

Software for the Thompson and Funk Polygonal Geometry

Hridhaan Banerjee ✉ 🏠

Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology, Virginia, USA

Carmen Isabel Day ✉ 🏠

California State University Channel Islands, California, USA

Auguste H. Gezalyan ✉ 🏠 

Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, USA

Olga Golovatskaia ✉ 🏠

Mount Holyoke College, Massachusetts, USA

Megan Hunleth ✉ 🏠

Montgomery Blair High School, Silver Spring, Maryland, USA

Sarah Hwang ✉ 🏠

University of Maryland, College Park, USA

Nithin Parepally ✉ 🏠

Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, USA

Lucy Wang ✉ 🏠

Princeton University, New Jersey, USA

David M. Mount ✉ 🏠 

Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA

Abstract

Metric spaces defined within convex polygons, such as the Thompson, Funk, reverse Funk, and Hilbert metrics, are subjects of recent exploration and study in computational geometry. This paper contributes an educational piece of software for understanding these unique geometries while also providing a tool to support their research. We provide dynamic software for manipulating the Funk, reverse Funk, and Thompson balls in convex polygonal domains. Additionally, we provide a visualization program for traversing the Hilbert polygonal geometry.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Computational geometry

Keywords and phrases Thompson metric, Hilbert metric, Funk metric, balls

1 Introduction

Thompson, Funk, reverse Funk, and Hilbert are closely related distance measures that apply to points in the interior of a convex body (see Section 2 for definitions). The Hilbert metric has applications in convex approximation [1, 2, 15], real analysis [8], linear algebra [9], clustering [11], and machine learning [14] and has been the subject of recent study for this reason [3–6, 10]. The Funk, reverse Funk, and Thompson metrics are comparatively unexplored but all share similarities with the Hilbert metric [12, 13].

In this paper, we present new dynamic software for manipulating the Funk, reverse Funk, and Thompson balls in convex polygonal domains. Additionally, we provide visualization software for traversing the Hilbert polygonal geometry. Our code is predominantly written in Javascript and is available at <https://github.com/nithin1527/funk-geo-visualizer>. To use the software, please go to <https://funk-geo-visualizer.vercel.app/>. For more information on the usage, please see the README on the GitHub repository or watch the accompanying video available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IeRIO25iK-o>.

2 Definitions

Throughout, Ω refers to a convex polygon in \mathbb{R}^2 with m sides. Let $\partial\Omega$ denote its boundary. When clear, we omit explicit reference to Ω .

► **Definition 1** (Funk weak metric). *Given two distinct points $p, q \in \text{int } \Omega$ in \mathbb{R}^d , let q' denote the intersection of the ray from p through q with $\partial\Omega$. Define the Funk weak metric to be:*

$$F_{\Omega}(p, q) = \ln \frac{\|p - q'\|}{\|q - q'\|},$$


where $F_{\Omega}(p, q) = 0$.

The above definition is also sometimes called the *forward Funk metric*. Note that the Funk weak metric is asymmetric. Its reverse, the *reverse Funk metric*, is defined to be $rF_{\Omega}(p, q) = F_{\Omega}(q, p)$. Define the *Funk ball* centered at a point p of radius r , denoted $B_F(p, r)$, to be the set of points $q \in \text{int } \Omega$ such that $F_{\Omega}(p, q) \leq r$. The reverse Funk ball is defined analogously. These are scaled homotheties of Ω (see Figure 1(b) and (c)).

► **Lemma 2.** *The open forward Funk ball of radius r around a point p is the image of Ω under Euclidean homothety around the point p with dilation factor of $(1 - e^{-r})$ [12].*

► **Lemma 3.** *The open reverse Funk ball of radius r around a point p is the image of Ω under Euclidean homothety around the point p with dilation factor of $(e^r - 1)$ [12].*

The *Hilbert metric* can be defined as the average of the forward and reverse Funk metrics [12].



■ **Figure 1** The Hilbert (a), Funk (b), Reverse Funk (c), and Thompson (d) balls around a point

► **Definition 4** (Hilbert metric). *Given two distinct points p, q in a convex polygonal $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the Hilbert metric to be:*

$$H_{\Omega}(p, q) = \frac{1}{2}(F_{\Omega}(p, q) + rF_{\Omega}(p, q)),$$

Note that the Hilbert metric is a proper metric, obeying the identity of indiscernibles, symmetry, and the triangle inequality. Hilbert balls are polygons with at most $2m$ sides (see Figure 1(a)). For a characterization of Hilbert balls see “Balls in the Hilbert Polygonal Geometry” by Nielsen and Shao [10].

The notion of the Hilbert metric gave rise to the definition of another metric by A.C. Thompson in 1963 called the *Thompson metric* [13] on convex cones. The formulation of this metric can be generalized through the Funk metric.

► **Definition 5** (Thompson metric). *Given two distinct points p, q in a convex polygonal $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we define the Thompson metric to be:*

$$T_{\Omega}(p, q) = \max(F_{\Omega}(p, q), rF_{\Omega}(p, q)),$$

Note that the identity of indiscernibles and triangle inequality clearly carry over from the Funk metric. The symmetry of the Thompson metric follows from the fact that it is the maximum of the forward and reverse of a weak metric.

The Thompson ball (see Figure 1(d)) is the intersection of the forward and reverse Funk balls. Since both these balls are convex (as they are homotheties of Ω intersected with Ω [12]), computing the Thompson ball reduces to calculating the intersection of two convex polygons. This can be done linearly in the complexity of the polygons. Hence, we get:

► **Lemma 6.** *The Thompson ball around a point p with radius r has at most $2m$ sides and is the intersection of the forward and reverse Funk balls around p with radius r .*

Thompson balls have an interesting property that sets them apart from many other metrics.

► **Lemma 7.** *Thompson balls are not pseudo-disks (see Figure 2(a)).*

► **Lemma 8.** *A Thompson ball of radius r centered at p can be nested between two Hilbert balls of radius $\frac{1}{2}r$ and r centered at p (see Figure 2(b)).*


Proof. Given a convex body $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, for every point $p \in \Omega$ and radius $0 < r$, we will show:

$$B_H(p, r/2) \subset B_T(p, r) \subset B_H(p, r).$$


To prove that $B_T(p, r) \subset B_H(p, r)$, we must show that the Thompson distance from p to a point on the boundary of the ball is greater than or equal to the Hilbert. This follows directly from the definition of the Hilbert and Thompson metrics:

$$H(a, b) = \frac{1}{2}(F(a, b) + F(b, a)) \leq 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}(\max(F(a, b), F(b, a)) = T(a, b).$$

To prove that $B_H(p, r/2) \subset B_T(p, r)$, we must show that the Thompson distance from p to a point on the boundary of the ball is less than or equal to the Hilbert distance. This follows from the fact that if $H(a, b) = \frac{1}{2}r$ then $\frac{1}{2}(F(a, b) + F(b, a)) = \frac{1}{2}r$ so $F(a, b) + F(b, a) = r$ and so $T(a, b) = \max(F(a, b), F(b, a)) \leq r$. ◀



■ **Figure 2** (a) Thompson balls are not pseudo-disks, (b) a Thompson ball of radius 1 between two Hilbert balls of radii $1/2$ and 1 .



■ **Figure 3** (a) Travelling in a hendecagon and (b) after travelling some distance in the square.

3 Traversing the Hilbert Geometry

We provide a visualization software for inserting Hilbert balls into a user-specified Hilbert polygonal geometry, and then traveling around that geometry (see Figure 3). In order to give users the ability to move in the Hilbert geometry, we implement a projective mapping that first affinely shifts Ω so that its centroid is at the origin O . Then, using a map ϕ_v , we map $O + v$ to the centroid $\phi_v(\Omega)$ where v is an accumulated displacement vector. This mapping is given by:

$$\phi_v(p) = \frac{p}{1 + \langle p, v \rangle},$$

where p is an arbitrary point [7].

However, this projective mapping often deforms Ω into very skinny forms. To handle this situation, we first capture the approximate John ellipsoid of the original shape scaled with the Mahalanobis distance. After movement, we calculate the new approximate John ellipsoid

with respect to the projection of the vertices of Ω . Then, we map the new John ellipsoid to the unit circle using a Cholesky decomposition. Lastly, we map the unit circle to the original approximate John ellipsoid to center the new geometry. Since all the maps we use are affine maps, they preserve the Hilbert metric. For more information on the mapping used, see the README on the GitHub repository.

References

- 1 Ahmed Abdelkader and David M. Mount. Economical Delone sets for approximating convex bodies. In *Proc. 16th Scand. Workshop Algorithm Theory*, pages 4:1–4:12, 2018. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SWAT.2018.4.
- 2 Ahmed Abdelkader and David M. Mount. Convex approximation and the Hilbert geometry. In *2024 Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, pages 286–298. SIAM, 2024. doi:10.1137/1.9781611977936.26.
- 3 Hridhaan Banerjee, Carmen Isabel Day, Megan Hunleth, Sarah Hwang, Auguste H Gezalyan, Olya Golovatskaia, Nithin Parepally, Lucy Wang, and David M Mount. On the heine-borel property and minimum enclosing balls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.17138*, 2024.
- 4 Madeline Bumpus, Caesar Dai, Auguste H. Gezalyan, Sam Munoz, Renita Santhoshkumar, Songyu Ye, and David M. Mount. Software and analysis for dynamic Voronoi diagrams in the Hilbert metric. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02745*, 2023.
- 5 Auguste H Gezalyan, Soo H Kim, Carlos Lopez, Daniel Skora, Zofia Stefankovic, and David M Mount. Delaunay triangulations in the hilbert metric. In *19th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory (SWAT 2024)*, pages 25–1. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2024.
- 6 Auguste H. Gezalyan and David M. Mount. Voronoi diagrams in the Hilbert metric. In *39th International Symposium on Computational Geometry (SoCG 2023)*. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2023.35.
- 7 Ivan Izместiev. Matching centroids by a projective transformation. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 217(3):53, 2023.
- 8 Bas Lemmens and Roger D Nussbaum. Birkhoff’s version of hilbert’s metric and its applications in analysis, 2014.
- 9 Carlangelo Liverani and Maciej P. Wojtowski. Generalization of the Hilbert metric to the space of positive definite matrices. *Pacific Journal Of Mathematics*, 166(2):339, 1994.
- 10 Frank Nielsen and Laetitia Shao. On balls in a Hilbert polygonal geometry (multimedia contribution). In *Proc. 33rd Internat. Sympos. Comput. Geom.*, volume 77 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 67:1–67:4. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2017. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2017.67.
- 11 Frank Nielsen and Ke Sun. Clustering in Hilbert’s projective geometry: The case studies of the probability simplex and the elliptope of correlation matrices. In Frank Nielsen, editor, *Geometric Structures of Information*, pages 297–331. Springer Internat. Pub., 2019. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-02520-5_11.
- 12 Athanase Papadopoulos and Marc Troyanov. *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*, volume 22 of *IRMA Lectures in Mathematics and Theoretical Physics*. European Mathematical Society Publishing House, 2014. doi:10.4171/147.
- 13 Anthony C. Thompson. On certain contraction mappings in a partially ordered vector space. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 14(3):438–443, 1963. doi:10.2307/2033816.
- 14 Julian Vanecek, Auguste H Gezalyan, and David M Mount. Support vector machines in the hilbert geometry.
- 15 Constantin Vernicos and Cormac Walsh. Flag-approximability of convex bodies and volume growth of Hilbert geometries. In *Annales Scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure*, volume 54, pages 1297–1315, 2021.