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## 1. Introduction

An immersed hypersurface $S$ in a riemannian manifold $M$ will be called $\varepsilon$-convex for some $\varepsilon>0$ if all principal curvatures have the same sign and absolute value at least $\varepsilon$. Can one characterize all compact $\varepsilon$-convex immersed hypersurfaces of a complete manifold $M$ ? If $M$ is euclidean $n$-space, $n \geqq 3$, this problem is solved by a theorem of Hadamard [14] generalized by Hopf [15]: $S$ is embedded and bounds a convex $n$-disk (see $6.6,6.3$ ). If $M$ is a flat space form, $S$ is no longer necessarily embedded, but it still bounds an (immersed) convex $n$-disk. The aim of this paper is to show the same fact for a manifold $M$ of curvature $K \geqq 0$ :

Theorem A. Let $M$ be a complete riemannian manifold with nonnegative sectional curvature and dimension $n \geqq 3$. Let $S$ be a compact connected $C^{\infty}$-manifold of dimension $n-1$ and $y: S \rightarrow M$ an $\varepsilon$-convex immersion, for some $\varepsilon>0$. Then there is an immersion $\hat{y}: D \rightarrow M$ where $D$ is the standard $n$-disk, and a diffeomorphism $\phi: S^{n-1}=\partial D \rightarrow S$ such that $\left.\hat{y}\right|_{\partial D}=y \circ \phi$ and the mean curvature vector of $y(S)$ is pointing towards $\hat{y}(D)$.

Theorem A is not true for negative curvature; e.g. $S$ could be the boundary of a tubular neighborhood around a closed geodesic. It is also false for $n=2$ : Any locally strongly convex closed plane curve of winding number 2 or more provides a counterexample. The idea of the proof is to contract the hypersurface by pushing it along the gradient lines of a smoothed modification of its local distance function. The distance function is essentially strictly convex, due to $K \geqq 0$ ((Chap. 3), and the smoothing does not disturb the convexity (Chap. 4), and therefore, this motion is distance-decreasing with respect to the inner metric of $S$. In the case of the 2-dimensional counterexample mentioned above, $S$ would eventually develop a cusp and the motion would stop there. A main step of the proof is to show that this cannot happen in higher dimension. Since this is a local question, it can be treated in euclidean space (Chap. 6), by means of suitable coordinates (Chap. 5). So the contraction ends with a point and the hypersurface bounds an immersed disk (Chap. 7).

Convexity methods have been used extensively in the geometry of nonnegative curvature (see [11, 4, 9]). The main difference is that we have to work with functions which are defined only locally.

A useful application of this theorem is a very short and direct proof of the sphere theorem of Berger and Klingenberg [2, 17, 10]:

Theorem B. Let $M$ be a complete connected riemannian manifold with bounded positive curvature $0<K_{\min } \leqq K \leqq K_{\max }$ and $K_{\max } / K_{\min }<4$. Then $M$ is diffeomorphically covered by a twisted sphere.

As usual, by a twisted sphere we mean the union of two discs $D_{+}$and $D_{-}$, pasted together by a diffeomorphism between $\partial D_{+}$and $\partial D_{-}$(see [3]). The proof of Theorem B uses neither Toponogov's theorem nor Klingenberg's estimate of the injectivity radius. In fact, this latter theorem is a consequence of the proof:

Theorem C. Let $M$ be complete, simply connected with $0<K_{\min } \leqq K \leqq K_{\max }$ and $K_{\max } / K_{\min }<4$. Then for any point $p$ in $M$, the injectivity radius at $p$ equals precisely the conjugate radius at $p$ which is not less then $\pi / \sqrt{K_{\max }}$.

## 2. Proof of the Theorems $B$ and $C$

Let $M$ be as in the assumption of Theorem B. Multiplying the metric of $M$ by a suitable factor, we may assume $\frac{1}{4} \leqq K<1$. Choose an arbitrary point $p \in M$. Due to $K<1$, the conjugate distance $r_{0}$ of $p$ is strictly larger than $\pi$ (see remark in 3.4). So for any $r \in\left(\pi, r_{0}\right)$, the exponential map $e:=\exp _{p}$ has highest rank on the closed ball $\bar{B}_{r}(0)$ in $T_{p} M$. Let $S:=\partial B_{r}(0)$ and $y:=\left.e\right|_{S}: S \rightarrow M$; this is an immersion. Let $N: S$ $\rightarrow T M$ be the unit normal vector field along $y$ which points towards the interior, $e\left(B_{r}(0)\right)$. Then due to $K \geqq \frac{1}{4}$, there is an $\varepsilon>0$ such that $\left\langle D_{X} N, X\right\rangle \geqq \varepsilon\|X\|^{2}$ for any tangent vector $X$ of $S$. (Just apply Lemma $3.4(\mathrm{~b})$ to the manifold $B_{r_{0}}(0)$ with metric induced by $\exp _{p}$ and to the hypersurface $S=\partial B_{r}(0)$.) Thus the immersed hypersurface $S$ in $M$ is $\varepsilon$-convex with mean curvature vector pointing towards the exterior. By Theorem A, there is a diffeomorphism $\phi: S^{n-1}=\partial D \rightarrow S$ and an immersion $\hat{y}: D \rightarrow M$ with $\left.\hat{y}\right|_{\partial D}=y \circ \phi$ such that the normal field $N$ along $y$ is pointing outside $\hat{y}(D)$. Let $D_{+}=B_{r}(0)$ and $D_{-}=D$ and consider the twisted sphere $S_{\phi}=D_{+} \bigcup_{\phi} D_{-}$. Then $\psi=e \bigcup_{\phi} \hat{y}$ is a local diffeomorphism of $S_{\phi}$ onto $M$ and hence a covering map which proves Theorem B. If $M$ is simply connected, $\psi$ is even a global diffeomorphism and in particular, $e=\exp _{p}$ is injective on $\bar{B}_{r}(0)$ for all $r<r_{0}$. This proves Theorem C.

## 3. Hypersurfaces and distance function

3.1. Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $S$ and $\bar{S}$ hypersurfaces in $M$ which touch each other at some point $p \in M$. Let $N$ and $\bar{N}$ be unit normal fields on $S$ and $\bar{S}$ whith $N_{p}=\bar{N}_{p}$. Let $t_{0}$ and $\bar{t}_{0}$ be the focal distances of $S$ and $\bar{S}$ in the direction of $N_{p}$.
Lemma 3.1. If $\left\langle D_{X} N, X\right\rangle<\left\langle D_{X} \bar{N}, X\right\rangle$ for every $0 \neq X \in T_{p} S$, then $t_{0}<\bar{t}_{0}$.

Proof. Let $c$ be the geodesic with $c(0)=p, c^{\prime}(0)=N_{p}$. For any parameter $t$, we identify the subspace $c^{\prime}(t)^{\perp}$ of $T_{c(t)} M$ with $T_{p} S=c^{\prime}(0)^{\perp}$ via parallel transport along $c$. For any $x \in T_{p} S$ let $J_{x}(t)$ be the Jacobifield along $c$ with $J_{x}(0)=x$ and $J_{x}^{\prime}(0)=D_{x} N$ and similar $\bar{J}_{x}(t)$ with $\bar{J}_{x}^{\prime}(0)=D_{x} \bar{N}$. Thus we defined two families of linear mappings $J(t), \bar{J}(t)$ on $T_{p} S$ by setting $J(t) x=J_{x}(t), \bar{J}(t) x=\bar{J}_{x}(t)$, and these satisfy the Jacobi equation $J^{\prime \prime}+R J=0$ where $R(t)$ is the symmetric linear map $R(t) x=R\left(x, c^{\prime}(t)\right) c^{\prime}(t)$. By symmetry of $R$ and $D \bar{N}$, we get that $\bar{J}^{\prime} \bar{J}^{*}$ is also symmetric. It follows that for $0 \leqq t<t_{0}$, we have $J(t)=\bar{J}(t) X(t) C$ with $C=D N-D \bar{N}$ and

$$
X(t)=C^{-1}+\int_{0}^{t}\left(\bar{J}^{*} \bar{J}\right)^{-1}(\tau) d \tau
$$

Note that $C$ is negative definite on $T_{p} S$, in particular invertible, and that $\bar{J}$ and hence $\bar{J}^{*} \bar{J}$ is invertible on [ $0, \bar{t}_{0}$ ). For $t=0$, all eigenvalues of $X(t)$ are negative. If $t$ comes close to $\bar{t}_{0}$, then $\int_{0}^{t}\left(\bar{J}^{*} \bar{J}\right)(\tau) d \tau$ gets a very large eigenvalue: Since $\|\bar{J}(t) x\|^{2}$ $\leqq k\left(t-t_{0}\right)^{2}\|x\|^{2}$ for some $x \neq 0$ and some $k>0$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{trace}\left(\bar{J}^{*} \bar{J}\right)^{-1}(\tau) & =\operatorname{trace}\left(\bar{J}^{-1 *} \bar{J}^{-1}\right)(\tau) \geqq \frac{\left\langle\bar{J}^{-1 *} \bar{J}^{-1} J x, J x\right\rangle}{\langle J x, J x\rangle}(\tau) \\
& \geqq k^{-1}\left(\tau-\bar{t}_{0}\right)^{-2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and so the trace of the integral goes to $\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \bar{t}_{0}$. Thus for $t_{1}$ close enough to $\bar{t}_{0}$, $X\left(t_{1}\right)$ has a positive eigenvalue. So there is some $t_{2} \in\left(0, t_{1}\right)$ where $X\left(t_{2}\right)$ and hence $J\left(t_{2}\right)$ is not invertible. Since $t_{0}$ is the first parameter value where this happens, we have $t_{0} \leqq t_{2}<\bar{t}_{0}$.

Remark. The ideas of this proof go back to Green ([7], see also [5]).
3.2. For our purposes, the following form of the Jordan-Brouwer separation theorem is useful.

Theorem. Let $M$ be a simply connected smooth manifold and $S$ a smooth closed connected hypersurface of $M$. Then $M \backslash S$ has exactly two connected components.

Proof. Let $p \in S$ and $U$ a small coordinate ball around $p$ in $M$ such that $U \backslash S$ has two connected components $U_{+}$and $U_{-}$. Choose points $p_{+} \in U_{+}, p_{-} \in U_{-}$. Assume that $M \backslash S$ is connected. Then there is a smooth curve $c_{1}$ in $M \backslash S$ which connects $p_{+}$ to $p_{-}$. Choose a curve $c_{2}$ in $U$ connecting $p_{-}$to $p_{+}$and intersecting $S$ transversally. Then $c=c_{1} \cup c_{2}$ is a closed curve which can be assumed to be smooth and which intersects $S$ exactly once and transversally. By simple connectivity, $c$ is homotopic to a closed curve $\bar{c}$ which does not intersect $S$. Since the intersection number mod 2 is a homotopy invariant (see [13], p. 78), this is a contradiction.

Moreover, if $M_{+}\left(M_{-}\right)$denotes the connected component of $M \backslash S$ containing $U_{+}\left(U_{-}\right)$, then $\partial M_{+}$and $\partial M_{-}$are open and closed in $S$. So there are no further components since $S$ is connected.
3.3. Now let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $S$ a connected, two-sided hypersurface in $M$ with unit normal vector field $N$. We will say that a point $q \in M$
projects onto $S$ if there is a shortest geodesic from $q$ to $S$. If $M$ is complete and $S$ is closed (as a subset of $M$ ), every point projects onto $S$. Let $M_{+}^{\prime \prime}\left(M_{-}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ denote the set of points which project onto the upper (lower) side of $S$, i.e. if $q \in M_{ \pm}^{\prime \prime}$ and $c:[0, d]$ $\rightarrow M$ is shortest with $c(0) \in S, c(d)=q, d=d(q, S)>0$, then $c^{\prime}(0)= \pm N_{c(0)}$. Put $M^{\prime \prime}=M_{+}^{\prime \prime} \cup S \cup M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$. E.g. if $M$ is complete and $S=\partial B$ for some open subset $B$ of $M$, and if $N$ denotes the outer unit normal field, then $M^{\prime \prime}=M, M_{-}^{\prime \prime}=B, M_{+}^{\prime \prime}=M \backslash \bar{B}$. Further, let $M^{\prime} \subset M^{\prime \prime}$ be the interior of the set of points where the shortest geodesic to $S$ is unique. This is an open neighborhood of $S$. Put $M_{ \pm}^{\prime}=M^{\prime} \cap M_{ \pm}^{\prime \prime}$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $M$ be a complete Riemannian manifold and $S \subset M$ a twosided hypersurface. Let $p \in S$ and $0<\delta<i(p)$ where $i$ denotes the injectivity radius function on $M$, and assume that $S \cap B_{\delta}(p)$ is connected and $S \cap \bar{B}_{\delta}(p)$ is closed in $M$. Then $B_{\delta / 2}(p) \subset M^{\prime \prime}$.

Proof. If $q \in B_{\delta / 2}(p)=: B$, there is a shortest geodesic $c$ from $q$ to the compact set $S$ $\cap B_{\delta}(p)$. But since the length of $c$ has to be smaller than $\delta / 2$, the endpoint of $c$ lies in the open subset $S \cap B_{\delta}(p)$ of $S$. Thus $q$ projects onto $S$. Since $S \cap B$ is closed in $B$, the point $q$ cannot project onto both sides of $S$, by 3.2 , unless $q \in S$. So $B \subset M^{\prime \prime}$.
3.4. On $M^{\prime \prime}$, we may define the signed distance function $d$ of $S$ as follows: $|d(x)|$ is the distance $d(x, S)$ from $x$ to $S$, and $d(x)$ is positive (negative) for $x \in M_{+}^{\prime \prime}\left(x \in M_{-}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Then $M^{\prime}$ is the set of points where $d$ is smooth. Its gradient $\hat{N}:=\nabla d$ is the extension of $N$ on $M^{\prime}$ with $D_{\hat{N}} \hat{N}=0$. Let $D^{2} d$ denote the Hessean 2-form of $d$. The proof of the following facts is based on an idea of Green [7]:
Lemma 3.4(a). Let $k, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold with curvature $K \geqq k$ and let $S$ be a hypersurface in $M$ with unit normal field $N$ and $\left\langle D_{X} N, X\right\rangle \geqq \lambda\|X\|^{2}$ for every nonzero tangent vector $X$ of $S$. Then $D^{2} d(X, X) \geqq v(d)\|X\|^{2}$ for all 0 $\neq X \in T M_{-}^{\prime}$ with $X \perp \nabla d$, where $v$ is a solution of

$$
v^{\prime}+v^{2}+k=0, v(0)=\lambda \text {. }
$$

If $K>k$ or $D N>\lambda$, the inequality is strict.
Lemma 3.4(b). Let $M$ be as above, $\bar{p} \in M$ and $r<i(p)$. Let $S=\partial B_{r}(\bar{p})$ and $N$ the inner unit normal field on $S$. Then $\left\langle D_{X} N, X\right\rangle \geqq v(0)\|X\|^{2}$ for any nonzero tangent vector $X$ of $S$, where $v$ is a solution of

$$
v^{\prime}+v^{2}+k=0, \lim _{t \rightarrow r} 1 / v(t)=0 .
$$

If $K>k$, the inequality is strict.
Proof. Let $\hat{N}=\nabla d$, where $d$ is the signed distance function of $S$ in both cases. If $c$ is an integral curve of $\hat{N}$, i.e. a geodesic orthogonal to $S$, then as a consequence of the Jacobi equation, the familiy of linear maps $U(t) x:=D_{x} \hat{N}$ for $x \in c^{\prime}(t)^{\perp}$ satisfies the Riccati equation

$$
U^{\prime}+U^{2}+R=0
$$

with $R(t)$ as in 3.1. Let us assume first that $R>k$, that means that $R(t)-k I$ is positive definite for all $t$. Let $v$ be a solution of $v^{\prime}+v^{2}+k=0$ and put $V=v I$. Then

$$
(U-V)^{\prime}<-(U+V)(U-V)
$$

If $(U-V)\left(t_{1}\right)>0$ for some $t_{1}$, then the same is true for all $t \in\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right)$ where $t_{0}$ is the largest parameter smaller then $t_{1}$ where $U$ or $V$ has a pole. Namely, if $\bar{t} \in\left(t_{0}, t_{1}\right)$ was the largest parameter where this fails, there would be some $x \neq 0$ with $(U-V)(\bar{t}) x=0$, hence we would have $\langle(U-V) x, x\rangle^{\prime}(\bar{t})<0$ which contradicts $\langle(U-v) x, x\rangle(t)>0$ for $\bar{t}<t \leqq t_{1}$. (Here we identified $x$ with its corresponding parallel field along $c$, as in 3.1.) In particular, if $t_{0}$ is finite, it must be a pole of $U$ since otherwise we would get a contradiction from $\lim v(t)=+\infty$ and $U>V$.

This proves immediately 3.4 (a) for $K>k, D N>\lambda$. Since $v$ depends continuously on $k$ and $\lambda$, the result follows also for the weaker assumption.

If $S=\partial B_{\mathrm{r}}(p)$ and $N$ the inner normal field, note that $U(t)^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow r$, and $\left(U^{-1}\right)^{\prime}=I+U^{-1} R U^{-1}$. Therefore, the singularities of $U^{-1}$ and $V^{-1}$ at $t=r$ are removable, and $\left(U^{-1}\right)^{\prime}(r)=\left(V^{-1}\right)^{\prime}(r)=I,\left(U^{-1}\right)^{\prime \prime}(r)=\left(V^{-1}\right)^{\prime \prime}(r)=0,\left(U^{-1}\right)^{\prime \prime \prime}(r)$ $=2 R(r)>2 k=\left(V^{-1}\right)^{\prime \prime \prime}(r)$ if $R>k$. Thus for $t_{1}<r$ sufficiently near to $r$, we have $U\left(t_{1}\right)^{-1}<V\left(t_{1}\right)^{-1}$, hence $(U-V)\left(t_{1}\right)<0$. So by the previous argument we get $U(0)>v(O) I$. The result for $R \geqq k$ follows by continuity, as above.

Remark. Exactly the analogous arguments are valid under the assumption $K \leqq k$ which implies the opposite inequalities. In particular it follows that then the conjugate distance on $M$ is larger than on a sphere of curvature $k$.
3.5. Remark. The Rauch comparison theorems are an easy consequence of the previous section. E.g. if $J$ is a Jacobi field along a geodesic $c$ with $J^{\prime}(0)=0$, then $J$ belongs to the normal flow of any hypersurface $S$ through $c(0)$ with $N_{c(0)}=c^{\prime}(0)$ and $\left.D N\right|_{c(0)}=0$. Therefore, if $d$ is the signed distance function of $S$ and $U(t):=\left.D \nabla d\right|_{c(t)}$ its Hessean, then $J^{\prime}=U J$. If $K \geqq 0$, then $U(t) \geqq 0$ for $t \leqq 0$ up to the focal distance, by $3.4(\mathrm{a})$. Therefore, $\|J\|^{\prime}=\langle U J, J\rangle /\|J\| \geqq 0$, hence $\|J(t)\| \leqq\|J(0)\|$ for $t \leqq 0$. Reversing the orientation of $c$ we get the same for $t \geqq 0$.
3.6. Let $M$ be an arbitrary Riemannian manifold and $S \subset M$ a hypersurface which is $\varepsilon$-convex with respect to a unit normal vector field $N$, that means $\left\langle D_{X} N, X\right\rangle$ $\geqq \varepsilon\|X\|^{2}$ for any $X \in T S$. Let $d: M^{\prime \prime} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be its signed distance function. Then for any $q \in M^{\prime \prime}$ and $\eta<\varepsilon$ we get a support function $\bar{d}=d_{q, \eta}$ of $d$ at $q$ as follows (see [18, 20]): Let $c$ be a shortest geodesic from $q$ to $S$ and $p \in S$ its end point. Let $\bar{S}$ be another hypersurface through $p$ with normal field $\bar{N}$ and suppose that $\bar{N}_{p}=N_{p}$ and $D_{X} \vec{N}=\eta X$ for any $X \in T_{p} S$. We may choose

$$
\bar{S}=\exp _{p}\left(\partial B_{\bar{R}}\left(-\bar{R} N_{p}\right) \cap V\right),
$$

where $\bar{R}=1 / \eta$ and $V$ an open neighborhood of $O_{p}$ in $T_{p} M$ which lies in the injectivity domain of $\exp _{p}$. By Lemma 3.1, applied to the normal fields $-N$ and $-\bar{N}$, the first focal point of $\bar{S}$ along $c$ comes behind $q$. So the signed distance function $\bar{d}$ of $\bar{S}$ is defined and smooth in a small neighborhood $U$ of $q$, if $V$ is small enough to exclude cut locus points near $q$. Moreover, if $\gamma:[0, \delta) \rightarrow \bar{S}$ is a geodesic in $\bar{S}$ with $\gamma(0)=p$, and if we put $\phi=d \circ \gamma$, then $\phi(0)=0, \phi^{\prime}(0)=0, \phi^{\prime \prime}(0) \geqq \varepsilon-\eta>0$. Thus we have $d \geqq 0$ on a neighborhood of $p$ in $\bar{S}$. Making $\bar{S}$ even smaller if necessary, we may assume $\bar{S} \subset M^{\prime \prime}$ and $\left.d\right|_{\bar{s}} \geqq 0$. Let $x \in M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$ be in the domain of $\bar{d}$ and let $\bar{p}$ be a point in $\bar{S}$ with shortest distance to $x$. Then $|d(x)-d(\bar{p})| \leqq d(x, \bar{p})=|\bar{d}(x)|$, hence $d(x) \geqq \bar{d}(x)$ because $d(\bar{p}) \geqq 0$. So we have shown:

Lemma 3.6. If $q \in \operatorname{Int}\left(M_{-}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and $\eta<\varepsilon$, then $\bar{d}=d_{q, \eta}$ is a smooth support function of $d$ in $q$, more precisely, $\bar{d}$ is defined and smooth on a neighborhood $U$ of $q$ with $\bar{d} \leqq d$ and $\bar{d}(q)=d(q)$.

## 4. $\varepsilon$-convex functions and smoothing

In the following chapter, we use ideas of various authors $[1,6,8,9,12,18,20]$ to describe the smoothing of a certain type of convex functions. We discuss details since our notion of $\varepsilon$-convexity is sligtly different.
4.1. Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $\varepsilon$ any real number. A continuous real valued function $f$ on $M$ is called $\varepsilon$-convex if for any $q \in M$ and any $\eta<\varepsilon$ there is a smooth support function $f_{q, \eta}$ of $f$ in $q$ (defined near $\left.q, f_{q, \eta} \leqq f, f_{q, \eta}(q)=f(q)\right)$, such that

$$
D^{2} f_{q, \eta}(X, X) \geqq \eta\|X\|^{2} \quad \text { for all } \quad X \in T_{q} M .
$$

It is easy to see that $\varepsilon$-convexity implies convexity for $\varepsilon \geqq 0$. (In fact, for $\varepsilon>0$, $\varepsilon$-convexity implies strict convexity in the sense of $[1,20]$.) Namely, for a curve $c:[a, b] \rightarrow M$ let $\phi_{n, c, f}=\phi_{\eta}$ be the real quadratic polynomial with

$$
\phi_{\eta}(a)=f(c(a)), \quad \phi_{\eta}(b)=f(c(b)), \quad \phi_{\eta}^{\prime \prime}=\eta .
$$

If $c$ is a geodesic (parametrized by arc length), then $f \circ c \leqq \phi_{\varepsilon}$ : Otherwise $f \circ c-\phi_{\eta}$ for some $\eta<\varepsilon$ would attain an interior maximum at some point $u \in(a, b)$, and this would contradict to $\left(f_{c(u), \eta^{\prime}} c-\phi_{\eta}\right)^{\prime \prime}(u) \geqq \eta^{\prime}-\eta>0$ for any $\eta^{\prime} \in(\eta, \varepsilon)$. Moreover, a similar argument still holds if $c$ is slightly curved:

Lemma 4.1. Let $f$ be an $\varepsilon$-convex function on $M$ with $\left\|\nabla f_{q, \eta}(q)\right\| \leqq L$ for any $q \in M$ and $\eta<\varepsilon$. Let $c:[a, b] \rightarrow M$ be a curve with $\left\|D_{c^{\prime}} c^{\prime}\right\| \leqq \gamma$ and $\left\|c^{\prime}\right\|^{2} \geqq 1-\beta$ for small positive $\beta$, $\gamma$. Let $\eta=\eta(\beta, \gamma)=\varepsilon-\varepsilon \beta-L \gamma$. Then $f \circ c \leqq \phi_{\eta}$.
4.2. Clearly, a smooth function $f$ is $\varepsilon$-convex if and only if $D^{2} f \geqq \varepsilon$; this follows from 4.1. If $S$ is a regular level hypersurface of a smooth function $f$ with $D^{2} f \geqq \varepsilon$ and $\|V f\| \leqq L$ along $S$, then $S$ is $(\varepsilon / L)$-convex with respect to the unit normal vector field $N=\nabla f /\|\nabla f\|$.
4.3. Let $U$ be an open subset of $M$ such that curvature and injectivity radius are bounded on $U$. Let $f$ be a continuous real valued function on $U$. For any $r>0$ which is smaller than the convexity radius on $U$, we may approximate $f$ by a smooth function $f_{r}$ defined on $U_{r}:=\left\{x \in M ; B_{r}(x) \subset U\right\}$ as follows (see [8, 12]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{r}(x) & =\int_{T_{x} M} f\left(\exp _{x}(u)\right) \psi_{r}(\|u\|) d^{n} u \\
& =\int_{B_{r}(x)} f(y) \psi_{r}(d(x, y)) d \mu_{x}(y)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $d^{n} u$ denotes the volume element on $T_{x} M$ and $d \mu_{x}$ the measure on $B_{r}(x)$ with $\exp _{x}^{*}\left(d \mu_{x}\right)=d^{n} u$, and $\psi_{r}: \mathbb{R}_{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}$is a smooth function with $\left.\psi_{r}\right|_{[0, r / 2]}=$ const $>0$,
$\left.\psi_{r}\right|_{(r, \infty)}=0$ and $\int_{0}^{r} \psi_{r}(t) t^{n-1} d t=1 / \omega_{n-1}$ (where $\omega_{n-1}$ denotes denotes the volume of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ ).

If $f$ is a Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant $L$, we get immediately $\left|f-f_{r}\right| \leqq L r$. (Note that $\int \psi_{r}(\|u\|) d^{n} u=1$.) Moreover, if $K \geqq 0$ on $U$, then $f_{r}$ has the same Lipschitz constant $L$ : If $x, y \in U_{r}$ are sufficiently near and $P: T_{x} M \rightarrow T_{y} M$ denotes the parallel displacement along the shortest geodesic between $x$ and $y$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|f_{r}(x)-f_{r}(y)\right| & \leqq \int_{r_{x} M}\left|f\left(\exp _{x}(u)\right)-f\left(\exp _{y}(P u)\right)\right| \psi_{r}(\|u\|) d^{n} u \\
& \leqq L \int_{T_{x} M} d\left(\exp _{x}(u), \exp _{y}(P u)\right) \psi_{r}(\|u\|) d^{n} u \\
& \leqq L d(x, y)
\end{aligned}
$$

by Rauch's theorem (see 3.5 ).
Next we want to estimate the derivatives (see [12]):
Lemma 4.3. Let $0 \leqq K \leqq k$ on $U$ and $f$ be a smooth function with $\|D f\| \leqq L$, $\left\|D^{2} f\right\| \leqq C$. Then

$$
\left\|D f_{r}-D f\right\| \leqq C r+\frac{1}{2} L k r^{2}
$$

Proof. Fix $x \in U_{r}, v \in T_{x} M$ with $\|v\|=1$. Let $c$ be a geodesic with $c(0)=x, c^{\prime}(0)=v$. For any $u \in T_{x} M$ with $\|u\| \leqq r$ let $a_{u}(s, t)=\exp _{c(t)} s P_{t} u$ where $P_{t}$ denotes the parallel displacement along $c$. Let $U=\frac{d}{d s} a_{u}, V=\frac{d}{d t} a_{u}$. Then $V_{t}(s)=V(s, t)$ is the Jacobi field along the geodesic $c_{t}(s)=a_{u}(s, t)$ with $V_{t}(0)=c^{\prime}(t), V_{t}^{\prime}(0)=\frac{D}{d t} U(0, t)=0$. Since $\|U\|=\|u\| \leqq r$ and $\|V\| \leqq\|v\|=1$, by 3.5 , we have $\left\|V^{\prime \prime}\right\|=\|R(V, U) U\| \leqq k r^{2}$, and so $\left\|V^{\prime}\right\|^{\prime} \leqq\left\|V^{\prime \prime}\right\| \leqq k r^{2}$, hence $\left\|V_{t}^{\prime}(s)\right\| \leqq k r^{2} s$. Now

$$
D f_{r}(v)-D f(v)=\left.\frac{d}{d t}\right|_{t=0} \int_{T_{x} M}\left(f\left(a_{u}(1, t)\right)-f\left(a_{u}(0, t)\right) \psi_{r}(\|u\|) d^{n} u\right.
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d t} & \left(f\left(a_{u}(1, t)\right)-f\left(a_{u}(0, t)\right)=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{d}{d t} \frac{d}{d s} f\left(a_{u}(s, t) d s\right.\right. \\
& =\int_{0}^{1}\left[D^{2} f(U(s, t), V(s, t))+D f\left(V_{t}^{\prime}(s)\right)\right] d s
\end{aligned}
$$

so the result follows.
4.4. Now we want to show that $\varepsilon$-convexity is almost preserved by smoothing. Let $M$ be any Riemannian manifold, $M_{0}$ a relatively compact open subset, and let $r_{0}>0$ be smaller than the convexity radius on $M_{0}$. The following lemma is essentially due to Greene and $\mathrm{Wu}[8,9]$ :

Lemma 4.4. For any $\varepsilon, L>0$ there is a monotonely decreasing function $\eta:\left(0, r_{0}\right) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\eta(r) \rightarrow \varepsilon$ as $r \rightarrow 0$ with the following property: If $f$ is any $\varepsilon$-convex function defined on some open convex subset $U$ of $M_{0}$, with $\left\|\nabla f_{q, \bar{\varepsilon}}(q)\right\| \leqq L$ for all $q \in U, \bar{\varepsilon}<\varepsilon$, then the smoothing $f_{r}$ of $f$ is $\eta(r)$-convex, for any $r \in\left(0, r_{0}\right)$.
Proof. For any $x \in \bar{M}_{0}$ and $u, v \in T_{x} M$ with $\|u\| \leqq r,\|v\|=1$ let $c=c_{v o}$ be the geodesic with $c(0)=x, c^{\prime}(0)=v$; further let $c_{v u}(t):=\exp _{c t(t)}\left(P_{t} u\right)$ where $P_{t}$ denotes the parallel displacement along $c$. Let

$$
\beta(v, u)=1-\left\|c_{v u}^{\prime}(0)\right\|^{2}, \quad \gamma(v, u)=\left\|D_{c_{v u}^{\prime}}, \quad c_{v u}^{\prime}(0)\right\|,
$$

and let $\beta(r), \gamma(r)$ be the maxima of these functions (note that the set of all $(u, v)$ is compact). We have $\beta(r), \gamma(r) \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. Hence, if $c:[a, b] \rightarrow U_{r}$ is a geodesic segment, then for any $u \in T_{c(a)} M$ with $\|u\| \leqq r$, we have by Lemma 4.1 for $t \in[a, b]$

$$
f\left(\exp _{c(t)}\left(P_{t} u\right)\right)=f\left(c_{v u}(t)\right) \leqq \phi_{\eta(r), c_{u u}, f}(t),
$$

where $\eta(r)=\varepsilon-\varepsilon \beta(r)-L \gamma(r)$, and so $f_{r} \circ c \leqq \phi_{\eta(r), c, f_{r}}$. Since $f_{r}$ is smooth, this implies $D^{2} f_{r} \geqq \eta(r)$.
4.5. Let $M$ be any Riemannian manifold and $S$ an $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface. Then its signed distance function $d$ fails to be $\varepsilon$-convex along $S$ since we have $D^{2} d(X, X) \geqq \varepsilon\|X\|^{2}$ only for $X \in T S$. Therefore, we consider the function $f=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d$ instead (compare [1]) with

$$
\chi_{\varepsilon}(t):=t+\frac{\varepsilon}{2} t^{2} .
$$

Now $f$ is $\varepsilon$-convex with $\|\nabla f\|=1$ along $S$.
If $K \geqq 0$ on $M$, then on $M_{-}^{\prime}$ we have $D^{2} d(X, X) \geqq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon d}\|X\|^{2}$ for any $X \perp \nabla d$, by Lemma 3.4(a). Hence

$$
D^{2} f=\varepsilon D d \cdot D d+(1+\varepsilon d) D^{2} d \geqq \varepsilon
$$

on $M_{-}^{\prime}$. So for $q \in M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$ with $d(q)>-R:=-1 / \varepsilon$, the function $f_{q, \eta}:=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d_{q, \eta}$ (compare 3.6) is a smooth support function of $f$ at $q$ with $D^{2} f_{q, \eta}(X, X) \geqq \eta\|X\|^{2}$ for any $X \in T_{q} M$. Thus we have shown
Lemma 4.5. If $K \geqq 0$ on $M$ and $S$ is an $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface with signed distance function $d>-R$, then $f=\chi_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\circ} d$ is $\varepsilon$-convex on $M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$.

Further note that $f$ has Lipschitz constant $L_{t}=1+\varepsilon t$ on the set $\{d \leqq t\}$ and we have $d \leqq f \leqq d / 2$ on $\{0 \geqq d \geqq-R\}$.
Remark. Since the focal distance of $S$ is not bigger than $R$, by Lemma 3.4(a), we have always $d \geqq-R$, and it is not difficult to show that $d(q)=-R$ for some $q$ occurs only if $S \subset \partial B_{R}(q)$ and $M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$ is flat (see [6]). However, one may avoid this argument by choosing $\varepsilon$ sligtly smaller, if necessary; then $R=1 / \varepsilon$ gets larger and we have $d>-R$ for the new $R$.
4.6. In particular we have shown: If $K \geqq 0$ on $M$ and $B$ is a relatively compact open subset with smooth boundary $S=\partial B$ which is $\varepsilon$-convex with respect to the
outer unit normal field, then $f=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d$ is $\varepsilon$-convex on $\bar{B}$. This remains true if $M=\bar{B}$, that means that $M$ is a compact manifold with boundary $S$. Namely, $f$ is $\varepsilon$-convex on the subset $M_{-}^{\prime}$ where $d$ is smooth. Moreover, the parallel hypersurfaces $S_{r}=\{d=-r\}$ are smooth for small positive $r$, and for the signed distance function $d_{r}$ of $S_{r}$ we have $d_{r}=d+r$. Since $S_{r}$ is $\bar{\varepsilon}$-convex for $\bar{\varepsilon}=(R-r)^{-1}$ with $R=1 / \varepsilon$ (see Lemma 3.4(a)), the function $f=\chi_{\varepsilon}{ }^{\circ}\left(d_{r}-r\right)$ is $\varepsilon$-convex on $\{d \leqq-r\}$.

## 5. Coordinates preserving convexity

5.1. Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold and $(U, \phi)$ a coordinate chart, i.e. $U$ is an open subset of $M$ and $\phi$ a diffeomorphism of $U$ onto an open subset $V$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Let $d s^{2}=\| \|^{2}$ be the given metric on $U$ and $d s_{0}^{2}=\| \|_{0}^{2}$ the euclidean metric induced by $\phi$, and let $D, D^{0}$ denote the corresponding Levi-Civita connections. Assume that

$$
\left\|D-D^{0}\right\| \leqq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{1}{4} d s^{2}<d s_{0}^{2}<4 d s^{2} .
$$

Lemma 5.1. If $S \subset U$ is an $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface, then $\phi(S) \subset V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is $\frac{\varepsilon}{16}$-convex.
Proof. Let $d$ be the signed distance function of $S$ and $f=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d$. Then for any $p \in S$ we have $\left\|\left.D f\right|_{p}\right\|_{0}<2\left\|\left.D f\right|_{p}\right\|=2$, and for all $X \in T_{p} M$,

$$
\left|\left(D^{0} D f-D D f\right)(X, X)\right|=\left|D f\left(D_{X} X-D_{X}^{0} X\right)\right| \leqq\left\|\left.D f\right|_{p}\right\|\left\|D_{X} X-D_{x}^{0} X\right\| \leqq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|X\|^{2} .
$$

On the other hand, $D D f(X, X) \geqq \varepsilon\|X\|^{2}$ (see 4.5) and so

$$
D^{0} D f \geqq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|X\|^{2} \geqq \frac{\varepsilon}{8}\|X\|_{0}^{2} .
$$

Therefore, $S$ is $\frac{\varepsilon}{16}$-convex with respect to $d s_{0}^{2}$, by 4.2.
5.2. A coordinate system satisfying the assumptions of 5.1 will be called a good coordinate system. If $M_{0} \subset M$ is a relatively compact, open subset of $M$, then by continuity, there is a radius $\varrho>0$ such that the exponential coordinates in $B_{e}(p)$ have this property, for any $p \in M_{0}$. A more explicit lower bound for the radius of a good coordinate patch in terms of the injectivity radius and the curvature bounds has been given by Jost and Karcher [16] using almost-linear coordinates.
5.3. Let $y: S \rightarrow M$ be an $\varepsilon$-convex immersion. For every $s \in S$ let $p=y(s)$ and ( $\left.B_{e}(p), \phi_{p}\right)$ be the good coordinate system of 5.2. Let $S^{\prime}$ be the connected component of $y^{-1}\left(B_{e}(p)\right)$ through $s$. Then $x:=\left.\phi_{p} \circ y\right|_{s^{\prime}}: S^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{16}$-convex immersed hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Thus on a small scale, the properties of $\varepsilon$-convex immersions can be studied in euclidean space.

## 6. e-convexity in euclidean space

6.1. Throughout this chapter, we let $M=\mathbb{R}^{n}$ be the euclidean $n$-space. Let $S$ be a connected hypersurface which is $\varepsilon$-convex with respect to the unit normal field $N$ on $S$, and let $d$ denote its signed distance function. In the following, we always put $R:=1 / \varepsilon$. A special property of the flat space is

$$
D^{2} d(X, X) \geqq(d+R)^{-1}\|X\|^{2} \quad \text { for any } \quad X \perp \nabla d
$$

at any point where $d$ is smooth, also on $M_{+}^{\prime}$. Hence, by 4.5, the function $f=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d$ is $\varepsilon$-convex on $M^{\prime} \cup M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$. Moreover, we have canonical support functions: For any $p \in S$ let $B_{p}:=B_{R}\left(p-R N_{p}\right)$ and $S_{p}:=\partial B_{p}$. Let $d_{p}$ be the signed distance function of $S_{p}$ and $f_{p}=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d_{p}$. The function $f_{p}$ is defined and smooth everywhere with $D^{2} f_{p}(X, X)=\varepsilon\|X\|^{2}$ for every tangent vector $X$. Hence $g:=f-f_{p}$ is 0 -convex with $g(p)=0, \nabla g(p)=0$. So $g$ attains a local minimum at $p$ and consequently, $f \geqq f_{p}$ on any convex neighborhood $U$ of $p$ in $M^{\prime} \cup M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$. It follows that $d \geqq d_{p}$ and therefore, $S$ $\cap U \subset \bar{B}_{p}$.
6.2. Lemma. Let $f$ be a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ which is convex on a neighborhood $U$ of the closed set $\bar{B}=\{f \leqq 0\}$, and assume that $\bar{B}$ is connected. Then $\bar{B}$ is convex.

Proof. Let $p$ be an arbitrary point in $\bar{B}$. Let $C$ be the set of all $q \in \bar{B}$ such that the straight line segment $\overline{p q}$ lies in $\bar{B}$. Clearly, $C$ is closed. We show that $C$ is also open in $\bar{B}$. Since $\overline{p q} \subset \bar{B}$ for $q \in C$ and since $U$ is a neighborhood of $\bar{B}$, there is a neighborhood $V$ of $q$ such that $\overline{x p} \subset U$ for any $x \in V$. By convexity, $f$ takes its maximum on $\overline{x p}$ at the end points, therefore $\overline{x p} \subset B$ whenever $x \in V \cap \bar{B}$. So $V \cap \bar{B}$ $C C$ and therefore, $C$ is open. Since $p \in C$, we have $C=\bar{B}$ by connectivity which finishes the proof.
6.3. Now let $S \subset M=\mathbb{R}^{n}$ be a compact, $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface. By the JordanBrouwer separation theorem (see 3.2), $S$ bounds an open domain $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ which lies on the side of the normal field $-N$ on $S$. Then $B=M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$ (see 3.3 ), and by $6.2, \bar{B}$ is convex. Consequently, for any $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash \bar{B}$, there is a unique shortest line segment from $q$ to $S$, and therefore, $\mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash \bar{B}=M_{+}^{\prime}$. So by 6.1 we have $d \geqq d_{p}$ on all of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, for every $p \in S$, thus $d \geqq \max _{p \in S} d_{p}$. On the other hand, for any $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ there is a closest point $p \in S$ for which $d(q)=d_{p}(q)$, so we get in fact $d=\max _{p \in S} d_{p}$. Consequently, $\bar{B}=\bigcap_{p \in S} \bar{B}_{p}$.

More generally, a connected open subset $B$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ (with smooth boundary or not) will be called $\varepsilon$-convex for some $\varepsilon \geqq 0$ if for any $p \in \partial B$ there is a neighborhood $U$ of $p$ and a ball $B_{p}$ of radius $R=1 / \varepsilon$ with $p \in \partial B_{p}$ (support ball or support half space) such that $B \cap U \subset B_{p}$. Applying the same arguments as above to the signed distance function $d$ of $\partial B$ which is negative on $B$ and positive outside, we see again the convexity of $B$, more precisely: $B=\bigcap_{p \in \partial B} B_{p}$ as above.
6.4. Lemma. Let $\varepsilon=1 / R>0$ and $B$ a connected, $\varepsilon$-convex open domain containing a line segment of length $a$. Then $B$ contains $a$ ball of radius $a^{2} / 8 R$.

Proof. If $B$ is a ball of radius $R$ containing a line segment of length $a$ with center $q$, then $B$ contains the ball $B_{r}(q)$ with $r=R-\left(R^{2}-a^{2} / 4\right)^{1 / 2} \geqq a^{2} / 8 R$. Hence for an arbitrary $\varepsilon$-convex open set $B$ we have $B_{r}(q) \subset B_{p}$ for any $p \in \partial B$ and so $B_{r}(q)$ $\subset \bigcap_{p \in \partial B} B_{p}=B$ (see 6.3).
6.5. Let $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}:=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} ; x_{n}>0\right\}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}^{n}$ its closure. Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be an $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface such that $S \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ is connected and $S \cap \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}^{n}$ compact. Thus $S \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ is closed in $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$, and hence it bounds an open set $B$ in $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ which lies on the side of the normal field $-N$ (see 3.2). So the full boundary of $B$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is contained in $S \cup \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and therefore, $B$ is 0 -convex and hence convex (6.3). However, in general $B$ is no more contained in its support ball $B_{p}$ for arbitrary $p \in S \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$. Nevertheless, there is one point $p$ for which $B \subset B_{p}$ remains true:

Lemma 6.5. Let $p \in S$ be the point where the coordinate $x_{n}$ attains its maximum on $S$. Then $B \subset B_{p}$.

Proof. Let $d, d_{p}, f, f_{p}$ be the functions defined in 6.1. Then $g:=f-f_{p}$ is convex on $M^{\prime} \cup M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$. Since $B$ is convex, every point of $\mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash B$ has a unique projection onto $\partial B$ from which we conclude $M_{+}^{\prime \prime}=M_{+}^{\prime}$. So $g$ is convex on $M^{\prime \prime}$ with local minimum 0 on the line $L_{p}^{\prime \prime}:=\left(p+\mathbb{R} e_{n}\right) \cap M^{\prime \prime}$. All we have to show is that every point of $S_{+}:=S$ $\cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ can be connected to some point of $L_{p}^{\prime \prime}$ by a straight line segment in $M^{\prime \prime}$. Then by convexity we have $g \geqq 0$ on $S_{+}$and hence $S_{+} \subset\left\{d_{p} \leqq 0\right\}=\bar{B}_{p}$ which implies $B$ C $B_{p}$.

Let $T=\bar{B} \cap \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Then $\partial B=S_{+} \cup T$. To examine the size of $M^{\prime \prime}$, let $\bar{d}$ be the signed distance function of $\partial B$ which is defined on all of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Put

$$
A:=\left\{\bar{d}-x_{n}<0\right\} \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}, \quad C:=\left\{\bar{d}+x_{n}<0\right\} \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n} .
$$

These sets are convex since $\bar{d}$ is a convex function. We have $S \subset A \backslash \bar{C}$. Moreover, on $A \backslash \bar{C}$ we have $|\bar{d}|<x_{n}$. So the points of this set project on $S_{+}$and therefore $A \backslash \bar{C} \subset M^{\prime \prime}$ with $d=\bar{d}$ on $A \backslash \bar{C}$.

Let $Z=T+\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+} e_{n} \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}^{n}$ be the cylinder over $T$; this is a closed convex set. We claim that $C \subset Z \cap B$. In fact, $C \subset B$ since $\bar{d}, x_{n} \geqq 0$ on $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}^{n} \backslash B$. Moreover, for any $q \in B \backslash Z$, the vertical ray $L_{q}^{-}=q-\mathbb{R}_{+} e_{n}$ starting at $q$ intersects $\partial B$ at some point $q^{\prime} \in \partial B \backslash T=S_{+}$, so $x_{n}\left(q^{\prime}\right)>0$. Therefore, $-\bar{d}(q) \leqq d\left(q, q^{\prime}\right)=x_{n}(q)-x_{n}\left(q^{\prime}\right)<x_{n}(q)$ and hence $q \notin C$ which proves the claim.

Now for $q \in S_{+}$the vertical rays $L_{q}^{+}=q+\mathbb{R}_{+} e_{n}$ do not meet the set $Z \cap B$ since either $q \notin Z$ or the line $L_{q}=q+\mathbb{R} e_{n}$ leaves $B$ at $q$. In both cases there is an open cone $C_{q}$ with vertex $q$ around $L_{q}^{+}$which does not meet $Z \cap B$; in the first case this is because $Z \cap B$ is contained in the truncated cylinder of hight $x_{n}(p)$ over $T$. So there is a line segment $L$ from $q$ to some point of $L_{p}^{+}$within $C_{q}$. On the other hand, $L_{p}^{+}$ $\subset A$, so $L \subset A \cap C_{q} \subset A \backslash \bar{C} \subset M^{\prime \prime}$ which finishes the proof.
6.6. Lemma. $[14,15]$ : Let $S$ be a compact connected manifold of dimension $n-1$ and $x: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ an $\varepsilon$-convex immersion. If $n=2$, assume further that the closed plane curve $x$ has winding number $\pm 1$. Then $S$ is diffeomorphic to the $(n-1)$-sphere and $x$ is an embedding.

Proof. Let $v: S \rightarrow S_{1}^{n-1}$ be the Gauss mapping of the immersion $x$. Due to the $\varepsilon$-convexity, this is a local diffeomorphism and in particular a covering map. So it must be a global diffeomorphism since $S_{1}^{n-1}$ is simply connected for $n \geqq 3$ and the degree of $v$ is $\pm 1$ for $n=2$. Consequently, for every $v \in S_{1}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ the hight function $h_{v}(s)=\langle v, x(s)\rangle, s \in S$, has exactly two critical points: one maximum and one minimum. Therefore, $x$ is an embedding: If $s \in S$ and $v=v(s)$ its outer normal vector, then $h_{v}$ attains its maximum only at $s$ and so we have $x\left(s^{\prime}\right) \neq x(s)$ for every $s^{\prime}$ $\neq s$ in $S$.
6.7. We now can prove the main result of this section. For any immersion $x: S$ $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and any $s \in S, r>0$ let $U_{r}(s)$ be the connected component of $x^{-1}\left(B_{r}(x(s))\right)$ containing $s$.

Lemma 6.7. Let $x: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be an $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface immersion, for $n \geqq 3$. Let $s_{0} \in S$ and assume that $S^{\prime}:=U_{e}\left(s_{0}\right)$ is relatively compact in $S$, for some $\varrho>0$. Let $\delta=\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \varrho^{2}$ and $S^{\prime \prime}:=U_{\delta}\left(s_{0}\right)$. Then $\left.x\right|_{S^{\prime \prime}}$ is an embedding.
Proof. Let $p:=x\left(s_{0}\right)$. We may assume that the $n^{\text {th }}$ basis vector $e_{n}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is the outer normal vector of $x$ at $s_{0}$ so that the hight function $x_{n}=\left\langle x, e_{n}\right\rangle$ on $S$ has a local maximum $h:=x_{n}\left(s_{0}\right)=p_{n}$ at $s_{0}$. Since $x(S)$ lies locally on one side of each of its tangent hyperplanes, every critical point of $x_{n}$ is either a maximum or a minimum, so the set $C$ of critical points is isolated.

Let $U$ be a neighborhood of $s_{0}$ in $S$ such that $\left.x\right|_{U}$ is an embedding with $x(U)$ $\subset B_{\varrho}(p)$. For every $t<h$ let $S_{t}$ denote the connected component of $\left\{s \in S ; x_{n}(s) \geqq t\right\}$ through $s_{0}$. For $t$ sufficiently close to $h$ we have $S_{t} \subset U \subset S^{\prime}$. Let $u: \neq \inf \left\{t<h ; S_{t}\right.$ $\left.\subset S^{\prime}\right\}$. The set $S_{u}$ is a closed subset of $\overline{S^{\prime}}$ and therefore compact, and $S_{u}$ is invariant under the flow $\phi_{t}, t \geqq 0$, of the vector field $\nabla x_{n}$. Every flow line ends at a maximum, so every point in $S_{u} \backslash C$ lies in the domain of attraction of some maximum. Since these domains are open and $S_{u} \backslash C$ is connected (here we need $\operatorname{dim} S \geqq 2$ ), there is no other local maximum then $s_{0}$ on $S_{u}$. Likewise, there is at most one local minimum on $S_{u}$, and if there exists such a minimum, its domain of attraction under the flow of $-\nabla x_{n}$ is $S_{u} \backslash\left\{s_{0}\right\}$. In this case we have $S^{\prime}=S_{u}$, so $S^{\prime}$ is compact and connected and therefore embedded by 6.6. So we may assume that the interval [ $u, h$ ) contains no critical values for $x_{n}$. In particular, $u<-\infty$, and by choice of coordinates we may assume $u=0$, so $S_{u}=S_{0}$.

For $0 \leqq t<h$ let $S^{t}:=\left\{s \in S_{0} ; x_{n}(s)=t\right\}$. This is a compact regular hypersurface of $S$ and the map $x^{t}: S^{t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1}, x^{t}(s)=x(s)-t e_{n}$ is an $\varepsilon$-convex immersion, by Meusnier's theorem. So for $n \geqq 4$, the immersions $x^{t}$ are embeddings (6.6), and so the same is true for $\left.x\right|_{s_{0}}$. For $n=3$, note that the flow $\psi_{t}$ of the vector field $\nabla x_{n} /\left\|\nabla x_{n}\right\|^{2}$ provides a diffeomorphism of $S^{0}$ onto $S^{t}$, so we have a smooth family of closed plane curves $x^{t} \circ \psi_{t}: S^{0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}$. For $t$ sufficiently close to $h$, this is an embedding and so the winding number is 1 . Since the winding number is constant for all $t \in[0, h)$, we get the same conclusion as in the case of higher dimension, by 6.6.

Now by 6.5 , the hypersurface $x\left(S_{0}\right) \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}^{n}$ is contained in the closure of the support ball $B_{p}:=B_{R}\left(p-R e_{n}\right)$ of radius $R=\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, and $B_{p} \cap \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n} \subset B_{r}(p)$ with $r=(2 R h)^{1 / 2}$. Since $0=\inf \left\{t<h ; x\left(S_{t}\right) \subset B_{Q}(p)\right\}$, we have $r \geqq \varrho$ and therefore $h \geqq \frac{1}{2} \varrho^{2} \varepsilon=\delta$. So $S^{\prime \prime} \subset U_{h}\left(s_{0}\right) \subset S_{0}$ is embedded and the proof is finished.

## 7. Proof of Theorem A

Throughout this chapter, let $M$ be a complete Riemannian manifold of dimension $n \geqq 3$ with nonnegative sectional curvature and $y: S \rightarrow M$ a compact, connected, $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface immersion, for $\varepsilon=\frac{1}{R}>0$. Let $M_{0}:=\{q \in M$; $d(q, y(S))<10 R\}$. The contraction of $S$ which we want to construct will take place within this set $M_{0}$. Since we also want to consider parallel hypersurfaces, let us assume more generally for the following sections $7.2-7.5$ that $M_{0}$ is an arbitrary relatively compact open subset of $M$ with $y(S) \subset M_{1}:=\left\{q \in M ; B_{R}(q) \subset M_{0}\right\}$. Let $\varrho \in(0, R)$ be a radius for good coordinates around any point of $M_{0}$ (see 5.2).
7.2. Lemma. For every $s \in S$, there is an open, connected neighborhood $S^{\prime \prime}$ of $\sin S$ such that $\left.y\right|_{s^{\prime \prime}}$ is an embedding and $y\left(S^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap \bar{B}_{\delta}(y(s))$ is compact for $\delta:=2^{-8} \varepsilon \varrho^{2}$.

Proof. Put $p=y(s)$. Let $\phi: B_{\ell}(p) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be the good coordinate system around $p$. Let $S^{\prime}$ be the connected component of $y^{-1}\left(B_{e}(p)\right)$ through $s$. Then $x=\left.\phi \circ y\right|_{s^{\prime}}$ is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{16}$-convex immersion (5.1). Since $\bar{B}_{\varrho / 2}^{0}(p) \subset B_{\varrho}(p)$, where the suffix ${ }^{0}$ refers to the euclidean metric induced by $\phi$, the set $x^{-1}\left(\bar{B}_{\varrho / 2}(\phi(p))\right)$ is compact. So we may apply 6.7 for $\varepsilon / 16$ and $\varrho / 2$ instead of $\varepsilon$ and $\varrho$, and so the s-component $S^{\prime \prime}$ of $x^{-1}\left(B_{2 \delta}(\phi(p))\right)$ for $\delta=2^{-8} \varepsilon \varrho^{2}$ is embedded. Moreover, $y\left(S^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap \bar{B}_{\delta}(p)$ is compact since $\bar{B}_{\delta}(p)$ $\subset B_{2 \delta}^{0}(p)$.
7.3. As before let $M^{\prime \prime}$ be the subset of $M$ where the signed distance function $d$ of the hypersurface $y\left(S^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is defined. By Lemma 3.3 we have $B_{\delta / 2}(p) \subset M^{\prime \prime}$ for $p=y(s)$.

Lemma 7.3. If $y(S)$ is not entirely contained in $B_{\delta / 2}(p)$, then there is a point $q \in B_{\delta / 2}(p)$ with $d(q) \leqq-\alpha$ for $\alpha=2^{-12} \delta^{2} \varepsilon$.

Proof. We have $\bar{B}_{\delta / 4}^{0}(p) \subset B_{\delta / 2}(p)$, and $B^{0}:=B_{\delta / 4}^{0}(p) \cap M_{-}^{\prime \prime}$ is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{16}$-convex domain with respect to the euclidean metric induced by $\phi$ since $\partial B^{0} \subset y\left(S^{\prime \prime}\right) \cup \partial B_{\delta / 4}^{0}(p)$ (see 6.3). Moreover, $\partial B^{0} \cap \partial B_{\delta / 4}^{0}(p) \neq \emptyset$, hence $B^{0}$ containes a euclidean straight line of length $\delta / 4$ and by 6.4 a cuclidean ball of radius $r=\frac{1}{8} \frac{\delta^{2}}{16} \frac{\varepsilon}{16}=2 \alpha$. Thus the center of this ball is a point $q \in B_{\delta / 2}(p) \cap M^{\prime \prime}$, with Riemannian distance $d(q, y(S))>r / 2$ and therefore $d(q)<-\alpha$.
7.4. For $s \in S$ let $U(s)$ and $V(s)$ be the connected components through $s$ of the sets $y^{-1}\left(B_{\delta}(y(s))\right)$ and $y^{-1}\left(B_{\delta / 8}(y(s))\right)$. We saw that $U(s)$ is relatively compact and $\left.y\right|_{U(s)}$ is an embedding. Let us assume that $U(s) \neq S$ for every $s \in S$, that means that $y(S)$ is contained in no ball of radius $\delta$. Put $\lambda=\frac{1}{16} \alpha=2^{-16} \delta^{2}$. Since $\delta<R$, we have $\lambda<2^{-16} \delta$.

Lemma 7.4. For every $s \in S$ there is a smooth function $g=g_{s}$ defined on $a$ neighborhood $M_{s}$ of $y(V(s))$ with the following properties:
(i) $y(V(s)) \subset g^{-1}(0) \subset y(U(s))$,
(ii) $\|\nabla g\| \leqq 2, D^{2} g \geqq \varepsilon / 2$,
(iii) $[-\lambda, 0]$ is a regular interval for $g$, and $g^{-1}(-\lambda)$ is an $\varepsilon_{1}$-convex hypersurface with $\varepsilon_{1}:=1 /(R-\lambda / 4)<\varepsilon$.
(iv) Let $\psi_{t}$ denote the flow of the vector field $X=-\nabla g /\|\nabla g\|^{2}$. Then $\psi_{t}(x) \in M_{s}$ for every $x \in y(V(s)), t \in[0, \lambda]$.

Moreover, if $V(s) \cap V\left(s^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset$ for $s, s^{\prime} \in S$, then $g_{s}=g_{s^{\prime}}$ on $M_{s^{\prime}} \cap M_{s^{\prime}}$.
Proof. Let $d$ be the signed distance function of $y(U(s))$ defined on $B_{\delta / 2}(p)$ for $p=y(s)$, and let $f=\chi_{\epsilon} \circ d$. The function $f$ is $\varepsilon$-convex with $d \leqq f \leqq \frac{1}{2} d$ on $\{d \leqq 0\}$. Moreover, $f$ is smooth on $\left\{|d| \leqq r_{1}\right\}$ where $r_{1}$ is the focal distance of the immersed hypersurface $y(S)$, and we have $\|\nabla f\|=1+\varepsilon d$. Therefore, if $\lambda<r_{1} / 2$, we may choose $g=f$ and $M_{s} \subset B_{\delta / 3}(p)$ an open set containing $\{0 \geqq d \geqq-2 \lambda\} \cap B_{\delta / 3}(p)$. If $s^{\prime}$ is another point in $S$ with $V(s) \cap V\left(s^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset$, then $d\left(p, p^{\prime}\right)<\delta / 8$ for $p^{\prime}=y\left(s^{\prime}\right)$. So the signed distance functions of $y(U(s))$ and $y\left(U\left(s^{\prime}\right)\right)$ agree on $B_{\delta / 3}(p) \cap B_{\delta / 3}\left(p^{\prime}\right)$ since the endpoint of a shortest geodesic from $q \in B_{\delta / 3}(p)$ to $y(U(s))$ lies in $B_{2 \delta / \beta}(p)$ $\cap y(U(s)) \subset B_{\delta}\left(p^{\prime}\right) \cap y(U(s)) \subset y\left(U\left(s^{\prime}\right)\right)$ and vice versa. Therefore, $g_{s}$ agrees to $g_{s^{\prime}}$ on $M_{s} \cap M_{s^{\prime}}$.

Now assume $\lambda \geqq r_{1} / 2$. Put $r_{0}=r_{1} / 6$. For $r<r_{0} \leqq \lambda / 3$, we consider the smoothing $f_{r}$ of $f\left(\right.$ see 4.3) on $B:=B_{\delta / 4}(y(s))$. Since the Lipschitz constant of $f$ is $L_{t}=1+\varepsilon t$ on $\{d \leqq t\}$ and in particular $L_{0}=1$ on $\{d \leqq 0\}$, we have $\left|f-f_{r}\right| \leqq r$ and $\left\|\nabla f_{r}\right\| \leqq 1$ on $B$ $\cap\{d \leqq-r\}$ (see 4.3). Moreover, the support functions $f_{q, \eta}$ of $f$ satisfy $\left\|\nabla f_{q, \eta}(q)\right\| \leqq 1$ for all $q \in\{d \leqq 0\}$ and $\eta<\varepsilon$. Applying Lemma 4.4 we get a function $\eta(r)$ independent of $s \in S$ with $\eta(r) \uparrow \varepsilon$ as $r \downarrow 0$, such that $f_{r}$ is $\eta(r)$-convex.

Let $q \in B_{\delta / 4}(p)$ with $f_{r}(q)=-\lambda$. Then $d(q) \leqq f(q) \leqq-\lambda+r \leqq-\frac{2}{3} \lambda$ and hence $\left\|\nabla f_{r}(q)\right\| \leqq 1+\varepsilon(d(q)+r)<1-\frac{1}{3} \varepsilon \lambda=\varepsilon(R-\lambda / 3)$. Now we choose $r$ so small that

$$
\eta(r) \geqq \frac{R-\lambda / 3}{R-\lambda / 4} \varepsilon .
$$

Then $f_{r}^{-1}(-\lambda)$ is an $\varepsilon_{1}$-convex hypersurface provided that $-\lambda$ is a regular value (4.2).

To satisfy (i), we have to connect $f$ and $f_{r}$. Let $\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow[0,1]$ be a smooth function with $\phi(t)=1$ for $t \leqq-2 r_{0}$ and $\phi(t)=0$ for $t \geqq-r_{0}$. Put $g=f$ on $\left\{|d| \leqq r_{0}\right\}$ and

$$
g=f+\phi(d)\left(f_{r}-f\right)
$$

on $\left\{d \leqq-r_{0}\right\}$. Since $\left|f-f_{r}\right|<r$ and $\left|D^{2} d\right|$ is bounded from above on $\left\{|d| \leqq 2 r_{0}\right\}$ independently of $s \in S$, we may assume $\|\nabla g\| \leqq 2, D^{2} g \geqq \varepsilon / 2$ on $\left\{-r_{0} \geqq d \geqq-2 r_{0}\right\}$ by choosing $r$ still smaller if necessary. Since $f$ is $\varepsilon$-convex with $\|\nabla f\| \leqq 1$ on $\left\{0 \geqq d \geqq-r_{0}\right\}$ and $f_{r}$ is $\eta(r)$-convex with $\eta(r)>\frac{2}{3} \varepsilon$ and $\left\|\nabla f_{r}\right\| \leqq 1$ on $\left\{d \leqq-2 r_{0}\right\}$, the function $g$ satisfies (ii) on an open set $M_{s} \subset B_{\delta / 4}(p)$ containing $\{d \leqq 0\} \cap B_{\delta / 4}(p)$. If $q \in g^{-1}(-\lambda)$, then $d(q) \leqq f(q) \leqq-\frac{2}{3} \lambda \leqq-2 r_{0}$. So $g^{-1}(-\lambda)=f_{r}^{-1}(-\lambda)$.

By 7.3 there is a point $q \in B_{\delta / 4}(p)$ with $d(q) \leqq-\alpha, \alpha=16 \lambda$. Thus $f(q) \leqq-\frac{\alpha}{2}=-8 \lambda$ and $g(q) \leqq f(q)+r \leqq-7 \lambda$. So for all $x \in B_{\delta / 4}(p) \cap\{g \geqq-\lambda\}$ we have $g(x)-g(q) \geqq 6 \lambda$ and $d(x, q) \leqq \delta / 2$. Using the convexity of $g$ along the geodesic between $x$ and $q$ in $B_{\delta / 4}(p)$, we get $\|\nabla g(x)\| \geqq \frac{6 \lambda}{\delta / 2}>8 \lambda / \delta$. In particular, the interval $[-\lambda, 0]$ contains no critical values for $g$ which finishes the proof of (iii).

If $c$ is an integral curve of the vector field $X=-\nabla g /\|\nabla g\|^{2}$ with $c(0) \in y(V(s))$ $\subset B_{\delta / 8}(p) \cap\{g=0\}$, then $g(c(t))=-t$ and $\left\|c^{\prime}(t)\right\|=\| \nabla g\left(c(t) \|^{-1}<\delta / 8 \lambda\right.$, for $t \leqq \lambda$. So the curve $c(t)$ stays within $B_{\delta / 4}(p)$ for $0 \leqq t \leqq \lambda$. In particular, $c$ is defined on [0, $\left.\lambda\right]$ with $c([0, \lambda]) \subset M_{s}$. This proves (iv).

Note that the choice of $r$ was uniform for all $s \in S$. If $V(s) \cap V\left(s^{\prime}\right) \neq \emptyset$, then as above the signed distance functions of $y(U(s))$ and $y\left(U\left(s^{\prime}\right)\right)$ agree on $B_{\delta / 3}(p)$ $\cap B_{\delta / 3}\left(p^{\prime}\right)$ for $p^{\prime}=y\left(s^{\prime}\right)$. Since $r<\delta / 12$, the smoothed functions $f_{r}$ agree on $B_{\delta / 4}(p)$ $\cap B_{\delta / 4}\left(p^{\prime}\right)$, hence $g_{s}=g_{s^{\prime}}$ on $M_{s} \cap M_{s^{\prime}}$.
7.5. Now we define an immersion $y^{1}: S \times[0, \lambda] \rightarrow M$ as follows: For $s \in V\left(s_{0}\right)$ let $y^{1}(s, t)=\psi_{t}(y(s))$ where $\psi_{t}$ denotes the flow of the vector field $X=-\nabla g /\|\nabla g\|^{2}$ for $g=g_{s_{0}}$. In 7.4 we have shown that this is well defined. Let $d s_{t}^{2}$ be the metric on $S$ induced by the immersion $y_{t}^{1}:=\left.y^{1}\right|_{S \times\{t}$. Put $\kappa:=e^{-\varepsilon \lambda / 4}$.

Lemma 7.5. $d s_{\lambda}^{2} \leqq \kappa^{2} d s_{0}^{2}$.
Proof. Let $s \in V\left(s_{0}\right), s_{0} \in S$. For $a \in T_{s} S$ put $A(t)=D y_{t}^{1}(a)$; this is a vector field along the curve $c(t)=\psi_{t}(y(s))$ with derivative $A^{\prime}(t)=D_{A(t)} X$. So

$$
\|A\|^{\prime}=\left\langle D_{A} X, A\right\rangle /\|A\|=-\left\langle D_{A} \nabla g, A\right\rangle /\left(\|\nabla g\|^{2}\|A\|\right) \leqq-\frac{\varepsilon}{4}\|A\|
$$

by 7.4 (ii). Integrating, we get $\|A(\lambda)\| \leqq \kappa\|A(0)\|$ which proves the lemma.
7.6. We now may replace the given immersion $y$ with $y_{\lambda}^{1}$. By Lemma 7.4 (iii) this is an $\varepsilon_{1}$-convex immersion of $S$. Since $\varepsilon_{1}>\varepsilon$ and $y_{\lambda}^{1}(S) \subset M_{0}$ (see 7.1), we may repeat the argument getting an immersion $y^{2}: S \times[\lambda, 2 \lambda] \rightarrow M$ such that the immersion $y_{2 \lambda}^{2}=\left.y^{2}\right|_{S \times\{2 \lambda\}}$ of $S$ is $\varepsilon_{2}$-convex for $\varepsilon_{2}=(R-2 \lambda / 4)^{-1}$ and the induced metric $d s_{2 \lambda}^{2}$ satisfies $d s_{2 \lambda}^{2} \leqq \kappa_{1}^{2} d s_{\lambda}^{2}$ for $\kappa_{1}=e^{-\varepsilon_{1} \lambda / 4}$ and so on. Since we proved $\|\nabla g\| \leqq 2$, any point of $y_{k \lambda}^{k}(S)$ has distance $\leqq 2 \lambda$ from $y_{(k-1) \lambda}^{k-1}(S)$, so we do not leave $M_{0}$ before $k$ exceeds $5 R / \lambda$. On the other hand, $\varepsilon_{k}=(R-k \lambda / 4)^{-1}$ is finite only for $k<4 R / \lambda$. So after, say, $m$ steps with $m<4 R / \lambda$, the set $y_{m \lambda}^{m}(S)$ is contained in a ball of radius $\delta<\varrho$ in $M_{0}$ and in particular in the domain of a good coordinate system $\phi$. Therefore, $x=\phi \circ y_{m \lambda}^{m}$ is an $\frac{\varepsilon}{16}$-convex immersion of $S$ into euclidean $n$-space. By Lemma 6.6, this is an embedding and $x(S)$ bounds a convex disk (6.3). So $y_{m \lambda}^{m}(S)$ bounds a closed embedded disk $B_{m+1}$ in $M$. Providing $B_{k}:=S \times[(k-1) \lambda, k \lambda]$ with the metric induced by $y^{k}$ and gluing together $B_{k}$ and $B_{k+1}$ at their common boundary, for $0 \leqq k \leqq m$, we get a compact Riemannian manifold $D$ with boundary $\left(S, d s_{0}^{2}\right)$, and an isometric immersion $\hat{y}: D \rightarrow M$ with $\left.\hat{y}\right|_{S}=y$. In particular, we have nonnegative curvature on $D$ and the boundary $S$ is an $\varepsilon$-convex hypersurface.
7.7. It remains to construct a diffeomorphism of $D$ onto the standard $n$-disk. Consider the $\varepsilon$-convex function $f=\chi_{\varepsilon} \circ d$ where $d$ is the negative distance to $S$ on $D$ (see 4.6). Let $f_{r}$ be the smoothing of $f$ for small enough $r$ and put $g=f$ on $\left\{|d| \leqq r_{0}\right\}$ and $g=f+\phi(d)\left(f_{r}-f\right)$ on $\left\{|d| \geqq r_{0}\right\}$ as in 7.4, but this time, $g$ is defined globally on $D$. Thus $g \leqq 0$ with $S=g^{-1}(0)$, and $g$ is $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$-convex if $r$ is small enough. By strong convexity, the set of critical points, $C$, contains only minima, and the domain of
attraction of each minimum is a connected component of $D \backslash C$; so there is exactly one minimum $q \in \operatorname{Int}(D)$. By the Morse lemma (see [19]), for small $\gamma>0$, the set $D_{\gamma}=\{x \in D ; g(x)-g(q) \leqq \gamma\}$ is diffeomorphic to the standard disk. Using the flow of $X=-\nabla g /\|\nabla g\|^{-2}$, we get a diffeomorphism of $D$ onto $D_{\gamma}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem A.
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