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## 1 Introduction

The paper is devoted to the proof of the following
Theorem 1.1 Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold homeomorphic to the Euclidean space. Let the sectional curvature of $M$ satisfy $0 \leq K \leq 1$ at any point and any twodimensional direction. Then every geodesic in $M$ of length $\leq \pi$ is minimal.

This statement was proved by Toponogov in the case $0<K \leq 1$ [5]. In the same paper, Toponogov proves that, if $0 \leq K \leq 1$ (not assuming the manifold to be homeomorphic to $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ ), then the injectivity radius of $M$ is positive, i.e., there exists $\delta>0$ such that every geodesic of length $\leq \delta$ is minimal. Actually we will prove a more general statement, see Theorem 3.1 below, which generalizes both Toponogov's results.

Theorem 1.1 was proved by Veiner [6] in the case when $M$ is a hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. Veiner's proof is based on the Buzemann - Feller theorem. The latter theorem says that, given a convex set $C \subset \mathbf{R}^{n}$, the metric projection $\varphi: \mathbf{R}^{n} \rightarrow C$ sending a point $p$ to the nearest point of $C$ does not increase lengths of curves. For a convex set $C$ in a Riemannian manifold, the metric projection $\varphi: U \rightarrow C$ is still defined in some neighborhood of $C$, but can increase distances as simple examples show. Nevertheless, if $C$ is the level surface of some convex function defined in $U$, the metric projection can be slightly corrected in such a way that the corrected map satisfies the Buzemann - Feller theorem. This construction is presented in Section 2. Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 3.

Pogorelov and Klingenberg are mentioned in the title of the paper because the corresponding theorem for compact manifolds is proved by Pogorelov in the two-dimensional case and by Klingenberg, in any dimension.

## 2 Integral curves of the gradient of a convex function

Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold. A set $C \subset M$ is said to be convex (totally convex) if, for any two points $p, q \in C$, every minimal geodesic (every geodesic) between $p$ and $q$ lies completely in $C$. The set $C$ is locally convex if every $p \in C$ has a neighborhood $U$ such
that $U \cap C$ is convex. Let us remind [1] that a closed connected locally convex set $C \subset M$ is a topological manifold with boundary $\partial C$.

Let $C \subset M$ be a connected locally convex set. For $p, q \in C$, by $\rho_{C}(p, q)$ we denote the infimum of lengths of curves joining $p$ and $q$ in $C$. Then $\rho_{C}(p, q) \geq \rho_{M}(p, q)$ (where $\rho_{M}$ is the metric of $M$ ) and $\rho_{C}(p, q)=\rho_{M}(p, q)$ for sufficiently close $p$ and $q$. In particular, $\rho_{C}$ and $\rho_{M}$ define the same topology on $C$.

Lemma 2.1 Let $C \subset M$ be a connected closed locally convex set. For any $p, q \in C$, there exists a geodesic of the length $\rho_{C}(p, q)$ joining $p$ and $q$ in $C$.

The proof is obvious.
A function $f: C \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is said to be convex if, for any geodesic $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow C$, the function $f \circ \gamma$ is convex, i.e., $f\left(\gamma\left(\alpha_{1} t_{1}+\alpha_{2} t_{2}\right)\right) \geq \alpha_{1} f\left(\gamma\left(t_{1}\right)\right)+\alpha_{2} f\left(\gamma\left(t_{2}\right)\right)$ for $t_{1}, t_{2} \in$ $[0,1], \alpha_{1}, \alpha_{2} \geq 0, \alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}=1$.

Let now $C \subset M$ be a compact connected locally convex set with nonemty boundary and $f: C \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function satisfying the following hypotheses:
(i) $f$ is a convex function;
(ii) $\left.f\right|_{\partial C}=0$;
(iii) $f$ is Lipschitz-continuous, i.e., there exists a constant $K$ such that

$$
|f(p)-f(q)| \leq K \rho_{C}(p, q)
$$

for any $p, q \in C$;
(iv) $m=\max \{f(p) \mid p \in C\}>0$.

The set $C$ and function $f$ are fixed in this Section. Let us agree to write $\rho(p, q)$ instead of $\rho_{C}(p, q)$. The latter will be sometimes abbreviated to $p q$. The minimal geodesic as in Lemma 2.1 will be sometimes also denoted by $p q$.

Given $p \in C$, denote $C_{p}=\left\{x \in M_{p} \mid \exp _{p} t x \in C\right.$ for sufficiently small $\left.t>0\right\}$. The closure $\bar{C}_{p}$ is a convex cone in $M_{p}$. By $\partial C_{p}$ we denote the boundary of $C_{p}$ with respect to its linear span in $M_{p}$. If $p \in C \backslash \partial C$, then $\partial C_{p}=\emptyset$. Set $\stackrel{\circ}{C}_{p}=C_{p} \backslash \partial C_{p}$. Obviously, $\stackrel{\circ}{C}_{p}=\left\{x \in M_{p} \mid \exp _{p} t x \in C \backslash \partial C\right.$ for sufficiently small $\left.t>0\right\}$. Set also $T C=\cup_{p \in C} C_{p}, \stackrel{\circ}{T} C=\cup_{p \in C} \stackrel{\circ}{C}_{p} . T C$ is the subset of $T M$, and we endow $T C$ with the induced topology. Then $\stackrel{\circ}{T} C$ is the open subset of $T C$.

Let $p \in C, x \in C_{p}$. Set $f_{x}(t)=f\left(\exp _{p} t x\right)$. The function $f_{x}$ is defined, convex, and Lipschitz-continuous on some interval $[0, \varepsilon)$ and hence has a finite right-hand derivative at any point of the interval. Let $f^{\prime}(p, x)$ denote the value of the right-hand derivative of $f_{x}$ at $t=0$. Extend the function $f^{\prime}(p, \cdot)$ to the closure $\bar{C}_{p}$ of $C_{p}$ by setting $f^{\prime}(p, x)=0$ for $x \in \bar{C}_{p} \backslash C_{p}$. The following lemma contains all properties of $f^{\prime}(p, x)$ we need.

Lemma 2.2 For any $p \in C$, the function $f^{\prime}(p, \cdot): \bar{C}_{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is Lipschitz-continuous, convex, and positively homogeneous, i.e., $f^{\prime}(p, t x)=t f^{\prime}(p, x)$ for $t \geq 0 ; f^{\prime}(p, x)=0$ if $x \in \partial C_{p}$. If $f(p)<m$, then the function $f^{\prime}(p, \cdot)$ reaches the positive maximal value on the set $C_{p} \cap S_{p}$ ( $S_{p}$ is the unit sphere in $M_{p}$ ) in a unique point of the set. The function $f^{\prime}: \stackrel{\circ}{T} C \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is lower semicontinuous.

All these statements are well known in the case $M=\mathbf{R}^{n}$, see [3]. In the general case, the proofs differ in minor details that are omitted. By the Lemma, given $p \in C$ such that
$f(p)<m$, there exists a unique vector $x \in C_{p} \cap S_{p}$ such that $0<f^{\prime}(p, x)=\max \left\{f^{\prime}\left(p, x^{\prime}\right) \mid\right.$ $\left.x^{\prime} \in C_{p} \cap S_{p}\right\}$. The vector $f^{\prime}(p, x) x \in M_{p}$ will be called the (generalized) gradient of the function $f$ at the point $p$ and will be denoted by $\nabla f(p)$.

Lemma 2.3 For every $x \in C_{p}$, the inequality holds

$$
f^{\prime}(p, x) \leq\langle x, \nabla f(p)\rangle .
$$

Proof. $\nabla f(p)+\lambda x \in C_{p}$ for any $\lambda>0$. By the definition of $\nabla f(p)$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
f^{\prime}(p, \nabla f(p)+\lambda x)=|\nabla f(p)+\lambda x| \cdot f^{\prime}(p,(\nabla f(p)+\lambda x) /|\nabla f(p)+\lambda x|) \leq \\
\leq|\nabla f(p)| \cdot|\nabla f(p)+\lambda x| .
\end{gathered}
$$

On the other hand, by the convexity of $f^{\prime}(p, \cdot)$,

$$
f^{\prime}(p, \nabla f(p)+\lambda x) \geq f^{\prime}(p, \nabla f(p))+\lambda f^{\prime}(p, x)=|\nabla f(p)|^{2}+\lambda f^{\prime}(p, x) .
$$

Comparing two last inequalities, we obtain

$$
|\nabla f(p)|^{2}+\lambda f^{\prime}(p, x) \leq|\nabla f(p)| \cdot|\nabla f(p)+\lambda x|=|\nabla f(p)|^{2}+\lambda\langle x, \nabla f(p)\rangle+o(\lambda) .
$$

This implies the desired inequality. The lemma is proved.
Corollary 2.4 Let $p, q \in C$ be such that $f(p)<m$ and $f(p) \leq f(q)$. Then the angle at the point $p$ between the vector $\nabla f(p)$ and the minimal geodesic pq is not greater than $\pi / 2$.

Proof. Let $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow C$ be the geodesic parameterization of the curve $p q$. Then $f \circ \gamma$ is the convex function on $[0,1]$ and $f(\gamma(0)) \leq f(\gamma(1))$. Therefore $f^{\prime}(p, \dot{\gamma}(0) \geq 0$.

Let $\varphi:[a, b] \rightarrow M$ be a continuous curve, $t \in[a, b)$, and $x \in M_{\varphi(t)}$. We say that $x$ is the right-hand tangent vector to the curve $\varphi$ at the point $t$ and write this fact as $x=\dot{\varphi}_{+}(t)$ if, for any $g \in C^{\infty}(M)$, the function $g \circ \varphi$ has the right-hand derivative at $t$ which is equal to $x g$.

Lemma 2.5 Let $\varphi:[a, b] \rightarrow M$ be a continuous curve and $t \in[a, b)$. For $\tau>0$, let $c_{\tau}:[0,1] \rightarrow M$ be the geodesic parameterization of the minimal geodesic $\varphi(t) \varphi(t+\tau)$. Set $x(\tau)=\dot{c}_{\tau}(0)$. A vector $x \in M_{\varphi(t)}$ is the right-hand tangent to $\varphi$ at $t$ if and only if

$$
\lim _{\tau \downarrow 0} x(\tau) / \tau=x .
$$

The proof is obvious.
Let a point $p \in C$ and number $T$ be such that $f(p)=t_{0}<T \leq m$. A continuous curve $\varphi_{p}:\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C$ will be called the integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from the point $p$ if it satisfies the following three conditions:
(1) $\varphi_{p}\left(t_{0}\right)=p$;
(2) $\varphi_{p}$ is locally Lipschitz-continuous on $\left[t_{0}, T\right)$, i.e., for any $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$ there exist such $K$ and $\varepsilon>0$ that

$$
\rho\left(\varphi_{p}\left(t^{\prime}\right), \varphi_{p}\left(t^{\prime \prime}\right)\right) \leq K\left|t^{\prime}-t^{\prime \prime}\right| \quad \text { if } \quad\left|t^{\prime}-t\right|<\varepsilon,\left|t^{\prime \prime}-t\right|<\varepsilon ;
$$

(3) $f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)<m$ and $\dot{\varphi}_{p+}(t)=\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right|^{2}$ for every $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$.

If additionally $T=m$, then $\varphi_{p}$ is called the maximal integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p$.

Theorem 2.6 For every point $p \in C$ satisfying $f(p)<m$, there exists a unique maximal integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p$.

The proof of the theorem is presented below as a sequence of lemmas.
Lemma 2.7 Let $p \in C, f(p)=t_{0}<T \leq m$, and $\varphi_{p}:\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C$ be an integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p$. Then $f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)=t$ for all $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right]$.

Proof. The function $g(t)=f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)$ is locally Lipschitz-continuous on $\left[t_{0}, T\right)$ as the composition of two Lipschitz-continuous functions. Therefore $g$ is differentiable almost at all $t$ and

$$
g\left(t_{2}\right)-g\left(t_{1}\right)=\int_{t_{1}}^{t_{2}} g^{\prime}(t) d t \quad \text { for } \quad t_{1}, t_{2} \in\left[t_{0}, T\right] .
$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that $g^{\prime}(t)=1$ under the assumption of the existence of $g^{\prime}(t)$. If the derivative $g^{\prime}(t)$ exists for some $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$, it coincides with the right-hand derivative $g_{+}^{\prime}(t)$. We will prove that the right-hand derivative exists and is equal to 1 for any $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$.

Fix $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$ and set $x=\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right|^{2}$. By Lemma 2.5,

$$
\rho\left(\varphi_{p}(t+\tau), \exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} \tau x\right)=o(\tau) \quad \text { for } \quad \tau>0
$$

Using the Lipschitz-continuity of $f$, this implies

$$
g(t+\tau)=f\left(\varphi_{p}(t+\tau)\right)=f\left(\exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} \tau x\right)+o(\tau) .
$$

Therefore $g_{+}^{\prime}(t)$ exists and is equal to 1 . The lemma is proved.
Lemma 2.8 Let points $p_{0}, p_{1} \in C$ and number $T$ be such that $f\left(p_{0}\right)=f\left(p_{1}\right)=t_{0}<T \leq$ $m$. Let $\varphi_{p_{i}}:\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C(i=0,1)$ be integral curves of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p_{0}$ and $p_{1}$ respectively. Then $g(t)=\rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}(t), \varphi_{p_{1}}(t)\right)$ is the nonincreasing function on $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$.

Proof. By the same arguments as in the previous lemma, it suffices to prove that the right-hand derivative $g_{+}^{\prime}(t)$ is nonpositive if it exists. By Lemma 2.1, there exists a geodesic $c:[0,1] \rightarrow C$ of the length $g(t)$ such that $c(i)=\varphi_{p_{i}}(t)(i=0,1)$. Let $\alpha_{i}(i=0,1)$ be the angle at the point $p_{i}$ between the geodesic $c$ and vector $x_{i}=\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p_{i}}(t)\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p_{i}}(t)\right)\right|^{2}$. By Lemma 2.6 and Corollary 2.4,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{i} \leq \pi / 2 \quad(i=0,1) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $x(s) \in C_{c(s)}(0 \leq s \leq 1)$ be a smooth vector field along $c$ satisfying $x(i)=x_{i}(i=$ $0,1)$. For $\tau \geq 0$, let $l(\tau)$ be the length of the curve $c_{\tau}:[0,1] \rightarrow C, c_{\tau}(s)=\exp _{c(s)} \tau x(s)$. The function $l(\tau)$ is smooth, $l(0)=g(t)$, and by the formula for the first variation of length, $l^{\prime}(0)=-\left(\left|x_{0}\right| \cos \alpha_{0}+\left|x_{1}\right| \cos \alpha_{1}\right)$. This implies with the help of (2.1)

$$
\begin{equation*}
l(\tau) \leq g(t)+o(\tau) . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Lemma 2.5,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(\varphi_{p_{i}}(t+\tau), c_{\tau}(i)\right)=o(\tau) \quad(i=0,1) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (2.2) and (2.3)

$$
\begin{gathered}
g(t+\tau)-g(t)=\rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}(t+\tau), \varphi_{p_{1}}(t+\tau)\right)-g(t) \leq \\
\leq \rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}(t+\tau), c_{\tau}(0)\right)+\rho\left(c_{\tau}(0), c_{\tau}(1)\right)+\rho\left(c_{\tau}(1), \varphi_{p_{1}}(t+\tau)\right)-g(t) \leq \\
\leq l(\tau)-g(t)+o(\tau) \leq o(\tau),
\end{gathered}
$$

i.e., $g(t+\tau)-g(t) \leq o(\tau)$. Hence $g_{+}^{\prime}(t) \leq 0$. The lemma is proved.

Applying this lemma for $p_{0}=p_{1}$, we obtain
Corollary 2.9 There exists at most one maximal integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from any point $p \in C$ such that $f(p)<m$.

The following statement is proved along the same line as Lemma 2.8.
Lemma 2.10 Let points $p_{0}, p_{1} \in C$ be such that $f\left(p_{0}\right)=t_{0}<m, t_{0} \leq f\left(p_{1}\right)=t_{1}$. Let $\varphi_{p_{0}}:\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right] \rightarrow C$ be the integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p_{0}$. Then the function $g(t)=\rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}(t), p_{1}\right)$ does not increase on $\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]$.

Let $p \in C$ and $t>0$ be such that $f(p)+t \leq m$. By $p^{t}$ we denote the nearest to $p$ point of the set $\{q \in C \mid f(q) \geq f(p)+t\}$. If there are several such points, let $p^{t}$ denote one of them.

Lemma 2.11 Let $p_{0} \in C, f\left(p_{0}\right)<m$. For any $\varepsilon>0$, there exist a neighborhood $U$ of $p_{0}$ and $t_{0}>0$ such that the inequality $t / p p^{t} \geq\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon$ holds for any $p \in U \cap C$ and $0<t<t_{0}$.

Proof. The vector $x_{0}=\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|$ belongs to $\stackrel{\circ}{C}_{p_{0}},\left|x_{0}\right|=1$, and $f^{\prime}\left(p_{0}, x_{0}\right)=$ $\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|$. Choose $\varepsilon^{\prime}>0$ such that $\left(\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) /\left(1+\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)>\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon$.

Since $f^{\prime}$ is lower semicontinuous on $\stackrel{\circ}{T} C$, we can find an open neighborhood $W$ of the point $\left(p_{0}, x_{0}\right)$ in $\stackrel{\circ}{T} C$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f^{\prime}(p, x) \geq\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $(p, x) \in W$. Let us now choose a compact neighborhood $U$ of the point $p_{0}$ in $C$ and a continuous section $x(p)$ of the bundle $\stackrel{\circ}{T} C$ over $U$ whose value at $p_{0}$ coincides with $x_{0}$. By decreasing $U$, we can assume that $x(p) \in W$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
|x(p)|<1+\varepsilon^{\prime} \quad(p \in U) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $p \in W$, we set

$$
h(p)=\sup \left\{s \mid d\left(\exp _{p} s^{\prime} x(p)\right) / d s^{\prime}\left(s^{\prime}\right) \in W \text { for } 0 \leq s^{\prime} \leq s\right\}
$$

The function $h$ is positive and lower semicontinuous on the compact set $U$ as one can easily show. Therefore

$$
t_{0}^{\prime}=\inf \{h(p) \mid p \in U\}>0
$$

Let now $p \in U$ and $0<t^{\prime}<t_{0}^{\prime}$. The function $g(s)=f\left(\exp _{p} s x(p)\right)$ is convex on $\left[0, t^{\prime}\right]$ and, by (2.4),

$$
g_{+}^{\prime}(s)=f^{\prime}\left(\exp _{p} s x(p), d\left(\exp _{p} s x(p)\right) / d s(s)\right) \geq\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime} .
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(\exp _{p} t^{\prime} x(p)\right)-f(p)=\int_{0}^{t^{\prime}} g_{+}^{\prime}(s) d s \geq t^{\prime}\left(\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, (2.5) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(p, \exp _{p} t^{\prime} x(p)\right)=t^{\prime}|x(p)| \leq t^{\prime}\left(1+\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Comparing (2.6) and (2.7), we see that

$$
p p^{t^{\prime}\left(\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)} \leq t^{\prime}\left(1+\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) .
$$

The last inequality holds for any $t^{\prime}$ satisfying $0<t^{\prime}<t_{0}^{\prime}$. Setting $t^{\prime}\left(\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)=t$, we obtain

$$
t / p p^{t} \geq\left(\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) /\left(1+\varepsilon^{\prime}\right) \geq\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon .
$$

The latter inequality holds for any $t$ satisfying $0<t<t_{0}^{\prime} /\left(\left|\nabla f\left(p_{0}\right)\right|-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)=t_{0}$. The lemma is proved.

Let a point $p \in C$ and number $T$ be such that $f(p)=t_{0}<T<m$. For a partition $\alpha=\left\{t_{0}<t_{1}<\ldots<t_{n}=T\right\}$ of the segment $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$, let $L(p, \alpha)$ denote the broken geodesic $p_{0} p_{1} \ldots p_{n}$, where $p_{0}=p, p_{i}=p_{i-1}^{t_{i}-t_{i-1}}(i=1, \ldots, n)$. Introduce the parameterization $L(p, \alpha):\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C$ of the broken geodesic by setting $L(p, \alpha)(t)=c_{i}(t)$ for $t \in\left[t_{i-1}, t_{i}\right](i=1, \ldots, n)$, where $c_{i}:\left[t_{i-1}, t_{i}\right]: \rightarrow C$ is the geodesic parameterization of the minimal geodesic $p_{i-1} p_{i}$.

The rank of a partition $\alpha=\left\{t_{0}<t_{1}<\ldots<t_{n}=T\right\}$ is the maximum of $t_{i}-t_{i-1}(i=$ $1, \ldots, n)$.

Lemma 2.12 Let $p \in C$ and $T$ be such that $f(p)=t_{0}<T<m$. The family $L(p, \alpha)$ of parameterized curves, where $\alpha$ runs over all partitions of the segment $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$, is Lipschitz equicontinuous, i.e., there exists $K$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(L(p, \alpha)(t), L(p, \alpha)\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right) \leq K\left|t-t^{\prime}\right| \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $\alpha$ and $t, t^{\prime} \in\left[t_{0}, T\right]$.
Proof. Set $K=d /(m-T)$, where $d$ is the diameter of $C$. Let $\alpha=\left\{t_{0}<t_{1}<\ldots<\right.$ $\left.t_{n}=T\right\}$ be a partition of $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$ and $p_{i}=L(p, \alpha)\left(t_{i}\right)(i=0, \ldots, n)$. Since $L(p, \alpha)$ coincides with the geodesic parameterization of the minimal geodesic $p_{i-1} p_{i}$ on $\left[t_{i-1}, t_{i}\right]$, it suffices to prove the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{i-1} p_{i} \leq K\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) \quad(i=1, \ldots, n) \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Fix some $i=1, \ldots, n$. Choose a point $q$ satisfying $f(q)=m$. Let $c:[0,1] \rightarrow C$ be the geodesic parameterization of a minimal geodesic $p_{i-1} q$. Set $q^{\prime}=c\left(\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) /\left(m-t_{i-1}\right)\right)$. Since $f$ is convex along $c$,

$$
f\left(q^{\prime}\right) \geq f(c(0))\left(m-t_{i}\right) /\left(m-t_{i-1}\right)+f(c(1))\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) /\left(m-t_{i-1}\right) .
$$

Taking the equalities $f(c(0))=f\left(p_{i-1}\right)=t_{i-1}$ and $f(c(1))=m$ into account, we obtain $f\left(q^{\prime}\right) \geq t_{i}$. Since $p_{i}$ is the closest point to $p_{i-1}$ among all points $q^{\prime}$ satisfying the last inequality, we deduce $p_{i-1} p_{i} \leq p_{i-1} q^{\prime}$. On the other hand,

$$
p_{i-1} q^{\prime}=p_{i-1} q \cdot\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) /\left(m-t_{i-1}\right) \leq d\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) /(m-T)=K\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) .
$$

Comparing two last inequalities, we obtain (2.9). The lemma is proved.
Remark. Lemma 2.12 is the only point in our arguments where the compactness of $C$ is used. I do not know whether Theorem 2.6 is true for a noncompact $C$. It is true in the case $M=\mathbf{R}^{n}$.

Lemma 2.13 Let $p_{0} \in C$ and $T$ be such that $f\left(p_{0}\right)=t_{0}<T<m$. Let $\alpha_{k}$ be a sequence of partitions of the segment $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$ such that rank $\alpha_{k} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Assume the sequence $L\left(p_{0}, \alpha_{k}\right)$ to converge uniformly to some parameterized curve $\varphi:\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C$. Then
(1) $\varphi\left(t_{0}\right)=p_{0}$;
(2) $\varphi$ is Lipschitz-continuous;
(3) $f(\varphi(t))=t$ for $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right]$;
(4) for any $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$,

$$
\varlimsup_{\tau \downarrow 0} \rho(\varphi(t+\tau), \varphi(t)) / \tau \leq 1 /|\nabla f(\varphi(t))| .
$$

Proof. The first statement is obvious, the second statement follows from Lemma 2.12. The third statement follows from the equalities $f\left(L\left(p_{0}, \alpha\right)\left(t_{i}\right)\right)=t_{i}(i=0, \ldots, n)$ which hold for any partition $\alpha=\left\{t_{0}<t_{1}<\ldots<t_{n}=T\right\}$.

Let us prove the last statement. Let $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$ and $\varepsilon>0$. By Lemma 2.11, there exist a neighborhood $U$ of the point $\varphi(t)$ and $\tau_{0}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau / p p^{\tau} \geq|\nabla f(\varphi(t))|-\varepsilon \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $p \in U \cap C$ and $0<\tau<\tau_{0}$. By decreasing $\tau_{0}$, we can assume that

$$
\varphi\left(\left[t, t+\tau_{0}\right]\right) \subset U
$$

Since $L\left(p_{0}, \alpha_{k}\right)$ converges uniformly to $\varphi$, we can find such $N$ that rank $\alpha_{k}<\tau_{0}$ and $L\left(p_{0}, \alpha_{k}\right)\left(\left[t, t+\tau_{0}\right]\right) \subset U$ for $k>N$.

Let $0<\tau<\tau_{0}$. Fix $k>N$ and consider the partition $\alpha_{k}=\left\{t_{0}<t_{1}<\ldots<t_{n}=T\right\}$. Set

$$
r=r(k)=\min \left\{i \mid t \leq t_{i}\right\} ; \quad s=s(k)=\max \left\{i \mid t_{i} \leq t+\tau\right\}
$$

Let $r<i \leq s, p_{i}=L\left(p_{0}, \alpha_{k}\right)\left(t_{i}\right), p_{i-1}=L\left(p_{0}, \alpha_{k}\right)\left(t_{i-1}\right)$. Since $p_{i}=p_{i-1}^{t_{1}-t_{i-1}},(2.10)$ implies that

$$
p_{i-1} p_{i} \leq\left(t_{i}-t_{i-1}\right) /(\mid \nabla f(\varphi(t))-\varepsilon) \quad(i=r+1, \ldots, s) .
$$

Taking the sum of these inequalities, we obtain

$$
\rho\left(L\left(p, \alpha_{k}\right)\left(t_{r(k)}\right), L\left(p, \alpha_{k}\right)\left(t_{s(k)}\right)\right) \leq\left(t_{s(k)}-t_{r(k)}\right) /(\mid \nabla f(\varphi(t))-\varepsilon) .
$$

Passing to the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we arrive to the inequality

$$
\rho(\varphi(t), \varphi(t+\tau)) \leq \tau /(\mid \nabla f(\varphi(t))-\varepsilon)
$$

which proves the desired statement because $\varepsilon$ is arbitrary. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.14 Let a point $p \in C$ be such that $f(p)=t_{0}<m$. Given any $T$ satisfying $t_{0}<T<m$, there exists an integral curve $\varphi_{p}:\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C$ of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p$.

Proof. Lemma 2.12 implies that the family $\{L(p, \alpha)\}$, where $\alpha$ runs over all partitions of the segment $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$, is equicontinuous and uniformly bounded. Therefore any sequence of the family contains a uniformly converging subsequence. Let $\alpha_{k}$ be such a sequence that $L\left(p, \alpha_{k}\right)$ converges uniformly to a curve $\varphi_{p}:\left[t_{0}, T\right] \rightarrow C$ and $\operatorname{rank} \alpha_{k} \rightarrow 0$.

By Lemma 2.13, the curve $\varphi_{p}$ satisfies two first conditions of the definition of an integral curve. Let us check the third condition. To this end, by Lemma 2.5, it suffices to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\tau \downarrow 0} x(\tau) / \tau=\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right|^{2} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $t \in\left[t_{0}, T\right)$, where $x(\tau)=\dot{c}_{\tau}(0)$ and $c_{\tau}:[0,1] \rightarrow C$ is the geodesic parameterization of the minimal geodesic $\varphi_{p}(t) \varphi_{p}(t+\tau)$.

By Lemma 2.13,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varlimsup_{\tau \downarrow 0}|x(\tau)| / \tau=\varlimsup_{\tau \downarrow 0} \rho\left(\varphi_{p}(t), \varphi_{p}(t+\tau)\right) / \tau \leq 1 /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right| . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, the function $x(\tau) / \tau$ is bounded. Let $x_{0}$ be a partial limit of the function as $\tau \downarrow 0$, and $\tau_{n}>0$ be a sequence converging to zero such that $x\left(\tau_{n}\right) / \tau_{n}$ converges to $x_{0}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|x_{0}\right| \leq 1 /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right| . \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The condition $x\left(\tau_{n}\right) / \tau_{n} \rightarrow x_{0}$ can be rewritten as:

$$
x\left(\tau_{n}\right)=\tau_{n} x_{0}+o\left(\tau_{n}\right)
$$

This implies that

$$
\rho\left(\varphi_{p}\left(t+\tau_{n}\right), \exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} \tau_{n} x_{0}\right)=\rho\left(\exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} x\left(\tau_{n}\right), \exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} \tau_{n} x_{0}\right)=o\left(\tau_{n}\right)
$$

On using the Lipschitz continuity of $f$, we obtain

$$
f\left(\varphi_{p}\left(t+\tau_{n}\right)\right)-f\left(\exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} \tau_{n} x_{0}\right)=o\left(\tau_{n}\right)
$$

Since $f\left(\varphi_{p}\left(t+\tau_{n}\right)\right)=t+\tau_{n}=f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)+\tau_{n}$ by Lemma 2.13, the previous formula can be rewritten as

$$
f\left(\exp _{\varphi_{p}(t)} \tau_{n} x_{0}\right)-f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)=\tau_{n}+o\left(\tau_{n}\right)
$$

Dividing this equality by $\tau_{n}$ and passing to the limit as $\tau_{n} \downarrow 0$, we obtain $f^{\prime}\left(\varphi_{p}(t), x_{0}\right)=1$. This implies with the help of (2.13) and the homogeneity of $f^{\prime}\left(\varphi_{p}(t), \cdot\right)$ that

$$
f^{\prime}\left(\varphi_{p}(t), x_{0} /\left|x_{0}\right|\right)=1 /\left|x_{0}\right| \geq\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right| .
$$

By Lemma 2.2, this implies that

$$
1 /\left|x_{0}\right|=\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right| \quad \text { and } \quad x_{0} /\left|x_{0}\right|=\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right| \text {, }
$$

i.e., that $x_{0}=\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right) /\left|\nabla f\left(\varphi_{p}(t)\right)\right|^{2}$. We have thus proved that every partial limit of the left-hand side of (2.11) coincides with the right-hand side. This proves (2.11) and the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Let $p \in C, f(p)=t_{0}<m$. The uniqueness of the maximal integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p$ is stated in Corollary 2.9. Let us prove the existence.

Let $t_{0}<t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots$ be a sequence converging to $m$. Using Lemma 2.14, we construct by induction on $n$ a curve $\varphi^{n}:\left[t_{n-1}, t_{n}\right] \rightarrow C$ for every $n=1,2, \ldots$ such that $\varphi^{1}$ is the integral curve of $\nabla f$ starting from $p$ and $\varphi^{n}$ is the integral curve starting from $\varphi^{n-1}\left(t_{n-1}\right)(n=2,3, \ldots)$. Define the curve $\varphi_{p}:\left[t_{0}, m\right) \rightarrow C$ by setting $\varphi_{p}(t)=\varphi^{n}(t)$ for $t \in\left[t_{n-1}, t_{n}\right]$. The restriction of $\varphi_{p}$ to any segment $\left[t_{0}, T\right]$ with $t_{0}<T<m$ is the integral curve of $\nabla f$. To finish the proof, we have to show that $\varphi_{p}(t)$ converges to some point as $t \rightarrow m$.

Let $q^{\prime} \in C$ be such that $f\left(q^{\prime}\right)=m$. By Lemma 2.10, $\rho\left(\varphi_{p}(t), q^{\prime}\right)$ is a nonincreasing function. Hence, the curve $\varphi_{p}$ is bounded and $\varphi_{p}(t)$ has at least one limit point $q$ as $t \rightarrow m$. By the same Lemma 2.10, $\rho\left(\varphi_{p}(t), q\right)$ is a nonincreasing function. Hence $\varphi_{p}(t) \rightarrow q$ as $t \rightarrow m$, and we can extend $\varphi_{p}$ to $\left[t_{0}, m\right]$ by setting $\varphi_{p}(m)=q$. The theorem is proved.

Now, we present the following analogue of the Buzemann - Feller theorem.
Theorem 2.15 Let $C_{t}=\{p \in C \mid f(p) \geq t\}$ for $0 \leq t \leq m$. Define the map $R_{t}: C \rightarrow C_{t}$ as follows: $R_{t}(p)=p$ if $f(p) \geq t$ and $R_{t}(p)=\varphi_{p}(t)$ if $f(p)=t_{0}<t$, where $\varphi_{p}:\left[t_{0}, m\right] \rightarrow$ $C$ is the maximal integral curve of the field $\nabla f$ starting from $p$. Then
(1) the map $R_{t}$ does not increase lengths of curves, i.e.,

$$
L(\gamma) \geq L\left(R_{t} \circ \gamma\right)
$$

for any curve $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow C$;
(2) the map $R: C \times[0, m] \rightarrow C, R(p, t)=R_{t}(p)$ is continuous. Thus, $R_{t}: C \rightarrow C_{t}$ is a deformation retraction.

Proof. The first statement is equivalent to the following one: $R_{t}$ does not increase distances, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho\left(R_{t}\left(p_{0}\right), R_{t}\left(p_{1}\right)\right) \leq \rho\left(p_{0}, p_{1}\right) \quad\left(p_{0}, p_{1} \in C\right) \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

For definiteness, let $f\left(p_{0}\right)=t_{0} \leq t_{1}=f\left(p_{1}\right)$. Consider three possible cases.
(a) $t \leq t_{0}$. (2.14) holds since $R_{t}\left(p_{0}\right)=p_{0}$ and $R_{t}\left(p_{1}\right)=p_{1}$.
(b) $t_{0} \leq t \leq t_{1}$. In this case $R_{t}\left(p_{1}\right)=p_{1}$ and, by Lemma 2.10,

$$
\rho\left(R_{t}\left(p_{0}\right), R_{t}\left(p_{1}\right)\right)=\rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}(t), p_{1}\right) \leq \rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}\left(t_{0}\right), p_{1}\right)=\rho\left(p_{0}, p_{1}\right) .
$$

(c) $t_{1} \leq t$. By Lemma 2.9,

$$
\rho\left(R_{t}\left(p_{0}\right), R_{t}\left(p_{1}\right)\right)=\rho\left(\varphi_{\varphi_{p_{0}}\left(t_{1}\right)}(t), \varphi_{p_{1}}(t)\right) \leq \rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}\left(t_{1}\right), p_{1}\right)
$$

and

$$
\rho\left(\varphi_{p_{0}}\left(t_{1}\right), p_{1}\right) \leq \rho\left(p_{0}, p_{1}\right)
$$

by Lemma 2.10. Comparing two last inequality, we obtain (2.14).
Let us prove the second statement of the theorem. Let $\left(p_{0}, t_{0}\right) \in C \times[0, m]$. For $t \in[0, m], R\left(p_{0}, t\right)=p_{0}$ if $t \leq f\left(p_{0}\right)$, and $R\left(p_{0}, t\right)=\varphi_{p_{0}}(t)$ if $f\left(p_{0}\right) \leq t$. So, the map $R\left(p_{0}, \cdot\right):[0, m] \rightarrow C$ is continuous. Given $\varepsilon>0$, we can find $\delta>0$ such that $\rho\left(R\left(p_{0}, t_{0}\right), R\left(p_{0}, t\right)\right)<\varepsilon / 2$ if $\left|t-t_{0}\right|<\delta$. Let now $(p, t)$ be such that $\rho\left(p, p_{0}\right)<\varepsilon / 2$ and $\left|t-t_{0}\right|<\delta$. Then

$$
\rho\left(R\left(p_{0}, t_{0}\right), R(p, t)\right) \leq \rho\left(R\left(p_{0}, t_{0}\right), R\left(p_{0}, t\right)\right)+\rho\left(R_{t}\left(p_{0}\right), R_{t}(p)\right)<\varepsilon / 2+\rho\left(p_{0}, p_{1}\right)<\varepsilon .
$$

The theorem is proved.

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We will prove a more general statement.
Let $C$ be a compact convex set in a Riemannian manifold $M$. If $\partial C$ is not empty, we set $C_{t}=\{p \in C \mid \rho(p, \partial C) \geq t\}$ for any $t \geq 0$. Let $t_{\max }=\max \left\{t \mid C_{t} \neq \emptyset\right\}$. The set $C_{t_{\max }}$ will be denoted by $C_{\text {max }}$.

Let now $M$ be an open (= complete, connected, noncompact, with no boundary) manifold of nonnegative curvature. Recall [1] that there exists a finite sequence

$$
\begin{equation*}
C^{1} \supset C^{2} \supset \ldots \supset C^{n+1}=S \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

of compact totally convex sets such that $C^{i+1}=C_{\max }^{i}(i=1, \ldots, n)$ and $S$ is a totally geodesic submanifold (soul) of $M$ with no boundary. Additionally, given a compact set $A \subset M$, the set $C^{1}$ can be chosen such that $A \subset C^{1}$ without changing other sets $C^{i}$ of the sequence. $M$ is homeomorphic to the Euclidean space if and only if the soul $S$ is a one-point set.

Recall also that the injectivity radius $r(M)$ of a Riemannian manifold $M$ is the supremum of such $s>0$ that every geodesic of length $s$ is minimizing. In the case of $\operatorname{dim} M=0$, the injectivity radius of $M$ is assumed to be equal to $\infty$.

Theorem 3.1 Let $M$ be an open Riemannian manifold whose sectional curvature satisfies $0 \leq K \leq 1$ at any point and any two-dimensional direction. Let $S$ be a soul of $M$. The injectivity radii of $M$ and $S$ satisfy the relation

$$
r(M) \geq \min \{\pi, r(S)\}
$$

Proof. Assume the statement to be wrong, and let $c_{0}$ be a geodesic in $M$ of the length $s_{0}<\pi, s_{0}<r(S)$ which is not minimizing. Join the ends of $c_{0}$ by a minimal geodesic $\bar{c}_{0}$, and denote by $\gamma_{0}$ the geodesic biangle formed by $c_{0}$ and $\bar{c}_{0}$. The biangle is nondegenerate and its length is less then $2 s_{0}$.

Let (3.1) be such a sequence of compact totally convex sets that $\gamma_{0} \subset C^{1}$. Consider the family of all nondegenerate geodesic biangles in $C^{1}$, and let $s$ be the infimum of lengths of such biangles. Then $s<2 s_{0}$ and $s>0$ because of the compactness of $C^{1}$.

Choose a sequence $\gamma_{k}$ of nondegenerate geodesic biangles in $C^{1}$ whose lengths converge to $s$. Using the total convexity of $C^{1}$ and the inequality $s<\pi$, one can show [2] that there exists a limit biangle $\gamma$ for some subsequence of the sequence and that $\gamma$ is a closed geodesic of length $s$. Let $\gamma:[0,1] \rightarrow C^{1}$ be a parameterization of the geodesic.

For every $i=1, \ldots, n$, define the function $f^{i}: C^{i} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ by $f^{i}(p)=\rho\left(p, \partial C^{i}\right)$. As is shown in [1], $f^{i}$ is a convex function. Besides this, $\left.f^{i}\right|_{\partial C^{i}}=0$ and $f^{i}$ is Lipschitz-continuous

$$
\left|f^{i}(p)-f^{i}(q)\right| \leq \rho(p, q) \quad\left(p, q \in C^{i}\right)
$$

Thus, for every $i=1, \ldots, n$, the set $C^{i}$ and functions $f^{i}$ satisfy conditions (i)-(iv) listed at the beginning of Section 2, and our results from Section 2 can be applied.

Let us set

$$
m_{i}=\max \left\{f^{i}(p) \mid p \in C^{i}\right\}(i=1, \ldots, n) ; \quad m=m_{1}+\ldots+m_{n}
$$

So, $C^{i+1}=C_{m_{i}}^{i}$. For every $i=1, \ldots, n$ and for every $t \in\left[0, m_{i}\right]$, let $R_{t}^{i}: C^{i} \rightarrow C_{t}^{i}$ be the retraction constructed in Theorem 2.15 with the help of the function $f^{i}$.

Now, for every $t \in[0, m]$, define the curve $\gamma_{t}:[0,1] \rightarrow C^{1}$ by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\gamma_{t}=R_{t}^{1} \circ \gamma \quad \text { for } t \in\left[0, m_{1}\right] ; \\
\gamma_{m_{1}+\ldots+m_{i-1}+t}=R_{t}^{i} \circ \gamma_{m_{1}+\ldots+m_{i-1}} \quad \text { for } t \in\left[0, m_{i}\right](i=1, \ldots, n) .
\end{gathered}
$$

By Theorem 2.15, $\gamma_{t}$ is a closed curve for any $t \in[0, m], \gamma_{0}=\gamma$, the length of $\gamma_{t}$ is not greater than $s$, and the map $(t, \tau) \mapsto \gamma_{t}(\tau)$ is continuous on $[0, m] \times[0,1]$. The curve $\gamma_{m}$ lies in $S$.

Let $t_{0}$ be the supremum of those $t \in[0, m]$ for which $\gamma_{t}$ is a nondegenerate closed geodesic. Then the curve $c=\gamma_{t_{0}}$ is a closed geodesic of the length $s$.

Observe that $t_{0}<m$ since $s<2 r(S)$. Choose a sequence $t_{k} \in\left(t_{0}, m\right)$ converging to $t_{0}$. The sequence $\gamma_{t_{k}}$ converges uniformly to $c$.

Since $\gamma_{t_{k}}$ is not a geodesic, its length can be decreased by a small deformation. More precisely, there exists a closed curve $c_{k}:[0,1] \rightarrow C^{1}$ whose length is less than the length of $\gamma_{t_{k}}$ and such that

$$
\sup \left\{\rho\left(c_{k}(\tau), \gamma_{t_{k}}(\tau)\right) \mid 0 \leq \tau \leq 1\right\}<1 / k \quad(k=1,2, \ldots)
$$

The sequence $c_{k}$ converges uniformly to $c$. We have thus found a closed geodesic $c$ of length $s$ and a uniformly converging to $c$ sequence of closed curves $c_{k}$ whose lengths are less than $s$. Now, the proof is finished by repeating the arguments of [2].

The author is grateful to V. Toponogov who has read the paper and made some remarks.

## References

[1] Cheeger J., Gromoll D. The structure of complete manifolds of nonnegative curvature. Ann. Math., 96 (1972), 413-443.
[2] Klingenberg W. Contributions to differential geometry in large. Ann. Math., 69 (1959), no. 3, 654-666.
[3] Rockafellar R. Convex Analysis. Princeton N.J., Princeton University Press, 1970.
[4] Sharafutdinov V. Pogorelov - Klingenberg theorem for manifolds homeomorphic to $\mathbf{R}^{n}$. Siberian Math. J., 18 (1977), no. 4, 915-925.
[5] Toponogov V. Theorems on minimal geodesics in noncompact Riemannian spaces of positive curvature. Reports of Soviet Acad., 191 (1970), no. 3, 537-539.
[6] Veiner E. Pogorelov - Klingenberg theorem for convex hypersurfaces. Siberian Math. J., 11 (1970), no. 6, 1396-1399.

