

Global hyperbolicity and manifold topology from the Lorentzian distance

A. Bykov* and E. Minguzzi†

Abstract

In this work, we seek characterizations of global hyperbolicity in smooth Lorentzian manifolds that do not rely on the manifold topology and that are inspired by metric geometry. In particular, strong causality is not assumed, so part of the problem is precisely that of recovering the manifold topology so as to make sense of it also in rough frameworks. After verifying that known standard characterizations do not meet this requirement, we propose two possible formulations. The first is based solely on chronological diamonds and is interesting due to its analogies with the Hopf-Rinow theorem. The second uses only properties of the Lorentzian distance function and it is suitable for extension to abstract ‘Lorentzian metric’ frameworks. It turns out to be equivalent to the definition of ‘Lorentzian metric space’ proposed in our previous joint work with S. Suhr, up to slightly strengthening weak d -distinction to ‘future or past d -distinction’. The role of a new property which we term d -reflectivity is also discussed. We then investigate continuity properties of the Lorentzian distance and the property of d -reflectivity in non-smooth frameworks. Finally, we establish a result of broader interest: the exponential map of a smooth spray is $C^{1,1}$ (smooth outside the zero section). Additionally, we derive a Lorentz-Finsler version of the Busemann-Mayer formula and demonstrate that, in strongly causal smooth Finsler spacetimes, the Finsler fundamental function can be reconstructed from the distance. As a consequence, distance-preserving bijections are shown to be Lorentz-Finsler isometries in the conventional smooth sense.

1 Introduction

The condition of global hyperbolicity is the most important in mathematical relativity, as it allows us to regard the evolution of spacetime as a well-defined PDE problem, with initial conditions imposed on a Cauchy hypersurface.

*Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica “U. Dini”, Università degli Studi di Firenze, Via S. Marta 3, I-50139 Firenze, Italy. E-mail: aleksei.bykov@unifi.it, ORCID:0009-0009-3994-2760

†Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Pisa, Via B. Pontecorvo 5, I-56127 Pisa, Italy. E-mail: ettore.minguzzi@unipi.it, ORCID:0000-0002-8293-3802

Many equivalent characterizations of global hyperbolicity have been proven over the years for smooth Lorentzian manifolds (all of which can be extended to $C^{1,1}$ metrics; we shall not concern ourselves here with the best regularity class). The many different, often disparate, ways of formulating the condition point to its ubiquity and fundamental physical importance.

The objective of this work is to formulate global hyperbolicity without appealing to the manifold topology. It is expected, particularly for unification with the quantum world, that at the most fundamental level spacetime is not described by a smooth manifold, as quantum mechanics usually introduces elements of discreteness. At the same time, causality and the related notion of global hyperbolicity appear too fundamental to be discarded lightly, so an alternative formulation of global hyperbolicity that does not use the manifold structure should be sought.

While we cannot be sure which mathematical structure will prove to be the correct one to replace the successful smooth Lorentzian manifold of general relativity, it seems reasonable to look for a formulation of global hyperbolicity that does not use the manifold topology. This is because the notion of order implicit in the causal structure, or the measure implicit in the spacetime volume, can be more easily substituted by other abstract mathematical entities than the manifold and its topology [40]. In a sense, the manifold topology should be recovered and hence justified among the many available possibilities, e.g. the discussion in [31, 50, 49]. In this endeavor, we shall take inspiration from metric geometry [11], thus following the recent trend in Lorentzian metric/length spaces [29, 47, 21, 14, 8, 36, 9, 35, 53, 30, 45, 4], rather than order/domain theory. In the latter direction, an important reference is the work by Martin and Panangaden [33] and subsequent developments [15, 16, 55, 17, 34]. For instance, it has been shown [16, 57] that under K -causality (which is equivalent to stable causality) the manifold topology can be recovered from the K (or Seifert) relation in a completely order theoretic manner using ideas from domain theory. Note that in these studies topology is derived from the notion of order, while in metric inspired theories topology is deduced from a two-point function.

Ultimately, we prove that globally hyperbolic spacetimes and their topologies are characterized as follows¹ (this is the same as Thms. 2.15, 2.21 but with all properties spelled out)

Theorem 1.1. *A smooth spacetime (M, g) is globally hyperbolic if and only if the Lorentzian distance has the following properties*

- (i) *d is finite,*
- (ii) *there is a topology T on M such that d is $T \times T$ -continuous and the chronological diamonds $I(p, q) := \{r : d_p(r)d^q(r) > 0\}$, $p, q \in M$, are relatively compact in the T topology.*

¹For basic properties of the Lorentzian distance $d : M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ we refer the reader to [3, 43]. We denote $d_p := d(p, \cdot)$ and $d^p := d(\cdot, p)$.

(iii) (M, d) is future or past d -distinguishing, namely

$$“\forall p, q \in M, d_p = d_q \Rightarrow p = q” \text{ or } “\forall p, q \in M, d^p = d^q \Rightarrow p = q”.$$

In this case T is the manifold topology and the causal relation is given by

$$J = \{(p, q) : d_p \geq d_q\} = \{(p, q) : d^p \leq d^q\}. \quad (1)$$

Taking into account that d satisfies the reverse triangle inequality for chronologically related events and that every event is included in some chronological diamond, we recognize that these properties are precisely those that define a Lorentzian metric space (without chronological boundary, $M = I(M)$) in the sense of our previous joint work with Suhr [45] [13, Thm. 2.14], up to the fact that in a Lorentzian metric space (iii) is replaced by the slightly weaker ‘weak d -distinction’: $\forall p, q \in M, d_p = d_q$ and $d^p = d^q \Rightarrow p = q$ (unfortunately, we do not know if (iii) can be weakened to such property).

The fact that properties (i)-(iii) are necessary was proved in [13, Prop. 2.4, Thm. 2.14] and is relatively straightforward, while the above type of converse is considerably more difficult and is only proved in this work. The difficulties are related to the absence of any a priori relative strength between Lorentzian metric space topology (i.e. the topology T , which is actually known to be unique and coincident with the initial topology of the functions $d^p, d_p, p \in M$) and the manifold topology: neither is a priori included in the other.

For instance, we expect that discontinuities of d in the manifold topology increase the family of T -open sets with respect to the manifold topology, while causal pathologies such as violation of strong causality decrease their number. Extreme care must be exerted in proofs, as continuous curves in one topology might not be continuous in the other, the time functions in the smooth spacetime sense might not coincide with the time functions in the Lorentzian metric space sense, causal curves in the smooth spacetime sense might not coincide with isocausal curves in the Lorentzian metric space sense, and so on. Still, the fact that for both topologies a limit curve theorem holds, though relative to different type of curves and topologies, signals that they could be related and actually coincide. In fact, the validity of a limit curve type theorem has been recognized as one important criteria to select the natural spacetime topology [31, 49].

It can be noted that the above properties (i)-(iii) are formulated just through d , and that they do not include conditions such as $p \in \text{Cl}_T(I^\pm(p))$, or the fact that through each point passes an isochronal curve. This fact makes them suitable for an abstract definition of Lorentzian metric space which includes causal sets [58] as they are naturally endowed with the discrete topology. If such pointwise conditions were included, the topology T would coincide with the Alexandrov topology [13, Thm. 3.9] and the proof would be considerably simplified.²

²Some authors [46, 35] work with a function $\tau : M \times M \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup [0, +\infty]$ which coincides with d only where it is not equal to $\{-\infty\}$, the locus $\{d = -\infty\}$ being the complement of a closed relation J identified with the causal relation. For a comparison of these approaches see

This work is structured as follows. We end this Introduction by recalling some characterizations of global hyperbolicity in subsection 1.1. In subsection 1.2 we single out a formulation independent of topology, and dependent on properties of the family of chronological diamonds, which is interesting for analogies with the Heine-Borel property in positive signature. In Section 2 we approach the problem of characterizing global hyperbolicity via the Lorentzian distance function. We introduce the interesting new notions of d -distinction and d -reflectivity, which turn out, in the smooth case considered there, to be equivalent to the standard notions, having however the advantage of being formulated directly via the Lorentzian distance. Ultimately, we prove the above main theorem, and in the following sections we demonstrate how the characterisations we suggest work in less regular or Finslerian cases.

In Section 3 we prove that globally hyperbolic proper Lorentz-Finsler spaces in the low regularity sense of [42] are Lorentzian metric spaces in the sense of [45, 13], extending a result for smooth spacetimes already contained in [13]. In Section 4 the folklore result that distance preserving maps of smooth spacetimes are actually Lorentzian isometries is proved. This is done to answer some questions in relation to the previous paper on Lorentzian metric spaces [52, 45]. Subsequently, the result is generalized to the Lorentz-Finsler case by passing through the proof of a Lorentz-Finsler Busemann-Mayer type formula (and another useful formula). In Section 5 we pass to the low regularity theory first showing that previous results on the Lorentzian distance of Section 2 generalize to proper Lorentz-Finsler spaces. Then, several results on the Lorentzian distance are explored for structure even more general than Lorentzian metric spaces. In particular, the interplay between the continuity properties of d , d -reflectivity and the condition $p \in I^\pm(p)$ is clarified.

Before we continue let us recall our notations and terminologies. In this work a manifold is always Hausdorff and second countable, hence paracompact. A spacetime (M, g) is a connected time-oriented Lorentzian manifold whose metric g is C^2 ($C^{1,1}$ will be enough) and of signature $(-, +, \dots, +)$. The inclusion \subset is reflexive. When comparing topology ‘finer’ shall always mean ‘as fine as’, that is, ‘containing’. With a curve γ we might mean a map $\gamma: I \rightarrow M$ or the image of the map. We write $p < q$ if there is a causal curve connecting p to q , and $p \ll q$ if there is a timelike curve connecting p to q . We write $p \leq q$ if $p < q$ or $p = q$. The sets $J = \{(p, q) : p \leq q\}$ and $I = \{(p, q) : p \ll q\}$ are the causal and chronological relations respectively. A *causal diamond* is a set of the form $J^+(p) \cap J^-(q)$. The *causally convex hull* of a set $S \subset M$, is the set $J^+(S) \cap J^-(S)$, namely the union of the images of all the causal curves which start and end in S . For most results of causality theory we refer to the recent review [43].

[13]. Essentially, in the latter framework τ contains more information than d so it is easier to obtain from conditions on it various results. The additional information in τ is not strictly needed as the causal relation and its closure can be recovered with formulas such as (1), see also [45, Eq. (10)] [13, Eq. (3)]. These formulas are related to relation D in the smooth settings [37, 19], as we shall recall.

1.1 Available characterizations

Let us consider some classical characterization of global hyperbolicity [23]

- (a) Strong causality and the causal diamonds are compact,
- (b) Existence of a Cauchy hypersurface [20],
- (c) Strong causality and compactness of the space of causal curves connecting any two events with respect to the C^0 topology [23, Prop. 6.6.2].

There are many variants of (a) in which strong causality is replaced by weaker conditions or in which the causal diamonds are replaced by different causal hulls [5, 25, 44] [38, Cor. 3.2, Thm. 3.6] [54] [42, Def. 2.20] but all make use of compactness with respect to the manifold topology.

As for (b), we recall that a Cauchy hypersurface is an acausal hypersurface (without edge) that intersects every inextendible causal curve exactly once. Here the manifold topology enters both the definition of hypersurface and curve. In particular, it seems difficult to dispense with it in the definition of curves.

Finally, in (c) the use of topology is evident as the topology on the space of curves is induced from that on the manifold.

To the previous classical list we can add

- (d) existence of a smooth h -steep Cauchy temporal function [6, Thm. 3] (see also [42, Thm. 2.45]);
- (e) There is a time function τ such that (M, \hat{d}_τ) is a complete metric space, where \hat{d}_τ is the null distance [12, Thm. 1.4].

Here use of the manifold topology is made in the time/temporal functions used which, by definition, must be continuous in the manifold topology.

1.2 A manifold-topology-independent characterization

Having established that none of the available characterizations of global hyperbolicity is independent of the manifold topology one might suspect that it should be difficult to find one. Instead, there is a rather simple characterization that accomplishes such objective:

Theorem 1.2. *A spacetime (M, g) is globally hyperbolic iff the topology generated by the chronological diamonds is Hausdorff and any chronological diamond is relatively compact in that topology.*

We recall that a chronological diamond is a set of the form $I(p, q) := I^+(p) \cap I^-(q)$ where I is the chronological relation (which is known to be open in the manifold topology). Observe that in a smooth spacetime if a point is contained in the intersection of two diamonds then we can find a third diamond containing the point and staying within the two diamonds (just consider the endpoints of a short timelike curve passing through the point). This means that the family of chronological diamonds, regarded as a subbasis for a topology, is actually a basis for such topology. The topology so generated is called *Alexandrov topology*.

Proof. The direction to the right is clear due to strong causality [22, 28, 51][43, Thm. 4.75] and the fact that chronological diamonds are contained within causal diamonds (which are compact by the standard definition of global hyperbolicity).

For the converse, the assumption that the Alexandrov topology is Hausdorff implies, by a classical result [22, 28, 51][43, Thm. 4.75], that the spacetime is strongly causal and that the Alexandrov topology coincides with the manifold topology. In particular, the spacetime is non-total imprisoning, and thus the result follows from [38, Cor. 3.3]: a spacetime is globally hyperbolic if it is non-total imprisoning and, for every $p, q \in M$, $\overline{I(p, q)}$ is compact. In the original formulation, the closure was taken with respect to the manifold topology, which we have just shown to coincide with the Alexandrov topology. This concludes the proof. \square

This simple characterization is remarkable in several respects. Not only does it achieve our objective; the definition also depends solely on the notion of a chronological diamond. This notion encapsulates the same information as the chronological relation; indeed, we defined the chronological diamond via the chronological relation, but the reverse direction can also be established via $(p, q) \in I \Leftrightarrow I(p, q) \neq \emptyset$.

In previous work, we argued that one of the best definitions of global hyperbolicity is one that frames it within the context of topological ordered spaces [39, Sec. 1.1, Def. 3.1] [42, 44]: the causal relation is a closed order, and the causally convex hull operation preserves compactness. This definition is highly robust when it comes to weakening the regularity conditions of the spacetime, precisely because it depends only on the topology and order. Notably, the characterization in Theorem 1.2 takes a completely different direction. It does not require a predefined topology, and the relation used is the open chronological one, not the closed causal one.

Clearly, Theorem 1.2 suggests using this characterization to define global hyperbolicity for sets endowed with a strict partial order (irreflexive, transitive, asymmetric) I , a mathematical setting quite distinct from that of closed ordered spaces.

To these authors, it remains puzzling that the notion of global hyperbolicity can be framed in such general yet distinct frameworks. This may further underscore the importance of this concept, though the origin of these manifestations has yet to be clarified.

We now wish to emphasize the formal analogy between the characterization in 1.2 and the Hopf-Rinow theorem in Riemannian geometry [27, Thm. 4.1], which, in particular, states: Let (M, g) be a connected and smooth Riemannian manifold. It is a complete Riemannian space if and only if the closed and bounded subsets of M are compact (Heine-Borel property).

Of lesser importance to us is the fact that the notion of a complete Riemannian space is related to the completeness of geodesics. This type of notion is clearly among the least robust under low regularity, as geodesics require at least a Lipschitz connection to be defined. Similarly, of little importance is the fact

that it is equivalent, by the same Hopf-Rinow theorem, to the completeness of the metric space (M, d) , where d is the metric. What is important for us is that the concept of a 'complete Riemannian space' can be introduced using the Heine-Borel property. That is, if we refer to $B(p, r) := \{q \in M : d(p, q) < r\}$ as a 'ball', we can rephrase

Theorem 1.3. *Let (M, g) be a connected and smooth Riemannian space. It is a complete Riemannian space iff the balls are relatively compact in the topology generated by the balls.*

There is a clear parallelism between Theorem 1.2 and this theorem, with the following replacements

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Spacetime} &\leftrightarrow \text{Riemannian space} \\ \text{Globally hyperbolic spacetime} &\leftrightarrow \text{Complete Riemannian space} \\ \text{Chronological diamond} &\leftrightarrow \text{Ball} \\ \text{Alexandrov topology} &\leftrightarrow \text{Metric topology} \end{aligned}$$

The main difference is the absence of the requirement for the Hausdorff property in the positive signature result. This is because the triangle inequality ensures it. Additionally, the triangle inequality guarantees that the distance d is continuous. These properties are lost in the Lorentzian signature. However, the triangle inequality ensures, as it does in the Lorentzian signature, that the balls generate the same topology whether considered as a basis or subbasis.

Theorem 1.2 thus supports the idea that globally hyperbolic spacetimes are analogous to complete Riemannian spaces in the Lorentzian signature. This correspondence can be extended further, with characterization (e) serving as an analog of the Hopf-Rinow theorem, as envisioned by Burtscher and García-Heveling. Perhaps Theorem 1.2 clarifies more than other results that the analog of balls in the Lorentzian signature are the *chronological diamonds*. Of course, the compactness of causal diamonds, which is part of the definition of global hyperbolicity, has long been viewed as analogous to the Heine-Borel property. However, only when this compactness condition is expressed in terms of chronological diamonds can we dispense with the manifold topology and establish a compelling correspondence between the two signatures.

2 Lorentzian distance function

Let us define the functions dependent on a choice of $r \in M$, $d_r = d(r, \cdot)$, and $d^r = d(\cdot, r)$.

In the remainder of this work we shall be interested in the problem of establishing properties of the Lorentzian distance function that might promote a generic spacetime to a globally hyperbolic one. Theorem 1.2 already provides a solution to this problem since the chronological relation, and hence the chronological diamonds, are expressible through the Lorentzian distance

$$I = d^{-1}((0, +\infty)), \quad I^+(p) = d_p^{-1}((0, +\infty)), \quad I^-(q) = (d^q)^{-1}((0, +\infty)).$$

Still, the formulation of global hyperbolicity would be rather indirect. We would prefer a formulation phrased directly in terms of continuity properties of d .

To start with, we shall explore some causality properties expressed via the Lorentzian distance function.

Proposition 2.1. *On a spacetime (M, g) for any two events $p, q \in M$, the inclusion $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$ is equivalent to the property $d_q \leq d_p$. Dually, the inclusion $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q)$ is equivalent to the property $d^p \leq d^q$.*

This result is a bit surprising since the function d contains much more information than the chronological relation. Note that we do not assume that d is finite or continuous.

Proof. Suppose that $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$ and let $r \in M$. If $r \notin I^+(q)$ then $d_q(r) = 0$ and the inequality we wish to prove follows. If $r \in I^+(q)$ for any $m > 0$, $m < d_q(r)$, there is a timelike curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ connecting $q = \gamma(0)$ to $r = \gamma(1)$ of Lorentzian length $\ell(\gamma) > m$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\ell(\gamma|_{[\delta, 1]}) > m$. But $\gamma(\delta) \gg q$ hence $\gamma(\delta) \gg p$, which implies $d_p(r) \geq \ell(\gamma|_{[\delta, 1]}) > m$. Since

$$m < d_q(r)$$

is arbitrary, $d_p(r) \geq d_q(r)$. By the arbitrariness of r , $d_q \leq d_p$.

For the converse, suppose that $d_q \leq d_p$, then if $r \in I^+(q)$ we have $d_q(r) > 0$ so $d_p(r) > 0$ which implies $r \in I^+(p)$. By the arbitrariness of r , $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$. \square

We recall [43, Def. 4.46] that a spacetime is *future distinguishing* if $I^+(p) = I^+(q) \Rightarrow p = q$ (and similarly in the past case). A spacetime is *weakly distinguishing* if $I^+(p) = I^+(q)$ and $I^-(p) = I^-(q) \Rightarrow p = q$, cf. [43, Def. 4.47]. A spacetime is *distinguishing* if $I^+(p) = I^+(q)$ or $I^-(p) = I^-(q) \Rightarrow p = q$, cf. [43, Def. 4.59].

It is convenient to introduce the following notions

Definition 2.2. We say that the *Lorentzian distance future distinguishes events* (the spacetime is *future d -distinguishing*) if $d_p = d_q \Rightarrow p = q$, and that is *past distinguishes events* if $d^p = d^q \Rightarrow p = q$. The spacetime is *d -distinguishing* if it is both future and past d -distinguishing, namely: $d^p = d^q$ or $d_p = d_q \Rightarrow p = q$. We say that the spacetime is *weakly d -distinguishing* if $d^p = d^q$ and $d_p = d_q \Rightarrow p = q$.

Note that d -distinction implies ‘future or past d -distinction’ which implies weak d -distinction.

Remark 2.3. Weak d -distinction is called just d -distinction (or it is said that the Lorentzian distance distinguishes events) in [45, 13] as this is the only version that plays a role in those works.

An immediate consequence of Prop. 2.1 is

Corollary 2.4. *On a spacetime (M, g) (future/past/weak) d -distinction is equivalent to (resp. future/past/weak) distinction.*

One might ask why introducing new terminology of ‘ d -’ type if the equivalence holds. The reason is that for less regular spacetimes the equivalence might not hold anymore. This problem will be explored later on.

We recall [43, Sec. 4.1] that a spacetime is future reflecting if $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q) \Rightarrow I^+(p) \supset I^+(q)$. The reverse direction of the implication holds for the past reflecting case. A spacetime is reflecting if it is both past and future reflecting, that is if $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q) \Leftrightarrow I^+(p) \supset I^+(q)$.

Definition 2.5. A spacetime is *future d -reflecting* if $d^p \leq d^q \Rightarrow d_q \leq d_p$. A spacetime is *past d -reflecting* if $d^p \leq d^q \Leftarrow d_q \leq d_p$. A spacetime is *d -reflecting* if it is both past and future d -reflecting, that is if $d^p \leq d^q \Leftrightarrow d_q \leq d_p$.

Another immediate consequence of Prop. 2.1 is

Corollary 2.6. *On a spacetime (M, g) (future/past) d -reflectivity is equivalent to (resp. future/past) reflectivity.*

Note that the validity of (d -)reflectivity makes all the weak/past/future (d -)distinction properties coincide.

By using the Lorentzian distance we can characterize causal continuity.

Theorem 2.7. *A spacetime (M, g) is causally continuous iff it is weakly d -distinguishing and d -reflective.*

Proof. This follows from the improved characterization of causal continuity: weak distinction and reflectivity [10] [43, Def. 4.109]. \square

The following result is classical [3, Thm. 4.24] [43, Prop. 5.2] but is phrased here in a stronger form than usual.

In statements concerning continuity of the functions $d, d_p, d^p, p \in M$, it is understood that such property is with respect to the manifold topology of M unless stated otherwise.

Proposition 2.8. *Let T be a topology on M such that $p \in \overline{I^+(p)} \cap \overline{I^-(p)}$ for every $p \in M$ (e.g. the Alexandrov or the manifold topology). The upper T -semi-continuity of the functions $d^r, r \in M$, where they vanish implies future reflectivity. Similarly, the upper T -semi-continuity of the functions $d_r, r \in M$, where they vanish implies past reflectivity.*

Note that in the statement the closure is with respect to T and that in the proof we avoid use of sequences. Indeed, the first countability of T is not assumed. The condition $p \in \overline{I^+(p)} \cap \overline{I^-(p)}$, means that the topology T is fine but not too fine.

Proof. Let us prove the latter statement, the former being analogous. Suppose that past reflectivity does not hold then we can find $p, q \in M$ such that $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$ but $I^-(p)$ is not a subset of $I^-(q)$, that is, there is $r \ll p$ such that $r \notin I^-(q)$. But $q \in \overline{I^+(q)}$ thus $q \in \overline{I^+(p)} \subset \overline{I^+(r)}$. For every T -open set O of q there is $q' \in O \cap I^+(p)$ and

$$d(r, q') \geq d(r, p) + d(p, q') \geq d(r, p) > 0$$

which proves that d_r has a discontinuity at q where it vanishes. \square

Remark 2.9. The condition “ $\forall p, q \in M, d(p, q) = \inf_{q' \in I^+(q)} d(p, q')$ and $\forall p, q \in M, d(p, q) = \inf_{p' \in I^-(p)} d(p', q)$ ” easily implies that $d^p, d_p, p \in M$ are upper semi-continuous and hence continuous in the Alexandrov topology. Hence under this condition reflectivity holds.

Proposition 2.8 allows us to replace reflectivity in a number of results, for instance

Theorem 2.10. *Every weakly d -distinguishing spacetime for which d is continuous on $d^{-1}(0)$ is casually continuous.*

Let us compare the continuity of d with that of the functions $d_p, d^p, p \in M$.

We already recalled that in the Alexandrov topology sets of the form $I(p, q)$ form a basis, not just a subbasis. Also sets of the form $I^+(p)$ and $I^-(q)$ are open in the Alexandrov topology.

Proposition 2.11. *The functions d, d_p and $d^p, p \in M$, are lower semi-continuous for the Alexandrov topology and hence any finer topology (e.g. the manifold topology). Conversely, if the functions d_p and $d^p, p \in M$, are lower semi-continuous for a topology then that topology contains the Alexandrov topology.*

In other words, the lower semi-continuity property is equivalent to the property that the topology contains the Alexandrov topology.

Proof. The proof of the first statement goes as the usual one for the lower semi-continuity of d , e.g. [43, Thm. 2.32]. For the second statement, lower semi-continuity of d_p implies that the set $d_p^{-1}((0, +\infty]) = I^+(p)$ is open, and lower semi-continuity of d^q implies that the set $(d^q)^{-1}((0, +\infty]) = I^-(p)$ is open, hence the sets of the form $I(p, q)$ are open. \square

Theorem 2.12. *If the Lorentzian distance d is $T \times T$ -continuous then the functions $d_p := d(p, \cdot)$ and $d^p := d(\cdot, p)$ are T -continuous for every $p \in M$. The converse holds if T is a topology such that $p \in \overline{I^+(p)} \cap \overline{I^-(p)}$ for every $p \in M$, e.g. the manifold topology or the Alexandrov topology.*

Once again the closure in this statement is with respect to T .

Proof. Note that whatever the direction considered, the assumption implies that T is finer than the Alexandrov topology. Suppose that d is $T \times T$ -continuous. The function $\phi_p : M \rightarrow M \times M, q \rightarrow (p, q)$ is T -continuous, so is the function $d_p = d \circ \phi_p$. Similarly, d^p is T -continuous.

For the converse, we already know by Prop. 2.11 that d is lower semi-continuous with respect to $T \times T$ so it is sufficient to prove upper semi-continuity with respect to $T \times T$. Let (p, q) be such that $d(p, q) < \infty$ (otherwise upper semi-continuity at (p, q) is clear), and let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $p' \ll p$. By upper semi-continuity of d^q the point p' can be chosen so close to p that $d(p', q) < d(p, q) + \epsilon/2$. Let

$q' \gg q$. By upper semi-continuity of $d_{p'}$ the point q' can be chosen so close to q that $d(p', q') < d(p', q) + \epsilon/2$, thus $d(p', q') < d(p, q) + \epsilon$. The open set $I^+(p') \ni p$, $I^-(q') \ni q$ belong to the Alexandrov topology and hence to the topology T ; we have $(p, q) \in I^+(p') \times I^-(q')$ and on this product $T \times T$ -open set the Lorentzian distance is bounded by $d(p', q')$ and hence by $d(p, q) + \epsilon$, which proves the upper semi-continuity of d with respect to $T \times T$. \square

In the next result the topology involved is the manifold topology.

Corollary 2.13. *The Lorentzian distance d is continuous iff the functions $d_p, d^p, p \in M$, are all continuous.*

The key point is that by using only the Lorentzian distance function, we have been able to derive properties as robust as strong causality, as demonstrated in Theorem 2.7. This is significant because it establishes the Hausdorff property of the Alexandrov topology, thereby ensuring its equivalence with the manifold topology [43, Thm. 4.75].

We recall the following key result [45, Prop. 1.6]

Proposition 2.14. *Let \mathcal{A} be a family of open subsets for a topology such that (a) \mathcal{A} separates points and (b) every point admits an open neighborhood in \mathcal{A} contained in a compact set. Then \mathcal{A} is a subbasis for the topology.*

Note that by (a) and (b) the topology is Hausdorff and locally compact.

This leads to the following result which is interesting as it characterizes global hyperbolicity using only properties of the Lorentzian distance functions and without invoking the manifold topology.

Theorem 2.15. *Let (M, g) be a spacetime which is weakly d -distinguishing, such that the chronological diamonds are relatively compact in a topology T that makes the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ lower semi-continuous, and such that at least one of the following conditions hold*

- (a) *d -reflectivity,*
- (b) *the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ are actually T -continuous and $p \in \overline{I^+(p)} \cap \overline{I^-(p)}$ for every $p \in M$, where closure is in the topology T ,*
- (c) *strong causality.*

Then the topology T , the Alexandrov topology, the manifold topology and the initial topology of the family $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ are all coincident. Moreover, (M, g) is globally hyperbolic and so d is finite and continuous (in the corresponding product topology).

We recall that “in a topology T that makes the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ lower semi-continuous” is equivalent to “in a topology T finer than the Alexandrov topology” by Prop. 2.11.

The role of (a),(b), and (c) is that of ensuring that T is not too fine. We do not know if they can be dispensed of.

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} be the family of chronological diamonds. Clearly, $\mathcal{A} \subset T$. The family \mathcal{A} provides a basis for the Alexandrov topology. If we assume d -reflectivity (option (a)) then, from Thm. 2.7, the spacetime is causally continuous hence strongly causal which implies that the Alexandrov topology is Hausdorff [43, Thm. 4.75] and hence \mathcal{A} separates points. Option (b) gives d -reflectivity due to Prop. 2.8 and so we are back to the previous case.

Strong causality also implies that the Alexandrov topology coincides with the manifold topology. Every point admits as neighborhood a chronological diamond, which thus belongs to \mathcal{A} , and which is contained in a T -compact set.

By Prop. 2.14 T coincides with the Alexandrov topology and hence with the manifold topology. The chronological diamonds are thus relatively compact in the manifold topology. A spacetime is globally hyperbolic iff it is strongly causal and every chronological diamond is precompact with respect to the manifold topology [38, Cor. 3.3], thus (M, g) is globally hyperbolic. In particular d , and $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ are finite and continuous in the manifold topology.

Note that the manifold topology is finer than the initial topology of the family $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ which is finer than the Alexandrov topology. Since the first and third (last) topology coincide, we conclude that the manifold topology coincides with the initial topology of the family $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$. \square

By using the manifold topology Theorem 2.15 gives the following corollary, as the continuity of d implies d -reflectivity and the continuity of the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$.

Corollary 2.16. *Let (M, g) be a spacetime which is weakly d -distinguishing, such that d is continuous and such that the chronological diamonds are relatively compact. Then the Alexandrov topology, the manifold topology and the initial topology of the family $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ are all coincident. Moreover, (M, g) is globally hyperbolic and so d is finite.*

We recall the following definition [13, Def. 2.1, Lemma 2.3, Thm. 2.14]

Definition 2.17. A *Lorentzian metric space without chronological boundary* is a pair (X, d) , where X is a set, $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfies the reverse triangle inequality for chronologically related triples $x \ll y \ll z$ (the chronology relation being $I = \{d > 0\}$), (X, d) is weakly d -distinguishing³, every point is contained in some chronological diamond, and every chronological diamond is relatively compact in some topology T that makes the function d continuous.

Remark 2.18. In what follows we shall call these objects simply ‘Lorentzian metric spaces’ as we shall only consider the case of empty chronological boundary. In other words, each event is contained in some chronological diamond.

The causal relation for a Lorentzian metric space is defined as follows [13, Def. 4.1]

$$\tilde{J} = \{(p, q) : d_p \geq d_q \text{ and } d^p \leq d^q\}.$$

³In [13] this is referred, more simply, as ‘ d distinguishes the events’.

A great deal is known about Lorentzian metric spaces and the topology T mentioned in the definition. In particular, the topology T is unique and coincides with the initial topology of the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$, and so is referred as ‘the topology of the Lorentzian metric space’. We also know that every smooth globally hyperbolic spacetime (M, g) is a Lorentzian metric space [13]. The rationale for the introduction of Lorentzian metric spaces is that they are very general. For instance, the definition comprises discrete versions of spacetime such as causal sets [58].

Our previous Theorem 2.15 aims to answer the following question: under what conditions a smooth spacetime (M, g) such that (M, d) is a Lorentzian metric space is globally hyperbolic? The main difficulty is in establishing that the Lorentzian metric space topology coincides with the manifold topology. In a sense, the real problem is that of justifying and recovering the manifold topology out of ingredients that do not use it. For that we needed to impose properties (a), (b) or (c).

Thus, Theorem 2.15 implies the following

Theorem 2.19. *Let (M, g) be a smooth spacetime and let d be the associated Lorentzian distance. Suppose that (X, d) is a Lorentzian metric space in the sense of Def. 2.17 which satisfies (a), (b) or (c) of Thm. 2.15, then (M, g) is globally hyperbolic and the Lorentzian metric space topology coincides with the manifold topology.*

Proof. It follows from [13, Thm. 2.14] and Thm. 2.15. □

This result suggests that in an abstract setting Lorentzian metric spaces augmented by properties (a), (b) or (c) could be particularly interesting. Property (b) is suited for Lorentzian length spaces in which any two chronologically related points are connected by an isochronal curve, however, it is too strong for causal sets. These are examples of Lorentzian metric spaces for which the natural (Lorentzian metric space) topology is the discrete one, so the property $p \in \overline{I^\pm(p)}$ does not hold. In those more general cases a property such as (a) would be preferred.

We single out the following result which characterizes globally hyperbolic spacetimes by using solely the Lorentzian distance.

Theorem 2.20. *Let (M, g) be a smooth spacetime. It is globally hyperbolic if and only if it is a d -reflective Lorentzian metric space.*

We are now going to improve Theorem 2.20 further.

On the smooth spacetime (M, g) let us introduce the relation [37] [43, p. 105]

$$D = \{(p, q) : I^+(p) \supset I^+(q)\} \cap \{(p, q) : I^-(p) \subset I^-(q)\}$$

then, by Prop. 2.1, it can be rewritten

$$D = \{(p, q) : d_p \geq d_q \text{ and } d^p \leq d^q\}. \quad (2)$$

Reflectivity is equivalent to $D = \bar{J}$, see [43, Def. 4.9], and in this case

$$D = \{(p, q) : d_p \geq d_q\} = \{(p, q) : d^p \leq d^q\}.$$

If the causal relation is closed we have $D = J$, see [43, Thm. 4.13].

Theorem 2.21. *Let (M, g) be a smooth spacetime. It is globally hyperbolic if and only if it is a future d -distinguishing or past d -distinguishing Lorentzian metric space. Moreover, in this case the Lorentzian metric space causal order coincides with J and the Lorentzian metric space topology T coincides with the manifold topology.*

It is equivalent to ask that (M, g) is a ‘future or past distinguishing’ spacetime and (M, d) is a Lorentzian metric space.

This is an improvement of Thm. 2.20 because d -reflectivity improves the weak d -distinction property implicit in the definition of Lorentzian metric space to d -distinction.

Proof. The direction to the right was proved in [13, Prop. 2.4, Thm. 2.14]

For the converse, we want to prove that d -reflectivity holds and then apply Thm. 2.15.

Since the manifold can be covered by a countable family of charts, by selecting the points corresponding to rational coordinates, we get a countable family of points \mathcal{S} such that for every $p \in M$, there are $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $p \in I(x, y)$. As a consequence, (M, d) is a countably generated Lorentzian metric space [13, Def. 2.12, Def. 3.17] which implies that the Lorentzian metric space topology is Polish [13, Prop. 3.20]. In particular, being metrizable, compactness for this topology is equivalent to sequential compactness.

Recalling the definition of causal relation for a Lorentzian metric space, namely $\tilde{J} = \{(p, q) : d_p \geq d_q \text{ and } d^p \leq d^q\}$ [13, Def. 4.1] we get $\tilde{J} = D$. Observe that $I = \{d > 0\}$ thus I is also the chronological relation for (M, d) .

Let us prove past d -reflectivity. Let $p, q \in M$ and suppose that $d_p \geq d_q$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$, $\gamma(0) = q$, be a smooth timelike curve. Then for each $t > 0$, $d_q(\gamma(t)) > 0$ which implies $d_p(\gamma(t)) > 0$ and hence $p \ll \gamma(t)$. The chronological diamond $I(p, \gamma(1))$ is relatively compact in the Lorentzian metric space topology. The sequence $q_n := \gamma(1/n)$ must have a subsequence $x_k = q_{n_k}$ which converges to some point x in the Lorentzian metric space topology (note that we do not assume the continuity of the curve in the Lorentzian metric space topology), see Fig. 1. Since for each t the sequence x_k is contained (for sufficiently large k) in $\tilde{J}^-(\gamma(t))$, which is closed in Lorentzian metric space topology, the point x belongs to $\cap_{t>0} \tilde{J}^-(\gamma(t))$. However, by $I \circ \tilde{J} \cup \tilde{J} \circ I \subset I$, for $t' > t$, $\tilde{J}^-(\gamma(t)) \subset I^-(\gamma(t'))$, thus $x \in \cap_{t>0} I^-(\gamma(t))$. This implies $q \in \overline{I^+(x)}$ (closure in the manifold topology) or equivalently $I^+(q) \subset I^+(x)$. However, the sequence x_k is also contained in $\tilde{J}^+(q)$ which is closed in Lorentzian metric space topology thus x belongs to it and hence $(q, x) \in D$ by the proved equality $D = \tilde{J}$. Since $q \in \overline{I^+(x)}$ and $x \in \overline{I^+(q)}$, we have by the openness of I , $I^+(x) = I^+(q)$ (see e.g. [43, Eq. (4.1)]).

Note that $(p, q_n) \in \tilde{J}$ thus $(p, x) \in \tilde{J} = D$. If $x = q$ we have $(p, q) \in \tilde{J}$ and, by the definition of \tilde{J} , we have $d^p \leq d^q$, and we have finished.

There remains the case in which $x \neq q$. We want to show that this possibility does not apply as it leads to contradictions.

We recall that the weak d -distinction property inherent in the Lorentzian metric space definition implies the weak distinction property.

Consider the sequence $x_{k+1} \gg x_k \gg I^+(q) = I^+(x)$, $x_k \rightarrow x$ in the Lorentzian metric space topology, $x_k \rightarrow q$ in the manifold topology. Let $\sigma_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a timelike curve connecting x to x_k . They do not contract to a point because in the manifold topology $x_k \rightarrow q \neq x$. But $\sigma_k((0, 1)) \subset I(x, x_k)$, thus $\sigma_k \subset D(x, x_k) = \tilde{J}(x, x_k)$ which are compact in the Lorentzian metric space topology and satisfy the finite intersection property. Note that $\bigcap_k \tilde{J}(x, x_k) = \{x\}$ because if $y \in \tilde{J}^-(x_k)$ for every k , then, (y, x) by the closure of \tilde{J} in the Lorentzian metric space topology.

For every neighborhood (in the Lorentzian metric space topology) $O \ni x$ there is a sufficiently large k such that $J(x, x_k) \subset O$. However, the limit curve theorem (version for smooth spacetimes), applied to the sequence σ_k , implies that there is either: (i) a causal curve connecting x to q , but this implies $(x, q) \in J \subset D$, which implies (we proved above $(q, x) \in D$) that D is not antisymmetric, a violation of weak distinction, a contradiction; or (ii) there are a past-inextendible causal curve $\sigma^q : (-1, 0] \rightarrow M$ of ending point q and a future inextendible causal curve $\sigma_x : [0, 1) \rightarrow M$ of starting point x , both suitable limits of σ_k .




Figure 1: A figure illustrating the proof of Thm. 2.21 under the assumption $q \neq x$. We have $(q, x) \in D$, $I^+(q) = I^+(x)$, $I^-(x) = I^-(r)$, so past and future distinction are violated. The figure suggests $I^+(r) \cap \sigma_k \neq \emptyset$ for any sufficiently large k , but this is just due to its bidimensionality.

Now, consider the curve σ_x and let $r = \sigma_x(s)$, for some $s \in (0, 1)$. Since $x \leq r$ we know that $I^+(x) \supset I^+(r)$ and $I^-(x) \subset I^-(r)$. If $I^-(x) \neq I^-(r)$ there is $w \ll r$ such that $x \notin I^+(w)$. Let us consider a timelike curve $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ connecting w to r , then we can find $u = \eta(1/2)$ so that $d(w, u) = c > 0$, $d(u, r) > 0$. Then $x \in d_w^{-1}((-\infty, c))$ and $r \in I^+(u)$ where $d_w^{-1}((-\infty, c)) \cap I^+(u) = \emptyset$. But $O := d_w^{-1}((-\infty, c))$ is a Lorentzian metric space topology open neighborhood of x thus, as we have shown above, σ_k is contained in it

for sufficiently large k and so it cannot intersect $I^+(u)$. But as $r \in I^+(u)$ and $r \in \sigma_x$, this contradicts convergence in the C^0 topology (induced on the space of curves by the manifold topology [23]) of σ_k to σ which holds (actually a stronger form of uniform convergence for suitably parametrized curves holds) for the standard limit curve theorem for smooth spacetimes [43]. The contradiction proves that $I^-(x) = I^-(r)$ (and by the arbitrariness of d , $I^-(x) = I^-(\sigma_x(s))$ for every $s \in (0, 1)$). Now we have $I^+(q) = I^+(x)$, $q \neq x$, $I^-(x) = I^-(r)$, $x \neq r$, thus both future and past distinction are violated, which contradicts the assumption. Past d -reflectivity is proved.

Future d -reflectivity is proved similarly (using again the validity of ‘past or future distinction’). We conclude that the spacetime is globally hyperbolic and the Lorentzian metric space topology coincides with the manifold topology. For a globally hyperbolic spacetime J is closed, thus $D = J$ which implies $\tilde{J} = J$. \square

Remark 2.22. It is natural to try to improve the theorem by dropping the assumption of future or past d -distinction. The assumption would then be ‘weak d -distinction’ as it is contained in the definition of Lorentzian metric space. The proof would proceed as above reaching the case $q \neq x$ where we would need to push further the description of the spacetime in search of a contradiction.

In this respect it is worth noting that the Lorentzian metric space topology looks rather peculiar. Indeed, since $I^+(q) = I^+(x)$, $I^-(q) \subset I^-(x)$, the two points are distinguished by a point $v \in I^-(x)$, $q \notin I^+(v)$. But then, chosen $b, c \in M$ such that $v \ll b \ll c \ll x$, since $I^+(v) \supset \tilde{J}^+(b)$, $q \in I^+(v)^C \subset \tilde{J}^+(b)^C = D^+(b)^C$ and $x \in I^+(c)$. Now, $I^+(c) \cap (\tilde{J}^+(b))^C = \emptyset$ where the two sets are open sets in the Lorentzian metric space topology (and the former also in the manifold topology). But any manifold topology open neighborhood of q intersects $I^+(q) = I^+(x) \subset I^+(c)$ the Lorentzian metric space topology open neighborhood of x .

Another interesting observation is that for $t' > t$, $I^+(\sigma_x(t')) \subsetneq I^+(\sigma_x(t))$, indeed if they were to coincide we would have a violation of weak distinction and we would have finished. Note that $(x, x_1) \in I$, thus for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, $(\sigma_x(\epsilon), x_1) \in I$. For given ϵ we must have for sufficiently large k , $(\sigma_x(\epsilon), x_k) \notin D$, otherwise $(\sigma_x(\epsilon), x) \in D$, which jointly with $(x, \sigma_x(\epsilon)) \in J \subset D$ would again give a violation of weak distinction. This means that there is some $0 < \tau = \inf\{s\}$ where s are parameters such that $(\sigma_x(\epsilon), \gamma(s)) \in I$. In principle there could be an achronal lightlike geodesic connecting $\sigma_x(\epsilon)$ to $\gamma(\tau)$. We hope that this type of description could lead to a counterexample to the possibility of improving the theorem or to an improved assumption.

3 Globally hyperbolic Lorentz-Finsler spaces

In [42] we developed the causality theory for manifolds endowed with upper semi-continuous cone structures, see [6, 7] for results on time functions. We already mentioned that for smooth spacetimes (M, g) , global hyperbolicity implies that

(M, d) is a Lorentzian metric space. In this section we seek to obtain a similar result for these more general structures.

In the following theorem and subsequent proof, the terminology of [42] is used. Unfortunately, it would be rather long to recall all the definitions here, so we shall assume the reader to be acquainted with that work.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (M, C, \mathcal{F}) be a globally hyperbolic locally Lipschitz proper Lorentz-Finsler space, where C is the cone distribution and \mathcal{F} the Finsler fundamental function. Assume that $\mathcal{F}(\partial C) = 0$. Let d be the associated Lorentz-Finsler distance function. Then (M, d) is a Lorentzian metric space, and the Lorentzian metric space topology coincides with the manifold topology.*

Proof. To begin with, let us note that by [42, Prop. 2.23], since (M, C, \mathcal{F}) is a proper Lorentz-Finsler space, (M, C) is a proper cone structure.

Originally, the chronological relation is defined via piecewise C^1 timelike curves and not via the equality $I = \{d > 0\}$. However, the inclusion \supset holds thanks to [42, Thm. 2.56] (here we have used the fact that the fundamental function vanishes on the boundary), while the inclusion \subset holds because on a proper Lorentz-Finsler space \mathcal{F} is positive on $\text{Int}(C_p)$ and hence on $(\text{Int}C)_p$ (this follows from the concavity properties of \mathcal{F} , its non-negativity, and the fact that $C_p^\times := \{(y, z) : y \in C_p, |z| \leq \mathcal{F}(y)\}$, must be a proper cone i.e. have non-empty interior).

We have to verify the three properties of the Lorentzian metric space introduced in [13, Def. 2.1], assuming that the topology mentioned in property (ii) is the manifold topology. By [13, Lemma. 2.3] the compactness assumption of property (ii) can be replaced by relative compactness of chronological diamonds.

The function d satisfies the reverse triangle inequality [42, Eq. (2.7)] and is lower semi-continuous [42, Thm. 2.53] in the manifold topology of M (here we have used again the fact that the fundamental function vanishes on the boundary). By (g) and (d) of [42, Thm. 2.60] it is also upper semi-continuous, thus continuous.

For each $p, q \in M$, $I(p, q) \subset J(p, q)$ (here J denote the causal relation for (M, C)). By global hyperbolicity of (M, C) , $J(p, q)$ is compact. Taking into account Hausdorffness of the manifold topology, $\overline{I(p, q)} \subset J(p, q)$ is also compact.

We need only to prove property (iii). By [42, Thm. 2.47] (recall that by definition of Lorentz-Finsler spaces, (M, C) is a closed cone structure, so the cited theorem applies), globally hyperbolic cone structure is distinguishing in the sense of [42, Def. 2.16], so, by [42, Prop. 2.18]⁴ and reflexivity of J , whenever $p \neq q$, we have $\overline{J^+(p)} \neq \overline{J^+(q)}$. As a consequence, due to [42, Thm. 2.7] it cannot be $I^+(p) = I^+(q)$, which implies that the distance d distinguishes the two events. \square

⁴Note we can use here both options (a) and (b), since global hyperbolicity implies reflexivity, while proper and local Lipschitz properties are assumed in the statement.

4 Distance preservation implies Lorentzian isometry

We believe the result of this section is a kind of folklore results which, nevertheless, requires a detailed argument as a proof would also answer recent questions in [52]. It shows that under low regularity it is natural to focus on bijections that preserve the Lorentzian distance, as done e.g. in [45], as under sufficient regularity they are equivalent to Lorentzian isometries.

Lemma 4.1. *On a distinguishing smooth spacetime (M, g) for any future-directed timelike curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$ passing through $p \in M$, $p = \gamma(0)$, with tangent $v \in T_p M$,*

$$g_p(v, v) = -\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0}$$

Note that we are not claiming $g_p = \frac{1}{2} \text{Hess} d_p^2$ as this is not entirely true in Lorentzian geometry because d_p vanishes and has zero Hessian outside the cone.

Proof. The point p admits an arbitrarily small distinguishing neighborhood U , that is such that every causal curve with one endpoint in p and the other in U is necessarily contained in U . As a consequence, $d_p|_U$ coincides with the d_p^U , the Lorentzian distance from p of the spacetime U . In particular U can be chosen inside a convex neighborhood. As a consequence, $d_p^2|_{I^+(p, U)}$ is a smooth function as it is the composition of the smooth function $\exp_p^{-1}|_U : U \rightarrow T_p M$ with the smooth function $v \mapsto -g_p(v, v)$.

For every smooth curve γ passing through $p = \gamma(0)$ with tangent v , we have $\frac{d}{dt} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = 0$ as $d_p(p) = 0$ which is the minimum. Now observe that $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0}$ depends only on $\dot{\gamma} = v$ and not on $\ddot{\gamma}(0)$, thus any curve passing from p with first derivative gives the same result, in particular a geodesic. For v timelike it holds $d_p^2(\gamma(t)) = -g_p(v, v)t^2$, thus for any curve with tangent v , $\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = -g_p(v, v)$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let (M, g) and (M', g') be strongly causal smooth spacetime and let $f : M \rightarrow M'$ be a distance preserving bijection:*

$$d'(f(p), f(q)) = d(p, q).$$

Then M and M' have the same dimension, f is a (smooth) diffeomorphism such that f_ sends at every point the future timelike cone into the future timelike cone, and $g = f^* g'$.*

The proof of this result could have passed through Hawking et al. [24] or Malament's result [32] to get first a conformal isometry, but we prefer to give a self contained proof, in which the Lorentzian distance, rather than the chronological/causal relations, plays a key role. The proof has also the advantage of being self-contained.

Proof. Let $p \in M$. By strong causality there is a chronologically convex neighborhood $U \ni p$. We choose U so small that it is included in a convex neighborhood. Since f preserves d , it sends chronologically related events to chronologically related events and the same holds for f^{-1} . As U is chronologically convex, it is sent to a chronologically convex set $U' = f(U)$. Let W be a convex neighborhood of p' then we can find $w', z' \in W$, $w' \ll p' \ll z'$, $I^+(w') \cap I^-(z') \subset W$, thus we can find $x, y \in U$, $w \ll x \ll p \ll y \ll z$. From here $I^+(x') \cap I^-(y') \subset W \cap f(I^+(x) \cap I^-(y))$. Thus by redefining U as $I^+(x) \cap I^-(y)$ we obtain that U' becomes $I^+(x') \cap I^-(y')$ and so contained in a convex neighborhood W of p' .

By chronological convexity $d|_{U \times U} = d_U$, where d_U is the Lorentzian distance function of $(U, g|_U)$, and d_U is finite and continuous because U is contained in a convex neighborhood. Let $t_i \in T_p M, i = 1, \dots, n+1$, with $n+1$ the dimension of the spacetime, be past timelike vectors that form a basis of $T_p M$, and let $q_i = \exp_p t_i$ where t_i is rescaled, if needed, so that $q_i \in U$. Since U is contained in a convex neighborhood and $q_i \ll p$ there is only one timelike geodesic in U connecting q_i to p , and furthermore there cannot be pairs of conjugate points in a convex neighborhood so q_i and p are not conjugate.

This implies that $d_{q_i} = \|\exp_{q_i}^{-1}\|$, where $\|v\| = \sqrt{-g_{q_i}(v, v)}$ is the Lorentzian "norm", is smooth in a neighborhood of p . Its differential at p is $g(u_i, \cdot)$ where $u_i := \dot{t}_i$ is a normalized past-directed timelike vector, see e.g. [41, Thm. 1.5]. The map $V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, r \mapsto (d_{q_1}(r), \dots, d_{q_{n+1}}(r))$ has thus non-singular Jacobian at p .

By the inverse function theorem the functions $\{d_{q_i} : i = 1, \dots, n+1\}$ provide in a neighborhood of p the chart of a smooth atlas. Let $p' = f(p)$ and $q'_i = f(q_i), i = 1, \dots, n+1$. We can construct analogous functions $d'_{q'_i}$ in a neighborhood of p' . We have already argued above that U' is a neighborhood of p' which contains all q'_i , and that U' is contained in a convex neighborhood of p' . The functions $d'_{q'_i}$ distinguish points because otherwise the preimage of two undistinguishable points would not be distinguished by the functions d_{q_i} , a contradiction. Thus we can construct this type of chart on a neighborhood of p and p' and with respect to these charts the map f is the identity of some open set $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ (this follows from distance preservations $d_{q'_i}(f(r)) = d_{q_i}(r)$). This shows that M and M' have the same dimension and f is smooth (the function components are smooth in a chart belonging to a smooth atlas).

Now, since f is a diffeomorphism $f_* : T_p M \rightarrow T_{p'} M'$ is linear and of maximal rank (hence open). If a future timelike vector is sent to a non future timelike vector then there is some timelike vector w sent to a non-zero non future causal vector z (i.e. we can find w so that its image z is spacelike or causal but past-directed). But if γ is a C^1 curve with tangent w and $\gamma' = f \circ \gamma$, we have $z = f_* w$, and hence z is the tangent to γ' . But $d_p^2(\gamma(t)) = d_{p'}^2(\gamma'(t))$ which is a contradiction because the former is positive for small t while the latter is zero for sufficiently small t , as $\gamma'(t) \notin I^+(p', U')$. This shows that f_* sends the future timelike cone of $T_p M$ into the future timelike cone of $T_{p'} M'$ (it is a bijection, it is sufficient to consider f_*^{-1}).

Thus if v is future timelike $v' := f_*v$ is future timelike. Let $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$ be a smooth curve passing through $p \in M$, $p = \gamma(0)$, with tangent $v \in T_pM$, then by Lemma 4.1, setting $\gamma' = f \circ \gamma$,

$$g_p(v, v) = -\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = -\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d_{p'}^2(\gamma'(t))|_{t=0} = g_{p'}(v', v'),$$

which, by the polarization identity, is equivalent to $g_p = f^*g_{f(p)}$, as we desired to prove. \square

4.1 The Lorentz-Finsler case

In this subsection we want to extend the previous result on Lorentzian geometry to the Lorentz-Finsler case. We work with a pair (M, L) where M is a paracompact connected manifold, and the *Finsler Lagrangian* $L : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a C^0 , positive and homogeneous of degree two function. We also assume that L is smooth on $TM \setminus 0$ and that has vertical Hessian g of Lorentzian signature there (the differentiability conditions on $TM \setminus 0$ can be weakened, we shall not be interested in the optimal conditions). These assumptions imply that L is actually C^1 [41, p. 5]. Furthermore, it is assumed that it is possible to select a continuous set-valued function $C : M \rightarrow TM \setminus 0$, $x \mapsto C_x$ such that C_x is a component of the set $\{v \in T_xM \setminus 0 : L(x, v) \leq 0\}$. The subset $C_x \subset T_xM \setminus 0$ is termed *future causal cone* at $x \in M$. It is often convenient to treat C as a cone subbundle of $TM \setminus 0$.

We shall also use $F : C \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, defined by $L = -\frac{1}{2}F^2$. We extend F by zero to the whole TM , so that $F(p, \cdot)$ becomes continuous on the whole T_pM .

We note that (M, C, F) is a Lorentz-Finsler space [42, Sec. 2.13, 3.7] (the approach used here in Subsection 3), while (M, L) is a Finsler spacetime [41]. In particular, we will use the local properties of geodesics, normal neighborhoods and the exponential map from [41] while using the concept of distinction defined for more general closed cone structures in [42].

We start generalizing the Busemann-Meyer formula to the Lorentz-Finsler case.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, be a continuous function defined on an open set U and differentiable in $U \setminus \{x_0\}$ for $x_0 \in U$. If $Df(x)$ converges for $x \rightarrow x_0$ to some linear map $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ then f is strongly differentiable at x_0 with strong differential L at x_0 . As a consequence f is Lipschitz in a neighborhood of x_0 . If $Df(x)$ is bounded (but not necessarily convergent) in neighborhood of x_0 , then f is Lipschitz in a neighborhood of x_0 , too.*

Proof. The first part is an improved statement of [48, point (2), p. 970] where the author assumes that f is differentiable at x_0 and $L = Df(x_0)$. For $d = 1$ it is well known, and consequence of L'Hôpital's rule, that if f is differentiable in a neighborhood of x_0 and the derivatives converge to L , then f is differentiable at x_0 with derivative L .

So, let us assume $d \geq 2$ and let us go through the proof of [48, point (2), p. 970]. The Lagrange mean value theorem there invoked uses differentiability

just on the interior of the segment $[x_1, x_2]$ there considered. So in the proof we just have to take x_1, x_2 such that the segment connecting them does not pass from x_0 . Then we arrive at the equation for every pair of such points

$$|f(x_2) - f(x_1) - L(x_2 - x_1)| \leq \epsilon|x_2 - x_1|$$

as in that proof. By continuity the inequality holds for every pair of points which proves that f is strongly differentiable at x_0 with strong differential L . In the case $n > 1$, by continuity the inequality holds for every pair of points which proves that f is strongly differentiable at x_0 with strong differential L . In the case $n = 1$ the special case $x_1 < x_0 < x_2$ (or $x_2 < x_0 < x_1$) can be achieved by splitting the segment at x_0 and a straightforward application of the triangle inequality.

Similarly, for the second part we can find a convex neighbourhood U of x_0 such that for some $C > 0$ we have $|Df| < C$ on $U \setminus \{x_0\}$. Then for $x_1, x_2 \in U$ such that the interior of the segment connecting them does not contain x_0 we have

$$|f(x_2) - f(x_1)| \leq C|x_2 - x_1|,$$

and we can conclude the proof along the same lines as for the first part. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Let a spray be smooth on $TM \setminus 0$. Then it is $C^{1,1}$ in a neighborhood of the zero section with zero derivatives on the zero section.*

In other words the local coefficients $G^\alpha(x, y)$ are $C^{1,1}$ in a neighborhood of the zero section $\{y = 0\}$.

Proof. We use local coordinates on TM induced by a chart on M . Since $G^\alpha(x, y)$ is positive homogeneous of degree 2, the first derivatives are positive homogeneous of degree 2 or 1 depending on whether we differentiate with respect to x^β or y^β . Let us introduce a complete Riemannian metric h on M and let us consider the unit sphere bundle of it. Let us consider a compact neighborhood of p and the h -unit sphere bundle projecting on it, which is thus compact. All the derivatives of the spray will be bounded on such bundle and so on the corresponding ball (minus the zero section) by positive homogeneity. Now, define G^α to be zero on the zero section. Since the derivatives converge to zero at the zero section, by Lemma 4.3 G^α has strong differential zero at the zero section, and so G^α is locally Lipschitz on TM .

Now, let us consider the derivatives of $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^\beta} G^\alpha$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\beta} G^\alpha$ on $TM \setminus 0$ extending them to the zero section as 0. Their derivative, namely the second derivatives of G^α , $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^\beta \partial x^\gamma} G^\alpha$, $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^\beta \partial x^\gamma} G^\alpha$, $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^\beta \partial y^\gamma} G^\alpha$, are positive homogeneous of degree 2, 1 and 0, respectively. As they are bounded on the h -unit bundle over a compact neighborhood of p , they are bounded over the corresponding ball (minus the zero section).

An application of the Lagrange mean value theorem, going in a way similar to what has been done in the proof of Lemma 4.3, see also [18, Thm. 4], implies that the derivatives of G^α are Lipschitz in a neighborhood of the zero section. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let us consider a spray which is smooth on $TM \setminus 0$, and let us consider the exponential map bijection $\exp_p : O \rightarrow N$, $O \subset T_p M$, where N is a normal open neighborhood of p . Then for some choice of O and N , \exp_p and \exp_p^{-1} are $C^{1,1}$ and actually C^∞ outside the origin (resp. p).*

Proof. The exponential map is determined by the following system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}^\alpha &= y^\alpha, \\ \dot{y}^\beta &= -2G^\beta(x, y).\end{aligned}$$

By ODE theory it is well known that if the spray is C^k , $k \geq 1$, then the exponential map is C^k (this whether we consider the restriction outside the zero section or not). The exponential map is strongly differentiable at the zero section with the strong differential being the identity [41] (hence it is invertible). This implies that the Jacobian of the exponential map will be invertible in a neighborhood of the zero section. This also implies that if the Jacobian, namely $(\exp_p)_*$ is Lipschitz so is $(\exp_p^{-1})_*$ (use e.g. formula [26, Prop. 2.5]). The fact that a $C^{1,1}$ spray leads to a $C^{1,1}$ exponential map with $C^{1,1}$ inverse was noted in [41, Remark 6]. \square

Theorem 4.6. *Let (M, L) be a Finsler spacetime and let N be a normal open neighborhood of p . Let $f, g : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$f(q) := F(p, \exp_p^{-1} q), \quad l(q) := -2L(p, \exp_p^{-1} q).$$

For every smooth curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow N$, $\gamma(0) = p$, $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v \neq 0$, the functions $f(\gamma(t))$ and $l(\gamma(t))$ are respectively C^0 (actually C^1 if γ is timelike) and C^2 on some interval $[0, \epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$, and

$$F(p, v) = \frac{d}{dt} f(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} f(\gamma(t)), \quad (3)$$

$$-2L(p, v) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} l(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} \frac{d}{dt} l(\gamma(t)). \quad (4)$$

Proof. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$, $\gamma(0) = p$, $v := \dot{\gamma}(0) \neq 0$ be any smooth curve, and let $v_t = \exp_p^{-1} \dot{\gamma}(t)$. Note that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} v_t = (\exp_p^{-1})_* v$. But $(\exp_p)_* : TT_p M \rightarrow T_p M$ (we can identify $TT_p M$ with $T_p M$) is well known to be the identity [56, Thm. 11.1.1] [2, 5.7.3] [41, Eq. (39)] (this result is independent of the signature of the Hessian metric, in fact it depends only on the spray), and so it is the inverse $(\exp_p^{-1})_*$. We conclude $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} v_t = v$ and so

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} f(\gamma(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} F(p, \frac{1}{t} v_t) = F(p, v),$$

where we used the positive homogeneity and continuity of F . Note that if γ is timelike then v_t is C^1 and timelike and so $F(p, v_t)$ is C^1 because F is evaluated on the smooth region.

Let us prove the second equation. From [41, Thm. 5] (but also from Lemma 4.5) we know that $l : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $C^{1,1}$ with differential at q , $dl = -2g_{P(p,q)}(P(p,q), \cdot)$ where $P(p,q)$, called *position vector*, is the tangent vector at q of the geodesic $\sigma_{p,q} : [0,1] \rightarrow N$, $\sigma_{p,q}(0) = p$, $\sigma_{p,q}(1) = q$. Thus $P(p,\gamma(t)) = (\exp_p)_* v_t$ and since \exp_p is C^1 , $(\exp_p)_*$ is C^0 and so $P(p,\gamma(t))$ converges to zero and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} P(p,\gamma(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} (\exp_p)_* (\frac{1}{t} v_t) = (\exp_p)_* v = v$.

The function

$$h(t) := \frac{d}{dt} l(\gamma(t)) = \langle dl, \dot{\gamma}(t) \rangle = -2g_{P(p,\gamma(t))}(P(p,\gamma(t)), \dot{\gamma}(t))$$

is C^0 and vanishes for $t = 0$ as $P(p,\gamma(0)) = 0$ (note that $g_{P(p,\gamma(t))}/t(P(p,\gamma(t))/t, \cdot) \rightarrow g_v(v, \cdot)$ for $t \rightarrow 0$). A standard result of real analysis which follows from L'Hôpital's rule states that if for a continuous function $h : [0, b) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $h'(t)$ exists for $t > 0$ and converges for $t \rightarrow 0^+$ then $h'(0)$ exists and coincides with that limit. For sufficiently small $t > 0$ (we just want to restrict ourselves to a segment that does not pass twice from p), we can write $l(\gamma(t)) = -2L(p, \exp_p^{-1}(\gamma(t)))^2$ where both $-2L(p, \cdot)$ and \exp_p^{-1} are twice differentiable in the point of interest (as the former function is evaluated over non-zero vectors, while the regularity of the latter function is smooth outside the zero section). Recalling that $v_t = \exp_p^{-1} \gamma(t)$, we have by the $C^{1,1}$ regularity of \exp_p^{-1} near the zero section that v_t is $C^{1,1}$ in a neighborhood of $t = 0$, and so \ddot{v}_t remains bounded as t approaches zero. For sufficiently small $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dh}{dt} &= -2 \frac{d^2}{dt^2} L(p, v_t) = -2 \left\{ \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^\mu \partial y^\nu} \dot{v}_t^\mu \dot{v}_t^\nu + \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^\mu}(p, v_t) \ddot{v}_t^\mu \right\} \\ &= -2 \left\{ g_{v_t}(\dot{v}_t, \dot{v}_t) + \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^\mu}(p, v_t) \ddot{v}_t^\mu \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The second term vanishes for $t \rightarrow 0^+$ because L is C^1 and $v_t \rightarrow 0$, while \ddot{v}_t remains bounded. Now, due to v_t being C^1 , $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \dot{v}_t = \dot{v}_0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} v_t = v$, thus $g_{v_t}(\dot{v}_t, \dot{v}_t) = g_{v_t/t}(\dot{v}_t, \dot{v}_t) \rightarrow g_v(v, v) = 2L(p, v)$, and we conclude that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} h'(t) = -4L(p, v)$ thus

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2} l(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = -4L(p, \dot{\gamma}(0)).$$

□

Theorem 4.7. *Let (M, L) be a future distinguishing Lorentz-Finsler spacetime and let d be the associated Lorentz-Finsler distance, then for every smooth curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$, $\gamma(0) = p$, $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v \neq 0$, with image in $J^+(p)$ (for instance, this is the case if γ is a continuous causal curve and v is causal [41, Thm. 6]) the function $d_p(\gamma(t))$ and $d_p^2(\gamma(t))$ are respectively C^0 (actually C^1 if γ is timelike) and C^2 on an interval $[0, \epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$, and*

$$F(p, v) = \frac{d}{dt} d_p(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} d_p(\gamma(t)), \quad (5)$$

$$F^2(p, v) = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} \frac{d}{dt} d_p^2(\gamma(t)). \quad (6)$$

The former formula is the Lorentz-Finsler generalization of the Busemann-Mayer formula, while the latter formula seems to be new also in positive signature, see Thm. 4.9.

The theorem states that the Finsler fundamental function can be recovered from the Lorentz-Finsler distance d . Of course, analogous past statements hold.

For the validity of the second equation L must be C^2 on the slit tangent bundle and so have finite Lorentzian Hessian also at the boundary of the future timelike cone, but need not be defined on the whole slit tangent bundle. In the proof of the latter equation the second derivative of L is only invoked outside the zero section.

Proof. Let U be a distinguishing neighborhood for p contained in a normal neighborhood N (the definition of distinguishing neighborhood is the same as for Lorentzian geometry, see [43, Thm. 4.44(iii)], for the existence of normal neighborhood, see [41, Thm. 4]). Every future directed causal curve starting from p and ending in U must necessarily be contained in U and so in the normal neighborhood N . This means that for $q \in J^+(p) \cap U$, $d(p, q) = d_U(p, q) = \tilde{d}_p(q)$ where \tilde{d} is the Lorentz-Finsler distance of the normal neighborhood. Since for sufficiently small t , $q := \gamma(t) \in J^+(p, N)$, by [41, Thm. 6] $\exp_p^{-1} q$ is causal and so $\tilde{d}_p(q) = F(p, \exp_p^{-1} q)$, thus for $q \in J^+(p) \cap U$, $d_p(q) = F(p, \exp_p^{-1} q)$, $d_p^2(q) = -2L(p, \exp_p^{-1} q)$. The result now follows from Thm. 4.6. \square

Theorem 4.8. *Let (M, L) and (M', L') be strongly causal smooth Finsler spacetime and let $f : M \rightarrow M'$ be a distance preserving bijection:*

$$d'(f(p), f(q)) = d(p, q).$$

Then M and M' have the same dimension, f is a (smooth) diffeomorphism such that f_ sends at every point the future timelike cone into the future timelike cone, and for every $p \in M$, and causal vector $v \in T_p M$*

$$F(p, v) = F'(f(p), f_*(v)).$$

Proof. The proof requires minimal modifications with respect to the isotropic case. We need to change just the third paragraph that reads as follows:

This implies that $d_{q_i}(r) = F(q_i, \exp_{q_i}^{-1}(r))$, which is smooth in a neighborhood of p as $\exp_{q_i}^{-1}(r)$ is timelike. Its differential at p is $g_{u_i}(u_i, \cdot)$ where $u_i := \hat{t}_i$ is a normalized past-directed timelike vector, see e.g. [41, Thm. 5].

The Legendre map $\ell : T_p M \setminus 0 \rightarrow T_p^* M \setminus 0$, $v \mapsto g_v(v, \cdot)$ has a Jacobian whose determinant is that of g_v , thus it is invertible and a diffeomorphism near some chosen normalized past-directed timelike vector v , which implies that if vectors t_i are chosen so that u_i are close to v , the images $g_{u_i}(u_i, \cdot)$ will be linearly independent. The map $V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $r \mapsto (d_{q_1}(r), \dots, d_{q_{n+1}}(r))$ has thus non-singular Jacobian at p .

The sixth paragraph changes as follows:

Thus if v is future-directed timelike $v' := f_*v$ is future-directed timelike. Let $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$ be a smooth timelike curve starting from $p \in M$, $p = \gamma(0)$, with timelike tangent $v \in T_pM$, then by Eq. (6), setting $\gamma' = f \circ \gamma$, we observe that by the equality $d_p = d'_p \circ f$, γ' has image contained in $I^+(p')$ thus Theorem 4.7 can be applied to it as well as to γ

$$-2L(p, v) = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{1}{2} d'^2_{p'}(\gamma'(t))|_{t=0} = -2L'(p', v'),$$

which shows that $v' = f_*(v)$ is timelike. By continuity, the just found identity holds also for v causal. □

4.1.1 The positive signature Finsler case

We give also the statements analogous to the above for a Finsler space but we omit the proof since simpler. Here F is defined by $L = \frac{1}{2}F^2$ over the whole TM .

Theorem 4.9. *Let (M, L) be a Finsler space and let N be a normal open neighborhood of p . Let $d_p : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,*

$$d_p(q) := F(p, \exp_p^{-1} q).$$

For every smooth curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow N$, $\gamma(0) = p$, $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v \neq 0$, the functions $d_p(\gamma(t))$ and $d_p^2(\gamma(t))$ are respectively C^1 and C^2 on some interval $[0, \epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$, and

$$F(p, v) = \frac{d}{dt} d_p(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} d_p(\gamma(t)), \quad (7)$$

$$2L(p, v) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} d_p^2(\gamma(t))|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{t} \frac{d}{dt} d_p^2(\gamma(t)). \quad (8)$$

We arrive at the following interesting result. It seems to us that the proof in [56, Prop. 11.3.3] tacitly uses the additional assumption that \exp , there denoted φ^{-1} , is C^2 . It is known that if the exponential map is C^2 the Finsler space is Berwald [1].

Corollary 4.10. *Let (M, L) be a Finsler space such that d_p^2 is C^2 in a neighborhood of p for every p , then (M, L) is necessarily Riemannian.*

Proof. Equation (7) multiplied by $d_p(\gamma(t))$ proves, by the arbitrariness of $\dot{\gamma}(0)$, that d_p^2 has vanishing differential at p . Thus Eq. (8) can be rewritten with the C^2 assumption on d_p^2 , $4L(p, v) = \frac{\partial^2 d_p^2}{\partial x^\mu \partial x^\nu}(p) v^\mu v^\nu$ which is quadratic. □

We include the following known consequence of the Busemann-Mayer formula for completeness.

Theorem 4.11. *Let (M, L) and (M', L') be smooth Finsler spaces and let $f : M \rightarrow M'$ be a distance preserving bijection:*

$$d'(f(p), f(q)) = d(p, q).$$

Then M and M' have the same dimension, f is a (smooth) diffeomorphism and for every $p \in M$, and vector $v \in T_p M$

$$L(p, v) = L'(f(p), f_*(v)).$$

5 Low regularity

In this section we discuss to what extent the results of Section 2, developed for smooth spacetimes (M, g) , generalize to less regular structures.

5.1 Equivalence of distinction/reflectivity concepts with their d -version

Proposition 2.1 and its consequences, Corollaries 2.4 and 2.6, are formulated for Lorentzian manifolds but their proof applies in much greater generality.

5.1.1 Proper Lorentz-Finsler spaces

For proper Lorentz-Finsler spaces [42] we have the generalization

Proposition 5.1. *Let (M, C, \mathcal{F}) be a locally Lipschitz proper Lorentz-Finsler space such that $\mathcal{F}(\partial C) = 0$. For any two events $p, q \in M$, the inclusion $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$ is equivalent to the property $d_q \leq d_p$. Dually, the inclusion $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q)$ is equivalent to the property $d^p \leq d^q$.*

Proof. The proof passes unaltered to this case due to the identity $I = \{d > 0\}$ (proved in the proof of Thm. 3.1) and from [42, Thm. 2.56] which is applied in the proof when establishing the existence of the timelike curve γ . \square

In the context of locally Lipschitz proper cone structures future distinction can be understood as the following property, see the proof of [42, Thm. 2.18], (antisymmetry of D_f) ‘ $y \in \overline{I^+(x)}$ and $x \in \overline{I^+(y)}$ implies $x = y$ ’, which is easily shown to be equivalent to the standard property $I^+(x) = I^+(y) \Rightarrow x = y$.

This implies, via the same proofs as in the smooth case,

Corollary 5.2. *Let (M, C, \mathcal{F}) be a locally Lipschitz proper Lorentz-Finsler space such that $\mathcal{F}(\partial C) = 0$. Then (future/past/weak) d -distinction is equivalent to (resp. future/past /weak) distinction. Similarly, (future/past) d -reflectivity is equivalent to (resp. future/past) reflectivity.*

Remark 5.3. Similarly, an inspection shows that, for the structure (M, C, \mathcal{F}) of a locally Lipschitz proper Lorentz-Finsler space such that $\mathcal{F}(\partial C) = 0$, we have, with the same proofs, the analog of Prop. 2.8, Prop. 2.11, Thm. 2.12, Cor. 2.13, Thm. 2.15, Cor. 2.16, Thm. 2.19 and Thm. 2.21.

5.1.2 Lorentzian length spaces

Lorentzian metric spaces can be endowed with a natural causal relation though which isocausal curves can be defined [45, 13]. By assuming that every two chronologically related points are connected by a (maximal) isocausal curve the *Lorentzian (resp. length) prelength spaces* are obtained [45, Def. 5.13] [13, Def. 5.1].

Proposition 5.4. *Let (X, d) be a Lorentzian length space. For any two events $p, q \in M$, the inclusion $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$ is equivalent to the property $d_q \leq d_p$. Dually, the inclusion $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q)$ is equivalent to the property $d^p \leq d^q$.*

Note that the point $\gamma(s)$ is close to q in the smooth version of the proof. Here we do not have this result but the proof works anyway.

Proof. Suppose that $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$ and let $r \in M$. If $r \notin I^+(q)$ then $d_q(r) = 0$ and the inequality we wish to prove follows. If $r \in I^+(q)$ there is a maximal isocausal curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ connecting $q = \gamma(0)$ to $r = \gamma(1)$ (note that it can have pair of points at null distance). Since both γ and d are continuous in the topology of the Lorentzian metric space X , for any $0 < m < d(q, r)$ we have $d(\gamma(s), r) = m$ for some s . By maximality of the isocausal curve we have $d(q, \gamma(s)) = d(q, r) - d(\gamma(s), r) = d(q, r) - m > 0$. Thus $\gamma(s) \gg q$ hence $\gamma(s) \gg p$, which implies

$$d(p, r) \geq d(p, \gamma(s)) + d(\gamma(s), r) \geq d(\gamma(s), r) = m.$$

Since $m < d_q(r)$ is arbitrary, $d_p(r) \geq d_q(r)$. By the arbitrariness of r , $d_q \leq d_p$.

For the converse, suppose that $d_q \leq d_p$, then if $r \in I^+(q)$ we have $d_q(r) > 0$ so $d_p(r) > 0$ which implies $r \in I^+(p)$. By the arbitrariness of r , $I^+(q) \subset I^+(p)$. \square

This implies, via the same proofs as in the smooth case,

Corollary 5.5. *Let (X, d) be a Lorentzian length space. Then (future/past/weak) d -distinction is equivalent to (resp. future/past /weak) distinction. Similarly, (future/past) d -reflectivity is equivalent to (resp. future/past) reflectivity.*

On every Lorentzian metric space we have a length functional $L : \sigma \rightarrow L(\sigma)$, cf. [45, Def. 6.1] [13, Def. 5.12]. A different proof of Prop. 5.4, more similar to that given for the smooth case, could have been obtained using the following result.

Proposition 5.6. *Let (X, d) be a Lorentzian metric space, and let $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ be an isocausal curve connecting x and y , $x \ll y$. Then the function $L(\sigma(s))$ is continuous.*

Proof. By definition of Lorentzian length, $0 \leq L(\sigma(s')) - L(\sigma(s)) \leq d(\sigma(s), \sigma(s'))$ for $s' \geq s$, thus $|L(\sigma(s')) - L(\sigma(s))| \leq d(\sigma(s), \sigma(s')) + d(\sigma(s'), \sigma(s))$. As both d and σ are continuous, fixing s and taking $s' \rightarrow s$ shows that $L(\sigma(s))$ is continuous. \square

5.2 Lorentzian distance in abstract setting

In this section, unless otherwise stated, (X, d) is just a set endowed with a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ which satisfies the reverse triangle inequality on chronologically related triples (the chronology relation being $I := \{d > 0\}$).

Proposition 5.7. *Let (X, d) be a pair as above endowed with a topology T . Suppose that in such topology $p \in \overline{I^\pm(p)}$ for every $p \in X$ and the functions $d_r, r \in X$, are upper semi-continuous, then the following property holds*

$$I^+(p) \supset I^+(q) \Rightarrow d^p \leq d^q, \quad (9)$$

which implies both past reflectivity and past d -reflectivity. Similarly, the upper semi-continuity of the functions $d^r, r \in X$, implies $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q) \Rightarrow d_q \leq d_p$, and hence both future reflectivity and future d -reflectivity.

The statement on the fact that the found implication is stronger than past reflectivity and past d -reflectivity follows from the trivial implications $d_q \leq d_p \Rightarrow I^+(p) \supset I^+(q)$ and $d^p \leq d^q \Rightarrow I^-(p) \subset I^-(q)$.

We call the property $I^+(p) \supset I^+(q) \Rightarrow d^p \leq d^q$ *strong past reflectivity*, and the property $I^-(p) \subset I^-(q) \Rightarrow d_q \leq d_p$ *strong future reflectivity*. Due to Prop. 5.4 the reflectivity/ d -reflectivity/strong reflectivity properties, declined also in the past/future versions, are all equivalent for Lorentzian length spaces, see also Cor. 5.5.

Proof. The proof of reflexivity coincides with that for the smooth case, cf. Prop. 2.8. The proof of past d -reflexivity goes as follows. We want to prove that $I^+(p) \supset I^+(q) \Rightarrow d^p \leq d^q$. Assume $I^+(p) \supset I^+(q)$ and let $r \in X$. If $d^p(r) = 0$ there is nothing to prove, thus suppose $r \ll p$.

By the upper T -semi-continuity of the function d_r for any $m > d(r, q)$ there is a T -open set $O \ni q$, such that $d(r, q') < m$ for every $q' \in O$. Let us choose $q' \in I^+(q) \cap O$. Thus $d_q(q') > 0$, which implies by the assumed inclusion $d_p(q') > 0$. By the reverse triangle inequality

$$m > d(r, q') \geq d(r, p) + d(p, q') \geq d(r, p) = d^p(r).$$

By the arbitrariness of m , $d^p(r) \leq d^q(r)$, which concludes the proof. \square

So, reflectivity/ d -reflectivity follows from upper semi-continuity in any topology in which every point has points in the chronological past and future in any neighborhood, it does not have to be the manifold topology. In particular, all Lorentzian metric spaces with this property are reflective, (and all such

Lorentzian length spaces are d -reflective). As a special case, all Lorentzian pre-length spaces, with any pair of chronologically ordered points being connected by an isochronal line, are d -reflective.

The proof of the next result coincides with that for the smooth case, cf. Thm. 2.12.

Theorem 5.8. *Let (X, d) be a pair as above endowed with a topology T . Suppose that in such topology $p \in \overline{I^\pm(p)}$ for every $p \in X$ and d is lower T -semi-continuous. The function d is $T \times T$ -continuous if and only if the functions d_p and d^p are T -continuous for every $p \in X$.*

The assumption that d is lower T -semi-continuous in the first sentence can be dropped for a Lorentzian length space. Indeed, the last statement implies that T contains the Alexandrov topology, and from there and the existence of a maximal curve (not necessarily isochronal) the lower T -semi-continuity follows.

The idea behind the following proof is it show how reflectivity works without using the manifold assumption.

Proposition 5.9. *Assume that weak d -distinction hold for (X, d) , $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$. Suppose that for every $r \in X$ there are $x, y \in X$ such that $r \in I(x, y)$. Let T be a topology of X , making d_p, d^p T -continuous for each $p \in X$. Assume that for every $p, q \in X$ the diamond $I(p, q)$ is T -relatively compact. Then T is the initial topology of the family $\{d_p, d^p, p \in X\}$. Moreover, if d -reflectivity holds any topology T' such that d_p, d^p , for $p \in X$, are lower T' -semi-continuous contains T (so d_p, d^p are actually T' -continuous).*

Proof. The first claim is proved in [45] using Prop. 2.14 (note that the initial topology of the family $\{d_p, d^p, p \in X\}$ is Hausdorff by weak d -distinction and it contains the Alexandrov topology. Its open set are the elements of \mathcal{A} in that result).

For the second statement, we are preliminarily going to show that d_p, d^p are continuous for every p . Assume that d_p is not upper T' -semi-continuous at some point q . Take $x, y \in X$ so that $x \ll q \ll y$. Then, by the lower T' -semi-continuity of d_x and d^y , $I^+(x)$ and $I^-(y)$ are T' -open and hence $I(x, y)$ is T' -open.

Let Λ be the family of T' -neighborhoods of q contained in $I(x, y)$ (it is non-empty as $I(x, y)$ belongs to it, further any neighborhood can be intersected with $I(x, y)$ to give another neighborhood, thus Λ generates the filter of neighborhoods for q).

There is some $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $O \in \Lambda$ there exists some $q'(O) \in O \subset I(x, y)$ such that $d_p(q'(O)) - d_p(q) > \epsilon$. The family Λ is a directed set by the reverse inclusion, thus $q' : \Lambda \rightarrow I(x, y)$ is a net (we shall also write q'_λ instead of $q'(O)$). Note that by construction, $q'_\lambda \rightarrow_{T'} q$. By the upper T -semi-continuity of d we can find an T -open set $U \ni q$ such that on it $d_p(r) - d_p(q) < \epsilon$ for every $r \in U$, thus for every $O \in \Lambda$, $q'(O) \notin U$. We conclude that $q' : \Lambda \rightarrow \text{Cl}_T(I(x, y)) \setminus U$ is a net with image in a compact set, thus there is a cluster point \tilde{q} and hence a subnet converging to $\tilde{q} \in \text{Cl}_T(I(x, y)) \setminus U$, $q'_\lambda \rightarrow_T \tilde{q}$. In particular, as $\tilde{q} \notin U$, $\tilde{q} \neq q$.

Now, consider any $z \in X$. By lower T' -semi-continuity of d_z and T -continuity of d_z we have

$$d(z, q) \leq \lim_{\lambda} d(z, q'_\lambda) = d(z, \tilde{q}),$$

so $d^q \leq d^{\tilde{q}}$, and thus, by d -reflectivity $d_q \geq d_{\tilde{q}}$. Moreover, again by lower T' -semi-continuity of d^u and T -continuity of d^u , for every $u \in X$,

$$d(q, u) \leq \lim_{\lambda} d(q'_\lambda, u) = d(\tilde{q}, u),$$

so $d_q \leq d_{\tilde{q}}$, and thus $d^q \geq d^{\tilde{q}}$. We conclude that $d_q = d_{\tilde{q}}$ and $d^q = d^{\tilde{q}}$, therefore $q = \tilde{q}$ by weak distinction, a contradiction which shows that d_p is T' -continuous. Similarly, d^p is T' -continuous. This means that T' is finer than the initial topology of these functions which coincides with T . \square

So, reflectivity is equivalent to upper semi-continuity (with lower semi-continuity assumed) in a very general setting.

We recall that we consider only Lorentzian metric spaces without chronological boundary, so that every point is contained in some chronological diamond.

Corollary 5.10. *Let (X, d) be a d -reflective Lorentzian metric space, and let T be any topology with respect to which d_p, d^p are lower T -semi-continuous. Then d_p, d^p are T -continuous for each $p \in X$.*

The property of d -reflectivity implies the coincidence of the Alexandrov and Lorentzian metric space topologies.

Corollary 5.11. *Let (X, d) be a d -reflective Lorentzian metric space. Assume that d_p, d^p for $p \in X$ are lower semi-continuous in the Alexandrov topology (e.g. X is a manifold and d is induced by a Lorentzian metric on X). Then the Alexandrov topology coincides with the initial topology of the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in X\}$, that is, with the Lorentzian metric space topology (which is Hausdorff).*

Proof. By Corollary 5.10, d_p, d^p is continuous in the Alexandrov topology for every $p \in X$, thus the Alexandrov topology is finer than the initial topology of the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$. It is clear that the initial topology of the functions $\{d_p, d^p, p \in M\}$ is finer than the Alexandrov topology. \square

Theorem 5.12. *Let (X, d) be a Lorentzian metric space and let T be a topology for X such that $p \in \overline{I^\pm(p)}$ for every $p \in X$, and such that the function d is lower T -semi-continuous. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) d is $T \times T$ -continuous;
- (ii) The functions d_p and d^p are T -continuous for every $p \in X$;
- (iii) T contains the Lorentzian metric space topology of X ;
- (iv) (X, d) is d -reflective;

in which case strong reflectivity holds.

Proof. The first two statements are equivalent by Theorem 5.8. The second is the same as the third one because the topology of the Lorentzian metric space X is the initial topology of the functions d_p, d^p . The second item implies the last one by Proposition 5.7, and the converse implication is due to Proposition 5.9. The last statement follows from Prop. 5.7. \square

6 Conclusions

The problem of defining a natural topology for spacetime and the challenge of establishing an abstract notion of a *Lorentzian metric space* are interconnected. This is because the latter must also be equipped with a topology derived solely from the two-point function d . In a smooth setting, this topology could, in principle, differ from that of the manifold. If the two were to coincide, it would be a significant result, as it would provide a way to define the “manifold topology” from an abstract framework—without relying on the structure of a manifold. This is precisely what we have achieved in this work.

We have identified certain properties, specifically (i)-(iii) in Theorem 1.1, which are expressed exclusively in terms of the function d . These properties ensure that the manifold topology (in the context of a Lorentzian manifold) aligns with the initial topology induced by the functions $d_p, d^p \in M$. We might thus refer to the canonical topology of the Lorentzian metric space as the “manifold topology” even if the structure (M, d) is not manifold.

This outcome validates the approach to Lorentzian metric spaces based solely on the function d , as introduced in [45, 13]. The only caveat is that the notion of *weak d -distinction* in [45, 13] must be replaced here with the slightly stronger condition of *future or past d -distinction*. We hope that future work will improve this result by demonstrating complete equivalence. Alternatively, the theory presented in [45, 13] could be reformulated by strengthening the conditions for a Lorentzian metric space to match the conditions (i)-(iii) established in this work. A further possibility is that of adding a condition of d -reflectivity to the definition.

We achieved this result through a detailed study of the continuity properties of the Lorentzian distance, uncovering findings that appear to be novel even within the smooth framework. Along the way, we found it necessary to introduce and explore new properties, such as *d -distinction* and *d -reflectivity*, which, as we demonstrated, coincide with traditional causality concepts in a smooth setting.

We believe this work strengthens the case for a “metric” type theory of spacetime based solely on the function d . Such a theory is not only feasible but may also prove useful in the development of a quantum spacetime theory, particularly in the pursuit of unifying gravity with the other fundamental forces.

References

- [1] H. Akbar-Zadeh. Sur les espaces de Finsler a courbures sectionnelles constantes. *Acad. Roy. Belg. Bull. Cl. Sci.*, 74:281–322, 1988.
- [2] D. Bao, S.-S. Chern, and Z. Shen. *An Introduction to Riemann-Finsler Geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [3] J. K. Beem, P. E. Ehrlich, and K. L. Easley. *Global Lorentzian Geometry*. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 1996.
- [4] T. Beran, A. Ohanyan, F. Rott, and D. A. Solis. The splitting theorem for globally hyperbolic lorentzian length spaces with non-negative timelike curvature. *Let. Math. Phys.*, 113:48, 2023.
- [5] A. N. Bernal and M. Sánchez. Globally hyperbolic spacetimes can be defined as ‘causal’ instead of ‘strongly causal’. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 24:745–749, 2007.
- [6] P. Bernard and S. Suhr. Lyapounov functions of closed cone fields: from Conley theory to time functions. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 359:467–498, 2018.
- [7] P. Bernard and S. Suhr. Cauchy and uniform temporal functions of globally hyperbolic cone fields. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148:4951–4966, 2020.
- [8] M. Braun. Rényi’s entropy on Lorentzian spaces. Timelike curvature-dimension conditions. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 117:46–128, 2023. arXiv:2206.13005v3.
- [9] M. Braun and R. J. McCann. Causal convergence conditions through variable timelike Ricci curvature bounds. arXiv:2312.17158v2, 2023.
- [10] R. Budic and R. K. Sachs. Causal boundaries for general relativistic spacetimes. *J. Math. Phys.*, 15:1302–1309, 1974.
- [11] D. Burago, Y. Burago, and S. Ivanov. *A course in metric geometry*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2001.
- [12] A. Y. Burtscher and García-Heveling L. Global hyperbolicity through the eyes of the null distance. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 405:90, 2024.
- [13] A. Bykov, E. Minguzzi, and S. Suhr. Lorentzian metric spaces and GH-convergence: the unbounded case. arXiv:2412.04311, 2024.
- [14] F. Cavalletti and A. Mondino. Optimal transport in Lorentzian synthetic spaces, synthetic timelike Ricci curvature lower bounds and applications. *Camb. J. Math.*, 12:417–534, 2024.
- [15] N. Ebrahimi. Causally simple spacetimes and domain theory. *Cankaya University Journal of Science and Engineering*, 11:1–6, 2014.

- [16] N. Ebrahimi. Domain theory in general relativity. *J. Dyn. Sys. Geom. Theor.*, 13:1–41, 2015.
- [17] F. Finster, A. Much, and K. Papadopoulos. *On Global Hyperbolicity of Spacetimes: Some Recent Advances and Open Problems*, pages 281–295. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2021. Mathematical Analysis in Interdisciplinary Research, I. N. Parasidis, E. Providas and T. M. Rassias eds.
- [18] M. Furi and M. Martelli. On the mean value theorem, inequality, and inclusion. *Am. Math. Mon.*, 98:840–846, 1991.
- [19] L. García-Heveling. Causality theory of spacetimes with continuous lorentzian metrics revisited. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 38:145028, 2021.
- [20] R. Geroch. Domain of dependence. *J. Math. Phys.*, 11:437–449, 1970.
- [21] L. Ake Hau, A. J. Cabrera Pacheco, and D. A. Solis. On the causal hierarchy of Lorentzian length spaces. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 37:215013, 2020.
- [22] S. Hawking. Singularities and the geometry of spacetime. *Eur. Phys. J. H*, 39:413–503, 2014. reprint of the Adams Prize essay 1966.
- [23] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis. *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973.
- [24] S. W. Hawking, A. R. King, and P. J. McCarthy. A new topology for curved space-time which incorporates the causal, differential, and conformal structures. *J. Math. Phys.*, 17:174–181, 1976.
- [25] R. A. Hounnonkpe and E. Minguzzi. Globally hyperbolic spacetimes can be defined without the ‘causal’ condition. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 36:197001, 2019. arXiv:1908.11701.
- [26] R. Howard. The inverse function theorem for Lipschitz maps (unpublished). 1997.
- [27] S. Kobayashi and K. Nomizu. *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, volume I of *Interscience tracts in pure and applied mathematics*. Interscience Publishers, New York, 1963.
- [28] E. H. Kronheimer and R. Penrose. On the structure of causal spaces. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 63:482–501, 1967.
- [29] M. Kunzinger and C. Sämann. Lorentzian length spaces. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 54:399–447, 2018.
- [30] M. Kunzinger and R. Steinbauer. Null distance and convergence of lorentzian length spaces. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 23:4319–4342, 2022.
- [31] R. J. Low. Spaces of paths and the path topology. *J. Math. Phys.*, 57:092503, 2016.

- [32] D. B. Malament. Causal theories of time and the conventionality of simultaneity. *Noûs*, 11:293–300, 1977.
- [33] K. Martin and P. Panangaden. A domain of spacetime intervals in general relativity. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 267:563–586, 2006.
- [34] L. Mazibuko, D. Baboolal, and R. Goswami. Causal structure of spacetime and Scott topology. *Afrika Matematika*, 34:94, 2023.
- [35] R. J. McCann. A synthetic null energy condition. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 405:38, 2024. arXiv:2304.14341.
- [36] R. J. McCann and C. Sämann. A Lorentzian analog for Hausdorff dimension and measure. *Pure and Applied Analysis*, 4:367–400, 2022. arXiv:1808.01536.
- [37] E. Minguzzi. Weak distinction and the optimal definition of causal continuity. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 25:075015, 2008. arXiv:0712.0338.
- [38] E. Minguzzi. Characterization of some causality conditions through the continuity of the Lorentzian distance. *J. Geom. Phys.*, 59:827–833, 2009. arXiv:0810.1879.
- [39] E. Minguzzi. Convexity and quasi-uniformizability of closed preordered spaces. *Topol. Appl.*, 160:965–978, 2013. arXiv:1212.3776.
- [40] E. Minguzzi. Topological ordered spaces as a foundation for a quantum spacetime theory. *J. of Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, 442:012034, 2013. Contribution to the proceedings of the conference 'DICE12, Space-Time-Matter-Quantum Mechanics, from the Planck scale to emergent phenomena', Castello Pasquini, Castiglione (Italy) September 17 - 21, 2012.
- [41] E. Minguzzi. Convex neighborhoods for Lipschitz connections and sprays. *Monatsh. Math.*, 177:569–625, 2015. arXiv:1308.6675.
- [42] E. Minguzzi. Causality theory for closed cone structures with applications. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 31:1930001, 2019. arXiv:1709.06494.
- [43] E. Minguzzi. Lorentzian causality theory. *Living Rev. Relativ.*, 22:3, 2019.
- [44] E. Minguzzi. Further observations on the definition of global hyperbolicity under low regularity. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 40:185001, 2023. arXiv:2302.09284.
- [45] E. Minguzzi and S. Suhr. Lorentzian metric spaces and their Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 114:73, 2024. arXiv:2209.14384.
- [46] A. Mondino and S. Suhr. An optimal transport formulation of the Einstein equations of general relativity. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, pages 933–994, 2023.

- [47] O. Müller. Lorentzian Gromov-Hausdorff theory and finiteness results. *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.*, 54:117, 2022. arXiv:1912.00988v6.
- [48] A. Nijenhuis. Strong derivatives and inverse mappings. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 81:969–980, 1974.
- [49] K. Papadopoulos. *Natural vs. Artificial Topologies on a Relativistic Space-time*, pages 389–401. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2021. Nonlinear Analysis and Global Optimization, T.M. Rassias and P.M. Pardalos eds.
- [50] K. Papadopoulos and B. K. Papadopoulos. Space-time singularities vs. topologies in the Zeeman-Göbel class. *Gravitation and Cosmology*, 25:116–121, 2019.
- [51] R. Penrose. *Techniques of Differential Topology in Relativity*. Cbms-Nsf Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1972.
- [52] A. Sakovich and C. Sormani. Introducing various notions of distances between space-times. arXiv::2410.16800.
- [53] A. Sakovich and C. Sormani. The null distance encodes causality. *J. Math. Phys.*, 64:012502, 2023.
- [54] C. Sämann. Global hyperbolicity for spacetimes with continuous metrics. *Ann. Henri Poincaré*, 17(6):1429–1455, 2016.
- [55] M. Sharifzadeh and M. Bahrami Seif Abad. Globally hyperbolic spacetimes as posets. *Math Phys Anal Geom*, 22:25, 2019.
- [56] Z. Shen. *Lectures on Finsler geometry*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2001.
- [57] R. D. Sorkin, Y. K. Yazdi, and N. Zwane. Manifold-topology from K -causal order. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 36:095006, 2019.
- [58] S. Surya. The causal set approach to quantum gravity. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 22:5, 2019.