

HILBERT SPACE FACTOR OF METRIC SPACES

THOMAS FOERTSCH, ALEXANDER LYTCHAK AND ELEFTERIOS SOULTANIS

ABSTRACT. We prove that any complete metric space has a unique decomposition as a direct product of a possibly finite or zero-dimensional Hilbert space and a space that does not split off lines.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *line* ℓ in metric space X is a subset isometric to the real line \mathbb{R} . We call a line $\ell \subset X$ a *splitting line* in X if there exists a metric space Y and an isometry $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times Y$ onto the direct product, such that the composition of Φ and the projection P^Y to Y sends ℓ to a point.

In this note we verify the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a complete metric space. Then there exists a unique decomposition of X as a direct product $X = Y \times H$, where the metric space Y does not contain splitting lines and H is a (possibly finite- or zero-dimensional) Hilbert space.*

For any point $x \in X$, the maximal Hilbert space factor H_x (with respect to inclusion) containing x coincides with the union of all splitting lines $\ell \subset X$ containing x .

As a consequence, the isometry group $Iso(X)$ of X is canonically isomorphic to $Iso(Y) \times Iso(H)$, cf. [FL08, Section 2.5].

Theorem 1.1 contains no assumptions on the space X other than completeness. Nevertheless, the proof is not completely trivial. The theorem is related to a problem formulated in a special form by Ulam, [Ula60], asking about the uniqueness of decompositions of a metric space as a product of some *irreducible factors*. For non-complete spaces there exist surprisingly simple counterexamples to uniqueness, [Fou71], [Her94]. For compact spaces this problem is widely open.

Under additional geometric assumptions, Theorem 1.1 is known. For geodesic metric spaces satisfying a finite-dimensionality assumption, a stronger uniqueness of product decompositions was proved in [FL08],

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C20, 51F99.

Key words and phrases. de Rham decomposition, line factor, Cartesian product.

generalizing the classical de Rham decomposition theorem in Riemannian geometry [dR52], [EH98].

If the space X is a CAT(0) space, then Theorem 1.1 is contained in [BH99, Theorem 6.15]. Moreover, in this case the Hilbert space factor H is identified with the group of all *Clifford translations* of X . More generally, for CAT(κ) spaces X with any κ , the Hilbert space factor is closely related to the space of continuous affine functions on X , [LS07].

If X is non-negatively curved in the sense of Alexandrov, then any line in X is a splitting line, by Toponogov's theorem [Mit10], [AKP24, Section 16G]. In this case, Theorem 1.1 states that the union H_x of all lines through $x \in X$ is the maximal Hilbert space factor of X .

Due to the splitting theorem proven by Gigli in [Gig13, Gig14], the last statement applies without changes to RCD(0, N) spaces, $N < \infty$.

Theorem 1.1 was obtained many years ago during the work on [FL08]. We were not aware of any consequence until recently, when the result appeared to play some role in the study of universal infinitesimal Hilbertianity [DMGPS21]. See also [CGGKSR24, Theorem A] for another recent appearance of the Hilbert space factor. The current paper is published jointly with the third named author who obtained an independent proof of a version of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Nicola Gigli for helpful discussions. The paper was finalized during the stay of Alexander Lytchak and Eleftherios Soultanis at the HIM in Bonn as part of the special trimester on Metric Analysis funded by the DFG under Germany's Excellence Strategy – EXC-2047/1 – 390685813. Eleftherios Soultanis was supported by the Research Council of Finland grant 355122.

2. NOTATION

By d we will denote distances in metric spaces without reference to the space. For metric spaces Y, \bar{Y} , the product $Y \times \bar{Y}$ will always denote the direct (Cartesian) product of the metric spaces. For a direct product $X = Y \times \bar{Y}$ we denote by $P^Y : X \rightarrow Y$ and $P^{\bar{Y}} : X \rightarrow \bar{Y}$ the canonical projections onto the factors.

For $x \in X$ we denote by $Y_x := (P^{\bar{Y}})^{-1}(P^{\bar{Y}}(x))$ the Y -fiber through x . The restriction $P^Y : Y_x \rightarrow Y$ is an isometry. We will identify Y_x with Y via this isometry. Using this identification, the projection $P^Y : X \rightarrow Y$ is identified with the closest-point projection π_{Y_x} which sends points $p \in X$ to the unique point $\pi_{Y_x}(p) \in Y_x \simeq Y$ minimizing $d(p, Y_x)$. The isometry $X \rightarrow Y \times \bar{Y}$ is then identified with the map

$$(\pi_Y, \pi_{\bar{Y}}) : X \rightarrow Y \times \bar{Y} \subset X \times X .$$

The map is surjective and satisfies for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$:

$$d^2(x_1, x_2) = d^2(\pi_Y(x_1), \pi_Y(x_2)) + d^2(\pi_{\bar{Y}}(x_1), \pi_{\bar{Y}}(x_2)).$$

3. MAIN OBSERVATION

3.1. Factor subsets. Fix a point x in a metric space X . We call a subset A containing x a *factor subset* if there exists an isometry $I : X \rightarrow Y \times \bar{Y}$, such that A coincides with Y_x under this isometry.

Any factor subset is closed. If $x \in A$ is a factor subset then the closest-point projection $\pi_A : X \rightarrow A$ is well-defined, the preimage $B := \pi_A^{-1}(x)$ is another factor subset of X and

$$(\pi_A, \pi_B) : X \rightarrow A \times B$$

is an isometry. We call B the *cofactor* of A .

We denote by \mathcal{F}_x the set of all factor subsets of X containing x . The set \mathcal{F}_x is partially ordered by inclusion. The map $\perp : \mathcal{F}_x \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_x$ which sends a factor subset $A \in \mathcal{F}_x$ to its complementary factor subset is an order-reversing involution of \mathcal{F}_x .

3.2. Intersections and projections of factor subsets. The question whether the intersection of two factor subsets is again a factor subset is closely related to the uniqueness of product decompositions, cf. [FL08, Lemma 5.1]. The following observation provides a sufficient criterion for an affirmative answer to this question:

Lemma 3.1. *Let X be a metric space and $x \in X$. Let $X = Z \times \bar{Z}$ be a decomposition and let $Y \in \mathcal{F}_x$ be some factor subset of X . For $p \in Y$, we set $G_p := \pi_Y(\bar{Z}_p)$ and $F_p := Y \cap Z_p$. Assume that, for all $p, q \in Y$:*

- (1) *The assumption $q \in G_p$ implies $G_q = G_p$.*
- (2) *$G_p \cap F_q$ contains exactly one point.*

Then F_x and G_x are factor subsets of Y and $Y = F_x \times G_x$.

Proof. The subsets $F_p, p \in Y$ constitute a disjoint decomposition of Y . Due to (1), the subsets $G_p, p \in Y$ constitute a disjoint decomposition of Y as well. By the second assumption, we obtain for all $p_1, p_2 \in Y$ a canonical map $I_{p_1, p_2} : F_{p_1} \rightarrow F_{p_2}$, which sends $q \in F_{p_1}$ to $G_q \cap F_{p_2}$.

By definition, $I_{p, p}$ is the identity, for all $p \in Y_x$. By the first assumption, $I_{p_2, p_3} \circ I_{p_1, p_2} = I_{p_1, p_3}$, for all $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in Y_x$.

Due to [FL08, Subsection 2.2], the subsets F_p are factor subsets of Y if, for all $p_1, p_2 \in Y$, we have

$$(3.1) \quad d^2(p_1, p_2) = d^2(p_1, I_{p_1, p_2}(p_1)) + d^2(I_{p_1, p_2}(p_1), p_2).$$

If this holds true, then G_x is the cofactor subset of F_x in Y through the point x . It remains to verify equality (3.1), essentially contained in [FL08, Lemma 2.1]; we present the computation here for convenience.

Set $q = I_{p_1, p_2}(p_1)$. By assumption, $G_q = G_{p_1}$, hence we find some $\bar{z} \in \bar{Z}_q$, such that $p_1 = \pi_Y(\bar{z})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d^2(p_2, \bar{z}) - d^2(q, p_2) &= d^2(q, \bar{z}) = d^2(\bar{z}, p_1) + d^2(p_1, q), \\ d^2(p_2, p_1) + d^2(p_1, \bar{z}) &= d^2(p_2, \bar{z}). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the sum of this two equalities we deduce

$$d^2(p_1, p_2) - d^2(q, p_2) = d^2(p_1, q),$$

hence (3.1). This finishes the proof. \square

3.3. Splitting lines. We can verify the assumptions of Lemma 3.1 in a special case:

Proposition 3.2. *Let x be a point in a metric space X . Let $Y \in \mathcal{F}_x$ be a factor subset and let $\ell \in \mathcal{F}_x$ be a splitting line. Then $\pi_Y(\ell)$ is either a point or a splitting line in Y .*

Proof. Denote by $\bar{Y} \in \mathcal{F}_x$ the cofactor of Y . For $p \in Y$, denote by ℓ_p the splitting line through p determined by ℓ and by Z_p the cofactor subset of ℓ_p through p . As in Lemma 3.1, we set $G_p := \pi_Y(\ell_p)$ and $F_p := Z_p \cap Y$. For any p , parametrize ℓ_p by an isometry $\gamma_p : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \ell_p$, such that $\pi_\ell \circ \gamma_p$ is a translation. Then $\pi_Y \circ \gamma_p$ and $\pi_{\bar{Y}} \circ \gamma_p$ are geodesics parametrized with constant velocities $\alpha = \alpha(p)$ and $\beta = \beta(p)$ such that $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, [FL08, Section 2.4].

For any $p, q \in Y$, the value

$$d^2(\gamma_p(t), \gamma_q(t)) = d^2(\pi_Y(\gamma_p(t)), \pi_Y(\gamma_q(t))) + d^2(\pi_{\bar{Y}}(\gamma_p(t)), \pi_{\bar{Y}}(\gamma_q(t)))$$

is independent of t . Hence, the first summand $d^2(\pi_Y \circ \gamma_p(t), \pi_Y \circ \gamma_q(t))$ is bounded. Therefore, the geodesics $\pi_Y \circ \gamma_p$ and $\pi_Y \circ \gamma_q$ have the same velocity $\alpha(p) = \alpha(q)$. Hence, α is independent of p .

The projection $G_x = \pi_Y(\ell_x)$ is a point if and only if $\alpha(x) = 0$. From now on, let G_x not be a single point. Then, for all $p \in Y$, the subset G_p is a line parametrized by $\pi_Y \circ \gamma_p$ with constant velocity $\alpha \neq 0$.

In order to prove that G_x is a splitting line in Y , we only need to verify properties (1) and (2) from Lemma 3.1.

Let $p, q \in Y$ be such that $q \in G_p$. In order to verify that G_p and G_q coincide, we consider the image $K = \pi_{Z_p}(G_p)$. This is a geodesic (possibly a point) containing $\pi_{Z_p}(p)$ and $\pi_{Z_p}(q)$. Hence

$$K \times \ell_p \subset Z_p \times \ell_p = X$$

is a Euclidean plane (possibly a line), which contains ℓ_p and ℓ_q as parallel lines. Applying [FL08, Proposition 1.4], we deduce that $\pi_Y(K)$ is isometric to a linearly convex subset of a normed vector space, such that $\pi_Y : K \rightarrow \pi_Y(K)$ is an affine map with respect to this linear structure (in fact, one can apply the more special [FS02, Proposition 1], to see that $\pi_Y(K)$ is a normed space). Hence, ℓ_p and ℓ_q are mapped by π_Y to parallel lines in the subset $\pi_Y(K)$ of a normed vector space. Since these images G_p and G_q intersect in q , these lines have to coincide. This proves (1).

The statement that G_p and F_q intersect in exactly one point is equivalent to the statement that $\pi_\ell : G_p \rightarrow \ell$ is a bijection. Then the unique intersection point will be the only point $o \in G_p$, for which $\pi_\ell(o) = \pi_\ell(q)$.

Applying [FL08, Section 2.4] again, we see that the restriction of the projection π_ℓ onto the line G_p is either constant or a bijective map onto a line. Since the only line contained in ℓ is ℓ itself, we deduce that either $\pi_\ell : G_p \rightarrow \ell$ is a bijection or constant. However, if $\pi_\ell(G_p)$ is a point, then G_p is contained in Z_p . But then p is the closest point on G_p to any point on ℓ_p . Since G_p is defined as the closest-point projection of ℓ_p onto Y , this would imply $G_p = \{p\}$, in contradiction to our assumption that G_x and hence G_p are not singletons. This finishes the proof of (2) and of the Lemma. \square

4. ZORN'S LEMMA

Consider the subset \mathcal{F}_x^0 consisting of all factor subsets in \mathcal{F}_x which are isometric to Hilbert spaces. We verify:

Lemma 4.1. *If X is complete, there exists a maximal element in \mathcal{F}_x^0 .*

Proof. By Zorn's Lemma we only need to show that for any increasing chain $I \subset \mathcal{F}_x^0$, there exists an element $H \in \mathcal{F}_x^0$ containing all $A \in I$. We let H be the closure

$$H := \overline{\bigcup_{A \in I} A}.$$

The union of a chain of Hilbert spaces is a pre-Hilbert space. Since X is complete, the closure H is a Hilbert space. Clearly, any $A \in I$ is a subset of H . It remains to prove that H is a factor subset of X .

For any $p \in X$ and any $A^\alpha \in I$ with cofactor B^α , we set

$$p^\alpha := \pi_{A^\alpha}(p) \in A^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad p_\alpha := \pi_{B^\alpha}(p) \in B^\alpha$$

For any $A^\alpha \subset A^\beta$ in I , A^α is a Hilbert subspace of the Hilbert space A^β hence a factor subset of A^β . Denote by $A^{\alpha,\beta}$ the orthogonal complement of A^α in A^β . Thus, $A^\beta = A^\alpha \times A^{\alpha,\beta}$. Then, for all $p \in X$,

$$\pi_{A^\alpha}(p^\beta) = p^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad d^2(p, p^\beta) + d^2(p^\alpha, p^\beta) = d^2(p, p^\alpha).$$

We deduce that the net of real numbers $d(p, p^\alpha)$ is monotonically decreasing, hence convergent. Moreover, the net of points p^α in X is Cauchy, hence convergent by the completeness of X . The limit point p^∞ is contained in H and it is the closest-point to p on H .

Denote by $B^\alpha, B^\beta \in \mathcal{F}_x$ the cofactors of A^α and A^β , respectively. Then we have a canonical isomorphism

$$B^\alpha = A^{\alpha, \beta} \times B^\beta .$$

As above, for any $p \in X$ the net of numbers $d(p, p_\alpha)$ is monotonically increasing. Since all these numbers are bounded by $d(p, x)$, this net of numbers is converging. Then, by completeness of X , the net of points p_α is convergent to a point $p_\infty \in X$, contained in

$$B^\infty := \bigcap_{A^\alpha \in I} B^\alpha .$$

Hence, the isometric embeddings

$$(\pi_{A^\alpha}, \pi_{B^\alpha}) : X \rightarrow X \times X$$

converge pointwise to a map

$$(\pi_H, \pi_{B^\infty}) : X \rightarrow X \times X .$$

By continuity, this map is again an isometric embedding. Moreover, by continuity the image coincides with $H \times B^\infty \subset X \times X$. This proves that H is a factor subset and finishes the proof. \square

5. END OF PROOF

Now we can easily provide

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix a point $x \in X$. By Lemma 4.1, there exists a maximal factor subset $H_x = H \in \mathcal{F}_x^0$ isometric to a Hilbert space. Let $Y \in \mathcal{F}_x$ denote the cofactor subset, thus $X = Y \times H$. If Y contained a splitting line ℓ then $Y = Z \times \ell$ and $X = Z \times \ell \times H$. Then $(\ell \times H)_x$ is a factor subset in \mathcal{F}_x^0 , which contains H and is not equal to H in contradiction to the maximality of H . Thus, Y contains no splitting lines.

We claim that H is the union of all splitting lines in X through the point x . This immediately implies the uniqueness statement.

Any line ℓ in the Hilbert space H through the point x is a splitting line in H . Since H is a factor subset of X , the line ℓ is a splitting line in X . On the other hand, let $\ell \in \mathcal{F}_x$ be a splitting line in X and assume that ℓ is not contained in H . Then $\pi_Y(\ell)$ is not a point, hence, by Proposition 3.2, this projection is a splitting line in Y . This contradiction finishes the proof of the claim and of the theorem. \square

REFERENCES

- [AKP24] S. Alexander, V. Kapovitch, and A. Petrunin. *Alexandrov geometry—foundations*, volume 236 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. 2024.
- [BH99] M. Bridson and A. Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. 1999.
- [CGGKSR24] M. Che, F. Galaz-García, M. Kerin, and J. Santos-Rodríguez. Isometric rigidity of metric constructions with respect to Wasserstein spaces. *arxiv: 2410.14648*, 2024.
- [DMGPS21] S. Di Marino, N. Gigli, E. Pasqualetto, and E. Soultanis. Infinitesimal Hilbertianity of locally $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ -spaces. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 31(8):7621–7685, 2021.
- [dR52] G. de Rham. Sur la reductibilité d’un espace de Riemann. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 26:328–344, 1952.
- [EH98] J. Eschenburg and E. Heintze. Unique decomposition of Riemannian manifolds. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 126:3075–3078, 1998.
- [FL08] T. Foertsch and A. Lytchak. The de Rham decomposition theorem for metric spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 18(1):120–143, 2008.
- [Fou71] G. Fournier. On a problem of S. Ulam. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 29:622, 1971.
- [FS02] T. Foertsch and V. Schroeder. Minkowski versus Euclidean rank for products of metric spaces. *Adv. Geom.*, 2:123–131, 2002.
- [Gig13] N. Gigli. Splitting theorem in the non-smooth context. *arXiv:1302.5555*, 2013.
- [Gig14] N. Gigli. An overview of the proof of the splitting theorem in spaces with non-negative Ricci curvature. *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces*, 2(1):169–213, 2014.
- [Her94] I. Herburt. There is no cancellation law for metric products. In *Intuitive geometry (Szeged, 1991)*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1994.
- [LS07] A. Lytchak and V. Schroeder. Affine functions on $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ -spaces. *Math. Z.*, 255(2):231–244, 2007.
- [Mit10] A. Mitsuishi. A splitting theorem for infinite dimensional Alexandrov spaces with nonnegative curvature and its applications. *Geom. Dedicata*, 144:101–114, 2010.
- [Ula60] S. M. Ulam. *A collection of mathematical problems*, volume no. 8 of *Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. 1960.