

Stability of systolic inequalities for the Möbius strip and Klein bottle

Jan Eyll*

Abstract

The systolic area α_{sys} of a nonsimply connected compact Riemannian surface (M, g) is defined as its area divided by the square of the systole, where the systole is equal to the length of a shortest noncontractible closed curve. The systolic inequality due to Bavard states that on the Klein bottle, the systolic area has the optimal lower bound $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$. Bavard also constructed metrics of minimal systolic area in any given conformal class. We give an alternative proof of these results, which also yields an estimate on the systolic defect $\alpha_{sys} - \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ in terms of the L^2 -distance of the conformal factor to the metric which minimizes the systolic area. On the Möbius strip, we also prove similar estimates for metrics in fixed conformal classes.

Introduction

The *systole* of a nonsimply connected Riemannian manifold (M, g) is defined as the infimum of the lengths of noncontractible closed curves, denoted with $\text{sys}(M, g)$. If M is compact, then the systole is positive and there exists a noncontractible closed curve of length $\text{sys}(M, g)$, which is necessarily a closed geodesic. If M is two-dimensional, we denote the Riemannian area induced by g with $\text{area}(M, g)$. Then the *systolic area* of (M, g) is defined as

$$\alpha_{sys}(M, g) := \frac{\text{area}(M, g)}{\text{sys}^2(M, g)}.$$

Clearly, $\alpha_{sys}(M, g)$ is invariant under rescalings of the metric. For a set C of metrics on M , we define

$$\alpha_{sys}(M, C) := \inf_{g \in C} \alpha_{sys}(M, g). \quad (1)$$

*Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Fakultät für Mathematik, Bochum, Germany
jan.eyll@rub.de

If C is the set of all metrics on M , we simply write $\alpha_{sys}(M) = \alpha_{sys}(M, C)$.

In 1949, Loewner discovered that on the two-dimensional torus \mathbb{T}^2 , the systolic area has a positive lower bound. More precisely, he proved

$$\alpha_{sys}(\mathbb{T}^2) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \quad (2)$$

and showed that this lower bound for $\alpha_{sys}(\mathbb{T}^2, g)$ is attained if and only if (\mathbb{T}^2, g) is isometric to a flat equilateral torus, which is defined as the quotient of the standard Euclidean plane by a hexagonal lattice. Similar results also exist for the real projective plane \mathbb{RP}^2 ([Pu52]) and the Klein bottle K ([Bav86]), namely

$$\alpha_{sys}(\mathbb{RP}^2) = \frac{2}{\pi}, \quad (3)$$

$$\alpha_{sys}(K) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}. \quad (4)$$

For the projective plane, the lower bound is attained uniquely (up to isometry and rescaling) by the round metric. In contrast, for the Klein bottle, the lower bound is attained only by continuous, but not smooth metrics, as we will see below. It is also worth noting that these three examples are the only surfaces for which the value of $\alpha_{sys}(M)$ is known. α_{sys} is known to be bounded from below by $1/2$ ([Heb82; Gro83]) and by a bound that grows with the genus of M ([Gro83]), but these bounds are not sharp.

In more recent times, these results have been generalized to Finsler metrics (see [BG24] for \mathbb{T}^2 , [Iva11] for the projective plane and [SY16] for the Klein bottle) and questions concerning the stability of the implied systolic inequalities have been studied: The difference

$$\alpha_{sys}(M, g) - \alpha_{sys}(M)$$

is called the *systolic defect*, and the goal is to understand whether a Riemannian metric g with small systolic defect is necessarily close to an optimal metric \hat{g} , i.e. a metric for which $\alpha_{sys}(M, \hat{g}) = \alpha_{sys}(M)$. In this situation, one cannot expect g and \hat{g} to be close in the C^0 -sense, because modifying \hat{g} by adding ‘spikes’ of small area has little effect on the systolic area but can make the C^0 -distance arbitrarily large. It turns out that using L^2 -distance of conformal factors gives good results, due to its close relations to the Riemannian area.

Due to the conformal representation theorem, any metric g on a closed surface is of the form $g = \phi^2 g_0$, where ϕ is a positive function and g_0 a metric of constant curvature. In some cases, this can be used to estimate the systolic defect: let g_{ground} be the metric of constant curvature 1 on \mathbb{RP}^2 and $\phi^2 g_{ground}$ any metric. It is shown in [KN20] that

$$\frac{2\pi \operatorname{Var}(\phi)}{\operatorname{sys}^2(\mathbb{RP}^2, \phi^2 g_{ground})} \leq \alpha_{sys}(\mathbb{RP}^2, \phi^2 g_{ground}) - \alpha_{sys}(\mathbb{RP}^2),$$

where the variance $\text{Var}(\phi)$ is defined as follows: denote with μ the probability measure on \mathbb{RP}^2 obtained by normalizing the Riemannian area measure induced by g_{round} . Then $E(\phi) := \int_{\mathbb{RP}^2} \phi d\mu$ is the expected value and

$$\text{Var}(\phi) := \int_{\mathbb{RP}^2} (\phi - E(\phi))^2 d\mu = E(\phi^2) - E(\phi)^2 \quad (5)$$

is the variance of ϕ . Because the variance measures the L^2 -distance between ϕ and its mean $E(\phi)$, these estimates show that metrics with small systolic defect are L^2 -close to metrics with constant conformal factor, (i.e. round metrics), which are precisely the optimal metrics on \mathbb{RP}^2 . A very similar result for the torus can be found in [HKK09].

Our goal is to prove an analogous result for the Klein bottle. Here, the main difference to the projective plane and the torus is that on the Klein bottle, the metric attaining the lower bound is not of constant curvature (and consequently the conformal factor ϕ is not constant in this case), so one cannot expect the variance of the conformal factor as a lower bound for $\alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, \phi^2 g_{\text{flat}}) - \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K)$. However, we will see that by changing the considered probability measure, our result can also be expressed in terms of the variance of a conformal factor (see Remark 2.7 below).

The space $\mathcal{C}(K)$ of conformal classes of metrics on the Klein bottle is one-dimensional and can be parametrized by the interval $(0, +\infty)$. A proof of this fact is given by Lemma 2.1, where we construct an explicit parametrization $(0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(K)$, $\beta \mapsto C_\beta$.

In [Bav88], Bavard showed that for every conformal class $C \in \mathcal{C}(K)$, there exists a continuous, not necessarily smooth metric $g_C \in C$ such that

$$\alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, C) = \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, g_C). \quad (6)$$

He also proved that the metric g_C with this property is unique up to rescaling and isometry. An explicit description of g_C can be found in Section 2. We will see that it is in general not of constant curvature, which is related to the fact that the isometry group of a constant curvature metric on the Klein bottle (i.e. a flat metric) does not act transitively on K . This makes the study of conformal systolic inequalities on K more difficult than on \mathbb{RP}^2 and \mathbb{T}^2 .

As a result of Bavard's work, the function $C \mapsto \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, C)$ can be computed explicitly. It has a unique minimizer $C_0 \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ with the property

$$\alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, C_0) = \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}(K)} \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, C) = \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}. \quad (7)$$

The graph of this function after the identification of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ with $(0, +\infty)$ is sketched in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. A sketch of the graph of the function $\beta \mapsto \alpha_{sys}(K, C_\beta)$. It is strictly decreasing for $\beta \leq \beta_0$, attains its minimum of $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ at $\beta = \beta_0$ and is strictly increasing for $\beta \geq \beta_0$.

For a conformal class $C \in \mathcal{C}(K)$, we denote by g_{flat}^C the unique flat metric in C normalized in such a way that the shortest closed horizontal geodesic is of length π (see Lemma 2.1 and the discussion before Remark 2.2). Then the minimizer g_C of the systolic area within C can be written as

$$g_C = \phi_C^2 g_{flat}^C, \quad (8)$$

for a suitable positive, continuous (but not necessarily smooth) function ϕ_C on K . We denote by $P_C : L^2(K) \rightarrow L^2(K)$ the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto the line $\mathbb{R}\phi_C \subset L^2(K)$ spanned by ϕ_C . Here, the L^2 -scalar product of functions on K is taken with respect to the Riemannian measure induced by g_{flat}^C . Now the main results of Section 2 can be stated as:

Theorem 1 *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ be a conformal class and $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^C \in C$ be a Riemannian metric on K . Then*

$$\frac{\|\phi - P_C(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(K, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(K, g) - \alpha_{sys}(K, C). \quad (9)$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(K, g) = \alpha_{sys}(K, C)$ holds if and only if g is a constant multiple of g_C .

Theorem 2 *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ be a conformal class and $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^C \in C$ be a Riemannian metric on K . Then*

$$\alpha_{sys}(K, C) - \alpha_{sys}(K) + \frac{\|\phi - P_C(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(K, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(K, g) - \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}. \quad (10)$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(K, g) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ holds if and only if $C = C_0$ and if g is a constant multiple of g_{C_0} .

Theorem 1 refines the conformal systolic inequality present in [Bav88]. It implies (6) and gives a statement about the stability of the conformal systolic inequality, because it shows that any metric g for which $\alpha_{sys}(K, g)$ is close to the conformal minimum $\alpha_{sys}(K, C)$ is necessarily close to a minimizing metric in the sense that their conformal factors are L^2 -close.

Similarly, Theorem 2 refines the original systolic inequality (4) for the Klein bottle, established first in [Bav86]. Here, the stability can be seen in the following way: if a metric g has systolic area close to $\alpha_{sys}(K) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$, then the conformal class C containing g has to be close to C_0 in the sense that $\alpha_{sys}(K, C)$ is close to $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$, and g has to be close to g_C in the above sense. The main ingredient for the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 is the projection inequality (Lemma 2.4, proved in Section 3), which implies that the projection P_C does not decrease the systole.

In Section 1, we perform almost the same considerations for the Möbius strip M . Since every Klein bottle contains embedded Möbius strips, it is not surprising that the methods for the Klein bottle and the Möbius strip have many similarities. In fact, some of the results of Section 1 are needed in the proof of the theorems about the Klein bottle in Section 2. For M , the space $\mathcal{C}(M)$ of conformal classes is one-dimensional and can be parametrized by $(0, +\infty)$. Every conformal class $C \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ contains a minimizer g_C of the systolic area within C , i.e. a metric such that

$$\alpha_{sys}(M, g_C) = \alpha_{sys}(M, C), \quad (11)$$

which is unique up to rescaling. We again distinguish suitably normalized metrics $g_{flat}^C \in C$ of constant curvature in every conformal class, write

$$g_C = \phi_C^2 g_{flat}^C \quad (12)$$

for a suitable continuous, not necessarily smooth function ϕ_C on M , denote with P_C the $L^2(M) = L^2(M, g_{flat}^C)$ -orthogonal projection onto the line spanned by ϕ_C and thus can state the main result of Section 1:

Theorem 3 *Let $C \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ be a conformal class and $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^C$ be a Riemannian metric on M . Then*

$$\frac{\|\phi - P_C(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(M, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(M, g) - \alpha_{sys}(M, C). \quad (13)$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(M, g) = \alpha_{sys}(M, C)$ holds if and only if g is a constant multiple of g_C .

This refines the conformal systolic inequality for the Möbius strip due to Pu, present in [Pu52] by including a stability estimate, similar to the result on the Klein bottle. Since $\inf_C \alpha_{sys}(M, C) = 0$, where the infimum runs over all conformal classes on M , the Möbius strip does not have a systolic inequality when the conformal class is not fixed, hence a theorem analogous to Theorem 2 does not exist for the Möbius strip.

1 The Möbius strip

For $\beta > 0$, consider $S_\beta = \mathbb{R} \times [-\beta, \beta] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and let g_{flat} be the Riemannian metric on S_β obtained by restricting the standard Euclidean metric to S_β . The diffeomorphism $A : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $A(x, y) = (x + \pi, -y)$ generates the subgroup $G = \{A^k | k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset \text{Diff}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Since A restricts to an isometry of (S_β, g_{flat}) , G acts isometrically on S_β . Moreover, G is a discrete group acting freely and properly on S_β , so $M_\beta := S_\beta/G$ is a smooth, two-dimensional manifold, which we call the *Möbius strip of width 2β* . The fact that G acts via isometries implies the existence of a unique Riemannian metric on M_β such that the quotient map $p : S_\beta \rightarrow M_\beta$ is a local isometry. We denote this metric also with g_{flat} . Thus, (M_β, g_{flat}) is a Riemannian manifold, which we call the *flat Möbius strip of width 2β* . Its isometry group is compact and consists of translations in the x -direction (induced by translations on S_β). Note that translation by $\pm\pi$ has the same effect as reflecting along the x -axis. By the conformal representation theorem, any Riemannian metric on an arbitrary Möbius band is conformally equivalent to (M_β, g_{flat}) for some $\beta > 0$, thus it is sufficient to only consider Möbius strips of the form $(M_\beta, \phi^2 g_{flat})$, where $\phi : M_\beta \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ is a smooth positive function. Consequently, the space $\mathcal{C}(M)$ of conformal classes of metrics on the Möbius strip is one-dimensional and can be parametrized by $(0, +\infty)$ via the map $\beta \mapsto C_\beta$, where C_β is defined as the conformal class of (M_β, g_{flat}) . To emphasize the membership to the conformal class, we sometimes also write $g_{flat} = g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$.

A conformal factor ϕ on M_β can be lifted to an G -invariant function $\hat{\phi} := \phi \circ p$ defined on the covering space S_β . Conversely, any G -invariant function $\psi : S_\beta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ induces a unique function ϕ defined on M_β such that $\hat{\phi} = \psi$. For these reasons, we will identify functions on M_β with G -invariant functions on S_β whenever suitable.

It is well-known that the projection onto metrics which are invariant under the isometry group of (M_β, g_{flat}) does not increase the systolic area. More generally, let (N, g) be a (nonsimply connected) two-dimensional Riemannian manifold, $\phi : N \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ a positive smooth function such that $(N, \phi^2 g)$ has finite area and H

a compact subgroup of the isometry group $\text{Isom}(N, g)$. As H is a compact group, it carries a unique invariant probability measure η , called the Haar measure. The Riemannian metric g induces a canonical measure on N , and the assumption $\text{area}(N, \phi^2 g) < +\infty$ is equivalent to $\phi \in L^2(N, g)$. Using H , we construct a map $P_H : L^2(N, g) \rightarrow L^2(N, g)$, $\phi \mapsto P_H(\phi)$ defined by

$$P_H(\phi)(p) = \int_H \phi(\xi(p)) d\eta(\xi), \quad (1.1)$$

for $p \in N$. A direct calculation involving the Fubini-Tonelli theorem and the invariance of the measures shows that P is the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto the subspace $L_H^2(N, g) = \{\phi \in L^2(N, g) \mid \phi \circ \xi = \phi \ \forall \xi \in H\}$ of H -invariant functions. Therefore

$$(P_H(\phi), \phi - P_H(\phi))_{L^2} = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L^2}$ denotes the scalar product on $L^2(N, g)$. Also, if $\phi^2 g$ is a Riemannian metric (i.e. $\phi > 0$ and smooth), then $P_H(\phi)$ is smooth and positive, thus $P_H(\phi)^2 g$ is again a Riemannian metric on N . When acting non-trivially, this projection reduces the systolic area:

Lemma 1.1 *Let $\phi : N \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ be a smooth positive function such that $\text{area}(N, \phi^2 g)$ is finite. Then the Riemannian metric $P_H(\phi)^2 g$ satisfies*

$$\text{area}(N, \phi^2 g) = \text{area}(N, P_H(\phi)^2 g) + \|\phi - P_H(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.3)$$

$$\text{sys}(N, \phi^2 g) \leq \text{sys}(N, P_H(\phi)^2 g). \quad (1.4)$$

Proof. The equality in (1.3) follows from the facts that P_H is an L^2 -orthogonal projection and that the area of a conformal metric is given by the squared L^2 -norm of the conformal factor:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area}(N, \phi^2 g) &= \|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 = \|P_H(\phi) + \phi - P_H(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \|P_H(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\phi - P_H(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &= \text{area}(N, P_H(\phi)^2 g) + \|\phi - P_H(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality between the systoles also follows from a calculation: let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow N$ be a smooth noncontractible closed curve. Using the fact that every $\xi \in H$ is

an isometry of (N, g) , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{P_H(\phi)^2g}(\gamma) &= \int_0^1 \sqrt{P_H(\phi)^2(\gamma(t)) g_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))} dt \\
&= \int_0^1 \int_H \phi(\xi(\gamma(t))) d\eta(\xi) \sqrt{g_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))} dt \\
&= \int_H \int_0^1 \phi(\xi(\gamma(t))) \sqrt{g_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))} dt d\eta(\xi) \\
&= \int_H \int_0^1 \phi(\xi \circ \gamma(t)) \sqrt{g_{\xi \circ \gamma(t)}((\xi \circ \gamma)'(t), (\xi \circ \gamma)'(t))} dt d\eta(\xi) \\
&= \int_H L_{\phi^2g}(\xi \circ \gamma) d\eta(\xi) \\
&\geq \int_H \text{sys}(N, \phi^2g) d\eta(\xi) = \text{sys}(N, \phi^2g).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the inequality $L_{\phi^2g}(\xi \circ \gamma) \geq \text{sys}(N, \phi^2g)$ holds, because $\xi \circ \gamma$ is again a smooth noncontractible closed curve. Now, by taking the infimum over all noncontractible closed curves γ , we obtain (1.4). \square

The result of Lemma 1.1, (albeit with an inequality and without the term $\|\phi - P_H(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2$ in (1.3),) is the first step in the proofs of Loewner's Torus inequality, the systolic inequality for \mathbb{RP}^2 (see [Pu52]) and Bavard's inequality for the Klein bottle (see [Bav86]). In its present form, and with $H = \text{Isom}(N, g)$, it also can be used to prove the estimates on the systolic defect on the torus and \mathbb{RP}^2 which appear in [HKK09] and [KN20]. Because on the flat Möbius strip and Klein Bottle, the isometry group does not act transitively, it is necessary to employ a second projection in order to minimize the systolic area, which will be discussed below and in Section 2.

As mentioned above, the isometry group $H_\beta := \text{Isom}(M_\beta, g_{flat})$ consists of (the maps induced by) translations in the x -direction, and includes the reflection along the x -axis. Thus, a metric $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$ is H_β -invariant if and only if ϕ is constant in the x -coordinate and the function $y \mapsto \phi(x, y)$ is even. On M_β , Pu constructed a special, H_β -invariant metric $g_0 := \phi_0^2 g_{flat}$ using the function

$$\phi_0 : M_\beta \rightarrow (0, +\infty), \quad \phi_0(x, y) = \frac{2e^y}{1 + e^{2y}}. \quad (1.5)$$

Since ϕ_0 is constant in x , we also use the symbol ϕ_0 for the function $[-\beta, \beta] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, $y \mapsto \phi_0(y) = \phi_0(x, y)$. It is smooth, even, decreasing for $y \geq 0$ and goes to zero for $y \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Its graph is sketched in Fig. 1.1.

Pu also defined a family of curves $\{\gamma_\tau\}_{\tau \in [0, \beta]}$ given by

$$\gamma_0 : [0, \pi] \rightarrow M_\beta, \quad \gamma_0(t) = p(t, 0) \quad (1.6)$$




Fig. 1.1. The graph of the function $y \mapsto \phi_0(y)$. $\beta_1 := \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$ satisfies $\phi_0(\beta_1) = \frac{1}{2}$. $\beta_0 := \log(1 + \sqrt{2})$ satisfies $\int_0^{\beta_0} \phi_0(y) dy = \frac{\pi}{4}$ and becomes important on the Klein bottle (see Section 2).

and

$$\gamma_\tau : [-\tau, \tau] \rightarrow M_\beta, \quad \gamma_\tau(t) = p \left(\pi/2 + \int_0^t \frac{\phi_0(\tau)}{\sqrt{\phi_0^2(s) - \phi_0^2(\tau)}} ds, -t \right) \quad (1.7)$$

for $\tau > 0$. Here, $p : S_\beta \rightarrow M_\beta$ denotes the quotient map. Each γ_τ is a closed, noncontractible curve of length $L_{g_0}(\gamma_\tau) = \pi$. g_0 and the curves γ_τ have a clear geometric interpretation: using the map

$$F : [-\pi/2, \pi/2] \times [-\beta, \beta] \rightarrow [-\pi/2, \pi/2] \times [-\arcsin(\tanh \beta), \arcsin(\tanh \beta)], \\ (x, y) \mapsto (x, \arcsin(\tanh y))$$

and spherical coordinates

$$\Psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow S^2 \\ (\theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto (\cos(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2), \sin(\theta_1) \cos(\theta_2), \sin(\theta_2))$$

on S^2 , one can show that (M_β, g_0) is isometric to the Möbius strip obtained from the region $\Psi([-\pi/2, \pi/2] \times [-\Theta_\beta, \Theta_\beta]) \subset S^2$ by identifying antipodal points on the boundary $\Psi(\{\pm\pi/2\} \times [-\Theta_\beta, \Theta_\beta])$, together with the (restriction of the) standard round metric on S^2 . Here, $\Theta_\beta := \arcsin(\tanh \beta) \in (0, \pi/2)$. Under this isometry, the curves γ_τ are mapped to segments of great circles connecting the antipodal points on the boundary.

For $\beta \leq \beta_1 := \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$, the curves γ_τ realize the systole on (M_β, g_0) and we thus have $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g_0) = \pi$. The fact that no shorter noncontractible closed curve exists can be seen in the following way: closed curves in the free homotopy class of γ_τ (or in the homotopy class of the curve obtained by reversing the orientation




Fig. 1.2. $\Psi \circ F$ maps the fundamental region of the Möbius strip (M_β, g_0) isometrically to a subset of the round sphere. The geodesic γ_τ is mapped to a half great circle connecting antipodal points.

of γ_τ) have to connect antipodal points in S^2 (when considering their image under the isometry F), and thus are of length at least π . For a closed noncontractible curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M_\beta$ in a different homotopy class, we can consider the lift to a curve $\hat{\gamma} : [0, 1] \rightarrow S_\beta$ of the form $\hat{\gamma}(t) = (\hat{x}(t), \hat{y}(t))$. It satisfies $\hat{x}(1) - \hat{x}(0) = \pi k$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|k| \geq 2$. The inequality $|k| \geq 2$ holds, because γ is neither homotopic to a point (corresponding to $k = 0$), nor to γ_τ or its reverse (corresponding to $k = \pm 1$). Furthermore, $\beta \leq \beta_1$ is equivalent to $\phi_0(y) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $y \in [-\beta, \beta]$, and thus


$$L_{g_0}(\gamma) = L_{g_0}(\hat{\gamma}) = \int_0^1 \underbrace{\phi_0(\hat{y}(t))}_{\geq 1/2} \underbrace{\sqrt{\hat{x}'(t)^2 + \hat{y}'(t)^2}}_{\geq |\hat{x}'(t)|} dt \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 |\hat{x}'(t)| dt \geq \frac{\pi|k|}{2} \geq \pi.$$

A direct calculation shows that for $\tau \in [-\beta, \beta]$, the ‘horizontal’ curve $\lambda_\tau : [-\pi/2, 3\pi/2] \rightarrow M_\beta$, $\lambda_\tau(t) = p(t, \tau)$ is of length $L_{g_0}(\lambda_\tau) = 2\pi\phi_0(\tau)$, which is less than π for $\tau > \beta_1$. Hence


$$\text{sys}(M_\beta, g_0) = \begin{cases} \pi, & \text{if } \beta \leq \beta_1 \\ 2\pi\phi_0(\beta), & \text{if } \beta > \beta_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

The geometric interpretation of this phenomenon is that for $\beta > \beta_1$, i.e. for round Möbius strips whose boundary is ‘close enough’ to the poles in S^2 , it is shorter to complete a full rotation near the boundary in the covering region contained in S^2 than to travel to the antipodal point in S^2 . For $\beta > \beta_1$ we call M_β a *thick* Möbius strip.

The curves λ_τ also show that any H_β -invariant metric $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}$ on M_β with systole at least π necessarily satisfies $\phi \geq \frac{1}{2}$. This motivates the construction of



The graph of ϕ_β for $\beta > \beta_1$.



For $\beta > \beta_1$, (M_β, g_β) is isometric to the Möbius strip on a sphere with two cylinders of radius $\frac{1}{2}$ attached.

Fig. 1.3. By identifying two antipodal meridians on the cylinder-sphere with opposing orientations, one obtains a Möbius strip isometric to (M_β, g_β) . The cylinders attached to the sphere are each of height $\frac{\beta - \beta_1}{2}$.

the metric $g_\beta := \phi_\beta^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta} \in C_\beta$, where

$$\phi_\beta : M_\beta \rightarrow (0, +\infty), \quad \phi_\beta(p(x, y)) = \max \left\{ \phi_0(y), \frac{1}{2} \right\} = \begin{cases} \phi_0(y), & \text{if } |y| \leq \beta_1, \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } |y| > \beta_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

Note that because ϕ_β is in general not smooth but only continuous, the metric g_β is not a smooth metric either. It satisfies

$$\text{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta) = \pi, \quad \text{area}(M_\beta, g_\beta) = \begin{cases} 2\pi \tanh \beta, & \text{for } \beta \leq \beta_1 \\ \pi\sqrt{3} + \frac{\pi}{2}(\beta - \beta_1), & \text{for } \beta > \beta_1. \end{cases} \quad (1.10)$$

It is the aim of the following to show that g_β in fact minimizes the systolic area of M_β in the conformal class of g_{flat} . The key part in the proof is showing that projecting H_β -invariant metrics onto g_β does not decrease the systole: consider the map

$$P_{\phi_\beta} : L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat}) \rightarrow L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat}), \quad P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi) = \frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}} \phi_\beta. \quad (1.11)$$

It is the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto the subspace $\mathbb{R}\phi_\beta \subset L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})$ and projects a positive function ϕ to a positive multiple of ϕ_β . Thus, in this case, $P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi) > 0$, hence $P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}$ is again a (continuous) Riemannian metric on M_β .

Lemma 1.2 *Let $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}$ be a H_β -invariant Riemannian metric on M_β . Then the metric $P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}$ satisfies*

$$\text{area}(M_\beta, \phi^2 g_{flat}) = \text{area}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}) + \|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.12)$$

$$\text{sys}(M_\beta, \phi^2 g_{flat}) \leq \text{sys}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}) \quad (1.13)$$

Proof. The proof of (1.12) is identical to the proof of (1.3) from Lemma 1.1. It follows from the fact that P_{ϕ_β} is an L^2 -orthogonal projection. Due to

$$\text{sys}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}) = \frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}} \text{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta) = \pi \frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}, \quad (1.14)$$

the inequality (1.13) is equivalent to

$$\frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}} \geq \frac{\text{sys}(M_\beta, g)}{\pi}. \quad (1.15)$$

As this inequality is invariant under rescalings of ϕ by positive constants, it is sufficient to only consider metrics satisfying $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) = \pi$, for which (1.15) simplifies to

$$(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2} \geq (\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}. \quad (1.16)$$

This inequality essentially follows from an equality of Pu that is stated and proven on pages 69 and 70 of [Pu52]. He showed that

$$\int_0^\beta \phi(y) \phi_0(y) dy = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\beta L_g(\gamma_\tau) \left(-\frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=\tau} \sqrt{\phi_0^2(s) - \phi_0^2(\beta)} \right) d\tau \quad (1.17)$$

holds for all $\beta > 0$ and all H_β -invariant metrics $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}$ on M_β , where γ_τ are the curves defined above. $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) = \pi$ implies $L_g(\gamma_\tau) \geq \pi$ and thus

$$\int_0^\beta \phi(y) \phi_0(y) dy \geq \int_0^\beta \left(-\frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=\tau} \sqrt{\phi_0^2(s) - \phi_0^2(\beta)} \right) d\tau = \tanh \beta. \quad (1.18)$$

Combining this with $\int_0^\beta \phi_0^2(y) dy = \tanh \beta$, we have what we will call Pu's inequality:

$$\int_0^\beta \phi(y) \phi_0(y) dy \geq \int_0^\beta \phi_0^2(y) dy. \quad (1.19)$$

It holds for all H_β -invariant functions ϕ satisfying $\text{sys}(M_\beta, \phi^2 g_{flat}) \geq \pi$.

Because H_β -invariant functions $f, h \in L^2(M, g_{flat})$ are constant in the x -coordinate and even in y , their scalar product is given by

$$(f, h)_{L^2} = \int_{M_\beta} f(x, y) h(x, y) dx dy = 2\pi \int_0^\beta f(y) h(y) dy. \quad (1.20)$$

Hence, it is sufficient to show $\int_0^\beta \phi(y) \phi_\beta(y) dy \geq \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y) dy$ in order to prove (1.16). For $\beta \leq \beta_1$, this immediately follows from (1.19), because $\phi_\beta(y) = \phi_0(y)$ for $y \leq \beta_1$.

For $\beta > \beta_1$, we observe that restricting g to $M_{\beta_1} \subset M_\beta$ cannot decrease the systole (because any noncontractible closed curve in M_{β_1} is also a noncontractible closed curve in M_β), so $\text{sys}(M_{\beta_1}, g|_{M_{\beta_1}}) \geq \pi$ holds, which implies

$$\int_0^{\beta_1} \phi(y)\phi_0(y)dy \geq \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi_0^2(y)dy. \quad (1.21)$$

Furthermore, $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) \geq \pi$ forces the curves λ_τ to be of length at least π , hence $\phi \geq \frac{1}{2}$. In particular, we obtain $\phi(y) \geq \phi_\beta(y) = \frac{1}{2}$ for $y \geq \beta_1$. In combination with (1.21) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy &= \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy + \int_{\beta_1}^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi(y)\phi_0(y)dy + \int_{\beta_1}^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \\ &\geq \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi_0^2(y)dy + \int_{\beta_1}^\beta \phi_\beta(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \int_{\beta_1}^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy, \end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. \square

The results above can be summarized as follows:

Theorem 1.3 *Let $\beta > 0$, $C_\beta \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ be a conformal class and $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta} \in C_\beta$ be a Riemannian metric on the Möbius strip M_β . Then*

$$\alpha_{sys}(M, C_\beta) = \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\pi} \tanh \beta, & \text{if } \beta \leq \beta_1 \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi} + \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{2\pi} & \text{if } \beta > \beta_1, \end{cases} \quad (1.22)$$

and

$$\frac{\|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(M_\beta, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) - \alpha_{sys}(M, C_\beta). \quad (1.23)$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) = \alpha_{sys}(M, C_\beta)$ holds if and only if ϕ is a positive multiple of ϕ_β .

Proof. Applying Lemma 1.1 with $H = H_\beta$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area}(M, g) &= \text{area}(M, P_{H_\beta}(\phi)^2 g) + \|\phi - P_{H_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \text{sys}(M, g) &\leq \text{sys}(M, P_{H_\beta}(\phi)^2 g). \end{aligned}$$

By construction, the metric $P_{H_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}$ is H_β -invariant, so we can use Lemma 1.2 to find

$$\text{area}(M_\beta, g) = \text{area}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(P_{H_\beta}(\phi))^2 g_{flat}) + \|\phi - P_{H_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{H_\beta}(\phi) - P_{\phi_\beta}(P_{H_\beta}(\phi))\|_{L^2}^2$$

and

$$\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) \leq \text{sys}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(P_{H_\beta}(\phi))^2 g_{flat}) \leq \text{sys}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(P_{H_\beta}(\phi))^2 g_{flat})$$

Because $\mathbb{R}\phi_\beta \subset L^2_H(M_\beta)$, we find $P_{\phi_\beta} \circ P_{H_\beta} = P_{\phi_\beta}$, so using the orthogonality of the projections and the Pythagorean Theorem yields

$$\|\phi - P_{H_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|P_{H_\beta}(\phi) - P_{\phi_\beta}(P_{H_\beta}(\phi))\|_{L^2}^2 = \|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Combined, these inequalities give

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) &= \frac{\text{area}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}) + \|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(M_\beta, g)} \\ &\geq \frac{\text{area}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat})}{\text{sys}^2(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat})} + \frac{\|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(M_\beta, g)}, \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{\|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(M_\beta, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) - \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}). \quad (1.24)$$

Because $P_\beta(\phi)$ is a constant multiple of ϕ_β , the scaling-invariance of the systolic area gives us $\alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, P_\beta(\phi)^2 g_{flat}) = \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta)$, so (1.24) implies $\alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) \geq \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta)$ for all $g \in C_\beta$, which proves (1.22) and consequently (1.23). If $\alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) - \alpha_{sys}(M, C_\beta) = 0$, then $\|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 = 0$ and hence

$$\phi = P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi), \quad (1.25)$$

so ϕ is a multiple of ϕ_β . Conversely, $\alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, \lambda^2 g_\beta) - \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, C_\beta) = 0$ holds by the scaling-invariance of the systolic area and by (1.22) for all constants $\lambda > 0$. \square

Instead of using $g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$ as a reference metric in the conformal class C_β , we can use the optimal metric g_β and get a similar result. It induces a measure on M_β , so we can consider the space $L^2(M_\beta, g_\beta)$, where the scalar product is taken with respect to this measure. Here, the orthogonal projection $h \mapsto \frac{(h, 1)_{L^2}}{(1, 1)_{L^2}}$ onto the space of constant functions is precisely the expected value of h with respect to the

probability measure μ_{g_β} obtained by normalizing the measure induced by g_β . For a metric $g \in C_\beta$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} g &= h^2 g_\beta \\ g &= \phi^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta} \end{aligned}$$

for suitable positive functions h, ϕ on M_β . Because of $g_\beta = \phi_\beta^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$, we find

$$\phi = h\phi_\beta, \tag{1.26}$$

and a direct calculation shows

$$(f_1, f_2)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_\beta)} = (f_1\phi_\beta, f_2\phi_\beta)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})} \tag{1.27}$$

for all functions $f_1, f_2 \in L^2(M_\beta, g_\beta)$. Using this and (1.26) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi) &= \frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})}} \phi_\beta \\ &= \frac{(h\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})}} \phi_\beta \\ &= \frac{(h, 1)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_\beta)}}{(1, 1)_{L^2(M_\beta, g_\beta)}} \phi_\beta \\ &= E(h)\phi_\beta, \end{aligned}$$

where $E(h)$ denotes the expected value of h with respect to the probability measure μ_{g_β} . This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})}^2 &= \|h\phi_\beta - E(h)\phi_\beta\|_{L^2(M_\beta, g_{flat})}^2 = \|h - E(h)\|_{L^2(M_\beta, g_\beta)}^2 \\ &= \text{area}(M_\beta, g_\beta) \text{Var}(h), \end{aligned} \tag{1.28}$$

where $\text{Var}(h) = E(h^2) - E(h)^2$ is the variance with respect to μ_{g_β} . Thus, as a corollary, we obtain a reformulation of (1.23), similar to the stability results involving the variance on \mathbb{RP}^2 and \mathbb{T}^2 , as in [KN20] and [HKK09].

Corollary 1.4 *Let $C_\beta \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ be a conformal class and $g = h^2 g_\beta \in C_\beta$ be a Riemannian metric on the Möbius strip M_β . Then*

$$\text{area}(M_\beta, g_\beta) \frac{\text{Var}(h)}{\text{sys}^2(M_\beta, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) - \alpha_{sys}(M, C_\beta). \tag{1.29}$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(M_\beta, g) = \alpha_{sys}(M, C_\beta)$ holds if and only if h is constant.

2 The Klein bottle

The Klein bottle can be constructed as a quotient of the standard Euclidean plane (\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat}) by a discrete group. For $\beta > 0$, consider the subgroup $\Gamma_\beta \subset \text{Isom}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat})$ generated by the isometries $A : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $A(x, y) = (x + \pi, -y)$ and $B : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $B(x, y) = (x, y + 4\beta)$. Γ_β acts isometrically, freely and properly on (\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat}) , thus $K_\beta := \mathbb{R}^2/\Gamma_\beta$ is a smooth manifold with a unique Riemannian metric, also denoted by g_{flat} , such that the quotient map $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow K_\beta$ is a local isometry. The pair (K_β, g_{flat}) is called *flat Klein bottle of width 4β* . It contains two Möbius strips of width 2β , as is suggested in Fig. 2.1. We denote with C_β the conformal class of (K_β, g_{flat}) , i.e. the set of metrics of the form $\phi^2 g_{flat}$, for some positive function ϕ , and sometimes write $g_{flat} = g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$ when we want to emphasize that $g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$ is an element of C_β or when β is not clear from the context. The following Lemma shows that up to isometry, the space $\mathcal{C}(K)$ of conformal classes of metrics on the Klein bottle can be parametrized by the map $(0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(K)$, $\beta \mapsto C_\beta$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let g be a Riemannian metric on a Klein bottle K . Then there exists $\beta > 0$ and a smooth function $\phi : K_\beta \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ such that (K, g) is isometric to $(K_\beta, \phi^2 g_{flat})$.*

Proof. Let g be a Riemannian metric on K . By the conformal representation theorem, any metric on K is conformally equivalent to a metric of constant curvature. Since K has vanishing Euler characteristic, this metric is necessarily flat, so without loss of generality, we can assume that g is a flat metric. Denote with $E \rightarrow K$ the universal cover of K and let \tilde{g} be the lifted metric on E . Then (K, g) is isometric to the quotient $(E, \tilde{g})/\tilde{\Gamma}$, where $\tilde{\Gamma} \cong \pi_1(K)$ is the group of deck transformations and a subgroup of $\text{Isom}(E, \tilde{g})$. The universal cover E is diffeomorphic to \mathbb{R}^2 and \tilde{g} is a flat metric on it, so by the characterization of space forms, (E, \tilde{g}) is isometric to the standard Euclidean plane (\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat}) . Thus, we have shown that (K, g) is isometric to the quotient of (\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat}) by a subgroup $\Gamma \subset \text{Isom}(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat})$. We now proceed by showing that such a group Γ has to be of the form Γ_β for some $\beta > 0$.

The fundamental group of the Klein bottle can be presented as $\pi_1(K) = \langle A, B \mid A^{-1}B^{-1}A = B \rangle$, so the same presentation can also be used for Γ . Because they are isometries of the Euclidean plane, the generators can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, y) &= L_A(x, y) + (x_A, y_A) \\ B(x, y) &= L_B(x, y) + (x_B, y_B) \end{aligned}$$

for $L_A, L_B \in O(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $(x_A, y_A), (x_B, y_B) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Γ acts freely on \mathbb{R}^2 , so A and B do not have fixed points. Because rigid rotations of \mathbb{R}^2 always have a fixed

point, this shows that the linear parts L_A and L_B are either reflections or the identity map. Assume that both of them are reflections. Then the linear part of $A \circ B \neq \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ has to be the identity map, because it is orientation preserving and cannot be a nontrivial rotation. This implies that L_A and L_B have to be the same reflection, so after an isometric change of basis we can assume that they reflect along the x -axis. If at most one of L_A or L_B is a reflection, then we also can assume that it reflects along the x -axis. This shows that in both cases we can assume that L_A and L_B are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} L_A(x, y) &= (x, \sigma_A y) \\ L_B(x, y) &= (x, \sigma_B y), \end{aligned}$$

for $\sigma_A, \sigma_B \in \{\pm 1\}$. Thus, A^{-1} and B^{-1} can easily be computed and the relation $A^{-1}B^{-1}A = B$ evaluated at the origin gives

$$(x_B, y_B) = (x_A - x_B - x_A, \sigma_A \sigma_B (y_A - y_B) - \sigma_A y_A). \quad (2.1)$$

This implies $x_B = 0$, so B is given by

$$B(x, y) = (x, \sigma_B y + y_B). \quad (2.2)$$

The fact that B has no fixed points thus is equivalent to the equation $y = \sigma_B y + y_B$ having no solution in \mathbb{R} , which implies $\sigma_B = 1$ and $y_B \neq 0$. Combining this information with (2.1) gives $y_B = -\sigma_A y_B$, which implies $\sigma_A = -1$. So far we have shown that A and B are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, y) &= (x + x_A, -y + y_A) \\ B(x, y) &= (x, y + y_B). \end{aligned}$$


The fact that A has no fixed point ensures that $x_A \neq 0$, and after conjugation with the translation $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y + \frac{y_A}{2})$ (which corresponds to declaring $(0, y_A/2)$ as the new origin of \mathbb{R}^2) we can assume that $y_A = 0$. Hence, (K, g) is isometric to $(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat})/\Gamma$, where Γ is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, y) &= (x + x_A, -y) \\ B(x, y) &= (x, y + y_B). \end{aligned}$$


A suitable choice of generators ensures $x_A, y_B > 0$ and now we see that the rescaling

$$(x, y) \mapsto (cx, cy), \quad c := \frac{x_A}{\pi}, \quad (2.3)$$

is an isometry from $(\mathbb{R}^2, c^2 g_{flat})/\Gamma_\beta$ to $(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat})/\Gamma$, where $\beta = \frac{\pi y_B}{4 x_A}$. Hence, we have shown that (K, g) is isometric to $(\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat})/\Gamma$ which in turn is isometric to a rescaling of $(K_\beta, g_{flat}^{C_\beta}) = (\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat})/\Gamma_\beta$, completing the proof. \square



K_β can be decomposed into three regions M_β^-, M_β^+ and M_β



M_β is a Möbius strip of width 2β , M_β^- and M_β^+ can be glued together to form a Möbius strip of the same width

Fig. 2.1. The Klein Bottle K_β contains two Möbius strips of width 2β

The maps

$$\hat{I} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \hat{I}(x, y) = (x, -y) \quad (2.4)$$

$$\hat{J} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \hat{J}(x, y) = (x, y + 2\beta) \quad (2.5)$$

$$\hat{T}_h : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \hat{T}_h(x, y) = (x + h, y), \quad \text{for } h \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.6)$$

are isometries of (\mathbb{R}^2, g_{flat}) and commute with Γ_β , so they induce isometries $I, J, T_h \in H_\beta := \text{Isom}(K_\beta, g_{flat})$.

By Lemma 2.1, every Riemannian metric on a Klein bottle is isometric to a metric of the form $\phi^2 g_{flat}$ on K_β , for some $\beta > 0$ and some smooth positive function $\phi : K_\beta \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$. Similar to the situation on the Möbius strip, Γ_β -invariant functions on \mathbb{R}^2 induce functions on K_β and vice versa, so we use the two notions interchangeably. It follows from Lemma 1.1 that metrics conformally equivalent to $g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$ which minimize the systolic area are necessarily H_β -invariant, i.e. the conformal factor ϕ has to be constant in x and satisfy

$$\phi(x, y) = \phi(x, -y) = \phi(x, y + 2\beta). \quad (2.7)$$

This shows that all information about ϕ can be retrieved from the function $[0, \beta] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, $y \mapsto \phi(x, y)$, which we also denote with ϕ . Conversely, any function on $[0, \beta]$ can be extended to a function on K_β via (2.7). Note that this extension process does yield continuous, but not necessarily smooth functions, even if the initial function was smooth on $[0, \beta]$. Another consequence of (2.7) is that the L^2 -inner product of H_β -invariant functions $f, h \in L^2(K_\beta, g_{flat})$ is given by

$$(f, h)_{L^2} = \int_{K_\beta} f(x, y)h(x, y)dxdy = 4\pi \int_0^\beta f(y)h(y)dy, \quad (2.8)$$

similar to (1.20) on the Möbius strip.

In [Bav88], Bavard constructed (continuous, not necessarily smooth) metrics $g_\beta = \phi_\beta^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$ of minimal systolic area in each conformal class C_β with the normalization $\text{sys}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = \pi$. He proved the minimality using a criterion from [Bav92]. Projecting onto the conformal factor ϕ_β (similar to the projection in Theorem 1.3) provides an alternative proof of minimality while also providing an estimate for the systolic defect.

The construction of ϕ_β is mostly based on the function ϕ_0 (defined in (1.5)) and divides into four cases. In each case, (2.7) is used to obtain functions defined on K_β from the description of ϕ_β on $[0, \beta]$. We denote the metric defined via ϕ_β by $g_\beta = \phi_\beta^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$.

Case 1: $\beta \leq \frac{\pi}{4}$. Here, ϕ_β is given by

$$\phi_\beta : [0, \beta] \rightarrow (0, +\infty), \quad \phi_\beta(y) = \frac{\pi}{4\beta}. \quad (2.9)$$

(K_β, g_β) satisfies $\text{area}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = \frac{\pi^3}{4\beta}$.

Case 2: $\frac{\pi}{4} < \beta < \beta_0 := \log(1 + \sqrt{2})$. Here, ϕ_β is given by

$$\phi_\beta : [0, \beta] \rightarrow (0, +\infty), \quad \phi_\beta(y) = \begin{cases} \phi_0(y), & \text{for } y \leq s_\beta, \\ \phi_0(s_\beta), & \text{for } y > s_\beta, \end{cases} \quad (2.10)$$

where $s = s_\beta$ is the unique solution of the equation

$$\int_0^s \phi_0(y) dy + (\beta - s)\phi_0(s) = \pi/4, \quad s \in (0, \beta). \quad (2.11)$$

(K_β, g_β) satisfies $\text{area}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = 4\pi \tanh(s_\beta) + 4\pi(\beta - s_\beta)\phi_0^2(s_\beta)$. For the definition of s_β , compare also Fig. 2.2.

Case 3: $\beta_0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_1 := \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$. Here, ϕ_β is given by

$$\phi_\beta : [0, \beta] \rightarrow (0, +\infty), \quad \phi_\beta(y) = \phi_0(y). \quad (2.12)$$

(K_β, g_β) satisfies $\text{area}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = 4\pi \tanh(\beta)$.

Case 4: $\beta > \beta_1$. Here, ϕ_β is given by

$$\phi_\beta : [0, \beta] \rightarrow (0, +\infty), \quad \phi_\beta(y) = \begin{cases} \phi_0(y), & \text{for } y \leq \beta_1, \\ \frac{1}{2} = \phi_0(\beta_1), & \text{for } y > \beta_1, \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

(K_β, g_β) satisfies $\text{area}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = 4\pi \tanh(\beta_1) + \pi(\beta - \beta_1) = 2\pi\sqrt{3} + \pi(\beta - \beta_1)$.




Fig. 2.2. The graph of ϕ_β for $\frac{\pi}{4} < \beta < \beta_0$. The function $s \mapsto I(s) := \int_0^s \phi_0(y)dy + (\beta - s)\phi_0(s)$ gives the integral of the continuous function that restricts to ϕ_0 on $[0, s]$ and is constant on $[s, \beta]$. I is continuous, strictly decreasing on $[0, \beta]$ and satisfies $I(0) = \beta > \pi/4$, $I(\beta) = \int_0^\beta \phi_0(y)dy < \pi/4$. $s_\beta := I^{-1}(\pi/4) \in (0, \beta)$ is hence well-defined.

The fact that g_β satisfies $\text{sys}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = \pi$ for all $\beta > 0$ can be seen as follows: consider a noncontractible closed curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow K_\beta$ and a lift $\hat{\gamma} = (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ of γ to the universal cover. We call γ *vertical*, if the image of $\hat{\gamma}$ contains an interval of length 4β (or equivalently, if γ considered as a map to the fundamental region $[0, \pi) \times [-2\beta, 2\beta)$ intersects the line $[0, \pi) \times \{c\}$ nontrivially for every $c \in [-2\beta, 2\beta)$). Otherwise, γ is called *horizontal*. If γ is vertical, the invariance in x -direction of ϕ_β and consequently of g_β implies $L_{g_\beta}(\gamma) \geq L_{g_\beta}(\gamma_0)$, where γ_0 is given by

$$\gamma_0 : [-2\beta, 2\beta] \rightarrow K_\beta, \quad \gamma_0(t) = p(0, t). \quad (2.14)$$

A direct calculation involving the invariance properties of ϕ_β shows

$$L_{g_\beta}(\gamma_0) = \int_{-2\beta}^{2\beta} \phi_\beta(t)dt = 4 \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta(t)dt. \quad (2.15)$$

By construction, we have $\int_0^\beta \phi_\beta(y)dy \geq \pi/4$, hence $L_{g_\beta}(\gamma) \geq \pi$ holds for every vertical curve γ .

If γ is horizontal, we can replace it by a curve $\tilde{\gamma}$ of the same length which is completely contained in the Möbius strip $M_\beta \subset K_\beta$. For this, consider the map

$$[0, \pi] \times [-2\beta, 2\beta] \rightarrow [0, \pi] \times [-\beta, \beta], \quad (x, y) \mapsto \begin{cases} (x, y) & \text{for } y \in [-\beta, \beta] \\ (x, 2\beta - y) & \text{for } y \in (\beta, 2\beta] \\ (x, -2\beta - y) & \text{for } y \in [-2\beta, -\beta). \end{cases}$$

It induces a continuous map $R : K_\beta \rightarrow M_\beta$ which restricts to the identity on M_β and maps the region M_β^\mp to its reflection along the line $p(\{(x, \pm\beta) | x \in [0, \pi]\})$ (compare Fig. 2.1). Now define $\tilde{\gamma} := R \circ \gamma$. The fact that γ is horizontal implies that its lift $\hat{\gamma} = (\hat{x}, \hat{y})$ satisfies $\hat{x}(a) \neq \hat{x}(b)$, hence $\tilde{\gamma} : [a, b] \rightarrow M_\beta$ is noncontractible. A direct comparison between ϕ_β and the conformal factor of the optimal metric g_β^M in the conformal class $C_\beta \in \mathcal{C}(M)$ on the Möbius strip M_β (see (1.9)) gives $L_{g_\beta}(\gamma) = L_{g_\beta}(\tilde{\gamma}) \geq L_{g_\beta^M}(\tilde{\gamma})$. Combined with $L_{g_\beta^M}(\tilde{\gamma}) \geq \text{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta^M) = \pi$, we obtain $L_{g_\beta}(\gamma) \geq \pi$ for every horizontal curve γ , thus proving $\text{sys}(K_\beta, g_\beta) \geq \pi$.

For the other inequality, one can simply consider curves attaining the systole: in Case 1 (and Case 2), the vertical curve γ_0 is of length π , in Cases 2 to 4 the horizontal curve $\gamma : [0, \pi] \rightarrow K_\beta$, $\gamma(t) = p(t, 0)$ has length π .

Remark 2.2 *The constructions for all four cases have geometric interpretation when one considers the embedded Möbius strip $M_\beta \subset K_\beta$: the normalization $\text{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \pi$ implies $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g|_{M_\beta}) \geq \pi$ and (K_β, g) has precisely twice as much area as (M_β, g) . So in order to construct a systolically optimal metric $g = \phi^2 g_{\text{flat}}$ on K_β , one tries to minimize the area of (M_β, g) (or equivalently, the L^2 -Norm of ϕ) under the constraints $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) \geq \pi$ as well as $\int_0^\beta \phi(y) dy \geq \pi/4$. The latter inequality comes from the fact that the vertical curves also have to be of length at least π .*

In the thin case (Case 1), these vertical curves (described precisely in Section 3) completely dominate the situation, so the fact that the flat Klein bottle (i.e. ϕ being constant) is area-minimizing follows directly from the Cauchy-Schwarz-inequality.

In Case 2, both the vertical curves as well as the horizontal closed curves in M_β play an important role. One would like to use just ϕ_0 , as it is area-minimizing with the property $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) \geq \pi$, but for $\beta < \beta_0$ this does not satisfy $\int_0^\beta \phi(y) dy \geq \pi/4$ (i.e. the vertical curves are too short). It turns out (this is what makes it a bit more complicated) that the two constraints can be satisfied in an area-minimizing way by taking $\phi_\beta(y) = \phi_0(y)$ for $y \leq s_\beta$ and constant for $y > s_\beta$, where the definition of s_β precisely ensures $\int_0^\beta \phi_\beta(y) dy = \pi/4$.

For Cases 3 and 4, the embedded Möbius strip is wide enough so that the vertical curves are naturally long, (i.e. $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g|_{M_\beta}) \geq \pi$ already implies $\int_0^\beta \phi(y) dy \geq \pi/4$), hence one only needs to ensure that all horizontal curves have length at least π . Consequently, the construction is similar to the construction on the Möbius strip.

For all $\beta > 0$ we have $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g_\beta) = \pi$, so the systolic area is given by

$$\alpha_{\text{sys}}(K_\beta, g_\beta) = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{4\beta}, & \text{for } \beta \leq \frac{\pi}{4}, \\ \frac{4}{\pi} \tanh(s_\beta) + \frac{4}{\pi}(\beta - s_\beta)\phi_0^2(s_\beta), & \text{for } \frac{\pi}{4} < \beta < \beta_0, \\ \frac{4}{\pi} \tanh \beta, & \text{for } \beta_0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_1, \\ \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\pi} + \frac{\beta - \beta_1}{\pi}, & \text{for } \beta > \beta_1. \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

Note that $\alpha_{\text{sys}}(K_{\beta_0}, g_{\beta_0}) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ is the minimum of the function $\beta \mapsto \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K_\beta, g_\beta)$, with $\beta_0 = \log(1 + \sqrt{2})$ being the unique minimizer (see also Fig. 1 for a sketch of the graph). This fact is used to retrieve the systolic inequality for metrics in all conformal classes on the Klein bottle due to Bavard (see [Bav86]) and provides a term depending on the conformal class in the estimate on the systolic defect (compare Corollary 2.6).

Analogously to the situation on the Möbius strip, the map

$$P_{\phi_\beta} : L^2(K_\beta, g_{\text{flat}}) \rightarrow L^2(K_\beta, g_{\text{flat}}), \quad P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi) = \frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}} \phi_\beta. \quad (2.17)$$

is the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto the subspace $\mathbb{R}\phi_\beta \subset L^2(K_\beta, g_{\text{flat}})$ and has essentially the same properties as the projection on the Möbius strip:

Lemma 2.3 *Let $g = \phi^2 g_{\text{flat}}^{C_\beta}$ be a H_β -invariant Riemannian metric on K_β . Then the metric $P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{\text{flat}}$ satisfies*

$$\text{area}(K_\beta, g) = \text{area}(K_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{\text{flat}}) + \|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (2.18)$$

$$\text{sys}(K_\beta, g) \leq \text{sys}(K_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{\text{flat}}) \quad (2.19)$$

Equality in (2.18) can be proven analogous to the proof of the similar equality in Lemma 1.1. However, proving that P_{ϕ_β} does not decrease the systole requires more than just Pu's inequality (1.19), because in K_β there are more noncontractible closed curves to consider than in M_β . It is a consequence of the following result, whose proof can be found in Section 3:

Lemma 2.4 (Projection inequality) *Let $\beta > 0$ and $g = \phi^2 g_{\text{flat}}^{C_\beta}$ be a H_β -invariant Riemannian metric on K_β such that $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g) = \pi$. Then*

$$\int_0^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \geq \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy. \quad (2.20)$$

We now show how (2.19) follows from the projection inequality, thus concluding the proof of Lemma 2.3. Due to the scaling-invariance of (2.19), we can assume

that $\text{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \pi$. Then it follows from a combination of (2.8) and Lemma 2.4 that

$$\frac{(\phi, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}}{(\phi_\beta, \phi_\beta)_{L^2}} \geq 1 \quad (2.21)$$

and hence $P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi) \geq \phi_\beta$. Thus

$$\text{sys}(K_\beta, P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)^2 g_{flat}) \geq \text{sys}(K_\beta, \phi_\beta^2 g_{flat}) = \pi = \text{sys}(K_\beta, g), \quad (2.22)$$

completing the proof.

As a consequence, we obtain the conformal systolic inequality of [Bav88] with an estimate on the systolic defect, which also implies the general systolic inequality on the Klein bottle from [Bav86].

Theorem 2.5 *Let $\beta > 0$ and $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta} \in C_\beta$ be a Riemannian metric on K_β . Then*

$$\alpha_{sys}(K, C_\beta) = \alpha_{sys}(K_\beta, g_\beta), \quad (2.23)$$

and

$$\frac{\|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(K_\beta, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(K_\beta, g) - \alpha_{sys}(K, C_\beta). \quad (2.24)$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \alpha_{sys}(K_\beta, C_\beta)$ holds if and only if g is a constant multiple of $g_\beta = \phi_\beta^2 g_{flat}$.

The proof is a direct consequence of Lemmas 1.1 and 2.3 and similar to the proof of Theorem 1.3. Using the fact that $\beta \mapsto \alpha_{sys}(K, C_\beta)$ attains its minimum of $\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ at the unique minimizer $\beta = \beta_0$ gives the following stability estimate for Bavard's original systolic inequality for the Klein bottle:

Corollary 2.6 *Let $g = \phi^2 g_{flat} \in C_\beta$ be a Riemannian metric on a Klein bottle K_β , for some $\beta > 0$. Then*

$$\alpha_{sys}(K) = \alpha_{sys}(K_{\beta_0}, g_{\beta_0}) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \quad (2.25)$$

and

$$\alpha_{sys}(K, C_\beta) - \alpha_{sys}(K) + \frac{\|\phi - P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi)\|_{L^2}^2}{\text{sys}^2(K_\beta, g)} \leq \alpha_{sys}(K_\beta, g) - \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}. \quad (2.26)$$

In particular, $\alpha_{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi}$ holds if and only if $\beta = \beta_0$ and if g is a constant multiple of g_{β_0} .

Remark 2.7 *Similar to the discussion preceding Corollary 1.4, any metric $g \in C_\beta$ can be written as $g = h^2 g_\beta$ and $g = \phi^2 g_{flat}^{C_\beta}$. The measure induced by g_β can be normalized by the factor $\frac{1}{\text{area}(K_\beta, g_\beta)}$ to give a probability measure, so expected value $E(h)$ and variance $\text{Var}(h)$ can be defined with respect to it. Direct calculations show that $P_{\phi_\beta}(\phi) = E(h)\phi_\beta$, hence (2.24) reformulates to*

$$\text{area}(K_\beta, g_\beta) \frac{\text{Var}(h)}{\text{sys}^2(K_\beta, g)} \leq \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K_\beta, g) - \alpha_{\text{sys}}(K, C_\beta). \quad (2.27)$$

3 Proof of the Projection Inequality

The proof of Lemma 2.4 divides into the four cases from the definition of ϕ_β . Cases 1, 3 and 4 have fairly short proofs, however, for Case 2 the situation is more complicated. Recall that $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow K_\beta$ denotes the quotient map.

Proof (of Case 1). We have $\beta \leq \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\text{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \pi$. The vertical curve $\gamma : [-2\beta, 2\beta] \rightarrow K_\beta$, $\gamma(t) = p(0, t)$ is closed, noncontractible and its length is given by

$$L_g(\gamma) = \int_{-2\beta}^{2\beta} \sqrt{g_{\gamma(t)}(\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t))} dt = \int_{-2\beta}^{2\beta} \phi(t) dt = 4 \int_0^\beta \phi(t) dt. \quad (3.1)$$

By the definition of the systole, we have $L_g(\gamma) \geq \text{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \pi$, so (3.1) gives us $\int_0^\beta \phi(t) dt \geq \frac{\pi}{4}$. As ϕ_β is constant, we can simply calculate

$$\int_0^\beta \phi(y) \phi_\beta(y) dy = \frac{\pi}{4\beta} \int_0^\beta \phi(y) dy \geq \frac{\pi}{4\beta} \frac{\pi}{4} = \frac{1}{\beta} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^2 \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y) dy = \beta \left(\frac{\pi}{4\beta}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{\beta} \left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right)^2, \quad (3.3)$$

which gives the desired inequality \square

Proof (of Case 3). Here, we are in the situation $\beta_0 \leq \beta \leq \beta_1$, and $\phi_\beta = \phi_0$. The Möbius strip $(M_\beta, g|_{M_\beta})$ contained in (K_β, g) satisfies $\text{sys}(M_\beta, g|_{M_\beta}) \geq \text{sys}(K_\beta, g) = \pi$ and $g|_{M_\beta} = \phi^2|_{M_\beta} g_{flat}$ is invariant under the isometry group of (M_β, g_{flat}) (due to the H_β -invariance of g). Thus, the assumptions for Pu's inequality (1.19) are fulfilled and we obtain

$$\int_0^\beta \phi(y) \phi_0(y) dy \geq \int_0^\beta \phi_0^2(y) dy. \quad (3.4)$$

Due to $\phi_\beta = \phi_0$, this finishes the proof. \square

Proof (of Case 4). We now consider $\beta > \beta_1$. As on the thick möbius strip, the horizontal curves that wrap around twice, given by $\lambda_\tau : [-\pi/2, 3\pi/2] \rightarrow K_\beta$, $\lambda_\tau(t) = p(t, \tau)$, have to be of length (with respect to the metric g) at least $\pi = \text{sys}(K_\beta, g)$, which implies $\phi \geq \frac{1}{2}$. By restricting to the Möbius strip $M_{\beta_1} \subset K_\beta$ (where $\phi_\beta = \phi_0$ holds) and proceeding as above, Pu's inequality yields

$$\int_0^{\beta_1} \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \geq \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi_\beta^2(y)dy. \quad (3.5)$$

Combing this with $\phi_0 \geq \frac{1}{2} = \phi_\beta(y)$ for $y \geq \beta_1$ gives the desired

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy &= \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy + \int_{\beta_1}^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \\ &\geq \int_0^{\beta_1} \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \int_{\beta_1}^\beta \phi_\beta(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the remaining Case 2 is based on the following general Lemma:

Lemma 3.1 *Let $s > 0$, $h : [0, s] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ be a continuous, positive and decreasing function and $g : [0, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous such that*

$$\int_0^z h(y)g(y)dy \geq 0, \quad \forall z \in [0, s]. \quad (3.6)$$

Then

$$\int_0^z h(y)g(y)dy \geq h(z) \int_0^z g(y)dy, \quad \forall z \in [0, s]. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. Consider the continuous function $u : [0, s] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $u(z) = \int_0^z h(y)g(y)dy - h(z) \int_0^z g(y)dy$. The claimed inequality is equivalent to $u(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in [0, s]$. To prove this, we argue by contradiction: assume there exists $z_0 \in [0, s]$ such that $u(z_0) < 0$. Because of $u(0) = 0$, we have $z_0 > 0$. The continuity of u implies that $a := \sup\{z \in [0, z_0] | u(z) \geq 0\}$ is in $[0, z_0)$ and satisfies $u(a) = 0$ as well as $u(z) < 0$ for all $z \in (a, z_0]$.

We now recall the definition of the (lower right-handed) Dini derivative. A good reference on this topic is Chapter 3 of [KK96]. Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and $x \in [a, b)$. Then

$$D_+f(x) := \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{f(x+t) - f(x)}{t} \quad (3.8)$$

is called the lower right-handed Dini derivative of f at x . Similar definitions for the upper and left-handed Dini derivatives also exist. A calculation shows that in our case we have

$$D_+u(z) = -D_+h(z) \int_0^z g(y)dy \quad (3.9)$$

for $z \in [0, s)$. As h is a decreasing function, we have $\frac{h(z+t)-h(z)}{t} \leq 0$ for all $t \in (0, s-z)$ and thus $D_+h(z) \leq 0$. For $z \in (a, z_0]$, we have $u(z) < 0$, which is equivalent to

$$\int_0^z h(y)g(y)dy < h(z) \int_0^z g(y)dy. \quad (3.10)$$

The assumptions $h > 0$ and $\int_0^z h(y)g(y)dy \geq 0$ for all $z \in [0, s]$ therefore imply

$$\int_0^z g(y)dy > 0 \quad (3.11)$$

for all $z \in (a, z_0]$. Combined with (3.9) and $D_+h \leq 0$, this yields

$$D_+u(z) \geq 0 \quad (3.12)$$

for all $z \in (a, z_0)$. Hence, $u|_{[a, z_0]}$ is a continuous function with nonnegative Dini derivative D_+u on (a, z_0) . This implies that $u|_{[a, z_0]}$ is increasing (see for example [KK96], Theorem 3.4.4). Consequently, we have

$$0 = u(a) \leq u(z_0) < 0, \quad (3.13)$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, such z_0 cannot exist, proving $u(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in [0, s]$. \square

Remark 3.2 *If we assume the function h in the above Lemma to be differentiable, then so is the function u used in the proof. In this case, one can compute the (usual) derivative of u to show that it is increasing on $[a, z]$, simplifying the proof.*

Proof (of Case 2). Here we are in the situation $\beta \in (\beta_0, \beta_1)$, ϕ_β is given by

$$\phi_\beta(y) = \begin{cases} \phi_0(y) & \text{for } \beta \leq s_\beta, \\ \phi_0(s_\beta) & \text{for } \beta > s_\beta, \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

where the definition of s_β ensures precisely $\int_0^\beta \phi_\beta(y)dy = \frac{\pi}{4}$. For $z \leq s_\beta$, the restriction to the Möbius strip $M_z \subset K_\beta$ combined with Pu's inequality, similar to the arguments in the proofs of Cases 3 and 4, gives us

$$\int_0^z \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \geq \int_0^z \phi_\beta^2(y)dy. \quad (3.15)$$

Similar to the situation in Case 1, the vertical curve γ ensures $\int_0^\beta \phi(y)dy \geq \frac{\pi}{4}$. We write $\phi = \phi_\beta + \sigma$, for $\sigma : [0, \beta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. (3.15) thus reformulates to

$$\int_0^z \phi_\beta^2(y)dy \leq \int_0^z (\phi(y) + \sigma(y))\phi_\beta(y)dy = \int_0^z \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \int_0^z \sigma(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy, \quad (3.16)$$

which implies

$$\int_0^z \sigma(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \geq 0, \quad \forall z \leq s_\beta. \quad (3.17)$$

Hence, $h = \phi_\beta$ and $g = \sigma$ satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 3.1 on the interval $[0, s_\beta]$. Consequently, we find

$$\int_0^{s_\beta} \sigma(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \geq \phi_\beta(s_\beta) \int_0^{s_\beta} \sigma(y)dy. \quad (3.18)$$

The inequality $\int_0^\beta \phi(y)dy \geq \pi/4$ gives us

$$\pi/4 \leq \int_0^\beta (\phi_\beta(y) + \sigma(y))dy = \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta(y)dy + \int_0^\beta \sigma(y)dy, \quad (3.19)$$

which, in combination with $\int_0^\beta \phi_\beta(y)dy = \pi/4$, yields precisely $\int_0^\beta \sigma(y)dy \geq 0$. Using that and (3.18), we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\beta \phi(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy &= \int_0^\beta (\phi_\beta(y) + \sigma(y))\phi_\beta(y)dy = \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \int_0^\beta \sigma(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \int_0^{s_\beta} \sigma(y)\phi_\beta(y)dy + \int_{s_\beta}^\beta \sigma(y) \underbrace{\phi_\beta(y)}_{=\phi_\beta(s_\beta)} dy \\ &\geq \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \phi_\beta(s_\beta) \int_0^{s_\beta} \sigma(y)dy + \phi_\beta(s_\beta) \int_{s_\beta}^\beta \sigma(y)dy \\ &= \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \phi_\beta(s_\beta) \left(\int_0^{s_\beta} \sigma(y)dy + \int_{s_\beta}^\beta \sigma(y)dy \right) \\ &= \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy + \underbrace{\phi_\beta(s_\beta)}_{>0} \underbrace{\int_0^\beta \sigma(y)dy}_{\geq 0} \\ &\geq \int_0^\beta \phi_\beta^2(y)dy, \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. □

References

- [Bav86] C. Bavard. “Inégalité isosystolique pour la bouteille de Klein”. *Mathematische Annalen* 274.3 (1986), pp. 439–441. ISSN: 1432-1807. DOI: 10.1007/bf01457227.
- [Bav88] C. Bavard. “Inégalités isosystoliques conformes pour la bouteille de Klein”. *Geometriae Dedicata* 27.3 (1988). ISSN: 1572-9168. DOI: 10.1007/bf00181499.

- [Bav92] C. Bavard. “Inégalités isosystoliques conformes”. *Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici* 67.1 (1992), pp. 146–166. ISSN: 1420-8946. DOI: 10.1007/bf02566493.
- [BG24] F. Balacheff and T. Gil Moreno de Mora. “Isosystolic inequalities on two-dimensional Finsler tori”. *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences* 11.2 (2024), pp. 205–233. ISSN: 2308-216X. DOI: 10.4171/emss/80.
- [Gro83] M. Gromov. “Filling Riemannian manifolds”. *Journal of Differential Geometry* 18.1 (1983). ISSN: 0022-040X. DOI: 10.4310/jdg/1214509283.
- [Heb82] J. J. Hebda. “Some lower bounds for the area of surfaces”. *Inventiones Mathematicae* 65.3 (1982), pp. 485–490. ISSN: 1432-1297. DOI: 10.1007/bf01396632.
- [HKK09] C. Horowitz, K. U. Katz, and M. G. Katz. “Loewner’s Torus Inequality with Isosystolic Defect”. *Journal of Geometric Analysis* 19.4 (2009), pp. 796–808. ISSN: 1559-002X. DOI: 10.1007/s12220-009-9090-y.
- [Iva11] S. V. Ivanov. “Filling minimality of Finslerian 2-discs”. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics* 273.1 (2011), pp. 176–190. ISSN: 1531-8605. DOI: 10.1134/s0081543811040079.
- [KK96] R. Kannan and C. K. Krueger. *Advanced Analysis*. Springer New York, 1996. ISBN: 9781461384748. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4613-8474-8.
- [KN20] M. G. Katz and T. Nowik. “A systolic inequality with remainder in the real projective plane”. *Open Mathematics* 18.1 (2020), pp. 902–906. ISSN: 2391-5455. DOI: 10.1515/math-2020-0050.
- [Pu52] P. M. Pu. “Some inequalities in certain nonorientable Riemannian manifolds.” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 2.1 (1952), pp. 55–71.
- [SY16] S. Sabourau and Z. Yassine. “Optimal systolic inequalities on Finsler Möbius bands”. *Journal of Topology and Analysis* 08.02 (2016), pp. 349–372. ISSN: 1793-7167. DOI: 10.1142/s1793525316500138.