converge pointwise to γ and γ' , respectively. So f_n converges pointwise to the integrand of $E(\gamma)$. Fatou's lemma implies

$$\begin{aligned} E(\gamma) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x, y) \, d\lambda(y) \, d\lambda(x) \\ &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f_n(x, y) \, d\lambda(y) \, d\lambda(x) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

Because E is bounded on bounded sets (see [Theorem 4.8](#)) and since $\{\gamma_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded, this completes the proof. \square

In passing, the Fatou argument also shows the following, which will be exploited in our proofs of metric completeness (see [Theorem 6.1](#)) and geodesic completeness (see [Theorem 7.3](#)):

Lemma 5.2 *The tangent-point energy $E: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is lower semicontinuous in $C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and sequentially lower semicontinuous with respect to the weak convergence in $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$.*

6 Metric completeness

We are now able to move on to the next of the Hopf–Rinow properties. Thanks to our careful investigation before, this is less intricate than the other properties.

Theorem 6.1 (Metric completeness) *With $\varrho_G: \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$, the geodesic distance function from (47), the space (\mathcal{M}, ϱ_G) is a complete (extended) metric space.*

Proof. Let $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{M} with respect to ϱ_G , so $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ must be G -bounded. Hence, we are allowed to use [Lemma 4.18](#), which now implies that $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy in H^s . Thus, the sequence converges strongly in H^s to some $\gamma \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$. Next we

show that γ is an embedding. Since the sequence is contained in a G -bounded set, [Lemma 4.16](#) implies that there are $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ such that $c \leq |\gamma'_n(x)| \leq C$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since convergence in H^s implies convergence in C^1 , we also have $c \leq |\gamma'(x)| \leq C$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$. Hence, γ is an immersion. By [Theorem 4.8](#), there is $0 < E_0 < \infty$ such that $E(\gamma_n) \leq E_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since E is weakly sequentially lower semi-continuous (see [Lemma 5.2](#)), we deduce that $E(\gamma) \leq E_0 < \infty$. Hence, γ is an embedding. We now have to show that $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to γ also in G . We may apply [Lemma 4.23](#) to find an $r > 0$ and a $K > 0$ such that

$$\varrho_G(\eta, \xi) \leq K \|\eta - \xi\|_{H^s} \text{ for all } \eta, \xi \in B_r(\gamma).$$

Since $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to γ with respect to ϱ_{H^s} , we know that there is a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma_n \in B_r(\gamma)$ for all $n \geq N$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_G(\gamma, \gamma_n) = \lim_{N \leq n \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_G(\gamma, \gamma_n) \leq K \lim_{N \leq n \rightarrow \infty} \|\gamma_n - \gamma\|_{H^s} = 0.$$

Thus, the sequence converges strongly in ϱ_G to $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$. □

7 Geodesic completeness

This chapter consists of the derivation of the geodesic equation and of showing short-time and long-time existence of the initial value problem for geodesics, also referred to by *geodesic shooting*.

7.1 The geodesic equation

Let $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ be two embeddings. Our aim is to find the shortest path between them, i.e., we consider the problem:

$$\text{Minimize } \mathcal{L}(\Gamma) \text{ among all } \Gamma \in C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M}) \text{ s.t. } \Gamma(0) = \gamma_0, \Gamma(1) = \gamma_1. \quad (53)$$

As it is well-known, it is easier to use the *Dirichlet* or *path energy* \mathcal{E}

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) := \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}^2 dt$$

and to solve the following variational problem:

$$\text{Minimize } \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \text{ among all } \Gamma \in H^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M}) \text{ s.t. } \Gamma(0) = \gamma_0, \Gamma(1) = \gamma_1. \quad (54)$$

Here we already relaxed the feasible set from the non-reflexive space $C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M})$ to the larger Hilbert space

$$H^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M}) := \left\{ \Gamma \in H^1([0, 1]; H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)) \mid \Gamma(t) \in \mathcal{M} \text{ for almost all } t \in [0, 1] \right\}$$

that we equip with the norm

$$\|U\|_{H^1} := \left(\int_0^1 (\|U(t)\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\dot{U}(t)\|_{H^s}^2) dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

Minimizing the path energy will essentially lead to the same results for two reasons: The Hölder inequality implies

$$L(\Gamma) = \int_0^1 1 \cdot \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} dt \leq \left(\int_0^1 1^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{2 \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)} \quad (55)$$

with equality if and only if $\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}$ is constant, i.e., if the path Γ has constant speed. And as we will see in the next paragraph, each minimizer of \mathcal{L} is indeed has constant speed. So each minimizer of Problem (53), once reparameterized to constant speed, will be a minimizer of Problem (54). And thus very minimizer of Problem (54) will be a minimizer of Problem (53).

We want to study the criticality equation of \mathcal{E} and thus have to differentiate the map $\gamma \mapsto G_\gamma$. To this end it will be helpful to write $G(\gamma)$ instead of G_γ . Let $\Gamma \in H^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M})$ be a critical point of Problem (54). Then for every admissible variation $W \in C^1([0, 1]; \mathcal{M})$, i.e., $W(0) = 0$ and $W(1) = 0$, has to satisfy $D\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)W = 0$. Abbreviating $\gamma_t := \Gamma(t)$ and $w_t := W(t)$, we may use integration by parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = D\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)W &= \int_0^1 \left(G(\gamma_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{w}_t) + \frac{1}{2} (DG(\gamma_t)w_t)(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) \right) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \left(-G(\gamma_t)(\ddot{\gamma}_t, w_t) - (DG(\gamma_t)\dot{\gamma}_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, w_t) + \frac{1}{2} (DG(\gamma_t)w_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) \right) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Thus, by virtue of the fundamental theorem of the calculus of variations, the following equation must hold for almost all $t \in (0, 1)$:

$$G(\gamma_t)(\ddot{\gamma}_t, w) + (DG(\gamma_t)\dot{\gamma}_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, w) - \frac{1}{2} (DG(\gamma_t)w)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) = 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in T_{\gamma_t}\mathcal{M}.$$

With the linear map $A_\gamma: T_\gamma\mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(T_\gamma\mathcal{M}; T_\gamma\mathcal{M})$, implicitly given by the *Koszul formula*

$$G(\gamma)(A_\gamma(u)v, w) = \frac{1}{2} \left((DG(\gamma)u)(v, w) + (DG(\gamma)v)(u, w) - (DG(\gamma)w)(u, v) \right), \quad (57)$$

this can be simplified to

$$G(\gamma_t)(\ddot{\gamma}_t + A_{\gamma_t}(\dot{\gamma}_t)\dot{\gamma}_t, w) = 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in T_{\gamma_t}\mathcal{M}. \quad (58)$$

In Riemannian geometry, the linear map A_γ called the *Christoffel symbol* of the so-called Levi–Civita connection of G at point γ . Equation (57) is referred to as *Koszul formula*.

Since $G(\gamma_t)$ is a nondegenerate bilinear form and since w runs through all tangent vectors, (58) implies: $\ddot{\gamma}_t + A_{\gamma_t}(\dot{\gamma}_t)\dot{\gamma}_t = 0$. This must hold for almost all $t \in (0, 1)$, hence the critical point Γ must satisfy the following *geodesic equation*:

$$\nabla_{\dot{\Gamma}}\dot{\Gamma} = \ddot{\Gamma} + A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma})\dot{\Gamma} = 0, \quad (59)$$

where ∇ denotes the *covariant derivative* of the Levi–Civita connection associated to G . Finally, we can also show that a critical path Γ must be parameterized with constant speed:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}G(\Gamma(t))(\dot{\Gamma}(t), \dot{\Gamma}(t)) &= (DG(\gamma_t)\dot{\gamma}_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) + 2G(\gamma_t)(\ddot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) \\ &= (DG(\gamma_t)\dot{\gamma}_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) + 2G(\gamma_t)(-A_{\gamma_t}(\dot{\gamma}_t)\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) \\ &= (DG(\gamma_t)\dot{\gamma}_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} (DG(\gamma_t)\dot{\gamma}_t)(\dot{\gamma}_t, \dot{\gamma}_t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

So, indeed, the solutions of Problem (53) and Problem (54) coincide up to reparametrization.

7.2 Short-time existence

Not only the boundary values problem (54) for geodesics is of interest. Finding a path $\Gamma: [0, T] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ satisfying

$$\ddot{\Gamma} + A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma}) \dot{\Gamma} = 0, \quad \Gamma(0) = \gamma_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\Gamma}(0) = v_0 \quad (61)$$

for some time $T > 0$, some starting point $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, and some starting velocity $v_0 \in T_{\gamma_0}\mathcal{M}$ is referred to as the *geodesic initial value problem* or the *geodesic shooting problem*.

Theorem 7.1 (Short-time existence)

For every $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and every $v_0 \in T_{\gamma_0}\mathcal{M} = H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ there is a $T > 0$ so that the initial value problem (61) has a unique solution.

Proof. The differential equation (61) is of second order. Introducing $V(t) := \dot{\Gamma}(t)$, we can turn it into a system of differential equations of first order:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}(t) \\ \dot{V}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{F}(\Gamma(t), V(t)) := \begin{pmatrix} V(t) \\ - (A_{\Gamma(t)} V(t)) V(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma(0) \\ V(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_0 \\ v_0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (62)$$

With the help of the Riesz isomorphism $J_\gamma: T_\gamma\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T'_\gamma\mathcal{M}$ from Theorem 4.5, we can write down the Christoffel symbol (57) a bit more explicitly:

$$A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma}) \dot{\Gamma} = J_\Gamma^{-1} \left((DG(\Gamma) \dot{\Gamma})(\dot{\Gamma}, \cdot) - \frac{1}{2} (DG(\Gamma) (\cdot))(\dot{\Gamma}, \dot{\Gamma}) \right). \quad (63)$$

So the forcing term $\mathcal{F}: T\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M} \times H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ looks as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(\gamma, v) = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ J_\Gamma^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{2} (DG_\gamma (\cdot))(v, v) - (DG_\gamma v)(v, \cdot) \right) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

Because the metric G is smooth (see Theorem 4.5), the term \mathcal{F} is smooth as well. In particular, $D\mathcal{F}$ exists and it is continuous. Hence \mathcal{F} is locally Lipschitz-continuous. Now the Picard–Lindelöf theorem on Banach spaces applies and shows that this system of ordinary differential equations gives rise to a unique short-time solution. \square

We would also like to point out that this can be generalized to submanifolds. This fact is not required for the further line of argument. Therefore, we conclude this subsection with the following remark, which may be skipped on first reading.

Remark 7.2 Suppose that $\Phi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is some sufficiently smooth submersion with values in some Banach space \mathcal{X} . We denote the constraint submanifold by $\mathcal{N} := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{M} \mid \Phi(\gamma) = 0\}$. At a point $\gamma \in \mathcal{N}$ the tangent space is given by $T_\gamma\mathcal{N} = \ker(D\Phi(\gamma))$. If one tests (56) only by admissible infinitesimal variations, i.e., by mappings $W: [0, 1] \rightarrow H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfying $W(t) \in T_{\Gamma(t)}\mathcal{N}$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$, $W(0) = 0$ and $W(1) = 0$, then we are led to the *constrained geodesic equation*

$$(\text{id} - Q(\Gamma)) \nabla_{\dot{\Gamma}} \dot{\Gamma} = 0. \quad (65)$$

Here, the linear operator $Q(\gamma): T_\gamma\mathcal{M} \rightarrow T_\gamma\mathcal{M}$ is the G -orthogonal projection operator onto the G_γ -orthogonal complement $\ker(D\Phi(\gamma))^\perp$ of $T_\gamma\mathcal{N}$. Our aim is to express this constrained geodesic equation as an unconstrained ordinary differential equation of second order, so that we can apply the Picard–Lindelöf theorem once more. To

this end, we recall the definition of the *second fundamental form* \mathbb{I} of the submanifold $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$: For $\gamma \in \mathcal{N}$, it is a bilinear map $\mathbb{I}_\gamma: T_\gamma \mathcal{N} \times T_\gamma \mathcal{N} \rightarrow (T_\gamma \mathcal{N})^\perp \subset T_\gamma \mathcal{M}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{I}_\gamma(u, v) := -(\nabla_u Q)v := -(DQ(\gamma)u)v + Q(\gamma)A_\gamma(u)v \quad u, v \in T_\gamma \mathcal{N}.$$

The fact that $\mathbb{I}_\gamma(u, v) \in (T_\gamma \mathcal{N})^\perp$ results from the projector property $Q^2 = Q$:

$$(\text{id} - Q(\gamma))(DQ(\gamma)u)v = D((\text{id} - Q)(\gamma)u) - (D(\text{id} - Q)(\gamma)u)Q(\gamma)v = 0.$$

It is now remarkable that

$$Q(\Gamma)\nabla_{\dot{\Gamma}}\dot{\Gamma} = Q(\Gamma)\ddot{\Gamma} + Q(\Gamma)A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma})\dot{\Gamma} = \frac{d}{dt}\left(Q(\Gamma)\dot{\Gamma}\right) - \left(\frac{d}{dt}Q(\Gamma)\right)\dot{\Gamma} + Q(\Gamma)A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma})\dot{\Gamma} = \mathbb{I}_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma}, \dot{\Gamma}).$$

This allows us to rewrite (65) as

$$\nabla_{\dot{\Gamma}}\dot{\Gamma} = \mathbb{I}_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma}, \dot{\Gamma}) \quad \text{or, equivalently, as} \quad \ddot{\Gamma} = \mathbb{I}_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma}, \dot{\Gamma}) - A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma})\dot{\Gamma}. \quad (66)$$

We have expressed \mathbb{I}_γ already in terms of $DQ(\gamma)$. Next we express $Q(\gamma)$ in terms of $D\Phi(\gamma)$. Since Φ is a submersion, the differential $D\Phi(\gamma): T_\gamma \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is surjective. Recall from [Theorem 4.1](#) that we denoted the Riesz isomorphism of G_γ by $J_\gamma: T_\gamma \mathcal{M} \rightarrow T'_\gamma \mathcal{M}$. Now it is straight-forward to check that

$$D\Phi(\gamma)^\dagger := J_\gamma^{-1}D\Phi(\gamma)'(D\Phi(\gamma)J_\gamma^{-1}D\Phi(\gamma)')^{-1} \quad (67)$$

is a bounded right-inverse of $D\Phi(\gamma)$. (In fact, if \mathcal{X} is a Hilbert space, then $D\Phi(\gamma)^\dagger$ is the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse of $D\Phi(\gamma)$. Note that $D\Phi(\gamma)$ is assumed to be surjective, not injective; so, this formula for the pseudoinverse here differs from the one we mentioned earlier in (4).) In any case, we have the following identity:

$$Q(\gamma) = D\Phi(\gamma)^\dagger D\Phi(\gamma).$$

It allows us to compute the derivative of Q via product rule and the rule for the derivate of the inversion in a Banach algebra. For $u, v \in T_\gamma \mathcal{N} = \ker(D\Phi(\gamma))$, it can be simplified to

$$(DQ(\gamma)u)v = (D(\eta \mapsto D\Phi(\eta)^\dagger)(\gamma)u)D\Phi(\gamma)v + D\Phi(\gamma)^\dagger D^2\Phi(\gamma)(u, v).$$

Hence, (66) can be reformulated to

$$\ddot{\Gamma} = -D\Phi(\Gamma)^\dagger D^2\Phi(\Gamma)(\dot{\Gamma}, \dot{\Gamma}) - (\text{id} - Q(\Gamma))A_\Gamma(\dot{\Gamma})\dot{\Gamma}. \quad (68)$$

The analogue of (62) in this submanifold setting is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Gamma} \\ \dot{V} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V \\ \mathbb{I}_\Gamma(V, V) - A_\Gamma(V)V \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V \\ -D\Phi(\Gamma)^\dagger D^2\Phi(\Gamma)(V, V) - (\text{id} - Q(\Gamma))A_\Gamma(V)V \end{pmatrix}. \quad (69)$$

If we suppose that Φ is of class $C_{\text{loc}}^{2,1}$, then the right-hand side is still locally Lipschitz-continuous. Thus, we obtain short-time existence for the geodesic initial value problem in the constrained manifold \mathcal{N} as well. \diamond

7.3 Long-time existence

Theorem 7.3 (Geodesic completeness) *The Riemannian manifold (\mathcal{M}, G) is geodesically complete.*

Proof. We prove this theorem by contradiction. Let $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and let $v_0 \in T_{\gamma_0} \mathcal{M} = H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ be a vector with $\|v_0\|_{G(\gamma_0)} = 1$. Let $T > 0$ and $\Gamma: [0, T) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \subset H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ be a maximal

geodesic starting at $\Gamma(0) = \gamma_0$ in direction $\dot{\Gamma}(0) = v_0$. In particular, $\xi(t) := (\Gamma(t), \dot{\Gamma}(t))$ is a solution of the geodesic equation

$$\xi(0) = (\gamma_0, v_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\xi}(t) = \mathcal{F}(\xi(t)) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T],$$

where \mathcal{F} is the forcing term from (64).

Now assume $T < \infty$.

We are using the ‘‘escape lemma’’ [Theorem A.4](#) with $X := H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \times H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $\Omega := \mathcal{M} \times H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ to lead this to a contradiction. To this end, we have to check two things:

- (i) $\overline{\xi([0, T])} \subset \Omega$ and
- (ii) $t \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\xi(t))$ is uniformly bounded on $[0, T]$.

As we have checked in (60), solutions to the geodesic equations are parameterized by constant speed, i.e., $\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, we have

$$\varrho_G(\Gamma(t), \Gamma(0)) \leq t \leq T < \infty, \quad \text{for every } t \in [0, T] \text{ and all } x \in \mathbb{T},$$

showing that $\Gamma([0, T]) \subset \mathcal{M}$ is G -bounded. By [Theorem 4.8](#), [Lemma 4.16](#), and [Lemma 4.17](#), there are $0 < E_0 < \infty$ and $0 < c < C < \infty$ such that

$$E(\Gamma(t)) \leq E_0 \quad \text{and} \quad c < |\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)| < C \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T] \text{ and all } x \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (70)$$

To show the first claim, let $(\gamma, v) \in \overline{\xi([0, T])}$. Then there is a sequence $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, T]$ such that $\xi(t_k)$ converges in norm to $(\gamma, v) \in X$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, we have $\Gamma(t_k) \rightarrow \gamma$ in $H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ and $C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, we have pointwise convergence of $\partial_x \Gamma(t_k, x)$ to $\partial_x \gamma(x)$, hence

$$|\partial_x \gamma(x)| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\partial_x \Gamma(t_k, x)| \in [c, C] \subset (0, \infty) \quad \text{for each } x \in \mathbb{T}.$$

This shows that γ is an immersion. Moreover, since E is sequentially weakly lower semi-continuous (see [Lemma 5.2](#)), we also have

$$E(\gamma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} E(\Gamma(t_k)) \leq E_0.$$

Thus, we have shown that $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}$, hence $(\gamma, v) \in \Omega$.

Next we show the second claim. For this we have to look more closely into the forcing term:

$$\mathcal{F}(\xi(t)) = \mathcal{F}(\Gamma(t), \dot{\Gamma}(t)) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}(t) \\ A_{\Gamma(t)}(\dot{\Gamma}(t)) \dot{\Gamma}(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

With [Lemma 2.1](#) and [Lemma 4.3](#) we find a $C > 0$ such that $\|\cdot\|_{H^s} \leq C \|\cdot\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}(\xi(t))\|_X &\leq \|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s} + \|A_{\Gamma(t)}(\dot{\Gamma}(t)) \dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{H^s} \\ &\leq C \left(\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} + \|A_{\Gamma(t)}(\dot{\Gamma}(t)) \dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We already know that $\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T)$. By [Theorem 4.1](#), the map $J_{\Gamma(t)}$ is an isometry with respect to $\|\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}$ and its dual norm. By the Koszul formula [\(57\)](#), we have

$$\|A_{\Gamma(t)}(\dot{\Gamma}(t))\dot{\Gamma}(t)\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \leq \frac{3}{2} \sup_{u, v, w \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|(DG(\Gamma(t))w)(u, v)|}{\|u\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \|v\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}} \|w\|_{G_{\Gamma(t)}}}.$$

Next we bound $|(DG(\gamma)w)(u, v)|$. Using the recursion formula [\(40\)](#), we can compute $(DB^k(\gamma)w)(u, v)$, $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ in a straight-forward, but lengthy computation. Then we apply Hölder's inequality and simplify using the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s \gamma\|_{L^2(\mu_\gamma)} &= \sqrt{E(\gamma)}, \quad \|\mathcal{R}_\gamma^s u\|_{L^2(\mu_\gamma)} = \sqrt{B_\gamma^1(u, u)} \leq \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \quad \text{for } u \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \|D_\gamma \gamma\|_{L^\infty} &= 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

For the sake brevity we skip the details and just sketch the results. For $k = 1$ and $u, v, w \in H^s(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |(DB^1(\gamma)w)(u, v)| &\leq (2s+1) \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \|v\|_{G_\gamma} \left\| \frac{w(y) - w(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + C \sum_{(\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3, \psi_4)} \|\psi_1\|_{G_\gamma} \|\psi_2\|_{G_\gamma} \|D_\gamma \psi_3\|_{L^\infty} \|D_\gamma \psi_4\|_{L^\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

where the sums run over all permutations of $\{\gamma, u, v, w\}$. For $k = 2$ and $k = 3$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |(DB^2(\gamma)w)(u, v)| &\leq C C'(\gamma, w) \left\| \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \frac{v(y) - v(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{and} \\ |(DB^3(\gamma)w)(u, v)| &\leq C C'(\gamma, w) \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \|D_\gamma v\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \text{where} \\ C'(\gamma, w) &= \left(\sqrt{E(\gamma)} \|w\|_{G_\gamma} + E(\gamma) \|D_\gamma w\|_{L^\infty} + E(\gamma) \left\| \frac{w(y) - w(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the lower order terms, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} |D(\gamma \mapsto \langle u, v \rangle_{L^2(\gamma)})(w)| &\leq \|D_\gamma w\|_{L^\infty} \|u\|_{L^2(\gamma)} \|v\|_{L^2(\gamma)} \quad \text{and} \\ |D(\gamma \mapsto \langle D_\gamma u, D_\gamma v \rangle_{L^2(\gamma)})(w)| &\leq \|D_\gamma w\|_{L^\infty} \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^2(\gamma)} \|D_\gamma v\|_{L^2(\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

From [Lemma 2.3](#) and [Corollary 2.6](#) we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C_{M, s-1} L(\gamma)^{\alpha-1} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)} \quad \text{and} \\ \left\| \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} &\leq C_{M, s-1} C_{\text{distor}} L(\gamma)^{\alpha+1/\alpha} E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/(2\alpha^2)} [u]_{H^s(\gamma)}, \quad \alpha = s - 3/2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining these with [Lemma 4.3](#), which states $[u]_{H^s(\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{32 + C} L(\gamma) E(\gamma)^{(\alpha+1)/\alpha} \|u\|_{G_\gamma}$, we see that there are continuous functions F_1 and F_2 such that

$$\|D_\gamma u\|_{L^\infty} \leq F_1(L(\gamma), E(\gamma)) \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{|\gamma(y) - \gamma(x)|} \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq F_2(L(\gamma), E(\gamma)) \|u\|_{G_\gamma}.$$

All together, we find a continuous function such that

$$|(DG(\gamma)w)(u, v)| \leq F_3(L(\gamma), E(\gamma)) \|u\|_{G_\gamma} \|v\|_{G_\gamma} \|w\|_{G_\gamma}.$$

Due to $c < |\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)| \leq C$ and $E(\Gamma(t)) \leq E_0$, we can bound the arc length of $\Gamma(t)$ and its energy uniformly from above and below for all $t \in [0, T)$. Since $F_3(L(\gamma), E(\gamma))$ is uniformly bounded for all $\gamma = \Gamma(t)$, $t \in [0, T)$, this proves our second claim. Finally [Theorem A.4](#) implies that the solution ξ can be extended a bit beyond T . This is a *contradiction* to the assumption that $T < \infty$. \square

Remark 7.4 In view of [Remark 7.2](#) and in particular of (69), it is now straight-forward to identify some mild and sufficient conditions for geodesic completeness of $C^{2,1}$ -submanifolds $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$. For example, it suffices that the second fundamental form \mathbb{I} is bounded on each G -bounded subset of \mathcal{N} . In particular, this is the case for constraints Φ with $D\Phi^\dagger$ and $D^2\Phi$ being globally G -Lipschitz continuous. \diamond

8 Minimal geodesics

In this section we consider many one-parameter families in functions spaces on the domains \mathbb{T} and $\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$. So, for the sake of brevity, we write $I := [0, 1]$ and use the following abbreviations for general $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$, $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ and a finite-dimensional Euclidean space Z :

$$\begin{aligned} L^p L^q &:= L^p(I; L^q(\mathbb{T}; Z)), & H^\sigma H^\tau &:= H^\sigma(I; H^\tau(\mathbb{T}; Z)), & L^p L_\mu^q &:= L^p(I; L_\mu^q(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; Z)), \\ L^p H^\tau &:= L^p(I; H^\tau(\mathbb{T}; Z)), & H^\sigma L^q &:= H^\sigma(I; L^q(\mathbb{T}; Z)), & H^\sigma L_\mu^q &:= H^\sigma(I; L_\mu^q(\mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; Z)). \end{aligned}$$

Most of the time we will have $Z = \mathbb{R}^m$ or $Z = \mathbb{R}$, but occasionally, we will also use $Z = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^m)$, the space of linear maps $\mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$. The concrete choice will be clear from the context.

Theorem 8.1 (Existence of minimal geodesics) *Let $\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\gamma_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ lie in the same path component. Then there is a length-minimizing G -geodesic Γ from γ_0 to γ_1 .*

Proof. We use the direct method of calculus of variations to show that there exists a minimizer of the variational problem (54) for the Dirichlet energy \mathcal{E} . Let Γ_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be paths such that $\Gamma_n(0) = \gamma_0$ and $\Gamma_n(1) = \gamma_1$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_n) \leq \mathcal{E}_0 + 1/n \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{E}_0 := \inf_{\Gamma} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma),$$

where the infimum is taken over all paths $\Gamma \in H^1(I; \mathcal{M}) \subset H^1 H^s$ satisfying $\Gamma(0) = \gamma_0$ and $\Gamma(1) = \gamma_1$. The Hölder inequality (55) implies the following bound on the path lengths:

$$\mathcal{L}(\Gamma_n) \leq \mathcal{L}_0 := \sqrt{2\mathcal{E}_0 + 2}. \tag{71}$$

So for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $t \in I$ we have

$$\varrho_G(\Gamma_n(t), \gamma_0) \leq \mathcal{L}(\Gamma_n) \leq \mathcal{L}_0,$$

showing that $\{\Gamma_n(t) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I\}$ is G -bounded. By combining [Lemma 4.13](#), [Lemma 4.14](#), and [Lemma 4.18](#) we can find $0 < K < \infty$ such that

$$\|\dot{\Gamma}_n(t)\|_{H^s} \leq K \|\dot{\Gamma}_n(t)\|_{G(\Gamma_n(t))} \quad \text{and} \quad \varrho_{H^s}(\Gamma_n(t), \gamma_0) \leq K \varrho_G(\Gamma_n(t), \gamma_0)$$

hold true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $t \in I$. We claim that $(\Gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $H^1 H^s$. Indeed, we have

$$\|\Gamma_n(t) - \gamma_0\|_{H^s} = \varrho_{H^s}(\Gamma_n(t), \gamma_0) \leq K \varrho_G(\Gamma_n(t), \gamma_0) \leq K \mathcal{L}(\Gamma_n) \leq K \mathcal{L}_0$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Gamma_n\|_{H^1 H^s} &= \left(\int_0^1 \|\Gamma_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} + \left(\int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}_n(t)\|_{H^s}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sup_{t \in I} \|\Gamma_n(t)\|_{H^s} + K \left(\int_0^1 \|\dot{\Gamma}_n(t)\|_{G(\Gamma_n(t))}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s} + \sup_{t \in I} \|\Gamma_n(t) - \gamma_0\|_{H^s} + K \mathcal{L}_0 \leq \|\gamma_0\|_{H^s} + 2K \mathcal{L}_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since the $H^1 H^s$ is a Hilbert space, and because of the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, there is a subsequence $(\Gamma_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ that converges weakly to some Γ in $H^1 H^s$. We have to show that $\Gamma(t) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $t \in I$ and that Γ is a minimizer of \mathcal{E} .

Due to a generalization of the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem [42, Thm. 47.1], the embedding

$$H^1 H^s \hookrightarrow C^0 C^1 := C^0(I; C^1(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m))$$

is compact, hence $(\Gamma_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges in $C^0 C^1$. This implies

$$\Gamma(0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{n_k}(0) = \gamma_0, \quad \Gamma(1) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_{n_k}(1) = \gamma_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_x \Gamma(t, x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \partial_x \Gamma_{n_k}(t, x).$$

By Lemma 4.16, there are $0 < c \leq C < \infty$ such that

$$c \leq |\partial_x \Gamma_n(t, x)| \leq C \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I, x \in \mathbb{T}.$$

So we obtain $c \leq |\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)| \leq C$ for all $t \in I$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}$, showing that Γ is a path in the space of immersions. By Theorem 4.8, there is an $E_0 < \infty$ such that $E(\Gamma_n) \leq E_0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Because E is lower semi-continuous in C^1 (see Lemma 5.2) and since $\Gamma_{n_k}(t)$ converges to $\Gamma(t)$ in C^1 , we conclude

$$E(\Gamma(t)) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} E(\Gamma_{n_k}(t)) \leq E_0 < \infty.$$

This shows that Γ is indeed a path in the space \mathcal{M} of embeddings.

Finally we show that Γ is a minimizer of the path energy \mathcal{E} . To this end, we employ Theorem 8.3 below. It states that \mathcal{E} is weakly sequentially lower semicontinuous, hence

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{n_k}) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\mathcal{E}_0 + 1/n_k) = \mathcal{E}_0.$$

Thus, Γ is indeed a minimal geodesic. □

Remark 8.2 One can extend this proof also to the case of minimal geodesics in a differentiable submanifold $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ (cf. Remark 7.2). The only point of failure here is that the weak limit Γ of the minimizing subsequence Γ_{n_k} may not be contained in \mathcal{N} anymore. So one needs some requirement that guarantees that $H^1(I; \mathcal{N})$ is weakly closed in $H^1(I; H^s)$. We give an example construction that often occurs in practice.

Suppose that \mathcal{N} is given as a zero set of a submersion $\Phi: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ into some Banach space \mathcal{X} . Moreover, suppose that Φ factors through some $H^{s-\varepsilon} := H^{s-\varepsilon}(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e., there is a continuous map $\Psi: H^{s-\varepsilon} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$

into some Banach space \mathcal{Y} and that there is some continuous embedding $\iota: \mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \mathcal{X} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota \\ H^{s-\varepsilon} & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & \mathcal{Y}. \end{array}$$

Then the minimizing subsequence satisfies

$$\iota(\Psi(\Gamma_{n_k}(t))) = \Phi(\Gamma_{n_k}(t)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t \in I \text{ and all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since ι is injective, this implies $\Psi(\Gamma_{n_k}(t)) = 0$. Because the embedding $H^1 H^s \hookrightarrow C^0 H^{s-\varepsilon}$ is compact, and because Ψ is continuous, this results in

$$\Psi(\Gamma(t)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Psi(\Gamma_{n_k}(t)) = 0 \quad \text{hence } \Gamma(t) \in \mathcal{N} \quad \text{for all } t \in I.$$

For example, one can use $\Psi: H^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$, $\Psi(\gamma) = L(\gamma) - L_0$ to constrain the arc length of curves. Or one may require that curves are parameterized by arc length by using $\Psi: H^{s-\varepsilon} \hookrightarrow C^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} = C^0(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R})$, $\Psi(\gamma) := |\gamma'|^2 - 1$. Moreover, we may constrain our curves to lie on a submanifold $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ by representing Σ as a level set of a function ψ and put $\Psi(\gamma) := \psi \circ \gamma - c$, where c is a regular value of ψ such that $\Sigma = \psi^{-1}(\{c\})$. In particular, $m = 4$ and $\Sigma = S^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ can be realized this way. \diamond

8.1 Weak sequential lower semicontinuity of path energy

Theorem 8.3 *Let $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 \in \mathcal{M}$ and let $\Gamma_n, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ be paths in \mathcal{M} such that $\Gamma_n(0) = \gamma_0$ and $\Gamma_n(1) = \gamma_1$. Moreover suppose that $\Gamma_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_\infty$ in $H^1 H^s$. Then*

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\infty) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_n).$$

Proof. The key idea is to write the Dirichlet energy $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ of a general path Γ as

$$2 \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \|A_\Gamma^{(i)} \dot{\Gamma}\|_{L^2 L_\mu^2}^2 + \|A_\Gamma^{(5)} \dot{\Gamma}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2 + \|A_\Gamma^{(6)} \dot{\Gamma}\|_{L^2 L^2}^2, \quad (72)$$

which is motivated by [20, Remark 5.4]. The expressions $A_\Gamma^{(i)} \dot{\Gamma}$ will be defined below. Since the squared norms are weakly lower semicontinuous, this reduces the problem of showing weak lower semicontinuity of \mathcal{E} to that of showing weak continuity of $\Gamma \mapsto A_\Gamma^{(i)} \dot{\Gamma}$.

There is nothing to show if $\mathcal{E}_0 := \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_n)$ is infinite. So let us assume that $\mathcal{E}_0 < \infty$. Hence, all curves $\Gamma_n(t), n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I$ lie in a common G -bounded set (cf. (71)). By Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 4.17, there are $0 < E_0 < \infty, 0 < L_0 < \infty$, and $0 < C < \infty$ such that

$$E(\Gamma_n(t)) \leq E_0, \quad L_0^{-1} \leq L(\Gamma_n(t)) \leq L_0, \quad \text{and } C^{-1} \leq |\partial_x \Gamma_n(t)| \leq C \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I. \quad (73)$$

By Theorem 2.5 there is also a $0 < K < \infty$ such that $\text{distor}(\Gamma_n(t)) \leq K$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I$. Analogously to Lemma 3.7, we define time-dependend functions

$$\Lambda^\beta(\Gamma_n)(t, x, y) := \left(\frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{|\Gamma_n(t, y) - \Gamma_n(t, x)|} \right)^\beta = \left(\frac{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y, x)}{\varrho_{\Gamma_n(t)}(y, x)} \right)^\beta \left(\frac{\varrho_{\Gamma_n(t)}(y, x)}{|\Gamma_n(t, y) - \Gamma_n(t, x)|} \right)^\beta$$

Combining the bounds from (73) with the above identity, we obtain

$$\Lambda^\beta(\Gamma_n)(t, x, y) \leq C^\beta K^\beta \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in I, x, y \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (74)$$

In order to use standard results from the calculus of variations, we model our energy as the sum of stationary L^2 -norms squared and put all the Γ -dependencies into the integrand. Therefore, we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_\Gamma^{(1)} u(t, x, y) &:= \Xi_\Gamma^{(1/2)}(t, x, y) \mathcal{R}_\Gamma^s u(t, x, y), \\ A_\Gamma^{(2)} u(t, x, y) &:= \Xi_\Gamma^{(3/2)}(t, x, y) \mathcal{R}_\Gamma^s \Gamma(t, x, y) \left(\frac{u(t, y) - u(t, x)}{\varrho_\mathbb{T}(y, x)} \right)^\top, \\ A_\Gamma^{(3)} u(t, x, y) &:= \Xi_\Gamma^{(1/2)}(t, x, y) \mathcal{R}_\Gamma^s \Gamma(t, x, y) (D_\Gamma u(x))^\top \\ A_\Gamma^{(4)} u(t, x, y) &:= \Xi_\Gamma^{(1/2)}(t, x, y) \mathcal{R}_\Gamma^s \Gamma(t, x, y) (D_\Gamma u(y))^\top, \\ A_\Gamma^{(5)} u(t, x) &:= \sqrt{|\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)|} D_\Gamma u(x), \\ A_\Gamma^{(6)} u(t, x) &:= \sqrt{|\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)|} u(x), \end{aligned}$$

with $\Xi_\Gamma^{(k)}(t, x, y) := \sqrt{|\partial_x \Gamma(t, x)|} \sqrt{|\partial_x \Gamma(t, y)|} \Lambda^k(\Gamma(t))(x, y)$. Since $\|\cdot\|_{L^2 L_\mu^2}^2$ and $\|\cdot\|_{L^2 L^2}^2$ are weakly lower semicontinuous, it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\Gamma_n}^{(k)} \dot{\Gamma}_n &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{\Gamma_\infty}^{(k)} \dot{\Gamma}_\infty \quad \text{in } L^2 L_\mu^2 \text{ for } k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \quad \text{and} \\ A_{\Gamma_n}^{(k)} \dot{\Gamma}_n &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} A_{\Gamma_\infty}^{(k)} \dot{\Gamma}_\infty \quad \text{in } L^2 L^2 \text{ for } k \in \{5, 6\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the embedding $H^1 H^s \hookrightarrow C^0 C^1$ is compact due to the Arzelà–Ascoli theorem (see [42, Thm. 47.1]). This yields strong convergence $\sqrt{|\partial_x \Gamma_n|} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{|\partial_x \Gamma_\infty|}$ in $L^\infty L^\infty$. Together with the uniform distortion bound (74), this implies that

$$\Lambda(\Gamma_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda(\Gamma_\infty) \quad \text{in } L^\infty L_\mu^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_{\Gamma_n}^{(k)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Xi_{\Gamma_\infty}^{(k)} \quad \text{in } L^\infty L_\mu^\infty$$

So, in light of Lemma 8.6, it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s \dot{\Gamma}_n &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_\infty}^s \dot{\Gamma}_\infty \quad \text{in } L^2 L_\mu^2, & \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s \Gamma_n &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_\infty}^s \Gamma_\infty \quad \text{in } L^\infty L_\mu^2, \\ \frac{\Delta \dot{\Gamma}_n}{\varrho_\mathbb{T}} &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta \dot{\Gamma}_\infty}{\varrho_\mathbb{T}} \quad \text{in } L^2 L_\mu^\infty & D_{\Gamma_n} \dot{\Gamma}_n &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} D_{\Gamma_\infty} \dot{\Gamma}_\infty \quad \text{in } L^2 L_\mu^\infty. \end{aligned}$$

We delegate this to Lemma 8.4 and Lemma 8.5 below. \square

8.2 Supplement

Lemma 8.4 *Let $0 < C < \infty$ and let $\Gamma_n \in H^1(I; \mathcal{M}) \subset H^1H^s$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfy*

$$C^{-1} \leq |\partial_x \Gamma_n| \leq C \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_\infty \text{ in } H^1H^s.$$

For $u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} u_\infty$ in L^2H^s and for every $1/2 < \tau < s - 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_\infty} u_\infty \text{ in } L^2H^\tau, \quad D_{\Gamma_n} u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} D_{\Gamma_\infty} u_\infty \text{ in } L^2H^\tau, \quad \frac{\Delta u_n}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta u_\infty}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}} \text{ in } L^2L_\mu^\infty, \quad (75)$$

where $\Delta u(t, x, y) := u(t, y) - u(t, x)$ denotes the difference operator in space.

Moreover, for $v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} v_\infty$ in H^1H^s we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_\infty} v_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L^\infty, \quad D_{\Gamma_n} v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} D_{\Gamma_\infty} v_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L^\infty, \quad \frac{\Delta v_n}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Delta v_\infty}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}} \text{ in } L^\infty L_\mu^\infty. \quad (76)$$

Proof. By assumption we have $\partial_x \Gamma_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial_x \Gamma_\infty$ in H^1H^{s-1} . The embedding $H^1H^{s-1} \hookrightarrow L^\infty H^\tau$ is compact, thus we have

$$\partial_x \Gamma_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial_x \Gamma_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty H^\tau.$$

The maps $U: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$, $X \mapsto X/|X|^2$ and $V: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $X \mapsto 1/|X|$ on the compact set $\Omega := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid (2C)^{-1} \leq |X| \leq 2C\}$ are smooth with each of their derivatives being uniformly bounded. This implies that

$$U(\partial_x \Gamma_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} U(\partial_x \Gamma_\infty) \text{ in } L^\infty H^\tau \cap L^\infty L^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad V(\partial_x \Gamma_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} V(\partial_x \Gamma_\infty) \text{ in } L^\infty H^\tau \cap L^\infty L^\infty.$$

Now the norm convergence results in (76) follow from the fact that the embedding $H^1H^s \hookrightarrow C^0C^1$ is compact and from the identities $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} v_n = (\partial_x v_n) U(\partial_x \Gamma_n)^\top$ and $D_{\Gamma_n} v_n = (\partial_x v_n) V(\partial_x \Gamma_n)$.

Next we show the first statement for u_n . By assumption we have $\partial_x u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial_x u_\infty$ in L^2H^{s-1} . Again, we write

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n = (\partial_x u_n) U(\partial_x \Gamma_n(t, x))^\top.$$

Since $1/2 < \tau < s - 1$, the bilinear map

$$B: L^\infty H^\tau \times L^2H^{s-1} \rightarrow L^2(I; H^\tau(\mathbb{T}; \text{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^m; \mathbb{R}^m))), \quad (\psi, \varphi) \mapsto \varphi \psi^\top$$

is well-defined and continuous. Hence, [Lemma 8.6](#) below shows that

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n = B(\partial_x u_n, U(\partial_x \Gamma_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} B(\partial_x u_\infty, U(\partial_x \Gamma_\infty)) = \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_\infty} u_\infty.$$

The proofs of the other two statements in (75) are analogous; we leave them to the reader. \square

Lemma 8.5 *Let $0 < C < \infty$ and let $\Gamma_n \in H^1(I; \mathcal{M}) \subset H^1H^s$, $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfy*

$$C^{-1} \leq |\partial_x \Gamma_n| \leq C, \quad \sup_{t \in I} \Lambda^s(\Gamma_n(t)) \leq C, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma_\infty \text{ in } H^1H^s.$$

Suppose that $u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} u_\infty$ in L^2H^s and $v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} v_\infty$ in H^1H^s . Then we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_\infty}^s u_\infty \text{ in } L^2L_\mu^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_\infty}^s v_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L_\mu^2.$$

Proof. First we pick a smooth embedding $\xi: \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, and define the following functions:

$$\Theta_n(t, x, y) := \frac{|\xi(y) - \xi(x)|^s}{|\Gamma_n(t, y) - \Gamma_n(t, x)|^s} = \frac{\Lambda^s(\Gamma_n(t))(x, y)}{\Lambda^s(\xi)(x, y)} \quad \text{for } t \in I, x, y \in \mathbb{T}, n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Now with (39) we may write

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s u_n(t, x, y) = \Theta_n(t, x, y) \mathcal{R}_\xi^s u_n(t, x, y) - \Theta_n(t, x, y) \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n(t, x) \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_n(t, x, y), \quad (77)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s v_n(t, x, y) = \Theta_n(t, x, y) \mathcal{R}_\xi^s v_n(t, x, y) - \Theta_n(t, x, y) \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} v_n(t, x) \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_n(t, x, y). \quad (78)$$

Since \mathcal{R}_ξ^s is a bounded linear operator, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_\xi^s u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_\xi^s u_\infty \text{ in } L^2 L_\mu^2, \quad \mathcal{R}_\xi^s v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_\xi^s v_\infty, \text{ in } H^1 L_\mu^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_\infty \text{ in } H^1 L_\mu^2.$$

Compactness of $H^1 H^s \hookrightarrow C^0 C^1$ together with the bounds on $\Lambda^s(\Gamma_n)$ implies

$$\Theta_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L_\mu^\infty. \quad (79)$$

Lemma 8.6 and continuity of the embedding $H^1 L_\mu^2 \hookrightarrow L^\infty L_\mu^2$ imply that

$$\Theta_n \mathcal{R}_\xi^s u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_\infty \mathcal{R}_\xi^s u_\infty \text{ in } L^2 L_\mu^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_n \mathcal{R}_\xi^s v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Theta_\infty \mathcal{R}_\xi^s v_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L_\mu^2.$$

This handles the first summands in (77) and (78), respectively. By **Lemma 8.4** we also have

$$\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_\infty} u_\infty \text{ in } L^2 H^\tau \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_\infty} v_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L^\infty.$$

Applying **Lemma 8.6** to $\psi_n(t, x, y) := \Theta_n(t, x, y) \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} v_n(t, x)$ and $\varphi_n(t, x, y) := \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_n(t, x, y)$ handles the second summand of (78) so that we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_n}^s v_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{R}_{\Gamma_\infty}^s v_\infty \text{ in } L^\infty L_\mu^2.$$

What remains to discuss is the second summand of (77). By (79) and **Lemma 8.6** it suffices to show that $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n(t, x) \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_n(t, x, y)$ converges weakly in $L^2 L_\mu^2$ to $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_\infty} u_\infty(t, x) \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_\infty(t, x, y)$. For the sake of readability, we define

$$\varphi_n(t, x) := \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_n} u_n(t, x), \quad \psi_n(t, x, y) := \mathcal{R}_\xi^s \Gamma_n(t, x, y), \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_n(t, x) := \int_0^t w_n(r, x) dr.$$

Because we gained one derivative in time direction, we now have $\Phi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_\infty$ in $H^1 H^\tau$. The embedding $H^1 H^\tau \hookrightarrow C^0(I; C^0(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)) = C^0(I \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$ is compact, so we have norm convergence

$$\Phi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_\infty \text{ in } C^0(I \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

To check weak convergence in $L^2 L_\mu^2$ it suffices to test against elements χ from the dense subset $C_0^\infty(I \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m)$, the set of smooth functions with support in $(0, 1) \times \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T}$. By integration by parts in t we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_n \psi_n, \chi \rangle_{L^2 L_\mu^2} &= \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \varphi_n \psi_n, \chi \rangle d\mu dt \\ &= - \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi_n (\partial_t \psi_n), \chi \rangle d\mu dt - \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \Phi_n \psi_n, \partial_t \chi \rangle d\mu dt \\ &= - \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \partial_t \psi_n, \Phi_n^\top \chi \rangle d\mu dt - \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \psi_n, \Phi_n^\top (\partial_t \chi) \rangle d\mu dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have weak convergence

$$\partial_t \psi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \partial_t \psi_\infty \text{ in } L^2 L_\mu^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\infty \text{ in } L^2 L_\mu^2,$$

and norm convergence

$$\Phi_n^\top \chi \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_\infty^\top \chi, \text{ in } L^2 L_\mu^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_n^\top (\partial_t \chi) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_\infty^\top (\partial_t \chi) \text{ in } L^2 L_\mu^2.$$

By [Lemma 8.6](#) (with $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{R}$, where weak convergence is equivalent to norm convergence) the above integrals converge to

$$- \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \partial_t \psi_\infty, \Phi_\infty^\top \chi \rangle d\mu dt - \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \langle \psi_\infty, \Phi_\infty^\top (\partial_t \chi) \rangle d\mu dt = \langle \varphi_\infty \psi_\infty, \chi \rangle_{L^2 L_\mu^2}.$$

This shows that $\varphi_n \psi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_\infty \psi_\infty$ in $L^2 L_\mu^2$, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We conclude this section with the following general result on convergence of bilinear maps.

Lemma 8.6 *Let $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z}$ be Banach spaces and let $B: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be a bounded, bilinear map. Let $\varphi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_\infty$ in \mathcal{X} and $\psi_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\infty$ in \mathcal{Y} . Then $B(\varphi_n, \psi_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} B(\varphi_\infty, \psi_\infty)$ in \mathcal{Z} .*

Proof. The uniform boundedness principle implies that weakly convergent sequences are bounded. Hence, $C := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|\varphi_n\|$ is finite. Thus, for every continuous and linear functional $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}'$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \zeta, B(\varphi_n, \psi_n) \rangle - \langle \zeta, B(\varphi_\infty, \psi_\infty) \rangle| &\leq |\langle \zeta, B(\varphi_n, \psi_n - \psi_\infty) \rangle| + |\langle \zeta, B(\varphi_n - \varphi_\infty, \psi_\infty) \rangle| \\ &\leq C \|\zeta\| \|B\| \|\psi_n - \psi_\infty\| + |\langle \xi, \varphi_n - \varphi_\infty \rangle| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi \in \mathcal{X}'$ is the linear functional defined by $\langle \xi, \varphi \rangle := \langle \zeta, B(\varphi, \psi_\infty) \rangle$. \square

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Cy Maor for stimulating discussions and for bringing the papers [13, 15, 16, 21] to our attention. Our thanks go also to Jason Cantarella for vivid discussions and for a never-ending supply of inspiration for numerical simulations and illustrations.

Funding

Elias Döhner gratefully acknowledges the funding support from the European Union and the Free State of Saxony (ESF).

Appendix: Grönwall inequality, Morrey inequality, and Escape lemma

For the reader's convenience, we provide precise statements of some well-known results that are applied in this paper.

Theorem A.1 (Grönwall inequality, differential version) Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval of the form $[a, \infty)$, $[a, b]$, or $[a, b)$ with $a < b$. Furthermore, let $\beta \in C(I, \mathbb{R})$. Suppose that $u \in C^0(I; \mathbb{R})$ is differentiable on the interior I° of I and that it satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t) \leq \beta(t) u(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in I^\circ.$$

Then

$$u(t) \leq u(a) \exp\left(\int_a^t \beta(s) ds\right) \quad \text{for all } t \in I.$$

Theorem A.2 (Grönwall inequality, integral version) Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval of the form $[a, \infty)$, $[a, b]$, $[a, b)$ with $a < b$. Furthermore, let $\beta \in C^0(I; \mathbb{R})$ be nonnegative and $\alpha : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be non-decreasing and such that $\min(0, \alpha) \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$. Suppose that $u \in C^0(I; \mathbb{R})$ satisfies

$$u(t) \leq \alpha(t) + \int_a^t \beta(s) u(s) ds \quad \text{for all } t \in I.$$

Then

$$u(t) \leq \alpha(t) \exp\left(\int_a^t \beta(s) ds\right) \quad \text{for all } t \in I.$$

A proof of the following result can be found, e.g., in [43, Thm. 8.2]. A careful inspection of the cited argument reveals that $C_{M,\sigma} = 1 + 2^{1+\sigma}$.

Theorem A.3 (Morrey inequality) For every $\sigma \in (1/2, 1)$ there is a $C_{M,\sigma} > 0$ such that the following holds true:

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_{M,\sigma} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left| \frac{u(y) - u(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y,x)^\sigma} \right|^2 \frac{d\lambda(y) d\lambda(x)}{\varrho_{\mathbb{T}}(y,x)} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } u \in H^\sigma(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Finally, we provide the following paraphrasation of the escape lemma from [24, Theorem 10.5.5] for autonomous systems:

Theorem A.4 (Extension of ODEs: Escape lemma) Let Ω be an open set in the Banach space X , and let $F : \Omega \rightarrow X$ be locally Lipschitz-continuous. Let $T > 0$ and let $\xi : [0, T) \rightarrow \Omega$ be a solution of $\frac{d}{dt}\xi(t) = F(\xi(t))$ for $t \in [0, T)$ that satisfies

(i) $\overline{\xi([0, T))} \subset \Omega$;

(ii) there is a $0 < C < \infty$ such that $\|F(\xi(t))\| \leq C$ for all $t \in [0, T)$.

Then there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ and an extension $\tilde{\xi} : [0, T + \varepsilon) \rightarrow \Omega$ of ξ such that

$$\tilde{\xi}(t) = \xi(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt}\tilde{\xi}(t) = F(\tilde{\xi}(t)) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T + \varepsilon).$$

References

- [1] C. J. Atkin. [The Hopf–Rinow theorem is false in infinite dimensions](#). *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 7:261–266, 1975.
- [2] C. J. Atkin. [Geodesic and metric completeness in infinite dimensions](#). *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 26(1):1–61, 1997.
- [3] J. M. Ball. [Global invertibility of Sobolev functions and the interpenetration of matter](#). *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 88(3–4):315–328, 1981.
- [4] S. Bartels and Ph. Reiter. [Numerical solution of a bending-torsion model for elastic rods](#). *Numer. Math.*, 146(4):661–697, 2020.
- [5] S. Bartels and Ph. Reiter. [Stability of a simple scheme for the approximation of elastic knots and self-avoiding inextensible curves](#). *Math. Comp.*, 90(330):1499–1526, 2021.
- [6] S. Bartels, Ph. Reiter, and J. Riege. [A simple scheme for the approximation of self-avoiding inextensible curves](#). *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 38(2):543–565, 2018.
- [7] M. Bauer, M. Bruveris, Ph. Harms, and P. W. Michor. [Geodesic distance for right invariant Sobolev metrics of fractional order on the diffeomorphism group](#). *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 44(1):5–21, 2013.
- [8] M. Bauer, M. Bruveris, and B. Kolev. [Fractional Sobolev metrics on spaces of immersed curves](#). *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 57(1):Paper No. 27, 24, 2018.
- [9] M. Bauer, M. Bruveris, and P. W. Michor. [Overview of the geometries of shape spaces and diffeomorphism groups](#). *J. Math. Imaging Vis.*, 50(1–2):60–97, 2014.
- [10] M. Bauer, N. Charon, E. Klassen, S. Kurtek, T. Needham, and T. Pierron. [Elastic metrics on spaces of Euclidean curves: theory and algorithms](#). *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, 34(3):Paper No. 56, 37, 2024.
- [11] M. Bauer, Ph. Harms, and P. W. Michor. [Sobolev metrics on shape space of surfaces](#). *J. Geom. Mech.*, 3(4):389–438, 2011.
- [12] M. Bauer, Ph. Harms, and P. W. Michor. [Fractional Sobolev metrics on spaces of immersions](#). *Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ.*, 59(2):62, 2020.
- [13] M. Bauer, P. Heslin, and C. Maor. [Completeness and geodesic distance properties for fractional Sobolev metrics on spaces of immersed curves](#). *J. Geom. Anal.*, 34:Paper No. 214, 2024.
- [14] M. Bauer, B. Kolev, and S. C. Preston. [Geometric investigations of a vorticity model equation](#). *J. Differ. Equ.*, 260(1):478–516, 2016.
- [15] M. Bauer, B. Kolev, and S. C. Preston. [Geodesic completeness of the \$H^{3/2}\$ metric on \$\text{Diff}\(S^1\)\$](#) . *Monatsh. Math.*, 193(2):233–245, 2020.
- [16] M. Bauer, C. Maor, and P. W. Michor. [Sobolev metrics on spaces of manifold-valued curves](#). *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 24(4):1895–1948, 2023.
- [17] S. Blatt. [The energy spaces of the tangent point energies](#). *J. Topol. Anal.*, 5(3):261–270, 2013.
- [18] S. Blatt and Ph. Reiter. [Regularity theory for tangent-point energies: The non-degenerate sub-critical case](#). *Adv. Calc. of Var.*, 8(2):93–116, 2015.
- [19] S. Blatt, Ph. Reiter, A. Schikorra, and N. Vorderobermeier. [Scale-invariant tangent-point energies for knots](#). *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 2024. published online first.
- [20] M. Bruveris. [Completeness properties of Sobolev metrics on the space of curves](#). *J. Geom. Mech.*, 7(2):125–150, 2015.
- [21] M. Bruveris, P. W. Michor, and D. Mumford. [Geodesic completeness for Sobolev metrics on the space of immersed plane curves](#). *Forum Math. Sigma*, 2:Paper No. e19, 38, 2014.
- [22] G. Buck and J. Orloff. [A simple energy function for knots](#). *Topology Appl.*, 61(3):205–214, 1995.
- [23] A. Constantin and J. Escher. [Wave breaking for nonlinear nonlocal shallow water equations](#). *Acta Math.*, 181(2):229–243, 1998.
- [24] J. Dieudonné. *Foundations of modern analysis*. Enlarged and corrected printing. New York-London: Academic Press. xv, 387 p., 1969.
- [25] D. G. Ebin and J. Marsden. [Groups of diffeomorphisms and the motion of an incompressible fluid](#). *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 92:102–163, 1970.
- [26] J. Escher and B. Kolev. [Right-invariant Sobolev metrics of fractional order on the diffeomorphism group of the circle](#). *J. Geom. Mech.*, 6(3):335–372, 2014.
- [27] J. Escher, B. Kolev, and M. Wunsch. [The geometry of a vorticity model equation](#). *Commun. Pure Appl.*

- Anal.*, 11(4):1407–1419, 2012.
- [28] Y. Fang, M. Li, C. Jiang, and D. M. Kaufman. [Guaranteed globally injective 3d deformation processing](#). *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 40(4), July 2021.
- [29] O. Gonzalez and J. H. Maddocks. [Global curvature, thickness, and the ideal shapes of knots](#). *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 96(9):4769–4773, 1999.
- [30] N. Grossman. [Hilbert manifolds without epiconjugate points](#). *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 16:1365–1371, 1965.
- [31] A. Havens and R. Koytcheff. [Spaces of knots in the solid torus, knots in the thickened torus, and links in the 3-sphere](#). *Geom. Dedicata*, 214:671–737, 2021.
- [32] B. Heeren, M. Rumpf, P. Schröder, M. Wardetzky, and B. Wirth. Exploring the Geometry of the Space of Shells. *Comput. Graph. Forum*, 33(5):247–256, 2014.
- [33] M. W. Hirsch. *Differential topology*, volume No. 33 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.
- [34] R. L. Jerrard and C. Maor. [Geodesic distance for right-invariant metrics on diffeomorphism groups: critical Sobolev exponents](#). *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 56(2):351–360, 2019.
- [35] J. Knappmann, H. Schumacher, D. Steenebrügge, and H. von der Mosel. [A speed preserving hilbert gradient flow for generalized integral menger curvature](#). *Adv. Calc. Var.*, 2023.
- [36] S. Krömer. [Global invertibility for orientation-preserving Sobolev maps via invertibility on or near the boundary](#). *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 238(3):1113–1155, 2020.
- [37] S. Krömer and Ph. Reiter. [Nonlinear elasticity with vanishing nonlocal self-repulsion](#). *Proc. R. Soc. Edinb. A: Math.*, pages 1–18, 2023. FirstView article.
- [38] M. Li, Z. Ferguson, T. Schneider, T. Langlois, D. Zorin, D. Panozzo, C. Jiang, and D. M. Kaufman. Incremental potential contact: Intersection-and inversion-free, large-deformation dynamics. *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 39(4), 2020.
- [39] J. H. McAlpin. [Infinite dimensional manifolds and Morse theory](#). ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1965. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Columbia University.
- [40] P. W. Michor and D. Mumford. [Vanishing geodesic distance on spaces of submanifolds and diffeomorphisms](#). *Doc. Math.*, 10:217–245, 2005.
- [41] W. Mio, A. Srivastava, and S. Joshi. [On shape of plane elastic curves](#). *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 73(3):307–324, 2007.
- [42] J. R. Munkres. *Topology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2nd edition, 2000.
- [43] E. Nezza, G. Palatucci, and E. Valdinoci. [Hitchhiker’s guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces](#). *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 136(5):521–573, 07 2012.
- [44] Ph. Reiter and H. Schumacher. [Sobolev gradients for the Möbius energy](#). *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 242(2):701–746, 2021.
- [45] J. Sassen, H. Schumacher, M. Rumpf, and K. Crane. [Repulsive shells](#). *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 43(4), July 2024.
- [46] A. Schmeding. [An introduction to infinite-dimensional differential geometry](#), volume 202 of *Camb. Stud. Adv. Math*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [47] A. Srivastava, E. Klassen, S. H. Joshi, and I. H. Jermyn. [Shape analysis of elastic curves in Euclidean spaces](#). *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 33(7):1415–1428, 2011.
- [48] D. Steenebrügge and N. Vorderobermeier. [On the analyticity of critical points of the generalized integral Menger curvature in the Hilbert case](#). *Nonlinear Anal.*, 221:27, 2022. Id/No 112858.
- [49] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. [Tangent-point self-avoidance energies for curves](#). *J. Knot Theory Ramifications*, 21(5):1250044, 28, 2012.
- [50] P. Strzelecki and H. von der Mosel. [Tangent-point repulsive potentials for a class of non-smooth m-dimensional sets in \$\mathbb{R}^n\$. Part I: Smoothing and self-avoidance effects](#). *J. Geom. Anal.*, 23(3):1085–1139, 2013.
- [51] A. Volkmann. [A monotonicity formula for free boundary surfaces with respect to the unit ball](#). *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 24(1):195–221, 2016.
- [52] C. Yu, C. Brakensiek, H. Schumacher, and K. Crane. [Repulsive surfaces](#). *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 40(6):1–19, 12 2021.
- [53] C. Yu, H. Schumacher, and K. Crane. [Repulsive curves](#). *ACM Trans. Graph.*, 40(2):1–21, 5 2021.