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#### Abstract

We disprove two conjectures of H. Steinhaus by showing that: (1) there is a convex surface $S$ such that for any point $x$ on $S$ and any point $y$ in the set $F_{x}$ of farthest points from $x$, there are at most two segments from $x$ to $y$; (2) the properties $\left|F_{x}\right|=1$ and $F_{F_{x}}=x$ do not characterize the sphere.
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## 1. The First Conjecture

In a very interesting book by Croft, Falconer and Guy ([2], p. 44 (iii)) we find the following conjecture of Steinhaus: on each closed convex surface (whose class of differentiability remains unprecise), there exist points $x$ and $y$ in the set $F_{x}$ of farthest points from $x$, with at least three segments (i.e. shortest paths) joining them. We give here an example of a convex surface $S$ disproving Steinhaus's conjecture. First we construct it and then prove that $S$ provides a suitable example.

In the following, we consider closed convex surfaces in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. The coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ will be $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}$. For two points $x, y$ on a surface, the geodesic (intrinsic) distance between them will be denoted by $\delta(x, y)$. $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of the set $A$. Also, we shall not distinguish between a point and the set containing exactly that point.

Let $C_{1}$ be the arc of the circle of centre $o^{\prime}=(0,-\alpha, 0)$ and radius 1 lying in the half-plane $x_{2} \geqslant 0(\alpha \in(0,1))$. Let $C_{2}$ be the arc symmetric to $C_{1}$ with respect to the $x_{1}$-axis (see Figure 1).

Denote $\{a, b\}=C_{1} \cap C_{2}$ and let $d$ be the middle point of $C_{1}$. Take the points $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$ on the $x_{3}$-axis, symmetric with respect to the origin $o$ and consider the boundary $S$ of the convex hull of the set $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\} \cup C_{1} \cup C_{2}$. We choose $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$ far enough such that the length $l\left(C_{1}\right)$ of $C_{1}$ be less than the distance from $d$ to $v_{i}$ and such that $\beta<\pi$, where $\beta$ denotes the total angle of the tangent cone at $v_{i}$ $(i=1,2)$. For any point $u$ on $C_{1}$ we have $l\left(C_{1}\right)<\delta\left(u, v_{1}\right)$, since $\|d\|<\|u\|$.
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Figure 2.

PROPOSITION 1. On the surface $S$ constructed above, from an arbitrary point $x \in S$ to any point $y \in F_{x}$ there are at most two segments.

Proof. The surfaces $S_{+}=\left\{\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in S \mid x_{3} \geqslant 0\right\}$ and $S_{-}=\left\{\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \in\right.$ $\left.S \mid x_{3} \leqslant 0\right\}$ are unfoldable. Let us consider the unfoldings $S^{\prime}$ and $S^{\prime \prime}$ as in Figure 2, where we marked by a 'prime' and a 'double prime' the points or arcs of $S^{\prime}$ and $S^{\prime \prime}$ corresponding to those of $S$. On each unfolding the segments of $S$ became line segments. In the following we shall implicitly refer to these unfoldings.

Let $x$ be a point on $S$. We can assume that $x \in S_{-} \cap\left\{\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right) \mid x_{2} \geqslant 0\right\}$. If $x=a($ or $x=b)$ then $F_{x}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$ and from $x$ to each $v_{i}(i=1,2)$ there is precisely one segment. If $x$ lies on the segment $a v_{2}$ and is different from $a$ then there are two segments from $x$ to $v_{1}$, symmetric with respect to the plane $x_{1} o x_{3}$. Suppose now $x \notin a v_{2}$; let $s \in\left[0, l\left(C_{1}\right)\right]$ be the canonical parameter on the curve $C_{1}$ and $c(s)$ the corresponding point on $C_{1}(c(0)=a)$. Let $u^{1}(s)$ be the angle made in $c(s)$ by $C_{1}$ with the segment $\Gamma_{c(s) v_{1}}\left(\right.$ from $c(s)$ to $\left.v_{1}\right)$ and let $u^{2}(s)$ be the angle made in $c(s)$ by the segment $\Gamma_{c(s) x}$ with $C_{1}$. Since the angles $u^{1}$ and $u^{2}$ are increasing functions of $s$, their sum is also. A path $\Sigma$ from $x$ to $v_{1}$ is a segment if and only if the opposite angles made with $C_{1}$ in the point $c\left(s_{0}\right)$ given by $\left\{c\left(s_{0}\right)\right\}=\Sigma \cap C_{1}$ are equal. Equivalently, $\Sigma$ is a segment from $x$ to $v_{1}$ if and only if $u^{1}\left(s_{0}\right)+u^{2}\left(s_{0}\right)=\pi$. Since $u^{1}(0)+u^{2}(0)<\pi$ and $u^{1}\left(l\left(C_{1}\right)\right)+u^{2}\left(l\left(C_{1}\right)\right)>\pi$ there is an unique value $s_{0} \in\left[0, l\left(C_{1}\right)\right]$ with $u^{1}\left(s_{0}\right)+u^{2}\left(s_{0}\right)=\pi$. Therefore the proof is finished if we show that $F_{x} \subseteq\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$, with equality if and only if $x \in C_{1} \cup C_{2}$ (because of the symmetry with respect to the plane $x_{1} o x_{2}$ ). Equivalently, we have to check that all points of the surface $S_{+}$are at distance at most $\delta\left(x, v_{1}\right)$ from $x$. If $z$ is an arbitrary point on $S_{+}$then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta(x, z) & \leqslant \delta\left(x, c\left(s_{0}\right)\right)+\delta\left(c\left(s_{0}\right), z\right) \\
& \leqslant \delta\left(x, c\left(s_{0}\right)\right)+\max \left\{\delta\left(c\left(s_{0}\right), v_{1}\right), l\left(C_{1}\right)\right\} \\
& \leqslant \delta\left(x, c\left(s_{0}\right)\right)+\delta\left(c\left(s_{0}\right), v_{1}\right)=\delta\left(x, v_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with equality precisely for $z=v_{1}$.
This conjecture of Steinhaus remains open for the smooth case. It remains also open if restricted to those convex surfaces $S$ with $\left|F_{x}\right|=1$ for all $x \in S$.
T. Zamfirescu [5] conjectured that on any convex surface $S$ there are two points $x, y$ such that from $x$ to $y$ there are at least three segments. This conjecture is also open.

## 2. The Second Conjecture

In the same book of Croft, Falconer and Guy ([2], p. 44 (ii)) we find another conjecture of Steinhaus saying that a convex surface $S$ is a sphere if it verifies the properties $(S C):\left|F_{x}\right|=1$ and $F_{F_{x}}=x$ for any point $x$ on $S$. We shall disprove this conjecture by showing that the regular tetrahedron satisfies the above two conditions. Thus two new problems arise naturally:

PROBLEM A. Characterize the family sC of all convex surfaces which verify Steinhaus's conditions (SC).

Problem B. Sharpen (SC) to obtain a characterization of the sphere.


Figure 3.

In the last part of this section we give a partial answer to Problem A by defining a set $\mathcal{R}$ of convex surfaces and proving that $\mathcal{R}$ is a subfamily of $\mathcal{C}$.

By a regular tetrahedron we mean here the boundary of the regular simplex in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.

THEOREM 2. All points $x$ on a regular tetrahedron satisfy $F_{F_{x}}=x$ and $\left|F_{x}\right|=1$.
Proof. Let $x$ be a point on a regular tetrahedron $T=a b c d$. We shall prove separately the above two properties. We shall treat the cases:
(1) $x$ is a vertex;
(2) $x$ is interior to an edge;
(3) $x$ is interior to a face.

If the natural correspondence between elements on the tetrahedron $T$ and their correspondents on unfoldings is one-to-one then we shall make no distinction between them.

Property $\left|F_{x}\right|=1$
(1) Assume that $x=a$ and let us consider for $T$ an equilateral triangle $a_{1} a_{2} a_{3}$ as unfolding, obtained by cutting $T$ along the edges $a b, a c$ and $a d$ and straightening. Let $y$ be the centre of the circumscribed circle of this equilateral triangle. One can easily see that any other point $z \in T$ is closer to $a$ than $y$, hence we have $F_{a}=y$.
(2) Assume that our point $x$ is interior to an edge, say $a b$, and is closer to $a$ than to $b$ or is the middle point of the segment $a b$. Let us cut $T$ along the segments $x c$, $x d$ and $a b$ and consider an unfolding as in Figure 3. We get the isosceles trapezoid $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}$. The centre $y$ of the circumscribed circle of this trapezoid is uniquely determined by $x$ and $F_{x}=y$.
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Figure 5.
(3) Assume that $x$ is interior to the triangle $b c d$ (see Figure 4). We cut $T$ along the segments $x b, x c$ and $x d$ and we straighten the full triangles $x b c, x c d$ and $x d b$ to obtain the respectively coplanar points $a, b, c, x_{1} ; a, c, d, x_{2}$ and $a, d, b, x_{3}$. Let $T^{\prime}$ be the obtained (nonclosed) surface. Let $y$ be a point in $F_{x}$. If $y$ is the vertex $a$ then $x$ must be the centre of the triangle $b c d$ and $y$ is uniquely determined by $x$. If $y$ belongs to an edge (say $a c$ ) or to a face (say $a c d$ ) then there are three segments from $x$ to $y$, namely one from each $x_{i}$ to $y, i=1,2,3$. This follows from a known, more general fact: from any point $x$ on a convex surface $S$ to any point $y \in F_{x}$ where the tangent cone has full angle $2 \pi$ there are at least three segments. Assume that $y$ is interior to the face $a c d$ (the proof for the case $y \in a c$ is similar). If we cut $T^{\prime}$ (see Figure 4) along the edge $a b$ and we straighten such that the faces $a b x_{1} c$, $a c x_{2} d$ and $a d x_{3} b$ come into the same plane then we get a planar picture $T^{\prime \prime}$ as in Figure 5.

Then $c$ is the midpoint of $x_{1} x_{2}, d$ is the midpoint of $x_{2} x_{3}$ and $y$ is the circumcentre of $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}$.

Property $F_{F_{x}}=x$
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This follows at once from the fact that $y$ is the circumcentre of $a_{1} a_{2} a_{3}$ in case 1 , of $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}$ in Case 2, and of $x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}$ in Case 3.

This ends the proof of Theorem 2.
Remark 3. One can prove that $\left|F_{x}\right| \leqslant 2$ for any arbitrary tetrahedron $\mathbf{T}$, for all points $x \in \mathbf{T}$.

Remark 4. The property $F_{F_{x}}=x$ is not true for an arbitrary tetrahedron. One can see it on an 'almost degenerate' tetrahedron $a b c d$ with $c$ and $d$ close to the middle of $a b$ (see Figure 6).

## STEINHAUS' CONDITIONS IN THE PRESENCE OF SYMMETRY

The regular tetrahedrons are far from spheres in the space of all nondegenerate convex surfaces endowed with the Pompeiu-Haussdorf metric $\rho\left(S_{1}, S_{2}\right)=$ max $\left\{\sup _{x \in S_{1}} \inf _{y \in S_{2}}\|x-y\|, \sup _{x \in S_{2}} \inf _{y \in S_{1}}\|x-y\|\right\}$. Moreover, the proof for the regular tetrahedron is quite elementary, but this example does not cover the smooth case. Next we shall study Steinhaus' conditions ( $S C$ ) in the presence of a symmetry centre and discover a whole class $\mathcal{R}$ of convex surfaces which verify $(S C)$, including the ellipsoids of revolution with axes $a=b>c$. Thus $\mathcal{R}$ intersects all neighborhoods of a sphere.

From now on we shall denote by a 'prime' all symmetric objects.
THEOREM 5. Let $S$ be a centrally symmetric convex surface $\left(S=S^{\prime}\right)$ and $x \in S$. The following statements are equivalent:
(i) $F_{y}=x$ for all $y \in F_{x}$;
(ii) $F_{x}=x^{\prime}$.

Moreover, both of them imply $\left|F_{x}\right|=1$.
Proof. That (ii) implies (i) is immediate.
We now show that (ii) implies (i). Suppose there is a point $y \in F_{x}$ such that $y \neq x^{\prime}$. By hypothesis and by symmetry we have $F_{y}=x \neq y^{\prime}, F_{x^{\prime}}=y^{\prime}, F_{y^{\prime}}=x^{\prime}$ and $\delta(x, y)=\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)$. Denote by $\Sigma$ a segment between $x$ and $x^{\prime}$. By symmetry, $\Sigma^{\prime}$ is a segment between $x^{\prime}$ and $x$ and the curve $\Sigma \cup \Sigma^{\prime}$ divides the surface $S$ in two symmetric (topologically open) half-surfaces $S_{1}$ and $S_{1}^{\prime}$. Since $y^{\prime} \neq x$ and $\delta(x, y) \geqslant \delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right), y \notin \Sigma \cup \Sigma^{\prime}$. Suppose that $y \in S_{1}$, hence $y^{\prime} \in S_{1}^{\prime}$ and let $\Lambda$ be a
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segment from $y$ to $y^{\prime}$. We have $(\Lambda \cap \Sigma) \cup\left(\Lambda \cap \Sigma^{\prime}\right) \neq \phi$; suppose for example that $\Lambda \cap \Sigma=\{z\}$ (see Figure 7).

By applying twice the triangle inequality, we get $\delta(x, y) \leqslant \delta(x, z)+\delta(z, y)$ and $\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leqslant \delta\left(x^{\prime}, z\right)+\delta\left(z, y^{\prime}\right)$. Therefore $\delta(x, y)+\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leqslant \delta(x, z)+\delta(z, y)+$ $\delta\left(x^{\prime}, z\right)+\delta\left(z, y^{\prime}\right)=\delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)+\delta\left(y, y^{\prime}\right)$. But $\delta(x, y) \geqslant \delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)$ and $\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)=$ $\delta(y, x) \geqslant \delta\left(y, y^{\prime}\right)$. Hence $\delta(x, y)=\delta(x, z)+\delta(z, y)$. Since geodesics do not admit bifurcations, this implies that a segment from $x$ to $y$ strictly includes $\Sigma$. But now $\Sigma^{\prime}$ provides such a bifurcation, and a contradiction is found.

We propose here the following open problem: on any centrally symmetric convex surface $S$ if $\left|F_{x}\right|=1$ for all $x \in S$ then $F_{x}=x^{\prime}$.

PROPOSITION 6. Let $S$ be a convex surface with a symmetry centre o. If the points $x, y \in S$ determine the intrinsic diameter of $S$ then they are symmetric to each other: $y=x^{\prime}$.

Proof. Similar to that of Theorem 5. Suppose there is a point $y \in F_{x}$ such that $y \neq x^{\prime}$. By hypothesis and by symmetry we have $x \in F_{y}, x \neq y^{\prime}, F_{x^{\prime}}=y^{\prime}$, $x^{\prime} \in F_{y^{\prime}}$ and $\delta(x, y)=\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)$. Denote by $\Sigma$ a segment between $x$ and $x^{\prime}$. By symmetry, $\Sigma^{\prime}$ is a segment between $x^{\prime}$ and $x$ and the curve $\Sigma \cup \Sigma^{\prime}$ divides the surface $S$ in two symmetric (topologically open) half-surfaces $S_{1}$ and $S_{1}^{\prime}$. Since $y^{\prime} \neq x$ and $\delta(x, y) \geqslant \delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right), y \notin \Sigma \cup \Sigma^{\prime}$. Suppose that $y \in S_{1}$, hence $y^{\prime} \in S_{1}^{\prime}$, and let $\Lambda$ be a segment from $y$ to $y^{\prime}$. We have $(\Lambda \cap \Sigma) \cup\left(\Lambda \cap \Sigma^{\prime}\right) \neq \phi$; suppose for example that $\Lambda \cap \Sigma=\{z\}$ (see Figure 7). By applying twice the triangle inequality, we get $\delta(x, y) \leqslant \delta(x, z)+\delta(z, y)$ and $\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leqslant \delta\left(x^{\prime}, z\right)+\delta\left(z, y^{\prime}\right)$. Therefore $\delta(x, y)+\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right) \leqslant \delta(x, z)+\delta(z, y)+\delta\left(x^{\prime}, z\right)+\delta\left(z, y^{\prime}\right)=\delta$ $\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)+\delta\left(y, y^{\prime}\right)$. But $\delta(x, y) \geqslant \delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)$ and $\delta\left(x^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right)=\delta(y, x) \geqslant \delta\left(y, y^{\prime}\right)$. Hence $\delta(x, y)=\delta(x, z)+\delta(z, y)$. Since geodesics do not admit bifurcations, this implies that a segment from $x$ to $y$ strictly includes $\Sigma$. But now $\Sigma^{\prime}$ provides such a bifurcation, and a contradiction is found.

COROLLARY 7. If $S$ is a convex surface of revolution with symmetry centre then the diameter of $S$ is equal to the half-length of a meridian.

Proof. Let $x, y \in S$ such that diam $S=\delta(x, y)$. By Proposition 6 we have $y=F_{x}=x^{\prime}$. Since all meridians are geodesics and between any two symmetrical
points there is a meridian $\mathcal{M}$ we get $\delta\left(x, x^{\prime}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{2} l(\mathcal{M})$. But the only segments between the poles of the surface are the meridians, therefore $\delta(x, y)=\frac{1}{2} l(\mathcal{M})$.

Let $\varphi:[0, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a convex function differentiable at 0 with $-a<\varphi(0)<0=$ $\varphi(a), \varphi^{\prime}(0)=0$ and such that $\psi:[0, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\psi(u)=\sqrt{u^{2}+\varphi(u)^{2}}$ is an increasing function. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the set of all surfaces obtained by rotating the curves $C$ given by $\pm \varphi$, i. e. with

$$
x_{1}=u \cos \beta, \quad x_{2}=u \sin \beta, \quad x_{3}= \pm \varphi(u) \quad(u \in[0, a], \beta \in[0,2 \pi])
$$

Each surface in $\mathcal{R}$ is convex (because $\varphi$ is a convex function), is differentiable at its points with $x_{1}=x_{2}=0$ (because $\varphi^{\prime}(0)=0$ ) and is symmetric with respect to the plane $x_{1} o x_{2}$.

Also notice that $\mathcal{R}$ contains the ellipsoids of revolution with axis $a=b>c$.
LEMMA 8. The length of a curve $\Gamma$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ is at least as long as its metric projection onto a convex body.

Proof. See [1] p. 80.
THEOREM 9. $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{C}$.
Proof. Let $S \in \mathcal{R}$. First, let $u \in S$ be an equatorial point and $\mathcal{M}$ a meridian of $S$ through $u$ and $-u$. Let $S_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the surface obtained by the revolution of $\mathcal{M}$ around the line through $u$ and the origin. Because $\psi$ is an increasing function, the surface $S_{\mathcal{M}}$ lies in the convex hull of $S$ and $S \cap S_{\mathcal{M}}=\mathcal{M}$. By Lemma 8, the only segments of $S$ from $u$ to $-u$ are the half-meridians. By Corollary 7 and Proposition 6, $F_{u}=-u$.

Let $x \in S$ be now an arbitrary (but not equatorial) point. Let $\Gamma$ be segment from $x$ to $-x$ and let $u$ be the intersection point between $\Gamma$ and the equator. By the symmetry of $S$ we get $\delta(-x, u)=\delta(x,-u)$. Therefore the length of $\Gamma$ is larger than or equal to the length of a half-meridian: $l(\Gamma)=\delta(u, x)+\delta(x,-u) \geqslant$ $\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{M})$. Hence $\delta(x,-x)=\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{M})$ and we obtain $F_{x}=-x$ for all $x \in S$. Applying Theorem 5 we get $S \in s \mathcal{C}$.

Remark 10. As shown in the above proof, for all surfaces $S \in \mathscr{R}$ the only geodesic segments from an arbitrary point $x \in S$ to $x^{\prime}$ are half-meridians.
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