ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'É.N.S.

TAKAO YAMAGUCHI

The isometry groups of riemannian manifolds admitting strictly convex functions

Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. 4e série, tome 15, nº 1 (1982), p. 205-212

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1982_4_15_1_205_0>

Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup.,
4e série, t. 15, 1982, p. 205 à 212.

THE ISOMETRY GROUPS OF RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS ADMITTING STRICTLY CONVEX FUNCTIONS

By TAKAO YAMAGUCHI

0. Introduction

A function f on a complete connected Riemannian manifold M is said to be *convex* if for any geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$, any $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $0<\lambda<1$, f satisfies the following inequality; $f \circ \gamma((1-\lambda)t_1+\lambda t_2) \leqq (1-\lambda) f \circ \gamma(t_1)+\lambda f \circ \gamma(t_2)$. It is well known that a convex function is Lipschitz continuous on every compact subset. If the above inequality is strict for all γ, t_1, t_2 and λ, then f is said to be *strictly convex*. A function is said to be locally nonconstant if it is not constant on any open subset. If M admits a nontrivial convex function, then M is noncompact. Clearly strict convexity induces local nonconstancy. Recentry the topological structure of manifolds which admit locally nonconstant convex functions has been decided by Greene-Shiohama [4]. Since a convex function imposes a certain restriction to the Riemannian structure, it is natural to ask the influences of the existence of a convex function on the Riemannian structure. In this paper we will investigate the influences of the existence of strictly convex functions with compact levels on the isometry groups. According to [4], if a level set $f^{-1}(t)$ of a locally nonconstant convex function f on M is compact then all level sets are also compact. Such an f is said to be with compact levels. And corresponding to each $t \in f(M)$ the diameter $\delta(t)$ of $f^{-1}(t)$, the diameter function of f, $\delta : f(M) \to \mathbb{R}$, is well defined and is monotone nondecreasing. We will prove the following theorems.

THEOREM A. — *If* M *admits a strictly convex function with minimum, then each compact subgroup of the isometry group* I(M) *of* M *has a common fixed point.*

THEOREM B. — *If* M *admits a strictly convex function with compact levels and with no minimum, then all the isometric images of any level set intersect the level set. In particular,* I(M) *is compact.*

Cheeger-Gromoll [3] proved the following splitting theorem for complete manifolds of nonnegative sectional curvature by constructing an expanding filtration of M by compact totally convex sets which are sublevel sets of a convex function.

THEOREM [3]. — *A complete Riemannian manifold* M *of nonnegative sectional curvature splits uniquely as* $\overline{M} \times \mathbb{R}^k$, *where the isometry group of* $\overline{M}$ *is compact and* $I(M) = I(\overline{M}) \times I(\mathbb{R}^k)$.

Recently S. T. Yau [9] has obtained a similar result to Theorem A for strongly convex functions, which is stronger than strict convexity. A function $f: M \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *strongly convex* if for a given compact set K of M there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\{f \circ \gamma(t) + f \circ \gamma(-t) - 2 f \circ \gamma(0)\} / t^2 > \varepsilon$ for any geodesic γ with $\gamma(0) \in K$. Clearly $f(t) = t^4$ is not strongly convex but strictly convex. It will be clear from examples which we will construct later that Theorem A is a natural extention of a classical theorem due to E. Cartan which states that each compact subgroup of the isometry group of a simply connected complete Riemannian manifold of nonpositive sectional curvature has a common fixed point. We note that any manifold satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem A is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n = \dim M$), and in the situation of Theorem B M is homeomorphic to $N \times \mathbb{R}$, where N is a level set [4]. The key to the proof of Theorem B is to show that the metric projection onto any sublevel set is locally distance decreasing. This is done in paragraph 3.

The author wishes to thank Professor K. Shiohama for his advice and suggestion.

1. Preliminaries

Hereafter let M be a complete connected Riemannian manifold with $\dim M \geqq 2$ and let ρ be the distance function induced from the Riemannian metric. For an $r > 0$ and a point p of M let $B_r(p)$ denote the open metric ball of radius r around p. It is well known as the Whitehead Theorem (*see* [2]) that there exists a positive continuous function c on M, which is called a convexity radius function, such that for every point $p \in M$ (1) any open ball $B_r(p')$ contained in $B_{c(p)}(p)$ is a strongly convex set, (2) $\rho^2(p', .)$ is C^∞-strongly convex on $B_r(p')$. A set $A \subset M$ is called to be *strongly convex* if for any two points p and q of A there exists a unique minimizing geodesic from p to q and it is contained in A. A set $A \subset M$ is called to be *totally convex* if A contains all geodesic segments which join any two points of A, and a set $C \subset M$ is called to be *convex* if for any point p of the closure $\overline{C}$ of C there exists a positive number $\varepsilon(p)$, $0 < \varepsilon(p) \leqq c(p)$, such that $C \cap B(p)$ is strongly convex.

PROPOSITION (*cf.* [4], Prop. 1.2). — *If* C *is a closed convex set of* M *then there exists an open neighborhood* U *of* C *such that for any point p of* C *there exists a unique point q of* C *such that* $\rho(p, q) = \rho(p, C)$.

Then the map $\pi_c : U \to C$, which is called the metric projection of U onto C, can be defined by $\rho(p, \pi_c(p)) = \rho(p, C)$ and is continuous.

For a real valued function f on M and for arbitrary real numbers a and b, $a \leqq b$, we will denote $f([a, b])$ and $f((-\infty, a])$ by $M_a^b(f)$ and $M^a(f)$ respectively, or briefly M_a^b and M^a. If M_a^a (resp. M^a) is not empty, then it is called a level set of f (resp. a sublevel set of f). It is clear that every sublevel set of a convex function is totally convex.

Let C be a convex set of M and let $p \in C$. A tangent vector v to M at p is *normal* to C at p if for any smooth curve γ in C emanating from p we have $\langle \gamma'(0), v \rangle \leqq 0$. If $\pi_c : U \to C$ is a metric projection onto C and if $p \in U - C$ and if γ is a minimizing geodesic from $\pi_c(p)$ to p, then $\gamma'(0)$ is normal to C at $\pi_c(p)$. Conversely if v is a normal vector to C at p then

$\pi_c(\exp_p tv/\|v\|)=p$ for any sufficiently small $t>0$. We note that the set of all normal vectors to C at p is a closed subset of M_p.

2. Proof of Theorem A and examples

Proof of Theorem A. — Let f be a strictly convex function with minimum on M and let G be a compact subgroup of the isometry group of M. We note that $M^\alpha(f)$ is compact for any $\alpha\in f(M)$. Let μ denote the Haar measure on G normalized by $\int_G d\mu=1$. We define a function F on M by:

$$F(x)=\int_G f(gx)\,d\mu(g).$$

For every element g of G, $f\circ g$ is also strictly convex, and so is F. Now we will show that F has also minimum.

ASSERTION. — For any $a\in\mathbb{R}$ there is a $b\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $M^a(F)\subset M^b(f)$.

To prove the assertion, suppose that it is not true. Then there are some $a\in\mathbb{R}$ and a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $M^a(F)$ so that $f(x_n)\to\infty$. It follows from the definition of F that for each n there is a $g_n\in G$ such that $f(g_n x_n)\leqq a$. Thus it turns out that $G\cdot M^a(f)$ is unbounded. This contradicts the compactness of G and $M^a(f)$.

The proof of Theorem A is complete since F has a unique minimum point by the strict convexity of F and since it is G-invariant.

Q.E.D.

Examples. — (*a*) Let H denote a simply connected Riemannian manifold of nonpositive sectional curvature. For a given point p of H $\rho^2(p,.)$ is C^∞-strongly convex with minimum.

(*b*) Palaboloid; $\{(x,y,z)\in\mathbb{R}^3;\ z=x^2+y^2\}$. $f(x,y,z)=z$ is strictly convex with minimum. The curvature is positive everywhere.

(*c*) (*see* [8]). Let $0<a<b$ and $h:[0,\infty)\to[0,1]$ be a C^∞-function such that (1) $h(v)=0$ for $v\leqq a$ and $h(v)=1$ for $v\geqq b$, (2) if we define g by $g(v)=v^2+h(v)$ for $v\geqq 0$, then $g'(v)>0$ for all $v>0$ and $g''(v_0)<0$ for some v_0, $a<v_0<b$. We consider a surface of revolution; $S=\{(v\cos u, v\sin u, g(v));\ 0\leqq u\leqq 2\pi,\ v\geqq 0\}$ whose curvature is negative on a neighborhood of $\{(u,v_0);\ 0\leqq u\leqq 2\pi\}$ and is positive on $\{(u,v);\ 0\leqq u\leqq 2\pi,\ v\leqq a \text{ or } v\geqq b\}$. For each positive integer n we define a function f_n on S by $f_n(u,v)=g^n(v)$. Then f_n is strongly convex with minimum for any sufficiently large n.

3. The diameter functions for strictly convex functions

Let f be a locally nonconstant convex function with compact levels on M and let $m=\inf_M f$, then the diameter function $\delta:(m,\infty)\to\mathbb{R}$ is defined by $\delta(t)=\max\{\rho(x,y);\ x,y\in M_t^t\}$. δ is monotone nondecreasing [4]. In this section we will prove that if f is strictly convex with compact levels, then δ is strictly increasing. Hereafter we will fix a strictly convex function f with compact levels. Let $a, b \in (m, \infty)$, $a \leqq b$, be fixed and B be a sufficiently large compact neighborhood of M_a^b and let $r_0 = \min_B c$ where c is a convexity radius function on M. There exists a neighborhood U of the zero section of TM such that $\mathrm{Exp} \mid U$ is an embedding and $\mathrm{Exp}(U) \supset \overline{B_{r_0}(x)} \times \overline{B_{r_0}(x)}$ for any $x \in M_a^b$, where $\mathrm{Exp} : TM \to M \times M$ is the exponential mapping defined by $\mathrm{Exp}(v) = (\pi(v), \exp_{\pi(v)} v)$ and $\pi : TM \to M$ is the natural projection. For each $x \in B$ let:

$$L_x = \inf \{ L > 0;\ L^{-1} \leqq \| d(\mathrm{Exp} \mid U)^{-1} \mid \overline{B_{r_0}(x)} \times \overline{B_{r_0}(x)} \| \leqq L \}$$

and let $L = \sup \{ L_x;\ x \in B \}$. It is clear from compactness argument that $0 < L < \infty$. Let $\varkappa$ be the maximum of the absolute values of the sectional curvature on B. Let $\mu = \min \{ \delta(a)/8, r_0/8 \}$ and let $A = \{ (x, y) \in M_\beta^\beta \times M_\beta^\beta;\ \mu \leqq \rho(x, y) \leqq r_0/2,\ a \leqq \beta \leqq b \}$. For each $x \in M$ we denote the set of all unit normal vectors to $M^{f(x)}$ at x by $N_x^1(f)$. Now for each $(x, y) \in A$ and for each $v_1 \in N_x^1(f)$, $v_2 \in N_y^1(f)$ let γ_1 and γ_2 be the geodesics emanating from x and y whose velocity vectors are v_1 and v_2 respectively. Let $x' = \gamma_1(t_1)$ and $y' = \gamma_2(t_2)$ be arbitrary fixed points on γ_1 and γ_2 so that $t_1 > 0$, $\mu/4 \geqq t_1 \geqq t_2 \geqq 0$. We reparametrize the subarc of γ_1 and γ_2 by $\tau_1(s) = \gamma_1(s)$ and $\tau_2(s) = \gamma_2(t_2 s/t_1)$, $0 \leqq s \leqq t_1$. $\alpha : [0, 1] \times [0, t_1] \to M$ is the rectangle such that each $\alpha_s = \alpha(\ , s)$ is a unique minimizing geodesic from $\tau_1(s)$ to $\tau_2(s)$. Let $L(\alpha_s)$ be the length of α_s. The next lemma follows from a standard argument using the second variation formula and the Rauch comparison theorem. *See* [4] for details.

LEMMA 3.1. — *There exists a positive constant* $C_2 = C_2(r_0, L, \varkappa, \mu)$ *such that for any* $(x, y) \in A$ *and any* $v_1 \in N_x^1(f)$, $v_2 \in N_y^1(f)$, x', y' *as above and for any* $s \in [0, t_1]$, *we have* $|L''(\alpha_s)| \leqq C_2$.

Next we will estimate the first variation for α. By the first variation formula, we have:

$$L'(\alpha_s)|_{s=0} = (\langle t_2 v_2/t_1, \alpha_0'(1) \rangle - \langle v_1, \alpha_0'(0) \rangle).$$

From the definition of normal vectors, we have $\langle v_2, \alpha_0'(1) \rangle \geqq 0$, $\langle v_1, \alpha_0'(0) \rangle \leqq 0$. By the strict convexity of f, $f(\alpha_0(1/2)) < \beta$. Suppose that $\langle v_1, \alpha_0(0) \rangle = 0$ and let U_1 be a neighborhood of $\alpha_0(1/2)$ on which f takes values smaller than β. Take a point z of the intersection of the geodesic surface $\{ \exp_x(t_1 v_1 + t_2(\alpha_0'(0)));\ t_1, t_2 > 0 \}$ with U_1 and let γ be a unique minimizing geodesic segment from x to z. Then by the convexity of f, γ is contained in M^β. Since $\gamma'(0)$ makes an acute angle with v_1, this is a contradiction for v_1 to be a normal vector. It follows that $L'(\alpha_s)|_{s=0} > 0$. Now let:

$$C_1 = \inf \{ L'(\alpha_s)|_{s=0};\ (x, y) \in A,\ v_1 \in N_x^1(f),\ v_2 \in N_y^1(f),\ x', y' \text{ as above} \}.$$

It is easy to see that $C_1 > 0$. It follows from the preceding lemma that $L'(\alpha_s) = L'(0) + s L''(\theta s) \geqq C_1 - s C_2$ for some θ, $0 \leqq \theta \leqq 1$. Hence we have obtained:

LEMMA 3.2. — *For any* $(x, y) \in A$ *and any* $v_1 \in N_x^1(f)$, $v_2 \in N_y^1(f)$ *and for any* $x' = \gamma(t_1)$, $y' = \gamma(t_2)$ *such that* $C_1/C_2 \geqq t_1 \geqq t_2 \geqq 0$, $t_1 > 0$ *as before*, $L(\alpha_s)$ *is strictly increasing on* $[0, t_1]$.

For any $\beta \in [a, b]$ M^β is a totally convex set. If we set $U = \bigcup_{x \in M^\beta} B_{r_0/2}(x)$ then the metric projection π_{M^β} of U onto M^β, which we briefly denote by π_β, can be defined as in paragraph 1.

LEMMA 3.3. — *There exists a positive constant* ε_0 *such that for each* $\beta \in [a, b]$ *if* $x \in M^{\beta+\varepsilon_0} - M^\beta$ *and* $y \in M_\beta^{\beta+\varepsilon_0}$ *satisfy* $2\mu \leqq \rho(x, y) \leqq 3 r_0/8$, *then we have* $\rho(x, y) > \rho(\pi_\beta(x), \pi_\beta(y))$.

Proof. — Let $\varepsilon_1 = \min\{\mu/4, C_1/C_2\}$ and let:

$$\varepsilon_0(\beta) = \inf\{f(\exp_x \varepsilon_1 v_x);\ x \in M_\beta^\beta,\ v_x \in N_x^1(f)\} - \beta.$$

The required constant will be obtained by $\varepsilon_0 = \inf\{\varepsilon_0(\beta);\ a \leqq \beta \leqq b\}$. We note that $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Then for any x and y as in this lemma we have $\rho(\pi_\beta(x), x) \leqq \varepsilon_1$, $\rho(\pi_\beta(y), y) \leqq \varepsilon_1$ and $(\pi_\beta(x), \pi_\beta(y)) \in A$ by triangle inequalities. Therefore the preceding lemma completes the proof.

Q.E.D.

PROPOSITION 3.4. — δ *is strictly increasing.*

Proof. — For a given $c \in (m, \infty)$ let ε_0 be the positive constant given in the preceding lemma for $a = b = c$. Fix an arbitrary s such that $0 < s \leqq \varepsilon_0$. Let x_0 and y_0 be two points of M_c^c such that $\rho(x_0, y_0) = \delta(c)$, and let $v_1 \in N_{x_0}^1(f)$, $v_2 \in N_{y_0}^1(f)$ and let x_1 and y_1 be two points of M_{c+s}^{c+s} at which two geodesics $\exp_{x_0} t v_1$, $\exp_{y_0} t v_2$, $t \geqq 0$, intersect M_{c+s}^{c+s} respectively. By $\sigma : [0, d] \to M$ we denote a minimizing unit speed geodesic from x_1 to y_1. We consider two cases.

Case 1. — $\sigma([0, d]) \cap M_c^c = \emptyset$.

We can choose a subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_k = d$ of $[0, d]$ such that $2\mu \leqq t_i - t_{i-1} \leqq 3 r_0/8$ for all i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$. Using Lemma 3.3 we have:

$$\rho(x_1, y_1) = \sum_1^k \rho(\sigma(t_{i-1}), \sigma(t_i)) > \sum_1^k \rho(\pi_c \sigma(t_{i-1}), \pi_c \sigma(t_i)) \geqq \rho(x_0, y_0).$$

Hence $\delta(c+s) > \delta(c)$.

Case 2. — $\sigma([0, d]) \cap M_c^c \neq \emptyset$.

Then there exist $s_1, s_2 \in (0, d)$, $s_1 \leqq s_2$, such that $\sigma([0, s_1))$ and $\sigma((s_2, d])$ are contained in $M^{c+s} - M^c$ and $\sigma([s_1, s_2])$ is contained in M^c. We can choose two subdivision, $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_{k_1} = s_1$ and $s_2 = u_0 < u_1 < \ldots < u_{k_2} = d$ of $[0, s_1]$ and $[s_2, d]$ which satisfy the following conditions:

$$2\mu \leqq t_i - t_{i-1} \leqq 3 r_0/8 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \ldots, k_1 - 1,\ s_1 - t_{k_1-1} < 2\mu,$$
$$2\mu \leqq u_i - u_{i-1} \leqq 3 r_0/8 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 2, \ldots, k_2,\ u_1 - s_2 < 2\mu.$$

Since $\rho^2(\sigma(s_1), .)$ and $\rho^2(\sigma(s_2), .)$ are C^∞-strongly convex on $B_{r_0}(\sigma(s_1))$ and $B_{r_0}(\sigma(s_2))$ respectively, we have $\rho(\sigma(t_{k-1}), \sigma(s_1)) > \rho(\pi_c(\sigma(t_{k-1})), \sigma(s_1))$ and $\rho(\sigma(s_2), \sigma(u_1)) > \rho(\sigma(s_2), \pi_c \sigma(u_1))$. It follows from the same argument as in case 1 that $\rho(x_1, \sigma(s_1)) > \rho(\pi_c(x_1), \sigma(s_1))$ and $\rho(\sigma(s_2), y_1) > \rho(\sigma(s_2), \pi_c(y_1))$. It follows that $\rho(x_1, y_1) > \rho(\pi_c(x_1), \pi_c(y_1))$. Therefore $\delta(c+s) > \delta(c)$.

Q.E.D.

4. Proof of Theorem B

Let f be a strictly convex function on M with compact levels and with no minimum, and let $m = \inf_M f$. The proof of Theorem B is achieved by supposing that it is not true and then by deriving a contradiction. The contradiction, roughly speaking, comes as follows. By the fact that M is homeomorphic to $N \times \mathbb{R}$ where N is any level set (*see* [4], Theorem C), the isometric image of a level set must always separate M into two unbounded components. But by the diameter increasing property this is not possible if a low level set is moved to a higher level, where a larger diameter would be required.

Suppose that $M_c^c \cap \psi(M_c^c) = \emptyset$ for some $c \in f(M)$ and some $\psi \in I(M)$. It follows that $\psi(M_c^c) \cap M^c = \emptyset$ or $\psi(M_c^c) \subset M^c$. We consider two cases.

Proof of Theorem B in the case $\psi(M_c^c) \cap M^c = \emptyset$. — Let $a = \min\{f(x); x \in \psi(M_c^c)\}$ and $b = \max\{f(x); x \in \psi(M_c^c)\}$. Notice that $c < a$. Let ε_0 denote the constant obtained in Lemma 3.3 for these a and b. We choose subdivision $a = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_k = b$ of $[a, b]$ such that $t_i - t_{i-1} \leqq \varepsilon_0$ for all i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k$. For each i, $1 \leqq i \leqq k-1$, let $\pi_{t_i} : M^{t_i+1} \to M^{t_i}$ be the metric projection and let $H = \pi_{t_0} \circ \ldots \circ \pi_{t_{k-1}} : M^b \to M^a$.

ASSERTION. — $d(H \circ \psi(M_c^c)) \leqq \delta(c)$, where $d(H \circ \psi(M_c^c))$ is by definition the diameter of $H \circ \psi(M_c^c)$.

Proof of Assertion. — We suppose that $d(H \circ \psi(M_c^c)) > \delta(c)$ and take two points x and y of $H \circ \psi(M_c^c)$ such that $\rho(x, y) = d(H \circ \psi(M_c^c))$. Let x' and y' be such points of $\psi(M_c^c)$ that $H(x') = x$ and $H(y') = y$. We may assume that $t_{i_0} \leqq f(x') < t_{i_0+1}$ and $t_{j_0} \leqq f(y') < t_{j_0+1}$ for $i_0 \geqq j_0$. Let $x_i = \pi_{t_i} \circ \ldots \circ \pi_{t_{i_0}}(x')$ for each $i \leqq i_0$ and let $y_j = \pi_{t_j} \circ \ldots \circ \pi_{t_{j_0}}(y')$ for each $j \leqq j_0$. In the proof of Proposition 3.4 if we replace $\mu = \min\{\delta(a)/8, r_0/8\}$ by $\min\{\delta(c)/8, r_0/8\}$ then we have $\rho(x, y) < \rho(x_1, y_1) < \ldots < \rho(x_{j_0}, y_{j_0}) < \rho(x_{j_0+1}, y')$. Let $\eta : [0, d] \to M$ be a unit speed minimizing geodesic from x' to y'. For each $i, j_0 + 1 \leqq i \leqq i_0$, let z_i be the point of intersection of η with $M_{t_i}^{t_i}$. In the same way as Proposition 3.4 we have $\rho(x', z_{i_0}) \geqq \rho(x_{i_0}, z_{i_0})$. It follows that:

$$\rho(x', z_{i_0-1}) \geqq \rho(x_{i_0}, z_{i_0}) + \rho(z_{i_0}, z_{i_0-1}) \geqq \rho(x_{i_0}, z_{i_0-1}).$$

Iterating this, we have:

$$\rho(x', z_{i_0-2}) \geqq \rho(x_{i_0-1}, z_{i_0-2}), \ldots, \rho(x', z_{j_0+1}) \geqq \rho(x_{j_0+2}, z_{j_0+1}) \geqq \rho(x_{j_0+1}, z_{j_0+1}).$$

It follows that:

$$\rho(x', y')=\rho(x', z_{j_0+1})+\rho(z_{j_0+1}, y')\geqq\rho(x_{j_0+1}, z_{j_0+1})+\rho(z_{j_0+1}, y')\geqq\rho(x_{j_0+1}, y').$$

Therefore we have:

$$\delta(c)\geqq\rho(x', y')\geqq\rho(x, y)=d(\mathrm{H}\circ\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c))$$

which contradicts the first assumption.

Q.E.D.

By Proposition 3.4 it is possible to take a point p_0 which belongs to $\mathrm{M}_a^a-\mathrm{H}\circ\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c)$. Coosing :

$$p_1\in\pi_{t_0}^{-1}(p_0)\cap\mathrm{M}_{t_1}^{t_1}, \qquad p_2\in\pi_{t_1}^{-1}(p_1)\cap\mathrm{M}_{t_2}^{t_2}, \ \ldots, \ p_k\in\pi_{t_{k-1}}^{-1}(p_{k-1})\cap\mathrm{M}_b^b$$

and joining p_0 to p_1, p_1 to p_2, ..., p_{k-1} to p_k in this order by minimizing geodesics we obtain a broken geodesic σ from p_0 to p_k which does not intersect $\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c)$. It is easy to construct a continuous extention $\sigma_1:\mathbb{R}\to\mathrm{M}$ of σ such that $\sigma_1(\mathbb{R})\cap\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c)=\emptyset$ and $f\circ\sigma_1(\mathbb{R})=(m, \infty)$. Since M is topologically a product of a level set and $\mathbb{R}$, it turns out that $f\circ\psi^{-1}\circ\sigma_1(\mathbb{R})=(m, \infty)$. This contradicts the fact that $\sigma_1(\mathbb{R})\cap\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c)=\emptyset$.

The rest of the proof of Theorem B is a direct consequence of the following:

COROLLARY C. — *Under the same hypothesis as in Theorem B, every isometry of* M *fixes each of the two ends of* M.

Proof. — If some $\psi\in\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{M})$ permutes the ends, then there is a compact set K of M such that ψ maps one component U_1 of M − K into the other component U_2 and maps U_2 into U_1. It turns out that ψ maps a low level set to a much higher level. This is impossible.

Proof of Theorem B in the case $\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c(f))\subset\mathrm{M}^c(f)$. — We note that since $f\circ\psi^{-1}$ is strictly convex, it follows from Theorem A in [4] that every level set of $f\circ\psi^{-1}$ is connected. Let A be the closure of the component of $\mathrm{M}-\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c(f))$ which does not contain $\mathrm{M}_c^c(f)$, then we get that $\mathrm{M}^c(f\circ\psi^{-1})=\mathrm{A}$ or $\mathrm{M}^c(f\circ\psi^{-1})=\overline{\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{A}}$. If $\mathrm{M}^c(f\circ\psi^{-1})(=\psi(\mathrm{M}^c(f)))=\overline{\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{A}}$, it contradicts Corollary C. Hence $\mathrm{M}^c(f\circ\psi^{-1})=\mathrm{A}$. We set $\alpha=\max\{f(x);\ x\in\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c(f))\}$ and $d=\max\{f\circ\psi^{-1}(x);\ x\in\mathrm{M}_\alpha^\alpha(f)\}$. Notice that $\delta(\alpha)<\delta(c)$ and $\mathrm{M}_\alpha^\alpha(f)\subset\mathrm{M}_c^d(f\circ\psi^{-1})$. Now we can use the same argument as in the case $\psi(\mathrm{M}_c^c(f))\cap\mathrm{M}^c(f)=\emptyset$ with $f\circ\psi^{-1}$ in place of f and define a projection from $\mathrm{M}^d(f\circ\psi^{-1})$ onto $\mathrm{M}^c(f\circ\psi^{-1})$ as before. Then projecting $\mathrm{M}_\alpha^\alpha(f)$ to $\mathrm{M}^c(f\circ\psi^{-1})$ derives a contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem B.

Q.E.D.

In general, in the situation of Theorem B a level set is not invariant under the isometries. It is not difficult to exhibit the examples.

REFERENCES

[1] R. L. BISHOP and B. O'NEILL, *Manifolds of Negative Curvature* (*Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. 145, 1969, p. 1-49).

[2] J. CHEEGER and D. G. EBIN, *Comparison Theorems in Riemannian Geometry*, North-Holland, 1975.

[3] J. CHEEGER and D. GROMOLL, *On the Structure of Complete Manifolds of Nonnegative Curvature* (*Ann. of Math.*, Vol. 96, 1972, p. 415-443).

[4] R. E. GREENE and K. SHIOHAMA, *Convex Functions on Complete Noncompact Manifolds; Topological Structure*, (*Inventiones Math.*, Vol. 63, 1981, p. 129-157).

[5] D. GROMOLL and W. MEYER, *On Complete Open Manifolds of Positive Curvature* (*Ann. of Math.*, Vol. 90, 1969, p. 75-90).

[6] S. HELGASON, *Differential Geometry*, *Lie Groups and Symmetric Spaces*, Academic press, 1978.

[7] R. T. ROCKAFELLAR, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton U.P., 1970.

[8] K. SHIGA, *Notes on Complete Noncompact Riemannian Manifolds with Convex Exaustion Functions* (*Hokkaido Math. J.*, Vol. 11, 1982, p. 55-61).

[9] S. T. YAU, *Remarks on the Group of Isometries on a Riemannian Manifold* (*Topology*, Vol. 16, 1977, p. 239-247).

(Manuscrit reçu le 17 juillet 1981,
révisé le 2 novembre 1981).

TAKAO YAMAGUCHI,
University of Tsukuba,
Sakura-mura Ibaraki,
305 Japan