

MINIMIZATION OF CURVE LENGTH THROUGH ENERGY MINIMIZATION USING FINITE DIFFERENCE AND NUMERICAL INTEGRATION IN REAL COORDINATE SPACE

AKIRA KITAOKA

ABSTRACT. The problem of determining the minimal length is garnering attention in various fields such as computer vision, robotics, and machine learning. One solution to this problem involves linearly interpolating the solution of a nonlinear optimization problem that approximates the curve's energy minimization problem using finite differences and numerical integration. This method tends to be easier to implement compared to others. However, it was previously unknown whether this approach successfully minimizes the curve's length under the Riemannian metric in real coordinate spaces. In this paper, we prove that the length of a curve obtained by linear interpolation of the solution to an optimization problem, where the energy of the curve is approximated using finite differences and the trapezoidal rule, converges to the minimal curve length at a rate of $1/2$ in terms of the number of points used in the numerical integration. Similarly, we prove that when using the left-point rule, the approximated curve's length likewise converges to the minimal curve length at a rate of $1/2$ in terms of the number of points used in the numerical integration.

AMS subject classifications: 65K10, 54-04, 53C22, 58E10, 65N06

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of determining the minimize geodesic, which represents the minimal path between two points, attracts the attention of many scientists across various fields. Diverse applications of the minimal geodesics include path detection and outputting the shortest route [CKS97, CK97, DC01], segmentation [BS07, PMC10], meshing [LFXH17], shape exploration [RPC10], use in optimal trajectory planning for robotic applications [ZZ07, ZZZ⁺10], satellite orbits [Gha70], clothing design [SRD08], and geodesic deep learning [MBBV15, HHY⁺19]. Regarding Riemannian manifolds, methods for approximately calculating the minimal geodesic and its length include: mesh approximations of the space to reduce the problem to a graph shortest path problem [CK97, DC01], solving an initial value problem using shooting methods and the geodesic equations (cf. Equation (3.2)) [PK03], solving boundary value problems using geodesic equations [PK03, KYA05, SG18], and formulating the energy minimization as a constrained nonlinear optimization problem with numerical integration [MXZ⁺21, LXM23].

The advantage of solving the energy minimization approximately through numerical integration lies in its reduced computational complexity and the simplicity with which the nonlinear programming problem can be formulated compared to other methods. In high-dimensional spaces, mesh approximation necessitates a large number of points, leading to substantial computational costs. Additionally, when implementing the geodesic equation approach, the formulation involves using Christoffel symbols, which incorporate first-order derivatives of the Riemannian metric, resulting in a nonlinear optimization problem. Utilizing Christoffel symbols complicates the implementation.

Key words and phrases. geodesic, minimum action method, finite difference method, numerical integration,

We would like to thank Rin Takano, Taichi Hirano, Yuzuru Okajima, Yoichi Sasaki for carefully reviewing this paper.

In contrast, the method of approximately solving energy minimization via numerical integration results in a nonlinear optimization problem involving only the Riemannian metric.

However, it was not generally known whether the solution to the nonlinear programming problem that approximates energy minimization via numerical integration actually minimizes the true energy. [MXZ⁺21] evaluates the true geodesic using second-order approximation on Sweep surfaces [MXZ⁺21, Theorem 4.1]. Nonetheless, to adapt the method of [MXZ⁺21] to general Riemannian metrics, it is necessary to improve the discussion on the rotational symmetry of Sweep surfaces.

In this paper, we prove that the convergence order of the minimum value of energy approximated using finite differences and numerical integration, and the true minimum energy in the Riemannian metric of the real coordinate space is $1/2$. Before introducing the main theorem, we define the notation. Let $D \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be an integer, $p \in [1, \infty]$, and $\|\bullet\|_p$ denote the ℓ^p norm in the real coordinate space \mathbb{R}^D . Let $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)} \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ be non-empty open sets. When M is a manifold, we denote by Ξ_{ps} the set of continuous piecewise C^1 curves $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow M$. For a set of curves $\Xi \subset \Xi_{\text{ps}}$, we define

$$\Xi(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) := \{\gamma \in \Xi \mid \gamma(0) \in X^{(0)}, \gamma(1) \in X^{(1)}\}.$$

When it is clear from the context, we identify $\{x\}$ with the point $x \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be a positive integer, $n = 0, \dots, N$, and set constants $t_n = n/N$, $h = 1/N$. The set of sequences of points in the real coordinate space \mathbb{R}^D is

$$\Xi_{\text{p}}^N := \{\gamma^{\text{p}}: \{t_n \mid n = 0, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D\}$$

and we define

$$\Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) := \{\gamma^{\text{p}} \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N \mid \gamma^{\text{p}}(0) \in X^{(0)}, \gamma^{\text{p}}(1) \in X^{(1)}\}$$

as well. Finite differences are defined by

$$\beta^{\text{p}}(t_n) := \frac{1}{h}(\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_{n+1}) - \gamma^{\text{p}}(t_n)), \text{ for } n = 0, \dots, N-1$$

and this corresponds to the derivative $\dot{\gamma}$ for a curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$. For a point sequence $\gamma^{\text{p}} \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, the linear interpolation γ^{pl} is defined as follows: for any $n = 0, \dots, N-1$, when $0 \leq s \leq h$, represented as $t = t_n + s$, we have

$$\gamma^{\text{pl}}(t) := (1 - Ns)\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_n) + Ns\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_{n+1}).$$

The energy $E^g(\gamma)$ and length $L^g(\gamma)$ of a curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$ with respect to the Riemannian metric g are defined as follows:

$$E^g(\gamma) := \int_0^1 g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) dt, \quad L^g(\gamma) := \int_0^1 g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))^{1/2} dt.$$

The distance between two points $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^D$ is defined by

$$d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma),$$

and for sets $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)} \subset \mathbb{R}^D$, it is defined by

$$d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) := \inf_{\substack{x^{(0)} \in X^{(0)}, \\ x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)}}} d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$$

The energy E^g , approximated by finite differences and numerical integration (trapezoidal rule), is defined for any sequence of point groups $\gamma^{\text{p}}: \{t_n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ as follows:

$$E_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^{\text{p}}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} g_{\frac{\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\text{p}}(t_{n+1})}{2}}(\beta^{\text{p}}(t_n), \beta^{\text{p}}(t_n)).$$

The energy E^g , approximated by finite differences and numerical integration (left-endpoint rule), is defined for any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_p^N$ as follows:

$$E_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} g_{\gamma^p(t_n)}(\beta^p(t_n), \beta^p(t_n)).$$

The point sequences $\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p}$ and $\gamma_{1,N}^{*p}$ are defined as follows:

$$\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p} \in \arg \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_p^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^p), \quad (1.1)$$

$$\gamma_{1,N}^{*p} \in \arg \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_p^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p). \quad (1.2)$$

The linear interpolations of the point sequences $\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p}$ and $\gamma_{1,N}^{*p}$ are denoted by $\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*pl}$ and $\gamma_{1,N}^{*pl}$, respectively.

The error when applying the trapezoidal rule to the energy is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. Let $g \in C^\infty$ be a Riemann metric on \mathbb{R}^D satisfying “there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^D$, $c_1 \|u\|_2^2 \leq g_x(u, u) \leq c_2 \|u\|_2^2$ ” and “written by $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$ satisfying $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H \|x - y\|_2$ ”. We assume that $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}$ are closed sets in \mathbb{R}^D , and suppose that at least one of them is bounded. Then, there exists a constant C which depends only $c_1, c_2, L_H, d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}), X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) - \frac{C}{N^{1/2}} &\leq E^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*pl}) - \frac{C}{N^{1/2}} \\ &\leq E_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p}) \leq \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) + \frac{C}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1 claims that the error between the solution of the nonlinear optimization problem using the trapezoidal rule and finite differences, and the minimum energy is $O(N^{-1/2})$.

The key to the proof of Theorem 1.1 involves the following steps. First, for any given curve, the error between the energy approximation using the trapezoidal rule and the true energy is evaluated by applying Morrey-type inequalities to the L^2 norms of the first- and second-order derivatives of the curve. Next, the L^2 norms of the first- and second-order derivatives of a geodesic are evaluated. Furthermore, when the curve is close to the minimum energy, it belongs to a neighborhood of the geodesic, allowing evaluation of the L^2 norms of the first- and second-order derivatives of all curves belonging to this neighborhood. Finally, for the neighborhood of the geodesic, the error between the energy approximated using the trapezoidal rule and the true energy is evaluated, thereby proving Theorem 1.1.

The length of the curve $\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p}$ obtained by the trapezoidal rule asymptotically approaches the minimal length at the rate of $O(N^{-1/2})$.

Theorem 1.2. We assume that the setting of Theorem 1.1. Then, there exists a constant C which depends only $c_1, c_2, L_H, d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}), X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}$ such that

$$L^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*pl})^2 - \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma)^2 \leq \frac{C}{N^{1/2}}.$$

The error when applying the left-endpoint rule to the energy is as follows.

Theorem 1.3. We assume that the setting of Theorem 1.1. Then, there exists a constant C which depends only $c_1, c_2, L_H, d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}), X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) - \frac{C}{N^{1/2}} &\leq E^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{pl}}) - \frac{C}{N^{1/2}} \\ &\leq E_{1,N}^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{p}}) \leq \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) + \frac{C}{N^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.3 claims that the error between the nonlinear programming problem with the left-endpoint rule and finite differences, and the minimum energy is $O(N^{-1/2})$.

The key to the proof of Theorem 1.3 involves the following steps. First, for any given curve, the error between the energy approximations using the trapezoidal rule and the left-endpoint rule is evaluated using the L^2 norm of the finite differences. Using this result, as the same way in Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.3 is proved.

The length of the curve $\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{p}}$ obtained by the left-endpoint rule asymptotically approaches the minimal length at the rate of $O(N^{-1/2})$.

Theorem 1.4. We assume that the setting of Theorem 1.1. Then, there exists a constant C which depends only $c_1, c_2, L_H, d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}), X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}$ such that

$$L^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{pl}})^2 - \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma)^2 \leq \frac{C}{N^{1/2}}.$$

We describe the methods for implementing the energy minimization problem. When using the trapezoidal rule, it is formulated as a constrained nonlinear optimization problem based on Equation (1.1). Moreover, constrained differential dynamic programming can be applied [XLH17, JBMC22]. Particularly, if $X^{(0)}$ and $X^{(1)}$ are one point sets, unconstrained differential dynamic programming can be employed [Ros72].

When using the left-endpoint rule, the implementation methods mentioned for the trapezoidal rule can be applied based on Equation (1.2). Applying (constrained or unconstrained) differential dynamic programming with the left-endpoint rule results in a simpler Hessian concerning the gradient in comparison to the trapezoidal rule, thereby facilitating easier implementation.

The structure of this paper is organized as follows. In §2, we describe the related research. In §3, we recall differential geometry. In §4, we show that the minimal curve is essentially the minimal geodesic. §5 provides an example where the minimization problem approximating length via numerical integration fails to approach the minimal length, irrespective of the number of points N . In §6, we show the equivalence between the energy minimization problem and finding the minimal geodesic for complete Riemannian manifolds. In §7 we prove Theorem 1.1. In §8, we prove Theorem 1.3. Finally, in §9 we prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.4.

2. RELATED WORK

Minimization of Lagrange functional and numerical integration. Examples of approximating functionals using finite differences and numerical integration are well-known in works such as [FU20, HJS24]. Theorem 3.2 in [HJS24] claims that when the functional is a Freidlin–Wentzell action functional, the error between the minimum of the functional and the minimum of the approximated functional can be estimated as $O(N^{-1/2})$. Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 present results for the case where the functional is the energy E^g .

Length minimization problem and numerical integration. To approximate the length of the minimal geodesic, one can consider a method that utilizes the solution of a nonlinear optimization problem where the length is approximated via numerical integration. However, there are examples, as discussed in §6, where the length obtained through this method does not asymptotically approach the minimal path length, regardless of the number of points N used. This indicates that there are instances where solving an optimization problem, approximated by numerical integration, does not yield the desired path by minimizing the Lagrange functional.

Formulation of the energy minimization problem. In addition to using the trapezoidal rule and the left-point rule [MXZ⁺21], [LFXH17] provides a method for approximatively formulating the energy minimization problem using numerical integration. [LFXH17] employs the fact that if a curve is a geodesic, it remains constant under the Riemannian metric, and formulates it as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } E_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) \\ & \text{subject to } g_{\gamma^p(t_n)}(\beta^p(t_n), \beta^p(t_n)) = g_{\gamma^p(t_{n+1})}(\beta^p(t_{n+1}), \beta^p(t_{n+1})) \text{ for } n = 0, \dots, N-1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Removing the constraints in Equation (2.1) results in the formulation proposed by us using the left-endpoint rule.

3. DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY

For any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and the interval $[s_1, s_2] \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p([s_1, s_2])}$ for any (Lebesgue measurable) mapping $\gamma: [s_1, s_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^D$ as follows:

$$\|\gamma\|_{L^p([s_1, s_2])}^p := \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \|\gamma(t)\|_2^p dt.$$

When the context is clear, we may simplify $L^p([s_1, s_2])$ as L^p . For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$, we define the operator norm as $\|A\|_B := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^D \setminus \{0\}} \|Ax\|_2 / \|x\|_2$.

Let M be a manifold. Denote the tangent bundle of M by TM and the cotangent bundle by T^*M . A function $g_\bullet(\bullet, \bullet) \in C^2(M, T^*M \otimes T^*M)$ is a Riemannian metric on M if, for any $x \in M$, g_x defines a real inner product on $T_x M$. The pair (M, g) is called a Riemannian manifold. When clear from the context, we may denote $g(u, v)$ as $g_x(u, v)$. A specific example of a Riemannian metric is given by taking $M = \mathbb{R}^D$ and specifying a positive definite matrix $H(x)$ for each $x \in M$ such that, for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^D$, we have $g_x(u, v) = u^\top H(x)v$. In this case, the pair (\mathbb{R}^D, g) forms a Riemannian manifold. Additionally, the Euclidean metric is denoted by $g_{\text{Eucl}, x}(u, u) := \|u\|^2$.

In a local neighborhood U with local coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_D)$,

$$g_{ij}(x) = g_x \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right)$$

are of class C^2 . At each point $x \in U$, the matrix $g = (g_{ij})$ is positive definite, which allows the inverse matrix $g^{-1} = (g^{ij})$ to be defined. The Christoffel symbols of the second kind for the Levi-Civita connection, $\Gamma_{ij}^k \in C^1$, are given by:

$$\Gamma_{ij}^k(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^D g^{k\ell} \left(\frac{\partial g_{\ell j}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial g_{i\ell}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_\ell} \right). \quad (3.1)$$

A path $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}} \cap C^2$ is called a geodesic if, in each local coordinate neighborhood U through which the curve γ passes, it satisfies the geodesic equation:

$$\ddot{\gamma}_k = - \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{ij}^k(\gamma) \dot{\gamma}_i \dot{\gamma}_j. \quad (3.2)$$

The set of all geodesics is denoted by Ξ_{geo} .

For a connected Riemannian manifold (M, g) , the distance d^g between any two points $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)} \in M$ is defined by

$$d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma).$$

A path $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ is said to be minimal if it satisfies

$$d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) = L^g(\gamma).$$

Hereafter, unless otherwise specified, we assume that the metric g is smooth (i.e., $g \in C^\infty$).

Proposition 3.1 (C.f. [Mil63, §10]). Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Then, for any geodesic $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}$,

$$g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))$$

is constant for $t \in [0, 1]$. Conversely, if

$$g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))$$

is constant for $t \in [0, 1]$, then γ is a geodesic.

In particular, we have

$$g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) = L^g(\gamma)^2.$$

A connected Riemannian manifold (M, g) is called complete if the metric space (M, d^g) is complete.

Proposition 3.2 ([HR31]). Let (M, g) be a connected and complete Riemannian manifold. Then, there exists a minimal geodesic connecting any two points in M .

A specific example of a complete Riemannian metric is given in the following proposition:

Proposition 3.3. Let g be a Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^D such that there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ for which $c_1 \|u\|_2^2 \leq g_x(u, u) \leq c_2 \|u\|_2^2$ holds for all $x, u \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Then, the manifold (\mathbb{R}^D, g) is complete.

Proof. For any curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$, we have

$$c_1^{1/2} L^{g_{\text{Euc}}}(\gamma) \leq L^g(\gamma) \leq c_2^{1/2} L^{g_{\text{Euc}}}(\gamma).$$

Applying $\inf_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})}$ to this inequality, we obtain

$$c_1 \|x^{(0)} - x^{(1)}\|^2 \leq d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})^2 \leq c_2 \|x^{(0)} - x^{(1)}\|^2.$$

Since the Euclidean distance is complete on \mathbb{R}^D , (\mathbb{R}^D, g) is also complete. \square

4. MINIMAL CURVES AND MINIMAL GEODESICS

In this section, we show that a given path, when it has the minimal length, is essentially a minimal geodesic. For any $x \in M$, let V_x be an open neighborhood of 0 in the tangent space $T_x M$, and define $\text{Exp}_x: V_x \rightarrow M$ as the exponential map on the Riemannian manifold (M, g) with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ .

For any $x \in M$, if there exists an open neighborhood V_x of 0 in $T_x M$ such that $\text{Exp}_x: V_x \rightarrow \text{Exp}_x(V_x)$ is a diffeomorphism, then V_x is called a normal coordinate neighborhood of x , and $\text{Exp}_x(V_x)$ is referred to as a normal neighborhood of x .

Geodesics are known for being locally minimal paths.

Proposition 4.1 (C.f. [Kon13, Theorem 4.2.1]). Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Let U be a normal neighborhood of $x^{(0)} \in M$, with some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B = \{x \in M \mid d^g(x, x^{(0)}) < \varepsilon\} \subset U$. Let $x^{(1)} \in B$. Then, a curve $\gamma^* \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ satisfies

$$L^g(\gamma^*) \leq L^g(\gamma)$$

for any curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ if and only if there exists a minimal geodesic $\gamma^{**} \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$, and a monotonically increasing continuous piecewise C^1 function $\phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\phi(0) = 0$, $\phi(1) = 1$, such that for any $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\gamma^*(t) = \gamma^{**} \circ \phi(t).$$

In this section, we show the following property of geodesics:

Proposition 4.2. Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Let $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)} \in M$ be arbitrary points. Then, a curve $\gamma^* \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ satisfies

$$L^g(\gamma^*) \leq L^g(\gamma)$$

for any curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ if and only if there exists a minimal geodesic $\gamma^{**} \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$, and a monotonically increasing continuous piecewise C^1 function $\phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\phi(0) = 0$, $\phi(1) = 1$, such that for any $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\gamma^*(t) = \gamma^{**} \circ \phi(t).$$

Before proceeding to the proof, we introduce how the exponential map provides a canonical local coordinate system:

Proposition 4.3 (C.f. [Kon13, Theorem 4.2.1]). Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Let $K \subset M$ be a compact set. Then, there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $x \in K$, the exponential map $\text{Exp}_x: \{v \in T_x M \mid g_x(v, v)^{1/2} < \varepsilon\} \rightarrow \{y \in M \mid d^g(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$ is a diffeomorphism.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Step 1: For any $[t^{(0)}, t^{(1)}] \subset [0, 1]$, let $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(\gamma^*(t^{(0)}), \gamma^*(t^{(1)}))$. Then, we have

$$\int_{t^{(0)}}^{t^{(1)}} g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))^{1/2} dt \leq L^g(\gamma). \quad (4.1)$$

Suppose, for contradiction, that there exists a curve $\gamma^{(1)}: [t^{(0)}, t^{(1)}] \rightarrow M$ such that

$$\int_{t^{(0)}}^{t^{(1)}} g_{\gamma^{(1)}(t)}(\dot{\gamma}^{(1)}(t), \dot{\gamma}^{(1)}(t))^{1/2} dt < \int_{t^{(0)}}^{t^{(1)}} g_{\gamma(t)}(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))^{1/2} dt. \quad (4.2)$$

Define the curve $\tilde{\gamma}^{(1)} \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ by

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{(1)}(t) := \begin{cases} \gamma^{(1)}(t), & t \in [t^{(0)}, t^{(1)}], \\ \gamma(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, $L^g(\tilde{\gamma}^{(1)}) < L^g(\gamma)$, resulting in a contradiction.

Step 2: Let $t^{(0)} \in [0, 1]$. Consider a normal neighborhood $U = \{x \in M \mid d^g(\gamma^*(t), x) < \varepsilon\}$ of the point $\gamma^*(t^{(0)})$. Since the curve γ^* is continuous, there exists an interval $[t^{(1)}, t^{(2)}] \ni t^{(0)}$ such that

$$\gamma^*([t^{(1)}, t^{(2)}]) \subset U, \quad d^g(\gamma^*(t^{(0)}), \gamma^*(t^{(1)})) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad d^g(\gamma^*(t^{(0)}), \gamma^*(t^{(2)})) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

By Proposition 4.2, there exists a geodesic $\gamma^{**} \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}$, and a monotonically increasing continuous piecewise C^1 function $\phi_2: [t^{(1)}, t^{(0)}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\phi_2(t^{(1)}) = 0$, $\phi_2(t^{(0)}) = 1$, and another function $\phi_3: [t^{(0)}, t^{(2)}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\phi_3(t^{(0)}) = 0$, $\phi_3(t^{(2)}) = 1$, such that

$$\gamma^*(t) = \gamma^{**} \circ \phi_2(t), \text{ for } t \in [t^{(1)}, t^{(0)}], \quad \gamma^*(t) = \gamma^{**} \circ \phi_3(t), \text{ for } t \in [t^{(0)}, t^{(2)}]. \quad (4.3)$$

Step 3: By applying Proposition 4.3 to the set $\gamma^*([0, 1])$, there exists some $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for any $x \in \gamma^*([0, 1])$, the exponential map $\text{Exp}_x: \{v \in T_x M \mid g_x(v, v)^{1/2} < \varepsilon\} \rightarrow \{y \in M \mid d^g(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$ is a diffeomorphism. Therefore, $\{y \in M \mid d^g(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$ is a normal coordinate neighborhood of $x \in \gamma^*([0, 1])$.

Step 4: We show the necessity of this condition. Let $\{\gamma^*(t^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^N$ be a sequence of points such that for any $n = 1, \dots, N-1$

$$d^g(\gamma^*(t^{(n)}), \gamma^*(t^{(n+1)})) < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad (4.4)$$

and for $i \neq j$,

$$\gamma^*(t^{(i)}) \neq \gamma^*(t^{(j)}). \quad (4.5)$$

For any $n = 1, \dots, N-2$, we have $d^g(\gamma^*(t^{(n)}), \gamma^*(t^{(n+2)})) < \varepsilon/2$. According to Equation (4.3), there exists a geodesic $\gamma^{*n} \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}$, and a monotonically increasing continuous piecewise C^1 function $\phi_n: [t^{(n)}, t^{(n+2)}] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\phi_n(t^{(n)}) = 0$, $\phi_n(t^{(n+2)}) = 1$ such that

$$\gamma^*(t) = \gamma^{*n} \circ \phi_n(t), \quad t \in [t^{(n)}, t^{(n+2)}].$$

As geodesics locally satisfy condition Equation (3.2), there exists a geodesic γ^{**} and a monotonically increasing continuous piecewise C^1 function $\phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\phi(0) = 0$, $\phi(1) = 1$ satisfying

$$\gamma^* = \gamma^{**} \circ \phi.$$

Step 5: We show the sufficiency of the condition.

Let $\{\gamma^*(t^{(n)})\}_{n=1}^N$ be the sequence of points satisfying Equations (4.4) and (4.5) any $n = 1, \dots, N-1$. By Equation (4.3) and Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\int_{t^{(n)}}^{t^{(n+1)}} g_{\gamma^*(t)} (\dot{\gamma}^*(t), \dot{\gamma}^*(t))^{1/2} dt = \int_{\gamma^{**^{-1}(\gamma^*(t^{(n)}))}^{\gamma^{**^{-1}(\gamma^*(t^{(n+1)}))}} g_{\gamma^{**}(t)} (\dot{\gamma}^{**}(t), \dot{\gamma}^{**}(t))^{1/2} dt. \quad (4.6)$$

By summing over n , we obtain

$$L^g(\gamma^*) = L^g(\gamma^{**}).$$

Since γ^{**} is a minimal geodesic, the sufficiency condition is thereby shown. \square

5. MINIMAL LENGTH PROBLEM AND NUMERICAL INTEGRATION

In this section, we show an example presenting that a minimization problem based on a numerical integration approximation of length cannot approximate the true length minimization problem, even by increasing the number of points N . For this section only, consider the function $f(x_1, x_2) := -\cos x_1 + 2$, with the metric $g^f := f^2 g_{\text{Euc}}$, where g_{Euc} is the Euclidean metric. The points are given by $x^{(0)} = (0, 0)$ and $x^{(1)} = (4\pi, 0)$.

5.1. Length of minimal path. To compute the minimal path length, consider that if a path γ is one of the minimal paths from $x^{(0)}$ to $x^{(1)}$ in the metric g^f , then $\gamma_2(t) = 0$. This follows since

$$\begin{aligned} L^{g^f}(\gamma) &= \int_0^1 (-\cos(\gamma_1(t)) + 2) \sqrt{(\dot{\gamma}_1(t))^2 + (\dot{\gamma}_2(t))^2} dt \\ &\geq \int_0^1 (-\cos(\gamma_1(t)) + 2) |\dot{\gamma}_1(t)| dt = L^{g^f}((\gamma_1, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, if γ is one of the minimal paths from $x^{(0)}$ to $x^{(1)}$ in the metric g^f , then $\gamma_1(t)$ must be monotonic increasing with respect to t . This can be proven by contradiction. Suppose there exists an interval $[t_1, t_2]$ over which $\gamma_1(t)$ is strictly decreasing. Then either $\gamma_1(t_1) > 0$ or $\gamma_1(t_2) < 4\pi$ must be satisfied. Assume first that $\gamma_1(t_1) > 0$. By the Intermediate Value Theorem, there exists some $t_3 \in [0, t_1]$ such that $\gamma_1(t_3) = \gamma_1(t_2)$. Define a new path

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) := \begin{cases} \gamma(t_2), & t_3 \leq t \leq t_2, \\ \gamma(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This yields $L^{g^f}(\gamma) > L^{g^f}(\tilde{\gamma})$, which contradicts the assumption that γ is a minimal path. Similarly, if $\gamma_1(t_2) < 4\pi$, a contradiction arises through a similar argument. Thus, $\gamma_1(t)$ must be monotone increasing with respect to t .

Furthermore, we have $\gamma([0, 1]) = [0, 4\pi] \times \{0\}$. This is because, by definition, $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$ and $\gamma(1) = (4\pi, 0)$, and since $[0, 1]$ is path-connected, $\gamma([0, 1])$ is also path-connected. Since $\gamma_2(t) = 0$, it follows that $\gamma([0, 1]) \supset [0, 4\pi] \times \{0\}$.

On the other hand, suppose there exists a point $(x_1, 0) \in \gamma([0, 1])$ with $x_1 \notin [0, 4\pi]$. If $x_1 < 0$, there would exist some $t_3 \in [0, 1]$ such that $\gamma(t_3) = x_1 < 0$. By the Intermediate Value Theorem, there must be some $t_2 \in (t_3, 1]$ such that $\gamma(t_2) = 0$. Define a new path by

$$\tilde{\gamma}(t) := \begin{cases} \gamma(0), & 0 \leq t \leq t_2, \\ \gamma(t), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This results in $L^{g^f}(\gamma) > L^{g^f}(\tilde{\gamma})$, which contradicts the assumption that γ is a minimal path. A similar contradiction arises if $x_1 > 4\pi$. Therefore, $\gamma([0, 1]) = [0, 4\pi] \times \{0\}$.

To sum up, if a curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})$ is a minimal path, then γ is monotone increasing, with $\gamma_1: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 4\pi]$ satisfying $\gamma_1(0) = 0$ and $\gamma_1(1) = 4\pi$. Additionally, since (\mathbb{R}^2, g^f) is complete, there exists a minimal geodesic γ^* from $x^{(0)}$ to $x^{(1)}$ with respect to g^f . This geodesic is unique. Solving Equation (3.2), we find that $\gamma_1^*: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 4\pi]$ is strictly monotone increasing and provides a diffeomorphism.

To show that $\hat{\gamma}(t) = t(4\pi, 0)$ can be taken as an example of a minimal curve, define $\phi := \gamma_1^{*-1} \circ \hat{\gamma}_1$. Here, ϕ is monotone increasing and satisfies $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(1) = 1$. Therefore, it follows that $\hat{\gamma} = \gamma^* \circ \phi$. According to Proposition 4.2, $\hat{\gamma}$ is indeed minimal.

The length of $\hat{\gamma}$ with respect to g^f is computed as follows:

$$L^{g^f}(\hat{\gamma}) = \int_0^1 (-\cos(8\pi t) + 2) \cdot 4\pi dt = 8\pi.$$

Thus, we have

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} L^{g^f}(\gamma) = 8\pi. \quad (5.1)$$

5.2. Left-endpoint rule. We approximate the length of a curve using the left-endpoint rule as follows:

$$L_{1,N}^g(\gamma^{\text{p}}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} g_{\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_n)}(\beta^{\text{p}}(t_n), \beta^{\text{p}}(t_n))^{1/2}.$$

We show that the minimization problem of $L_{1,N}^g$ does not coincide with the true length minimization problem, regardless of the choice of N .

The approximation of length using the left-endpoint rule can be evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{1,N}^g(\gamma^{\text{p}}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} g_{\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_n)}(\beta^{\text{p}}(t_n), \beta^{\text{p}}(t_n))^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f(\gamma^{\text{p}}(t_n)) \|\beta^{\text{p}}(t_n)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1}) - \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n)\|_2 && \because f(x_1, x_2) \geq 1 \\
&\geq \|\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_N) - \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_0)\|_2 = 4\pi && \because \text{triangle inequality.}
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\min_{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{P}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbb{L}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}) \geq 4\pi. \quad (5.2)$$

On the other hand, consider a sequence of points $\{\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n)\}_{n=0}^N$ such that $\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n) \in \{0, 2\pi, 4\pi\}$ and $\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n) \leq \gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1})$. In this case, since $f(\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n)) = 1$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{L}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}) = 4\pi. \quad (5.3)$$

From Equations (5.2) and (5.3), we have

$$\min_{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{P}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbb{L}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}) = 4\pi. \quad (5.4)$$

From Equations (5.1) and (5.4), we conclude that the approximation of length using the left-endpoint rule does not approximate the minimal length, regardless of how large N is chosen.

5.3. Trapezoidal Rule. We approximate the length of a curve using the trapezoidal rule as follows:

$$\mathbb{L}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} g_{\frac{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2}}(\beta^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n), \beta^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n))^{1/2}.$$

We show that the minimization problem for $\mathbb{L}_{\text{tra},N}^g$ does not coincide with the true length minimization problem, regardless of how large N is chosen.

The approximation of length using the trapezoidal rule can be evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{L}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} g_{\frac{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2}}(\beta^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n), \beta^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n))^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} f\left(\frac{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2}\right) \|\beta^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n)\|_2 \\
&\geq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1}) - \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_n)\|_2 && \because f(x_1, x_2) \geq 1 \\
&\geq \|\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_N) - \gamma^{\mathbb{P}}(t_0)\|_2 = 4\pi && \because \text{triangle inequality.}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\min_{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{P}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbb{L}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}) \geq 4\pi. \quad (5.5)$$

On the other hand, consider a sequence of points $\{\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n)\}_{n=0}^N$ such that $\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n) \in \{0, 4\pi\}$ and $\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n) \leq \gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1})$. Since

$$f\left(\frac{\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2}\right) = 1,$$

we obtain

$$\mathbb{L}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^{*\mathbb{P}}) = 4\pi. \quad (5.6)$$

From Equations (5.5) and (5.6), we have

$$\min_{\gamma^{\mathbb{P}} \in \Xi_{\mathbb{P}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbb{L}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^{\mathbb{P}}) = 4\pi. \quad (5.7)$$

From Equations (5.1) and (5.7), we conclude that the approximation of length using the trapezoidal rule does not approximate the minimal length, regardless of how large N is chosen.

6. CHARACTERIZATION OF MINIMAL GEODESICS VIA ENERGY MINIMIZATION

In this section, we show that for a complete Riemannian manifold, the problem of minimizing energy between two sets is equivalent to finding the minimal geodesic between them.

6.1. Case of two points. We recall the equivalence between the energy minimization problem and the problem of finding the minimal geodesic between two points.

Proposition 6.1 ([Mil63, Corollary 10.7, Lemma 12.1]). Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Assume there exists a minimal geodesic in (M, g) connecting the points $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)} \in M$. Then, we have

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma)^2, \quad \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) = \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma).$$

In particular,

$$\arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma)$$

is the set of curves consisting of geodesics.

6.2. Case of two sets. We show the equivalence between the energy minimization problem and the problem of finding the minimal geodesic between two sets.

Proposition 6.2. Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold, and $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)} \subset M$ be non-empty closed sets, where at least one is bounded. Then, the set

$$\mathcal{Y} := \{(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) \in X^{(0)} \times X^{(1)} \mid d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) = d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})\}$$

is non-empty, bounded, and closed.

Proof. By symmetry, assume $X^{(0)}$ is bounded. Since $X^{(1)}$ is non-empty, we can choose an element $x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)}$. Define the constant R and the set $X^{(1)'}$ as follows:

$$R := \max_{x^{(0)} \in X^{(0)}} d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}),$$

$$X^{(1)'} := \{x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)} \mid d^g(X^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) \leq R\}.$$

The set $X^{(1)'}$ is bounded and closed. Moreover, we have

$$d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) = d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)'}). \quad (6.1)$$

Since the function $d^g: \mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and $X^{(0)} \times X^{(1)'}$ is a bounded closed set, there exist $x^{(0)} \in X^{(0)}$ and $x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)'}$ such that d^g achieves its minimal value over $X^{(0)} \times X^{(1)'}$. Therefore, \mathcal{Y} is non-empty.

The set \mathcal{Y} is the preimage of the value $d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$ under the continuous function d^g . Therefore, the set \mathcal{Y} is closed. Furthermore, since \mathcal{Y} is contained in $X^{(0)} \times X^{(1)'}$, and $X^{(0)} \times X^{(1)'}$ is bounded, it follows that \mathcal{Y} is also bounded. \square

Proposition 6.3. Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold, $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)} \subset M$ non-empty closed subsets, where at least one is bounded. Then, we have

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma)^2,$$

$$\arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) = \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma) \neq \emptyset.$$

In particular,

$$\arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma)$$

consists of a collection of curves that are geodesics.

Proof. By symmetry, we assume that $X^{(0)}$ is bounded. We aim to show that

$$\arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma) \neq \emptyset, \quad d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) = \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma) \quad (6.2)$$

holds. According to Proposition 4.2, there exist $x^{(0)} \in X^{(0)}$ and $x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)}$ such that

$$d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) = d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) = \min_{\substack{x^{(0)} \in X^{(0)}, \\ x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)}}} \inf_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma) = \inf_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma).$$

From Proposition 6.1, there exists a geodesic γ connecting $x^{(0)} \in X^{(0)}$ and $x^{(1)} \in X^{(1)}$ such that

$$d^g(x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}) = L^g(\gamma).$$

Therefore, Equation (6.2) holds.

Next, we aim to show that

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma)^2 \quad (6.3)$$

holds, as well as

$$\arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma) = \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma) \quad (6.4)$$

holds. From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, for any path $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$, it follows that

$$L^g(\gamma) = \int_0^1 1 \cdot \sqrt{g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma})} dt \leq \left(\int_0^1 1 dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^1 g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) dt \right)^{1/2} \leq E^g(\gamma)^{1/2} \quad (6.5)$$

exists, where equality holds if $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma})$ is constant with respect to t . According to Proposition 3.1, this condition is equivalent to γ being a geodesic. From Equation (6.2), for any path $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$, we have

$$E^g(\gamma)^{1/2} \geq L^g(\gamma) \geq d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}).$$

The equality condition for the above inequalities is that $\gamma(0) \in X^{(0)}$, $\gamma(1) \in X^{(1)}$, $d^g(\gamma(0), \gamma(1)) = d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, and γ is a minimal geodesic. Therefore, Equations (6.3) and (6.4) hold. \square

7. APPROXIMATION OF ENERGY MINIMIZATION PROBLEM VIA TRAPEZOIDAL RULE

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.1. In §7.1, we will prove a Morrey-type inequality. In §7.2, we evaluate the error between the energy and the approximated energy with trapezoidal rule when an L^2 upper bound exists for first and second derivatives in the space of curves. In §7.3, we will assess the error concerning the energy approximated by the trapezoidal rule and the energy of curves obtained by linearly interpolating the point set. In §7.4, we evaluate the first derivative of the metric and the Christoffel symbols. In §7.5, we evaluate the L^2 norms for the first and second derivatives related to minimal geodesics. Finally, in §7.6, we will prove Theorem 1.1.

7.1. Morrey-type Inequality. In this subsection, we describe the Morrey inequality and the inequalities derived from it using its proof.

Proposition 7.1 (Morrey Inequality (c.f. [Eva10, §5.6.2, Theorem 4])). Let the curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$ satisfy $\|\gamma\|_{L^2}, \|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} < \infty$. Then, for any $0 \leq s_1 \leq s \leq s_2 \leq 1$, we have

$$\|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)\|_2 \leq (s_2 - s_1)^{1/2} \|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])}, \quad (7.1)$$

$$\|\gamma(s)\|_2 \leq \|\gamma\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])} + 2\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])}. \quad (7.2)$$

Moreover, using an application of the Morrey inequality proof, we can demonstrate the following inequality.

Proposition 7.2. Let the curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$ satisfy $\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2}, \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} < \infty$. Then, for any $0 \leq s_1 \leq s \leq s_2 \leq 1$, we have

$$\|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)\|_2 \leq (s_2 - s_1) (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])}).$$

Proof. By the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$\|\gamma(s_2) - \gamma(s_1)\|_2 \leq \left\| \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \dot{\gamma}(s) ds \right\|_2 \leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_2 ds.$$

From Equation (7.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \|\dot{\gamma}(s)\|_2 ds &\leq \int_{s_1}^{s_2} (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])}) ds \\ &= (s_2 - s_1) (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([s_1, s_2])}). \end{aligned}$$

□

The error between finite differences and derivatives can be evaluated using the following inequality.

Proposition 7.3. Let the curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$ satisfy $\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2}, \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} < \infty$. Then, for any $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$, we have

$$\|\beta(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 \leq 2N^{-1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}.$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\beta(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 \leq \|\beta(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t_n)\|_2 + \|\dot{\gamma}(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2.$$

For the first term, by Taylor's theorem, we have

$$\beta(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t_n) = \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h (h-s) \ddot{\gamma}(s+t_n) ds.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t_n)\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h (h-s) \|\ddot{\gamma}(s+t_n)\|_2 ds \\ &\leq \frac{1}{h} \|h-s\|_{L^2([0, h])} \|\ddot{\gamma}(s+t_n)\|_{L^2([0, h])} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} h^{1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}(s+t_n)\|_{L^2([0, h])} \\ &\leq N^{-1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, applying Proposition 7.1 to $\dot{\gamma}$, we have

$$\|\dot{\gamma}(t_n) - \dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 \leq N^{-1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}.$$

Combining these, we obtain the proposition. □

7.2. Error between curve energy and energy approximated by trapezoidal rule. For constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$, we define the following space of curves $\Xi_{K_1, K_2} \subset \Xi_{\text{ps}}$:

$$\Xi_{K_1, K_2} := \left\{ \gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}} \mid \|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([0,1])} \leq K_1, \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([0,1])} \leq K_2 \right\}.$$

In this section, we aim to evaluate the error between the curve energy and the energy approximated using the trapezoidal rule for the space of curves Ξ_{K_1, K_2} .

Proposition 7.4. Let $H: \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ be a matrix-valued function such that there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ satisfying $g_x(u, u) \leq c_2 \|u\|_2^2$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Suppose that $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H \|x - y\|_2$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| u_1^\top H(x_1) u_1 - u_2^\top H(x_2) u_2 \right| \\ & \leq L_H \|x_1 - x_2\|_2 \|u_1\|_2^2 + c_2 \|u_1 - u_2\|_2^2 + 2c_2 \|u_1\|_2 \|u_1 - u_2\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| u_1^\top H(x_1) u_1 - u_2^\top H(x_2) u_2 \right| \\ & \leq \left| u_1^\top (H(x_1) - H(x_2)) u_1 \right| + \left| (u_2 - u_1)^\top H(x_2) (u_2 - u_1) \right| + 2 \left| u_1^\top H(x_2) (u_2 - u_1) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

For the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| u_1^\top (H(x_1) - H(x_2)) u_1 \right| \\ & \leq \|u_1\|_2 \|H(x_1) - H(x_2)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \|u_1\|_2 \quad \because \text{Cauchy-Schwarz inequality} \\ & \leq L_H \|x_1 - x_2\|_2 \|u_1\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the second and third terms, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (u_2 - u_1)^\top H(x_2) (u_2 - u_1) \right| \leq c_2 \|u_1 - u_2\|_2^2, \\ & \left| u_1^\top H(x_2) (u_2 - u_1) \right| \leq c_2 \|u_1\|_2 \|u_1 - u_2\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 7.5. Let g be a Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^D such that when expressed as $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$, there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ satisfying $g_x(u, u) \leq c_2 \|u\|_2^2$ for any $x, y, u \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Suppose that $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H \|x - y\|_2$. Let $\gamma \in \Xi_{K_1, K_2}$. Then, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}^g(\gamma) - \mathbb{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma) \right| \leq \frac{L_H(K_1^3 + K_1^2 K_2)}{N} + \frac{4c_2 K_1 K_2}{N} + \frac{4c_2 K_2^2}{N^2}.$$

Proof. From the left-hand side,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}^g(\gamma) - \mathbb{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left| \dot{\gamma}(t)^\top H(\gamma(t)) \dot{\gamma}(t) - \beta(t_n)^\top H\left(\frac{\gamma(t_n) + \gamma(t_{n+1})}{2}\right) \beta(t_n) \right| dt \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left(L_H \left\| \gamma(t) - \frac{\gamma(t_n) + \gamma(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t) - \beta(t_n)\|_2^2 + 2c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t) - \beta(t_n)\|_2 \right) dt \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.4.} \quad (7.3) \end{aligned}$$

The focus is on the first term from Equation (7.3). By Proposition 7.1, for $t \in [t_n, t_{n+1}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \gamma(t) - \frac{\gamma(t_n) + \gamma(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t_n)\|_2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\gamma(t) - \gamma(t_{n+1})\|_2 \\ &\leq (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}) \frac{1}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to the first term of Equation (7.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} L_H \left\| \gamma(t) - \frac{\gamma(t_n) + \gamma(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2^2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2^2 dt \\ &\leq L_H N^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}^2 (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}) \\ &\leq L_H N^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}^2 (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([0, 1])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([0, 1])}) \\ &\leq L_H N^{-1} \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_{L^2([0, 1])}^2 (\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([0, 1])} + 2\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([0, 1])}) \leq L_H N^{-1} (K_1^3 + K_2 K_1^2). \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

The second term of Equation (7.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t) - \beta(t_n)\|_2^2 dt &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} 4c_2 \frac{1}{N} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}^2 dt && \because \text{Proposition 7.3} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{N} 4c_2 \frac{1}{N} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])}^2 = 4c_2 K_2^2 N^{-2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

The third term of Equation (7.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} 2c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t) - \beta(t_n)\|_2 dt \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} 4c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 N^{-1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} dt && \because \text{Proposition 7.3} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|1\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} 4c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} N^{-1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} && \because \text{Cauchy-Schwarz inequality} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} N^{-1/2} 4c_2 \|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} N^{-1/2} \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2([t_n, t_{n+1}])} \\ &\leq 4c_2 K_1 K_2 / N && \because \text{Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.} \end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

From Equations (7.4) to (7.6), we get the proposition. \square

Let the right-hand side of Proposition 7.5 be denoted by $C(K_1, K_2, N)$.

Proposition 7.6. We assume that $\Xi \subset \Xi_{K_1, K_2}$. In the setting of Proposition 7.5,

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Xi} E_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma) \leq \inf_{\gamma \in \Xi} E^g(\gamma) + C(K_1, K_2, N).$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \Xi$. By Proposition 7.5, we have

$$E^g(\gamma) \leq E_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma) + C(K_1, K_2, N).$$

By taking the infimum on both sides, the proposition follows. \square

7.3. Points which attain minimum of energy approximated trapezoidal rule, and its linear interpolation. In this section, we evaluate the error between the energy of a point set obtained using the trapezoidal rule and the energy of the curve resulting from linear interpolation of this point set.

Proposition 7.7. For any $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N x_n^3 \leq \left(\sum_{n=1}^N x_n^2 \right)^{3/2}.$$

Proof. If the vector x is the zero vector, the proposition holds clearly. Assuming the proposition is correct for the case $\|x\|_2 = 1$, then for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{x_n}{\|x\|_2} \right)^3 \leq 1,$$

and the proposition follows. Therefore, it suffices to prove the proposition for the case $\|x\|_2 = 1$.

In the case $\|x\|_2 = 1$, since $|x_n| \leq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N x_n^3 \leq \sum_{n=1}^N x_n^2 = 1.$$

Thus, the proposition holds. \square

Proposition 7.8. For any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_p^N$, let $K_3^2 := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 / N$. Then, we have

$$\left| \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^{\text{pl}}) - \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^p) \right| \leq \frac{L_H K_3^3}{4N^{1/2}}.$$

Proof. For any $0 < s < h$, we have

$$\gamma^{\text{pl}}(t_n + h/2) = \frac{\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1})}{2}, \quad (7.7)$$

$$\dot{\gamma}^{\text{pl}}(t_n + s) = \frac{\gamma^p(t_{n+1}) - \gamma^p(t_n)}{h} = \beta^p(t_n). \quad (7.8)$$

From Equations (7.7) and (7.8), it follows that

$$\|\dot{\gamma}^{\text{pl}}\|_{L^2([0,1])}^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 = K_3^2. \quad (7.9)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \gamma^{\text{pl}}(t_n + s) - \frac{\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| (1 - Ns)\gamma^p(t_n) + Ns\gamma^p(t_{n+1}) - \frac{\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| \left(\frac{1}{2} - Ns \right) \gamma^p(t_n) + \left(Ns - \frac{1}{2} \right) \gamma^p(t_{n+1}) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left| Ns - \frac{1}{2} \right| \left\| -\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1}) \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left| s - \frac{h}{2} \right| \|\beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)\|_2 \quad (7.10)$$

From the left-hand side of the proposition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^{\text{Pl}}) - \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^{\text{P}}) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left| \dot{\gamma}^{\text{Pl}}(t)^\top H(\gamma^{\text{Pl}}(t)) \dot{\gamma}^{\text{Pl}}(t) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)^\top H\left(\frac{\gamma^{\text{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\text{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2}\right) \beta^{\text{P}}(t_n) \right| dt \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left| \beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)^\top H(\gamma^{\text{Pl}}(t)) \beta^{\text{P}}(t_n) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)^\top H\left(\frac{\gamma^{\text{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\text{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2}\right) \beta^{\text{P}}(t_n) \right| dt \quad \because \text{Equation (7.8)} \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} L_H \left\| \gamma^{\text{Pl}}(t) - \frac{\gamma^{\text{P}}(t_n) + \gamma^{\text{P}}(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2 \|\beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)\|_2^2 dt \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.4} \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_0^h L_H \left| s - \frac{h}{2} \right| \|\beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)\|_2 \|\beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)\|_2^2 ds \quad \because \text{Equation (7.10)} \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{L_H}{4N^2} \|\beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)\|_2^3 \leq \frac{L_H}{4N^2} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^{\text{P}}(t_n)\|_2^2 \right)^{3/2} \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.7} \\ & = \frac{L_H}{4} K_3^3 N^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

7.4. Estimation of Christoffel symbols. In this section, we evaluate the first derivatives of g and the Christoffel symbols.

Proposition 7.9. Let $g \in C^1$ be the Riemannian metric in Euclidean space. Suppose that in coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_D)$, we can write $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$ and that $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H \|x - y\|_2$. Then, we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_\ell} \right| \leq L_H.$$

Proof. Let δ_{ij} denote the Kronecker delta, and let $\mathbf{e}_\ell := (\delta_{\ell i})_i$, identifying \mathbf{e}_ℓ with $\partial/\partial x_\ell$. Differentiating the function g_{ij} with respect to $\partial/\partial x_\ell$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_\ell} \right| &= \left| \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left(g_{x+h\mathbf{e}_\ell} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right) - g_x \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbf{e}_i^\top (H(x+h\mathbf{e}_\ell) - H(x)) \mathbf{e}_j \right| \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{1}{h} \mathbf{e}_i^\top (H(x+h\mathbf{e}_\ell) - H(x)) \mathbf{e}_j \right| \\ &\leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \|H(x+h\mathbf{e}_\ell) - H(x)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \frac{1}{h} L_H h \|\mathbf{e}_\ell\|_2 = L_H. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 7.10. Let $g \in C^1$ be the Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^D . Suppose that we can write $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$, and assume $c_1\|u\|_2^2 \leq g_x(u, u)$ and $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H\|x - y\|_2$. Then, we have

$$\left| \Gamma_{ij}^k(x) \right| \leq \frac{3L_H D^{1/2}}{2c_1}.$$

Proof. From Equation (3.1) and Proposition 7.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Gamma_{ij}^k(x) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \max \left(g^{k\ell} \left| \frac{\partial g_{\ell j}}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial g_{i\ell}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_\ell} \right|, 0 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \max \left(g^{k\ell} \left(\left| \frac{\partial g_{\ell j}}{\partial x_i} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial g_{i\ell}}{\partial x_j} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial x_\ell} \right| \right), 0 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{3L_H}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \max(g^{k\ell}, 0) \\ &= \frac{3L_H}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^D \max_{0 \leq y_\ell \leq 1} g^{k\ell} y_\ell \\ &= \frac{3L_H}{2} \max_{\substack{0 \leq y_\ell \leq 1 \\ \ell=1, \dots, D}} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^D g^{k\ell} y_\ell \right) \\ &\leq \frac{3L_H D^{1/2}}{2} \max_{\|y\|_2=1} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^D g^{k\ell} y_\ell \right) = \frac{3L_H D^{1/2}}{2c_1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

7.5. A Priori estimates for minimal geodesics. We conduct L^2 estimates for the first and second derivatives of the minimal geodesic. Define the constants $K_{1,g}$ and $K_{2,g}$ as follows:

$$K_{1,g} := c_1^{-1/2} d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}), \quad K_{2,g} := \frac{3L_H D^2}{2c_1} K_{1,g}^2.$$

Proposition 7.11. Let g be the Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^D . Suppose that we can express $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$ and assume the following conditions: $c_1\|u\|_2^2 \leq g_x(u, u) \leq c_2\|u\|_2^2$ and $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H\|x - y\|_2$. Then for any $\gamma \in \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma)$, we have

$$\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} \leq K_{1,g}, \quad \|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} \leq K_{2,g}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} E^g(\gamma)$ be a curve. By Propositions 3.3 and 6.3, γ is a minimal geodesic. From Propositions 3.1 and 6.3, we have

$$g(\gamma(t))(\dot{\gamma}(t), \dot{\gamma}(t)) = d^g(\gamma(0), \gamma(1))^2 = d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})^2. \quad (7.11)$$

Integrating both sides over $t \in [0, 1]$, we obtain

$$\|\dot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})}{c_1^{1/2}} = K_{1,g}. \quad (7.12)$$

Moreover, γ satisfies the equation of the geodesic. By Proposition 7.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\ddot{\gamma}_k(t)| &\leq \sum_{i,j=1}^D \sup_{t,i,j,k} |\Gamma_{ij}^k(\gamma(t))| |\dot{\gamma}_i| |\dot{\gamma}_j| \\
&\leq \sup_{t,i,j,k} |\Gamma_{ij}^k(\gamma(t))|^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^D |\dot{\gamma}_i| \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{t,i,j,k} |\Gamma_{ij}^k(\gamma(t))| D \left(\sum_{i=1}^D |\dot{\gamma}_i|^2 \right) && \because \text{Cauchy-Schwarz inequality} \\
&\leq \frac{3L_H D^{3/2}}{2c_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^D |\dot{\gamma}_i|^2 \right) && \because \text{Proposition 7.10} \\
&\leq \frac{3L_H D^{3/2}}{2c_1} K_{1,g}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $\|\ddot{\gamma}(t)\|_2$, we have

$$\|\ddot{\gamma}(t)\|_2 = \left(\sum_{k=1}^D \gamma_k(t)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq D^{1/2} \frac{3L_H D^{3/2}}{2c_1} \leq \frac{3L_H D^2}{2c_1} K_{1,g}^2.$$

The L^2 norm of $\ddot{\gamma}$ can be estimated as

$$\|\ddot{\gamma}\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{3L_H D^2}{2c_1} K_{1,g}^2 = K_{2,g}. \quad (7.13)$$

□

7.6. Proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. From Proposition 6.3, we have

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) = \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma).$$

By Proposition 7.11, we have

$$\Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) \subset \Xi_{K_{1,g}, K_{2,g}}.$$

Applying Proposition 7.6 to the set of geodesics $\Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) &\leq \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma) \\
&\leq \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{geo}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) + C(K_{1,g}, K_{2,g}, N) \\
&\leq \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) + C(K_{1,g}, K_{2,g}, N).
\end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

Define the set of points:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) \\
&:= \left\{ \gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) \mid \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) \leq \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) + C(K_{1,g}, K_{2,g}, N) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^p)}{c_1} \leq \frac{d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})^2 + C(K_{1,g}, K_{2,g}, N)}{c_1} =: K_{3,g}^2. \quad (7.15)$$

From Equation (7.14), since $\gamma_{1,N}^{*p} \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, $\gamma_{1,N}^{*p}$ satisfies Equation (7.15). By Proposition 7.8, we have

$$\mathbf{E}^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*pl}) \leq \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p}) + \frac{L_H K_{3,g}^3}{4N^{1/2}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) \leq \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^{pl}) \leq \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*pl}) \leq \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma_{\text{tra},N}^{*p}) + \frac{L_H K_{3,g}^3}{4N^{1/2}}. \quad (7.16)$$

From Equations (7.14) and (7.16), we obtain the theorem. \square

8. APPROXIMATION OF ENERGY MINIMIZATION PROBLEM VIA LEFT-ENDPOINT RULE

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. In §8.1, we compare the energy approximated by the left-endpoint rule with that approximated by the trapezoidal rule. In §8.2, we evaluate the error between the energy approximated for points obtained using the left-endpoint rule and the energy of a curve formed by linear interpolation of these points. Finally, in §8.3, we prove Theorem 1.3.

8.1. Left-endpoint rule and trapezoidal rule. In this section, we compare the energy approximated by the left-endpoint rule with that approximated by the trapezoidal rule:

Proposition 8.1. Let $g \in C^1$ be the Riemannian metric in \mathbb{R}^D . Suppose that we can express $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$ and that $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H \|x - y\|_2$. For any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N$, let

$$K_3^2 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2.$$

Then,

$$\left| \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) - \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^p) \right| \leq \frac{L_H K_3^3}{4N^{1/2}}.$$

Proof. From the left-hand side of the proposition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) - \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^p) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left| \beta^p(t_n)^\top H(\gamma^p(t_n)) \beta^p(t_n) - \beta^p(t_n)^\top H\left(\frac{\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1})}{2}\right) \beta^p(t_n) \right| \quad \because \text{Equation (7.8)} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} L_H \left\| \gamma^p(t_n) - \frac{\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1})}{2} \right\|_2 \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.4} \\ & = \frac{L_H}{2N^2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^3 \leq \frac{L_H}{2N^2} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 \right)^{3/2} \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.7} \\ & = \frac{L_H}{2} K_3^3 N^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

8.2. Points which attain minimum of energy approximated left-endpoint rule, and its linear interpolation. In this section, we evaluate the error between the energy approximated using the left-endpoint rule for points and the energy of curve by linearly interpolating these points.

Proposition 8.2. Let $g \in C^1$ be the Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^D . Suppose that we can express $g_x(u, u) = u^\top H(x)u$ and that $\|H(x) - H(y)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq L_H \|x - y\|_2$. For any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_p^N$, let

$$K_3^2 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2.$$

Then,

$$\left| \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^{\text{pl}}) - \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) \right| \leq \frac{L_H K_3^3}{2N^{1/2}}.$$

Proof. For $0 \leq s \leq h$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \gamma^{\text{pl}}(t_n + s) - \gamma^p(t_n) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| (1 - Ns)\gamma^p(t_n) + Ns\gamma^p(t_{n+1}) - \gamma^p(t_n) \right\|_2 \\ &= \left\| -Ns\gamma^p(t_n) + Ns\gamma^p(t_{n+1}) \right\|_2 \\ &= Ns \left\| -\gamma^p(t_n) + \gamma^p(t_{n+1}) \right\|_2 \\ &= s \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2. \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

The left-hand side of the proposition is

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^{\text{pl}}) - \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra},N}^g(\gamma^p) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left| \dot{\gamma}^{\text{pl}}(t)^\top H(\gamma^{\text{pl}}(t)) \dot{\gamma}^{\text{pl}}(t) - \beta^p(t_n)^\top H(\gamma^p(t_n)) \beta^p(t_n) \right| dt \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \left| \beta^p(t_n)^\top H(\gamma^{\text{pl}}(t)) \beta^p(t_n) - \beta^p(t_n)^\top H(\gamma^p(t_n)) \beta^p(t_n) \right| dt \quad \because \text{Equation (7.8)} \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} L_H \left\| \gamma^{\text{pl}}(t) - \gamma^p(t_n) \right\|_2 \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 dt \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.4} \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_0^h L_H s \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2 \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 ds \quad \because \text{Equation (8.1)} \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{L_H}{2N^2} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^3 \leq \frac{L_H}{2N^2} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 \right)^{3/2} \quad \because \text{Proposition 7.7} \\ & = \frac{L_H}{2} K_3^3 N^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

8.3. Proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. For any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, Equation (7.15) holds. Substituting $K_{3,g}$ into Proposition 8.1, we get

$$\min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) \leq \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) + \frac{L_H}{2} K_{3,g}^3 N^{-1/2} \\
&= \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) + \frac{L_H}{2} K_{3,g}^3 N^{-1/2}. \tag{8.2}
\end{aligned}$$

We define the set of points:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Xi_{\text{pE},1}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) \\
&:= \left\{ \gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)}) \mid \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p) \leq \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) + \frac{L_H}{2} K_{3,g}^3 N^{-1/2} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for any $\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE},1}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|\beta^p(t_n)\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{\mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma^p)}{c_1} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{c_1} \cdot \left(\min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) + \frac{L_H}{2} K_{3,g}^3 N^{-1/2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{c_1} \cdot \left(\min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{pE}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}_{\text{tra}, N}^g(\gamma^p) + \frac{L_H}{2} K_{3,g}^3 N^{-1/2} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{c_1} \cdot \left(d^g(X^{(0)}, X^{(0)})^2 + C(K_{1,g}, K_{2,g}, N) + \frac{L_H}{2} K_{3,g}^3 N^{-1/2} \right) =: K_{4,g}^2. \tag{8.3}
\end{aligned}$$

From Equation (8.2), since $\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{p}} \in \Xi_{\text{pE},1}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, $\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{p}}$ satisfies Equation (8.3). By Proposition 8.2, we have

$$\mathbf{E}^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{pl}}) \leq \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{p}}) + \frac{L_H K_{4,g}^3}{2N^{1/2}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) \leq \min_{\gamma^p \in \Xi_{\text{p}}^N(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^{\text{pl}}) \leq \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{pl}}) \leq \mathbf{E}_{1,N}^g(\gamma_{1,N}^{*\text{p}}) + \frac{L_H K_{4,g}^3}{2N^{1/2}}. \tag{8.4}$$

From Equations (8.2) and (8.4) and Theorem 1.1, the theorem follows. \square

9. LENGTH MINIMIZATION AND NUMERICAL INTEGRATION

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.2 and 1.4. The length of a curve can be evaluated by its energy.

Proposition 9.1. Let (M, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold. Let $X^{(0)}, X^{(1)} \subset M$ be non-empty closed sets, such that at least one is bounded. We define the curve $\gamma^* \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}$ by

$$\gamma^* \in \arg \min_{\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})} L^g(\gamma).$$

Then, for any curve $\gamma \in \Xi_{\text{ps}}(X^{(0)}, X^{(1)})$, we have

$$L^g(\gamma)^2 - L^g(\gamma^*)^2 \leq \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma) - \mathbf{E}^g(\gamma^*).$$

Proof. In general, from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$L^g(\gamma)^2 \leq E^g(\gamma).$$

From Proposition 6.3, it follows that

$$L^g(\gamma)^2 - L^g(\gamma^*)^2 \leq E^g(\gamma) - E^g(\gamma^*).$$

□

Proof of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4. From Proposition 9.1 and Theorem 1.1, we obtain Theorem 1.2. Furthermore, from Proposition 9.1 and Theorem 1.3, we obtain Theorem 1.4. □

REFERENCES

- [BS07] X. Bai and G. Sapiro, *A geodesic framework for fast interactive image and video segmentation and matting*, 2007 IEEE 11th International Conference on Computer Vision, 2007, pp. 1–8.
- [CK97] L. D Cohen and R. Kimmel, *Global minimum for active contour models: A minimal path approach*, International Journal of Computer Vision **24** (1997), 57–78.
- [CKS97] V. Caselles, R. Kimmel, and G. Sapiro, *Geodesic active contours*, International Journal of Computer Vision **22** (1997), 61–79.
- [DC01] T. Deschamps and L. D Cohen, *Fast extraction of minimal paths in 3d images and applications to virtual endoscopy*, Medical Image Analysis **5** (2001), no. 4, 281–299.
- [Eva10] L. C Evans, *Partial differential equations*, Vol. 19, American Mathematical Society, 2010.
- [FU20] Futurologist and User55937, *Can you numerically compute a trajectory by direct minimization of the action functional?*, 2020. <https://physics.stackexchange.com/questions/540043/>.
- [Gha70] A. Ghaffari, *Integration of the relativistic equations of motion of an artificial earth satellite*, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1970.
- [HHY⁺19] T. He, H. Huang, L. Yi, Y. Zhou, C. Wu, J. Wang, and S. Soatto, *Geonet: Deep geodesic networks for point cloud analysis*, 2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019, pp. 6881–6890.
- [HJS24] J. Hong, D. Jin, and D. Sheng, *Convergence analysis for minimum action methods coupled with a finite difference method*, IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis (2024), drae038.
- [HR31] H. Hopf and W. Rinow, *Ueber den Begriff der vollständigen differentialgeometrischen fläche (German)*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **3** (1931), 209–225.
- [JBMC22] W. Jallet, A. Bambade, N. Mansard, and J. Carpentier, *Constrained differential dynamic programming: A primal-dual augmented lagrangian approach*, 2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2022, pp. 13371–13378.
- [Kon13] H. Konno, *Differential geometry (Japanese)*, The University of Tokyo Press, 2013.
- [KYA05] E. Kasap, M. Yapici, and F T. Akyildiz, *A numerical study for computation of geodesic curves*, Applied Mathematics and Computation **171** (2005), no. 2, 1206–1213.
- [LFXH17] Y.-J. Liu, D. Fan, C.-X. Xu, and Y. He, *Constructing intrinsic delaunay triangulations from the dual of geodesic voronoi diagrams*, ACM Transactions on Graphics **36** (2017), no. 2.
- [LXM23] R. Liu, F. Xiao, and W. Meng, *Efficiently computing shortest paths on curved surfaces with newton’s method*, Engineering Letters **31** (2023), no. 1.
- [MBBV15] J. Masci, D. Boscaini, M. M. Bronstein, and P. Vandergheynst, *Geodesic convolutional neural networks on riemannian manifolds*, 2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Workshop, 2015December.
- [Mil63] J. W. Milnor, *Morse theory*, Princeton university press, 1963.
- [MXZ⁺21] W. Meng, S. Xin, J. Zhao, S. Chen, C. Tu, and Y. He, *A variational framework for computing geodesic paths on sweep surfaces*, Computer-Aided Design **140** (2021), 103077.
- [PK03] N. M Patrikalakis and K. Ko, *Computational geometry*, Lecture Notes, MIT (2003).
- [PMC10] B. L. Price, B. Morse, and S. Cohen, *Geodesic graph cut for interactive image segmentation*, 2010 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2010, pp. 3161–3168.
- [Ros72] H. H. Rosenbrock, *Differential dynamic programming. by D.H. Jacobson and D. Q. Mayne. Pp. viii, 208. 1970. (Elsevier.)*, The Mathematical Gazette **56** (1972), no. 395, 78–78.
- [RPC10] J. Rabin, G. Peyré, and L. D. Cohen, *Geodesic shape retrieval via optimal mass transport*, Computer Vision – ECCV 2010, 2010, pp. 771–784.

- [SG18] M. R. Seif and E. Ghalenoei, *Numerical determination of the geodesic curves: the solution of a two-point boundary value problem*, *Earth Observation and Geomatics Engineering* **2** (2018), no. 1, 26–35.
- [SRD08] J. Sánchez-Reyes and R. Dorado, *Constrained design of polynomial surfaces from geodesic curves*, *Computer-Aided Design* **40** (2008), no. 1, 49–55. *Constrained Design of Curves and Surfaces*.
- [XLH17] Z. Xie, C K. Liu, and K. Hauser, *Differential dynamic programming with nonlinear constraints*, 2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, 2017, pp. 695–702.
- [ZZ07] L. Zhang and C. Zhou, *Robot optimal trajectory planning based on geodesics*, 2007 IEEE International Conference on Control and Automation, 2007, pp. 2433–2436.
- [ZZZ⁺10] L. Zhang, C. Zhou, P. Zhang, Z. Song, Y. P. Kong, and X. Han, *Optimal energy gait planning for humanoid robot using geodesics*, 2010 IEEE Conference on Robotics, Automation and Mechatronics, 2010, pp. 237–242.

NEC CORPORATION, 1753 SHIMONUMABE, NAKAHARA-KU, KAWASAKI, KANAGAWA, JAPAN
Email address: akira-kitaoka@nec.com