

# A UNIQUENESS THEOREM FOR A SURFACE WITH PRINCIPAL CURVATURES CONNECTED BY THE RELATION $(1 - k_1d)(1 - k_2d) = -1$

V. A. Toponogov

UDC 513.013

Let  $F$  be an oriented complete regular surface in three-dimensional Euclidean space  $E^3$ . Denote by  $k_1(p)$  and  $k_2(p)$  ( $k_1(p) \leq k_2(p)$ ) the principal curvatures of  $F$  at a point  $p$ , whose signs are determined by some continuous field  $n(p)$  of normals to  $F$ . Denote by  $K(p)$  the Gaussian curvature of  $F$  at  $p$ . In the article we prove the following

**Theorem.** *If the surface  $F$  is analytic and there exists a continuous field  $n(p)$  of normals to  $F$  such that the principal curvatures  $k_1(p)$  and  $k_2(p)$  with signs determined by the field  $n(p)$  obey the condition  $(1 - k_1d)(1 - k_2d) = -1$ , then  $F$  is a circular cylinder of radius  $d/2$ .*

The proof of the theorem leans on two lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *If under the conditions of Theorem 1 there exists a regular curve on  $F$  such that the Gaussian curvature  $K(p)$  of  $F$  vanishes along the curve, then  $K(p) \equiv 0$ .*

The proof of the lemma is presented in [1, Lemma 10].

**Lemma 2.** *If  $F$  is a convex surface whose Gaussian curvature  $K(p)$  is not identical zero, then*

$$0 < \sup_{p \in F} k_1(p) \geq \inf_{p \in F} k_2(p).$$

**PROOF.** If  $F$  is a closed convex surface, then it is homeomorphic to a sphere and thus there exists at least one umbilical point  $p_0$  at which  $k_1(p_0) = k_2(p_0)$ ; in this case the claim of Lemma 2 is obvious. It remains to consider the case in which  $F$  is a complete open convex surface. In this case the surface  $F$  is homeomorphic to a plane by virtue of the assumptions of the lemma. We prove the claim of Lemma 2 by way of contradiction. Assume that

$$0 < k_1^0 = \sup_{p \in F} k_1(p) < \inf_{p \in F} k_2(p) = k_2^0. \quad (1)$$

From (1) it follows that there is a number  $d$  for which

$$1/k_2^0 < d < 1/k_1^0. \quad (2)$$

The surface  $F$  partitions  $E^3$  into domains  $D_1(F)$  and  $D_2(F)$ , one of which is convex. Assume that this is the domain  $D_1(F)$ . Assign

$$B_2 = \{p \in D_2(F) \mid \rho(p_1 F) > d\} \quad (3)$$

and let  $B_1 = E^3 \setminus B_2$ . Denote by  $F_d$  the surface that is obtained from  $F$  by indentation along the inner normal  $n(p)$  of  $F$  to the distance  $d$ , and denote by  $\varphi_d$  the map  $F \rightarrow F_d$  that results from the procedure. Then  $F_d$  satisfies the following properties:

( $\alpha$ )  $F_d \subset B_1$ ;

( $\beta$ )  $F_d$  is a smooth regular surface;

( $\gamma$ ) the Gaussian curvature  $\tilde{K}(q)$  of  $F_d$  is nonpositive; i.e.,  $\tilde{K}(q) \leq 0$  for all  $q \in F_d$ .

The validity of ( $\alpha$ ) follows from the definitions of the surface  $F_d$  and the domain  $B_1$ . Prove ( $\beta$ ). It follows from (1) that there are no umbilical points on the surface  $F$ . Therefore, in some neighborhood

of an arbitrary point  $p \in F$  we can choose a parameterization  $\bar{r} = \bar{r}(u, v)$  of  $F$  whose coordinate lines coincide with the curvature lines on  $F$ . Let  $q \in F_d$ ,  $q = \varphi_d(p)$ . In a neighborhood of  $q$  the equation of the surface  $F_d$  can be written in the form  $\tilde{r} = \bar{r}(u, v) + dn(u, v)$ . From the Rodriguez formula it follows that

$$\tilde{r}_u = \bar{r}_u - k_1 d \bar{r}_u = (1 - k_1 d) \bar{r}_u, \quad \tilde{r}_v = \bar{r}_v - k_2 d \bar{r}_v = (1 - k_2 d) \bar{r}_v. \quad (4)$$

Therefore,  $\tilde{r}_u \times \tilde{r}_v = (1 - k_1 d)(1 - k_2 d)(\bar{r}_u \times \bar{r}_v) \neq 0$  by virtue of (2); and item ( $\beta$ ) is proved.

Now, we let  $R_1(p)$  and  $R_2(p)$  denote the principal curvature radii of  $F$  at the point  $p$ , and we denote by  $R_1^d(q)$  and  $R_2^d(q)$  the principal curvature radii of  $F_d$  at the point  $q = \varphi_d(p)$ . Then the following relations hold

$$R_1^d(q) = R_1(p) - d, \quad R_2^d(q) = R_2(p) - d. \quad (5)$$

From (5) it follows that

$$\tilde{K}(q) = \frac{1}{R_1(p) - d} \cdot \frac{1}{R_2(p) - d} = \frac{k_1(p)k_2(p)}{[1 - k_1(p)d][1 - k_2(p)d]} \leq 0,$$

since  $k_1(p)k_2(p) \geq 0$ ,  $(1 - dk_1) > 0$ , and  $(1 - dk_2) < 0$ . Thus ( $\gamma$ ) is proved.

Now, let  $\Phi$  be a regular surface meeting the following conditions:

- (1) the Gaussian curvature  $K_\Phi(p)$  of the surface  $\Phi$  is strictly positive at every point  $p \in \Phi$ ;
- (2)  $\Phi$  is homeomorphic to a plane;
- (3)  $B_1 \subset D_1(\Phi)$ , where  $D_1(\Phi)$  is the convex domain bounded by  $\Phi$ .

We prove existence for such a surface. Since the Gaussian curvature of  $F$  is not identically equal to zero, there exists a point  $p \in \partial B_2$  at which the Gaussian curvature is strictly positive. Let  $q \in B_2$  be a point for which  $qp$  is orthogonal to  $\partial B_2$  at  $p$ . Denote by  $C$  the cone that is generated by all rays issuing from  $q$  and tangent to  $\partial B_2$ . If the length of the segment  $qp$  is sufficiently small, the cone  $C$  is strictly convex at the vertex  $q$ ; i.e., we can draw a plane through  $q$  which has no common points with  $C$  except the point  $q$ . However, then there exists a circular cone  $C_1$ , with vertex  $q$  and axis  $qp$ , containing the cone  $C$  and, consequently, the whole surface  $\partial B_2$ . Now, introduce a Cartesian coordinate system with origin  $q$  such that the positive direction of the axis  $z$  coincides with the ray  $qp$ . Assume the equation of the cone to be given by  $x^2 + y^2 - \text{tg}^2 \alpha \cdot z^2 = 0$  in this coordinate system. Take the upper sheet of the hyperboloid of two sheets defined by the equation  $-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{a^2} + \frac{(z+b)^2}{b^2} = 1$ , where  $b/a = \text{tg} \alpha$ , and denote it by  $\Phi$ . The surface  $\Phi$  possesses properties (1)–(3). Since  $F_d \subset B_1$ , we have  $F_d \in D_1(\Phi)$  and  $F_d \cap \Phi = \emptyset$ . Let  $q_1$  be a point in  $F_d$  and let  $p_1$  be a point in  $\Phi$ . Move the surface  $\Phi$  as a rigid body in the direction of the vector  $\overline{p_1 q_1}$  until the first moment at which the intersection of the surfaces  $F_d$  and  $\Phi$  becomes nonvoid. The surfaces  $F_d$  and  $\Phi$  are tangent to each other at any point  $q_0$  of the intersection and  $F_d$  lies entirely in  $\Phi$ . But in this case the Gaussian curvature of  $F_d$  at the point  $q_0$  is not less than the Gaussian curvature of  $\Phi$  at the same point  $q_0$ ; i.e., it is strictly positive. The contradiction obtained proves Lemma 2.

**PROOF OF THE THEOREM.** If the Gaussian curvature  $K(p)$  of the surface  $F$  takes values of distinct signs, then by virtue of analyticity of  $F$  there exists a regular curve  $\gamma$  along which  $K(p)$  vanishes, and Lemma 1 implies the equality  $K(p) \equiv 0$ . From the preceding equality and the assumptions of the theorem we obtain  $k_1(p) \equiv 0$  and  $k_2(p) = 2/d$ ; whence the assertion of the theorem ensues. It remains to eliminate the next two cases:

- (1)  $K(p) \geq 0$  for all  $p \in F$  and  $K(p) \equiv 0$ ;
- (2)  $K(p) \leq 0$  for all  $p \in F$  and  $K(p) \equiv 0$ .

In the first case, the inequality  $k_1(p) \geq 0$  and the equality  $(1 - k_1 d)(1 - k_2 d) = -1$  yield

$$0 \leq k_1 < 1/d < 2/d < k_2. \quad (6)$$

From (6) we infer  $0 < \sup_{p \in F} k_1(p) < \inf_{p \in F} k_2(p)$ , which contradicts Lemma 2. Consider the second case. Let  $F_d$  be the surface constructed from  $F$  in the same way as in Lemma 2. Define the normal

$\tilde{n}(q)$  to  $F_d$  at the point  $q = \varphi_d(p)$  by the equality  $\tilde{n}(q) = n(p)$ . Denote by  $\tilde{k}_1(q)$  and  $\tilde{k}_2(q)$  the principal curvatures of  $F_d$  at the point  $q$ . Then from (5) and the choice of the normal  $\tilde{n}(q)$  we infer

$$\tilde{k}_1(q) = \frac{-k_1(p)}{1 - k_1 d}, \quad \tilde{k}_2(q) = \frac{-k_2(p)}{1 - k_2 d}, \quad (7)$$

where  $q = \varphi_d(p)$ . From (7) we have

$$\tilde{K}(q) = \frac{-k_1(p)}{1 - k_1 d} \cdot \frac{-k_2(p)}{1 - k_2 d} = -k_1(p)k_2(p) = -K(p) \geq 0 \quad (8)$$

and

$$(1 - k_1(q)d)(1 - k_2(q)d) = \left(1 + \frac{k_1(p)d}{1 - k_1 d}\right) \left(1 + \frac{k_2(p)d}{1 - k_2 d}\right) = \frac{1}{1 - k_1 d} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - k_2 d} = -1. \quad (9)$$

From (8) and Theorem 9 of [2, p. 742], it follows that  $F_d$  is a convex surface. At the same time equality (9) shows that  $F_d$  satisfies the conditions of the theorem. Therefore, case (2) reduces to case (1) that has been excluded earlier. The theorem is proved.

### References

1. V. A. Toponogov, "Surfaces of generalized constant width," *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, **34**, No. 3, 179-189 (1993).
2. A. V. Pogorelov, *Extrinsic Geometry of Convex Surfaces* [in Russian], Nauka, Moscow (1969).

TRANSLATED BY V. B. MARENICH