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Metric spaces in which every pair of points can be joined by an arc isometric to a compact interval of the real line (geodesic metric spaces) and every triangle satisfies the “CAT(κ) inequality” (CAT(κ) spaces) are of considerable interest because not only does this inequality capture the concept of non-positive curvature, but spaces satisfying this condition have much of the geometry inherent in Euclidean space (a CAT(0) space).
Mikhail Gromov (b 1943) gave prominence to one of Alexandrov’s definitions for what it might mean for a metric space to have a curvature bounded above by a real number $\kappa$ which he called the $CAT(\kappa)$ inequality.
Comparison spaces

Curvature bounds on the space could be defined by comparing triangles in that space to triangles in appropriate comparison spaces $M^2_\kappa$ where,

$$M^2_\kappa = \begin{cases} 
S^2_\kappa, & \text{if } \kappa > 0; \\
E^2, & \text{if } \kappa = 0; \\
H^2_\kappa, & \text{if } \kappa < 0.
\end{cases}$$

Here:

$S^2_\kappa$ is classical two dimensional spherical space of constant positive curvature $\kappa$; namely, the two sphere,

$$\left\{ x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{E}^3 : ||x|| := \sqrt{\langle x \mid x \rangle} = 1 \right\}$$

where $\langle x \mid y \rangle := x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 + x_3y_3$, equipped with the metric,

$$d(x, y) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \cos^{-1}(\langle x \mid y \rangle),$$

$\mathbb{E}^2$ is two dimensional Euclidean space and
Comparison spaces

Curvature bounds on the space could be defined by comparing triangles in that space to triangles in appropriate *comparison spaces* $M^2_\kappa$ where,

\[ M^2_\kappa = \begin{cases} 
S^2_\kappa, & \text{if } \kappa > 0; \\
E^2, & \text{if } \kappa = 0; \\
H^2_\kappa, & \text{if } \kappa < 0.
\]

Here:

$S^2_\kappa$ is classical two dimensional spherical space of constant positive curvature $\kappa$; namely, the two sphere,

\[ \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{E}^3 : ||x|| := \sqrt{\langle x| x \rangle} = 1 \} \]

where $\langle x| y \rangle := x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 + x_3y_3$, equipped with the metric, $d(x, y) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \cos^{-1}(\langle x| y \rangle)$,

$E^2$ is two dimensional Euclidean space and
Comparison spaces

$H_\kappa^2$ is the hyperbolic two manifold of constant negative curvature $\kappa$; namely,

$$\{ x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle x | x \rangle = -1, \ x_3 > 0 \}$$

where here $\langle x | y \rangle := x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 - x_3 y_3$ and the distance between $x$ and $y$ is $d(x, y) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\kappa}} \cosh^{-1}(-\langle x | y \rangle)$.
Equivalently, $H^2_\kappa$ may be identified with the Poincaré upper half-plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z > 0\}$ equipped with the metric $\frac{1}{\sqrt{-\kappa}} d_P$ where

$$d_P(z_1, z_2) = \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \frac{|dz|}{\Im z} = \cosh^{-1} \left( 1 + \frac{|z_1 - z_2|^2}{2\Im z_1 \Im z_2} \right).$$

In which case, geodesics are semicircles with centres on the extended real axis.

**Henri Poincaré 1854–1912**
The geodesic through the points $z_1$ and $z_2$ in $H^2_{-1}$
Let \((X, d)\) be a metric space.

**Definition**

For \(x, y \in X\) with \(x \neq y\) a *geodesic segment* from \(x\) to \(y\) in \(X\) is an isometry \(\gamma_{xy} : [0, d(x, y)] \mapsto X\) with \(\gamma_{xy}(0) = x\) and \(\gamma_{xy}(d(x, y)) = y\).

**Definition**

A *geodesic ray* from \(\gamma(0)\) is an isometry \(\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow X\).

**Definition**

A *geodesic line* is an isometry \(\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X\).

**Definition**

The metric space \((X, d)\) is called a *geodesic metric space* if for every pair of points \(x, y \in X\) there is a geodesic segment from \(x\) to \(y\).
Let $(X, d)$ be a metric space.

**Definition**

For $x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$ a geodesic segment from $x$ to $y$ in $X$ is an isometry $\gamma_{xy} : [0, d(x, y)] \mapsto X$ with $\gamma_{xy}(0) = x$ and $\gamma_{xy}(d(x, y)) = y$.

**Definition**

A geodesic ray from $\gamma(0)$ is an isometry $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow X$.

**Definition**

A geodesic line is an isometry $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$.

**Definition**

The metric space $(X, d)$ is called a geodesic metric space if for every pair of points $x, y \in X$ there is a geodesic segment from $x$ to $y$. 
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Proj methods in CAT(0)
Let \((X, d)\) be a metric space.

**Definition**

For \(x, y \in X\) with \(x \neq y\) a **geodesic segment** from \(x\) to \(y\) in \(X\) is an isometry \(\gamma_{xy} : [0, d(x, y)] \to X\) with \(\gamma_{xy}(0) = x\) and \(\gamma_{xy}(d(x, y)) = y\).

**Definition**

A **geodesic ray** from \(\gamma(0)\) is an isometry \(\gamma : [0, \infty) \to X\).
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A **geodesic line** is an isometry \(\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to X\).

**Definition**

The metric space \((X, d)\) is called a **geodesic metric space** if for every pair of points \(x, y \in X\) there is a geodesic segment from \(x\) to \(y\).
Geodesic spaces

Let \((X, d)\) be a metric space.

**Definition**

For \(x, y \in X\) with \(x \neq y\) a *geodesic segment* from \(x\) to \(y\) in \(X\) is an isometry \(\gamma_{xy} : [0, d(x, y)] \mapsto X\) with \(\gamma_{xy}(0) = x\) and \(\gamma_{xy}(d(x, y)) = y\).

**Definition**

A *geodesic ray* from \(\gamma(0)\) is an isometry \(\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow X\).

**Definition**

A *geodesic line* is an isometry \(\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X\).

**Definition**

The metric space \((X, d)\) is called a *geodesic metric space* if for every pair of points \(x, y \in X\) there is a geodesic segment from \(x\) to \(y\).
Geodesic spaces

**Definition**

We say \((X, d)\) is *uniquely geodesic* if for all \(x, y \in X\) there is exactly one geodesic segment from \(x\) to \(y\) in which case we use \([x, y]\) to denote the unique segment from \(x\) to \(y\).

If the space is complete being a geodesic metric space is equivalent to being Menger (or metrically) convex; that is, for every pair of points \(x, y \in X\) and \(t \in [0, 1]\) there exists a point \(z_t\) such that \(d(x, z_t) = (1 - t)d(x, y)\) and \(d(z_t, y) = td(x, y)\). When the space is uniquely geodesic we denote \(z_t\) by \((1 - t)x \oplus ty\).

**Figure:** Metric (or Menger) convexity.
Geodesic spaces

Definition
We say geodesics are extendable or the space has the geodesic extension property if every geodesic segment is contained within a geodesic line.

NOTE: In a complete space this is equivalent to geodesics being “locally extendable”.

Karl Menger 1902–1985
Definition

We say *geodesics are extendable* or the space has the *geodesic extension property* if every geodesic segment is contained within a geodesic line.

NOTE: In a complete space this is equivalent to geodesics being “locally extendable”.

Karl Menger 1902–1985
A subset $C$ of a geodesic metric space is \textit{convex} if whenever $x$, $y$ are in $C$ every metric segment from $x$ to $y$ also lies in $C$. Equivalently, for a complete uniquely geodesic space, $(1 - t)x \oplus ty \in C$ whenever $x, y \in C$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. 
Geodesic and comparison triangles

Definition

A **geodesic triangle** \( \triangle \) in a geodesic metric space consists of three points \( x, y, z \in X \) and three geodesic segments \( \gamma_{xy}, \gamma_{yz} \) and \( \gamma_{zx} \).

Definition

A **comparison triangle** for \( \triangle \) is a geodesic triangle \( \tilde{\triangle} \) in \( M^2_\kappa \) with vertices \( \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \) such that \( d(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = d(x, y) \), \( d(\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) = d(y, z) \) and \( d(\tilde{z}, \tilde{x}) = d(z, x) \). For \( p \in [x, y] \) the comparison point in \( \tilde{\triangle} \) is the point \( \tilde{p} \in [\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}] \) with \( d(\tilde{x}, \tilde{p}) = d(x, p) \). Comparison points for points in \([y, z]\) and \([z, x]\) are defined in a similar way.
Geodesic and comparison triangles

**Definition**

A *geodesic triangle* $\triangle$ in a geodesic metric space consists of three points $x, y, z \in X$ and three geodesic segments $\gamma_{xy}, \gamma_{yz}$ and $\gamma_{zx}$.

**Definition**

A *comparison triangle* for $\triangle$ is a geodesic triangle $\bar{\triangle}$ in $M^2_\kappa$ with vertices $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ such that $d(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = d(x, y)$, $d(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) = d(y, z)$ and $d(\bar{z}, \bar{x}) = d(z, x)$. For $p \in [x, y]$ the comparison point in $\bar{\triangle}$ is the point $\bar{p} \in [\bar{x}, \bar{y}]$ with $d(\bar{x}, \bar{p}) = d(x, p)$. Comparison points for points in $[y, z]$ and $[z, x]$ are defined in a similar way.
A \textit{geodesic triangle} $\triangle$ in a geodesic metric space consists of three points $x, y, z \in X$ and three geodesic segments $\gamma_{xy}, \gamma_{yz}$ and $\gamma_{zx}$.

A \textit{comparison triangle} for $\triangle$ is a geodesic triangle $\bar{\triangle}$ in $M^2_\kappa$ with vertices $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ such that $d(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = d(x, y)$, $d(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) = d(y, z)$ and $d(\bar{z}, \bar{x}) = d(z, x)$. For $p \in [x, y]$ the comparison point in $\bar{\triangle}$ is the point $\bar{p} \in [\bar{x}, \bar{y}]$ with $d(\bar{x}, \bar{p}) = d(x, p)$. Comparison points for points in $[y, z]$ and $[z, x]$ are defined in a similar way.
A geodesic triangle satisfies the $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ inequality if for every pair of points $p$ and $q$ on it we have $d(p, q) \leq d(\bar{p}, \bar{q})$ where $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{q}$ are the respective corresponding points of the comparison triangle in $M^2_\kappa$.

**Definition**

For a given $\kappa$, a $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ space is a geodesic metric space in which every geodesic triangle satisfies the $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ inequality.

Such spaces enjoy a rich geometric structure. We will be especially interested in spaces which are $\text{CAT}(0)$.

Spaces with *curvature bounded below*; that is, spaces $X$ for which $\inf\{\kappa : X \text{ is a CAT}(\kappa) \text{ space}\} > -\infty$, have non-bifurcating geodesics and are important to us because if geodesics are extendable their extensions are unique.
A geodesic triangle satisfies the $CAT(\kappa)$ inequality if for every pair of points $p$ and $q$ on it we have $d(p, q) \leq d(\bar{p}, \bar{q})$ where $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{q}$ are the respective corresponding points of the comparison triangle in $M^2_\kappa$.

**Definition**

For a given $\kappa$, a $CAT(\kappa)$ space is a geodesic metric space in which every geodesic triangle satisfies the $CAT(\kappa)$ inequality.

Such spaces enjoy a rich geometric structure. We will be especially interested in spaces which are $CAT(0)$.

Spaces with *curvature bounded below*; that is, spaces $X$ for which $\inf\{\kappa : X \text{ is a } CAT(\kappa) \text{ space}\} > -\infty$, have non-bifurcating geodesics and are important to us because if geodesics are extendable their extensions are unique.
A geodesic triangle satisfies the $CAT(\kappa)$ inequality if for every pair of points $p$ and $q$ on it we have $d(p, q) \leq d(\bar{p}, \bar{q})$ where $\bar{p}$ and $\bar{q}$ are the respective corresponding points of the comparison triangle in $M^2_\kappa$.

**Definition**

For a given $\kappa$, a $CAT(\kappa)$ space is a geodesic metric space in which every geodesic triangle satisfies the $CAT(\kappa)$ inequality.

Such spaces enjoy a rich geometric structure. We will be especially interested in spaces which are $CAT(0)$.

Spaces with curvature bounded below; that is, spaces $X$ for which $\inf\{\kappa : X \text{ is a } CAT(\kappa) \text{ space} \} > -\infty$, have non-bifurcating geodesics and are important to us because if geodesics are extendable their extensions are unique.
A geodesic triangle satisfies the $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ inequality if for every pair of points $p$ and $q$ on it we have $d(p, q) \leq d(\overline{p}, \overline{q})$ where $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{q}$ are the respective corresponding points of the comparison triangle in $M_\kappa^2$.

**Definition**

For a given $\kappa$, a $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ space is a geodesic metric space in which every geodesic triangle satisfies the $\text{CAT}(\kappa)$ inequality.

Such spaces enjoy a rich geometric structure. We will be especially interested in spaces which are $\text{CAT}(0)$.

Spaces with *curvature bounded below*; that is, spaces $X$ for which $\inf\{\kappa : X \text{ is a } \text{CAT}(\kappa) \text{ space}\} > -\infty$, have non-bifurcating geodesics and are important to us because if geodesics are extendable their extensions are unique.
For any three points $x, y, z$ in a (geodesic) metric space, in the comparison triangle $\triangle(x, y, z)$ the interior angle at $\bar{x}$ is called the comparison angle subtended at $x$ by $y$ and $z$ and we denote it by $\bar{\angle}_x(y, z)$.

**NOTE:** $\bar{\angle}_x(y, z)$ is the unique angle $\{\theta : 0 \leq \theta \leq \pi\}$ such that

$$d(x, y)^2 = d(x, z)^2 + d(z, y)^2 + 2d(x, z)d(z, y) \cos \theta.$$
Alexandrov angles

Definition

Let $\gamma : [0, a] \rightarrow X$ and $\gamma' : [0, a'] \rightarrow X$ be two geodesics with $\gamma(0) = \gamma'(0)$. Given $t \in (0, a]$ and $t' \in (0, a']$ we consider the comparison triangle $\bar{\triangle} (\gamma(0), \gamma(t), \gamma'(t'))$ and the comparison angle $\bar{\angle}_{\gamma(0)} (\gamma(t), \gamma'(t'))$. The Alexandrov angle (or upper angle) between the geodesics $\gamma$ and $\gamma'$ at $\gamma(0)$ is

$$\angle (\gamma, \gamma') = \limsup_{t,t' \rightarrow 0} \bar{\angle}_{\gamma(0)} (\gamma(t), \gamma'(t'))$$

NOTE: In $CAT(0)$ spaces

$$\angle (\gamma, \gamma') = 2 \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \arcsin (d(\gamma(t), \gamma'(t))/2).$$
The definition of a $CAT(0)$ spaces did not require that $X$ be complete. However, in our work we will assume that our spaces are complete and we recall that complete $CAT(0)$ spaces are often called Hadamard spaces.

Jacques Salomon Hadamard 1865–1963
Basic Facts for $CAT(0)$ spaces

If $(X, d)$ is a $CAT(0)$ space then

1. $(X, d)$ is a hyperbolic metric space in the sense of Gromov;
2. Geodesics are unique;
3. Geodesics vary continuously with their endpoints;
4. Approximate mid-points are near to mid-points;
5. Every closed ball $B[x, r] := \{y; d(y, x) \leq r\}, r > 0$ is metrically convex, and is contractible to a point;
6. The metric $d$ is a convex function.
For a geodesic metric space $(X, d)$ the following are equivalent:

(1) $(X, d)$ is a $\text{CAT}(0)$ space;

(2) If $x$ is any vertex of a geodesic triangle and $p$ is any point on the opposite side then $d(x, p) \leq d_2(\bar{x}, \bar{p})$;
The Alexandrov angle at any vertex of a geodesic triangle is less than or equal to the angle at the corresponding vertex of the comparison triangle. This is equivalent to the law of cosines; for a geodesic triangle with sides of length $a, b$ and $c$ we have,

$$c^2 \geq a^2 + b^2 - 2ab \cos \gamma$$

where $\gamma$ is the Alexandrov angle between the sides of length $a$ and $b$. 
(4) The CN (Courbure Négative)-inequality of Bruhat and Tits holds. That is for any three points $x, y_1, y_2 \in X$, and noting that $y_0$ is the metric midpoint of $y_1$ and $y_2$ if $d(y_1, y_2) = d(y_1, y_0) + d(y_0, y_2)$ and $d(y_1, y_0) = d(y_0, y_2)$ then
\[
d(x, y_0)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} d(x, y_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} d(x, y_2)^2 - \frac{1}{4} d(y_1, y_2)^2.
\]
Basic Facts for $CAT(0)$ spaces

We recall that the parallelogram law for a translated parallelogram with vertices at $x, y_1, y_2$ and $(y_1 + y_2) - x$ in a Hilbert space is

$$||(y_1 + y_2) - 2x||^2 + ||y_1 - y_2||^2 = 2(||y_1 - x||^2 + ||y_2 - x||^2).$$

By rearranging and dividing by 4 we get

$$\left|\frac{1}{2}(y_1 + y_2) - x\right|^2 = \frac{1}{2}(||y_1 - x||^2 + \frac{1}{2}||y_2 - x||^2) - \frac{1}{4}||y_1 - y_2||^2.$$

After noting that $m = \frac{1}{2}(y_1 + y_2)$ is the (metric) midpoint of $y_1$ and $y_2$, we recognize this as the case of equality in the CN-inequality for points in a Hilbert space.
Fortunately the CN-inequality goes the right way to allow many Hilbert space arguments that depend on the parallelogram law to continue to work in $CAT(0)$ spaces.
(5) The 4-point condition holds. That is for any 4 points \(a, b, c, d\) let \(\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{d}\) be the corresponding comparison points in \(\mathbb{R}^2\) such that \(d(a, b) = d(\bar{a}, \bar{b})\), \(d(b, c) = d(\bar{b}, \bar{c})\), \(d(c, d) = d(\bar{c}, \bar{d})\) and \(d(d, a) = d(\bar{d}, \bar{a})\) then \(d(a, c) \leq d(\bar{a}, \bar{c})\) and \(d(b, d) \leq d(\bar{b}, \bar{d})\).
Nearest Point Projections

The following proposition ensures the existence of the nearest point projection, $P_C : X \to C$, onto a closed convex subset $C$ of a Hadamard space.

**Proposition**

Let $X$ be a $\text{CAT}(0)$ space and $C$ be a convex subset which is complete in the induced metric. Then,

1. for every $x \in X$ there exists a unique point $P_C(x) \in X$ such that $d(x, P_C(x)) = d(x, C) := \inf_{y \in C} d(x, y)$;

2. if $y$ belongs to the geodesic segment $[x, P_C(x)]$ we have $P_C(y) = P_C(x)$;

3. for any $x \in X \setminus C$ and $y \in C \setminus P_C(x)$ we have $\angle_{P_C(x)}(x, y) \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$

4. $P_C$ is a nonexpansive retraction onto $C$; the map $H : X \times [0, 1] \to X$ sending $(x, t)$ to the point a distance $td(x, P_C(x))$ from $x$ on the geodesic segment $[x, P_C(x)]$ is a continuous homotopy from the identity map $I$ to $P_C$. 
Corollary

For $X$ a CAT(0) space, $C$ a complete convex subset in $X$ and $d_C$ the distance function to $C$, that is $d_C(x) = d(x, C)$ then it follows that

1. $d_C$ is a convex function;
2. $|d_C(x) - d_C(y)| \leq d(x, y)$;
3. the restriction of $d_C$ to a sphere with centre $x$ and radius $r \leq d_C(x)$ means it attains its infimum at a unique point $y$ and $d_C(x) = d_C(y) + r$. 
An analogue of weak sequential convergence in $CAT(0)$ spaces

One of the difficulties in extending results from Hilbert spaces into $CAT(0)$ spaces is the seeming lack of a dual space and hence of a weak topology and of weak-compactness.

However, as noted by Art Kirk and others, many arguments involving weak-compactness can be replaced by asymptotic centre arguments.

William A. (Art) Kirk
In 1976, T. C. Lim introduced a concept of convergence in a general metric space setting which he called $\Delta$-convergence. Kuczumow introduced an identical notion of convergence in Banach spaces which he called 'almost convergence'. Kirk and B. Panyanak adapted Lim’s concept to CAT(0) spaces. They also showed that many Banach space results involving weak convergence have precise analogues in CAT(0) spaces; for example, Opial’s property, the Kadec-Klee property and the demiclosedness principle for nonexpansive mappings.

Mikhail I. Kadets (1923–2011)  
Victor Klee (1925–2007)
Asymptotic centres

Let $X$ be a complete $CAT(0)$ space. For any bounded sequence $(x_n)$ its asymptotic radius about $x$ is
$$r(x, (x_n)) := \limsup_n d(x, x_n);$$
its asymptotic radius is
$$r((x_n)) : = \inf\{r(x, (x_n)) : x \in X\};$$
and, its asymptotic centre is
$$A((x_n)) := \{x : r(x, (x_n)) = r((x_n))\}.$$

The notion of asymptotic centre of a sequence seems first to have been introduced by Michael Edelstein (1917–2003) [?]

Michael Edelstein
**Definition**

A sequence \((x_n)\) in \(X\) is said to \(\triangle\)-converge to \(x\), \((x_n \rightharpoonup x)\), if \(x\) is the unique asymptotic centre of every subsequence \((x_{n_k})\) of \((x_n)\).

A bounded sequence \((x_n)\) in \(X\) is said to be regular if 
\[
r((x_n)) = r((x_{n_k}))
\]
for every subsequence \((x_{n_k})\) of \((x_n)\). It is known that every bounded sequence has a regular subsequence. Since every regular sequence \(\triangle\)-converges, the following proposition follows immediately:

**Proposition**

*Every bounded sequence of a complete \(CAT(0)\) space has a \(\triangle\)-convergent subsequence.*
We note at this stage that the very definition of asymptotic centre shows that $CAT(0)$ spaces enjoy a property that has become known as Opial’s property: that is for $(x_n) \subset X$ such that $(x_n) \triangle$ - converges to $x$ and for $y \in X$ with $y \neq x$ we have

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} d(x_n, x) < \limsup_{n \to \infty} d(x_n, y).$$

\[Zdzislaw\ Opial\ (1930–1974)\]
We also note that in a Hilbert space, $\triangle$-convergence and weak convergence coincide. This is a simple consequence of closed balls being weak compact and Opial’s property.

Accordingly, in the context of CAT(0) spaces, we will and henceforth refer to $\triangle$-convergence as simply weak convergence and write $x_n \rightharpoonup x$. 
Let $X$ be a $CAT(0)$ space, for $x \in X$ and $G$, any geodesic through $x$, we define the function $\phi_G : X \to R$ by

$$\phi_G(x_n) := d(x, P_G(x_n)).$$

A specialization of Sosov’s notion of $\phi$—convergence.
Definition

A bounded sequence \((x_n) \subseteq X\) is said to \(\phi\)-converge to a point \(x \in X\) if

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \phi_G(x_n) = 0, \]

for every geodesic \(G\) containing \(x\).

Proposition

A sequence \((x_n) \subseteq X\) is weak-convergent to \(x \in X\) if and only if it is \(\phi\)-convergent to \(x \in X\).
(1) Closed convex sets are weakly closed.
(2) Closed bounded convex sets are weakly sequentially compact.
(3) For a convex set $C$ the distance function $d_C$ is weak lower semi-continuous.
(4) [Demiclosedness principle] If $T$ is a nonexpansive self mapping of a closed convex set, $d(x_n, Tx_n) \to 0$ and $x_n \rightharpoonup x$, then $x = Tx$.

As a corollary we obtain Kirk’s theorem: any nonexpansive self mapping of a non-empty closed bounded convex subset of a CAT(0) space has a fixed point.
New CAT(0) spaces from old

It is easily verified that:

(1) Convex subspaces of CAT(0) spaces are themselves CAT(0) spaces.

(2) If $X$ and $Y$ are CAT(0) spaces then so too is their product, $X \times Y$, equipped with the metric

$$d((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) := \sqrt{d_X(x_1, x_2)^2 + d_Y(y_1, y_2)^2}$$

(2) Closed bounded convex sets are weakly sequentially compact.

(3) Ultraproducts of CAT(0) spaces are CAT(0) spaces.

Another important way of building new CAT(0) spaces is:
(Reshetnyak’s Gluing Theorem.) Let \( \{(X_i, d_i)\}, i = 1, 2 \) be two complete spaces of curvature \( \leq k \). Suppose that there are convex sets \( C_i \in X_i \) and an isometry \( f : C_1 \to C_2 \). Attach these spaces together along the isometry \( f \). Then the resulting space \( (X, d) \) is a space of curvature \( \leq k \).

We illustrate with an example.
By identifying $\Gamma_1$ with $\Gamma_2$ we can “glue” $C_1$ to $C_2$ along $\Gamma_2$ to produce the space shown.
The convex feasibility problem associated with the nonempty closed convex sets $A, B$ is to

“find some $x \in A \cap B$”.

Projection algorithms in general aim to compute such a point. We consider two such algorithms in the context of CAT(0) spaces.

This allows us to treat feasibility problems where the sets are metrically, but not necessarily algebraically, convex. For example star shaped sets in $E^2$.

These projection algorithms play key roles in optimization and have many applications outside mathematics - for example in medical imaging. An extension into CAT(0) spaces allows their use in a much more general setting where there may be no natural linear structure, for example tree spaces, state spaces, phylogenomics and configuration spaces in robotics.
The method of alternating projection into convex sets (sometimes known as "project, project") emerged from initial work by John von Neumann (1903 – 1957) who, in the 1930s, proved that when $A$ and $B$ were closed affine manifolds of a Hilbert space the iterative scheme $x_{n+1} = P_B P_A x_n$ converged in norm for any initial starting point $x_0$ to $P_{A \cap B} x_0$. 

John von Neumann
Alternating Projection method

von Neumann’s alternating projection method

Norm convergent to nearest point in $A \cap B$
In 1965, weak convergence was established by L. M. Bregman when $A, B \in H$ are closed convex sets in a Hilbert space with $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Examples show that norm convergence need not occur.

The Hilbert space proof can be adapted to obtain an analogous result in CAT(0) spaces [Bacak, Searston & S].

**Theorem**

Let $X$ be a complete CAT(0) space and $A, B \subset X$ convex, closed subsets such that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Let $x_0 \in X$ be a starting point and $(x_n)$ be the sequence generated by alternating projections. Then $(x_n)$ weakly converges to a point $x \in A \cap B$.

*Strong convergence pertains when $A$ and $B$ satisfy certain “regularity” conditions and various estimates on the rate of convergence are possible.*

**Jim Douglas**  
**Henry H. Rachford**
In a Hilbert space $H$ we define \textit{reflection} in a closed convex set $A$ as

$$R_Ax = P_Ax + (P_Ax - x) = (2P_A - I)x$$

where $P_A$ is the closest point projection onto $A$. 
Douglas-Rachford method

Starting with any initial point $x_0$, the Douglas-Rachford algorithm is the iterative scheme

$$x_{n+1} := T(x_n) \text{ where, } T = \frac{1}{2}(R_A R_B + I).$$
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Proj methods in CAT(0)
Provided $A$ and $B$ are convex and have a non empty intersection the Douglas-Rachford algorithm was shown to converge weakly to a point $x$ with $P_B x \in A \cap B$, by P.-L. Lions and B. Mercier in 1979.

Pierre-Louis Lions  Bertrand Mercier
Impediments to extending Douglas-Rachford into CAT(0) spaces:

How to define reflection?

How to show convergence?

To discuss reflections in \( \text{CAT}(0) \) spaces we require geodesics to be extendable. We also require that the extension is unique which happens if and only if the curvature is bounded below.
With the above conditions we can define the reflection of a point $x$ in a closed convex subset $C$ of $X$, a $CAT(0)$ space, to be a point $R_C(x)$ on a geodesic which is an extension of the segment $[x, P_C(x)]$ such that

$$d(R_C(x), P_C(x)) = d(x, P_C(x)),$$

where $P_Cx$ is the projection of $x$ onto the set $C$. 

---

*Reflections in $CAT(0)$ spaces*
It is well known that reflections in Hilbert space are non-expansive; this follows since the closest point projection is firmly nonexpansive, something which is also true in an appropriate sense in CAT(0) spaces [David Ariza].

R-trees are also an example of a $CAT(0)$ space in which reflections are non-expansive.
Proposition (Fernández-Leon – Nicolae, 2012)

For $k \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $C$ is a nonempty closed and convex subset of $M^n_k$ and $x, y \in M^n_k$ such that $\text{dist}(x, C), \text{dist}(y, C) < D_k/2$. Then,

$$d(R_C x, R_C y) \leq d(x, y).$$

Using this they go on to establish weak convergence of Douglas-Rachford in such spaces of constant negative curvature.

However, in general reflections in CAT(0) spaces need not be nonexpansive.
To conclude we construct and investigate a special instance of a CAT(0) space of non-constant curvature.

We begin with the CAT(0) space $\Phi$ consisting of the geodesic (convex subset) $|z| = 1$ in the Poincaré upper half-plane which we may identify with

$$\Phi = \left( \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right), d_P \right)$$

where $d_P$ is the restriction of the “Poincaré metric” given by

$$d_P(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \int_{\phi_1}^{\phi_2} \frac{d\phi}{\cos(\phi)} = \left[ \ln(\sec(\phi) + \tan(\phi)) \right]_{\phi_1}^{\phi_2}.$$  

Since the function $\ln(\sec(\phi) + \tan(\phi))$ occurs frequently in what follows we will denote it by $H(\phi)$.
\[ X := \Phi \otimes_2 |\mathbb{E}^1| \]

- the \( \ell_2^2 \) - direct product of \( \Phi \) with \( |\mathbb{E}^1| \), the positive cone in 1-dimensional, Euclidean space, and metric given by,

\[
d_X((\phi_1, h_1), (\phi_2, h_2)) = \sqrt{(d_P(\phi_1, \phi_2))^2 + (h_1 - h_2)^2}
\]

\[
= \sqrt{(H(\phi_2) - H(\phi_1))^2 + (h_1 - h_2)^2},
\]

for \( h_1, h_2 > 0 \) and \( -\pi/2 < \phi_1, \phi_2 < \pi/2 \).

NOTE: \( X \) is flat (curvature 0).
The unique **geodesic** $\Gamma$ in $X$ passing through two distinct points $P_1 : (\phi_1, h_1)$ and $P_2 : (\phi_2, h_2)$ is:

the ‘vertical’ half line $\{(\phi, h) : h > 0\}$ if $\phi_1 = \phi_2$,

otherwise, using the Euler-Lagrange equation to minimize the length of a curve from $P_1$ to $P_2$, we find $\Gamma$ has equation,

$$h(\phi) = AH(\phi) + B,$$

where the constants $A$ and $B$ are uniquely determined from the condition that $P_1, P_2 \in \Gamma$, in particular $A = \frac{h_1 - h_2}{H(\phi_1) - H(\phi_2)}$. 
A geodesic in $X := \Phi \otimes_2 \mathbb{E}^1$
The **length of the segment** of $\Gamma$ between $P_1$ and $P_2$ is,

$$l(\Gamma_{P_1P_2}) = \frac{\sqrt{1 + A^2}}{A} |h_1 - h_2|,$$

when $\phi_1 \neq \phi_2$, and

$$l(\Gamma_{P_1P_2}) = |h_1 - h_2|,$$

when the geodesic is vertical.

The **midpoint** $(\phi_m, h_m)$ of $\Gamma_{P_1P_2}$ has, $h_m = (h_1 + h_2)/2$ and

$$\phi_m = 2 \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{e^{H_m} - 1}{e^{H_m} + 1}\right),$$

where $H_m = (h_m - B)/A$. 
In the upper half plane model of the hyperbolic space $H^2_{-1}$ let 
$Y = \{ z : \Im z > 0, |z| \leq 1 \}$ equipped with the metric $d_P$ inherited from $H^2_{-1}$.

$Y$ is a closed, convex subset of $H^2_{-1}$ and hence a $CAT(0)$ space of constant curvature $-1$.

Let $C$ be the geodesic in $Y$ given by $C = \{ e^{i\theta} : 0 < \theta < \pi \}$. Then, $C$ is also a closed, convex subset of $Y$ and under the mapping 
$\phi \mapsto e^{i(\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi)}$, $\Phi$ is isometric to $C$. 
The space $Z$

$Z$ is obtained by gluing $X$ to $Y$ under the identification of $\Phi$ with $C$ which by Reshetnyak’s gluing theorem is a CAT(0) space of non-constant curvature, bounded below by $-1$.

**Geodesics in $Z$ are uniquely extendable, and so reflection in closed convex sets of $Z$ is well defined.**
A model for $Z$ as a submanifold of $\mathbb{E}^3$

More usefully, however,
A model for $Z$ as a submanifold of $\mathbb{E}^3$

More usefully, however,
An upper-half plane model for $\mathbb{Z}$

We model $Y$ in the upper half-plane as above and identify points in $X$ with points in $W := \{\rho e^{i\theta} : \rho \geq 1, 0 < \theta < \pi\}$ under the mapping

$$(\phi, h) \mapsto (1 + h)e^{i(\frac{\pi}{2} - \phi)}.$$ 

This naturally identifies $\Theta$ with $C$ and is an isometry when $W$ is equipped with the metric,

$$d_W(\rho_1 e^{i\theta_1}, \rho_2 e^{i\theta_2} = \sqrt{(R(\theta_2) - R(\theta_1))^2 + (\rho_2 - \rho_1)^2},$$

where $R(\theta) := H(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta) = \ln(\csc(\theta) + \cot(\theta)).$
Geodesics in the upper half-plane model for $\mathbb{Z}$

Geodesics in $W$ are radial rays: $z = \rho e^{i\theta}$, where $\rho \geq 1$ and $\theta$ is constant; or curves of the form,

$$z = (AR(\theta) + b)e^{i\theta}.$$ 

The geodesic segment joining $P_1 \in W$ to $P_2 \in Y$ is $[P_1, Q] \cup [Q, P_2]$ where $Q = e^{i\theta_0} \in C$ is chosen so that $d_W(P_1, Q) + d_P(Q, P_2)$ is a minimum.

The extension of a geodesic $\Gamma$ in $W$ into $Y$ (or vice versa) may be determined from the requirement that $\frac{d\rho}{d\theta}$ be continuous at the point where $\Gamma$ meets $C$.

All these calculations have been implemented in Maple.
Geodesics in the upper half-plane model for $Z$

Geodesics in $W$ are radial rays: $z = \rho e^{i\theta}$, where $\rho \geq 1$ and $\theta$ is constant; or curves of the form,

$$z = (AR(\theta) + b)e^{i\theta}.$$

The geodesic segment joining $P_1 \in W$ to $P_2 \in Y$ is $[P_1, Q] \cup [Q, P_2]$ where $Q = e^{i\theta_0} \in C$ is chosen so that $d_W(P_1, Q) + d_P(Q, P_2)$ is a minimum.
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Geodesics in \( W \) are radial rays: \( z = \rho e^{i\theta} \), where \( \rho \geq 1 \) and \( \theta \) is constant; or curves of the form,

\[
z = (AR(\theta) + b)e^{i\theta}.
\]

The geodesic segment joining \( P_1 \in W \) to \( P_2 \in Y \) is \([P_1, Q] \cup [Q, P_2]\) where \( Q = e^{i\theta_0} \in C \) is chosen so that \( d_W(P_1, Q) + d_P(Q, P_2) \) is a minimum.

The extension of a geodesic \( \Gamma \) in \( W \) into \( Y \) (or vice versa) may be determined from the requirement that \( \frac{d\rho}{d\theta} \) be continuous at the point where \( \Gamma \) meets \( C \).

All these calculations have been implemented in Maple.
Geodesics in the upper half-plane model for $Z$

Geodesics in $W$ are radial rays: $z = \rho e^{i\theta}$, where $\rho \geq 1$ and $\theta$ is constant; or curves of the form,

$$z = (AR(\theta) + b)e^{i\theta}.$$

The geodesic segment joining $P_1 \in W$ to $P_2 \in Y$ is $[P_1, Q] \cup [Q, P_2]$ where $Q = e^{i\theta_0} \in C$ is chosen so that $d_W(P_1, Q) + d_P(Q, P_2)$ is a minimum.

The extension of a geodesic $\Gamma$ in $W$ into $Y$ (or vice versa) may be determined from the requirement that $\frac{d\rho}{d\theta}$ be continuous at the point where $\Gamma$ meets $C$.

All these calculations have been implemented in Maple.
Some geodesics in $\mathbb{Z}$

Some geodesics in the upper half-plane model of $\mathbb{Z}$
Reflections in $C$

To exploit the structure of $Z$ we consider reflections in $C$ (identified with $\Phi$).

The projection of a point $z$ onto $C$ is determined by the condition that the geodesic segment $[z, P_C(z)]$ meet $C$ orthogonally.

The reflection of $z$ is the point $R_C(z)$ on the extension of $[z, P_C(z)]$ such that $P_C(z)$ is the midpoint of $[z, R_C(z)]$.

From the uniqueness of geodesics it follows that,

$$R_C|_Y : Y \to W \quad \text{and} \quad R_C|_W : W \to Y,$$

are inverses.
To exploit the structure of $Z$ we consider reflections in $C$ (identified with $\Phi$).

The projection of a point $z$ onto $C$ is determined by the condition that the geodesic segment $[z, P_C(z)]$ meet $C$ orthogonally.

The reflection of $z$ is the point $R_C(z)$ on the extension of $[z, P_C(z)]$ such that $P_C(z)$ is the midpoint of $[z, R_C(z)]$.

From the uniqueness of geodesics it follows that,

$$R_C|_Y : Y \to W \quad \text{and} \quad R_C|_W : W \to Y,$$

are inverses.
Reflections in $C$

To exploit the structure of $Z$ we consider reflections in $C$ (identified with $\Phi$).

The projection of a point $z$ onto $C$ is determined by the condition that the geodesic segment $[z, P_C(z)]$ meet $C$ orthogonally.

The reflection of $z$ is the point $R_C(z)$ on the extension of $[z, P_C(z)]$ such that $P_C(z)$ is the midpoint of $[z, R_C(z)]$.

From the uniqueness of geodesics it follows that,

$$R_C|_Y : Y \to W \quad \text{and} \quad R_C|_W : W \to Y,$$

are inverses.
View of reflections in $\mathcal{C}$
In general $R_C|_Y$ is nonexpansive, but $R_C|_W = (R_C|_Y)^{-1}$ need not be.

For instance, as illustrated in the previous slide, the points $P_1 = i/2$ and $P_2 = 0.5439 + 0.4925i$ in $Y$ have $Q_1 := R_C(P_1) = 1.6931i$ and $Q_2 := R_C(P_2) = 1.453e^{\pi/4}$ and

$$d_W(Q_1, Q_2) = 0.9135 < d_Y(P_1, P_2) = 1.0476$$

and so,

$$d_Z(R_C(Q_1), R_C(Q_2)) = d_Y(P_1, P_2) > d_Z(Q_1, Q_2)$$
Reflection need not be nonexpansive

In general $R_C|_Y$ is nonexpansive, but $R_C|_W = (R_C|_Y)^{-1}$ need not be.

For instance, as illustrated in the previous slide, the points $P_1 = i/2$ and $P_2 = 0.5439 + 0.4925i$ in $Y$ have $Q_1 := R_C(P_1) = 1.6931i$ and $Q_2 := R_C(P_2) = 1.453e^{\pi/4}$ and

$$d_W(Q_1, Q_2) = 0.9135 < d_Y(P_1, P_2) = 1.0476$$

and so,

$$d_Z(R_C(Q_1), R_C(Q_2)) = d_Y(P_1, P_2) > d_Z(Q_1, Q_2)$$
We consider in $\mathbb{Z}$ an analogue of the following instance of Douglas-Rachford in $\mathbb{E}^2$.

An instance of Douglas-Rachford in $\mathbb{E}^2$
We take as our two convex sets in $\mathbb{Z}$ the closed half-rays
$A = \{e^{i\theta} : 3\pi/4 \leq \theta \leq \pi\}$ and $B = \{e^{i\theta} : 0 \leq \theta \leq 3\pi/4\}$ of $C$, so $A \cap B = \{e^{3\pi i/4}\} = \{-0.7071, 0.7071\}$. 
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Proj methods in CAT(0)
The following table shows three iteration of Douglas-Rachford, starting from \( x_1 = (0.5439, 0.4925) \); points \( z \) in \( Y \) are specified by \((\Re z, \Im z)\) and those in \( X \) by \((\theta, h)\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( n = 1 )</th>
<th>( n = 2 )</th>
<th>( n = 3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( x_n )</td>
<td>( (0.5439, 0.4925) )</td>
<td>((-0.607669, 0.625647))</td>
<td>((-0.624135, 0.613204))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_B x_n )</td>
<td>( \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) )</td>
<td>((-0.690260, 0.723561))</td>
<td>((-0.707009, 0.707205))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_B x_n )</td>
<td>( (\frac{\pi}{4}, 0.4530) )</td>
<td>((-0.761849, 0.190098))</td>
<td>((-0.785260, 0.190012))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_A R_B x_n )</td>
<td>( \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) )</td>
<td>( \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) )</td>
<td>( \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_A R_B x_n )</td>
<td>( (-0.895023, 0.122895) )</td>
<td>((-0.639941, 0.600583))</td>
<td>((-0.624326, 0.613055))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_{n+1} )</td>
<td>((-0.607669, 0.625647))</td>
<td>((-0.624135, 0.613204))</td>
<td>((-0.624231, 0.613130))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The iterates appear to be rapidly stabilizing with \( P_B x_n \) converging to the feasible point.
The iterates from the alternative starting point \( y_1 = (0, 0.5) \) behave similarly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( y_n )</th>
<th>( n = 1 )</th>
<th>( n = 2 )</th>
<th>( n = 3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( y_n )</td>
<td>((0, 0.5))</td>
<td>((-0.509291, 0.485280))</td>
<td>((-0.533052, 0.474962))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_B y_n )</td>
<td>((0, 1))</td>
<td>((-0.681383, 0.731927))</td>
<td>((-0.706154, 0.708058))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_B y_n )</td>
<td>((0, 0.6931))</td>
<td>((-0.749650, 0.492872))</td>
<td>((-0.784052, 0.495575))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( P_AR_B y_n )</td>
<td>((-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}))</td>
<td>((-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}))</td>
<td>((-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_A R_B y_n )</td>
<td>((-0.744747, 0.231161))</td>
<td>((-0.555758, 0.463751))</td>
<td>((-0.534775, 0.474034))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_{n+1} )</td>
<td>((-0.509291, 0.485280))</td>
<td>((-0.533052, 0.474962))</td>
<td>((-0.533914, 0.474499))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two tables also show that in these instances the iterated map \( T := \frac{1}{2}(I + R_A R_B) \) is nonexpansive, even though some intermediary steps are not.
Specifically;

\[ d_Y(Tx_1, Ty_1) = 0.3098 \leq d_Y(x_1, y_1) = 1.0476 \]
\[ d_Y(Tx_2, Ty_2) = 0.3056 \leq d_Y(x_2, y_2) = 0.3098 \]
\[ d_Y(Tx_3, Ty_3) = 0.3056 \leq d_Y(x_3, y_3) = 0.3056 \]

While \( d(R_AR_Bx_1, R_AR_By_1) = 1.0500 > d(x_1, y_1) = 1.0476 \)

Thus, while reflections in CAT(0) spaces of non-constant curvature need not be nonexpansive, it appears that the averaging process in Douglas-Rachford iteration may compensate for this. This seems deserving of further investigation.
Specifically;

\[ d_Y(Tx_1, Ty_1) = 0.3098 \leq d_Y(x_1, y_1) = 1.0476 \]
\[ d_Y(Tx_2, Ty_2) = 0.3056 \leq d_Y(x_2, y_2) = 0.3098 \]
\[ d_Y(Tx_3, Ty_3) = 0.3056 \leq d_Y(x_3, y_3) = 0.3056 \]

While \( d(R_AR_Bx_1, R_AR_By_1) = 1.0500 > d(x_1, y_1) = 1.0476 \) !

Thus, while reflections in CAT(0) spaces of non-constant curvature need not be nonexpansive, it appears that the averaging process in Douglas-Rachford iteration may compensate for this. **This seems deserving of further investigation.**