sharp geometric conditions for Sobolev extension operators

Sebastian Bechtel

(j.w. R.M. Brown, R. Haller, and P. Tolksdorf)

Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

November 18, 2022

Motivation

Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open.

Classical question: Does there exist $E\colon W^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded with $Ef = f$ on O?

Motivation

Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open.

Classical question: Does there exist $E\colon W^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded with $Ef = f$ on O?

Negative answer: not always, for example $O = B(0,1) \setminus [0,1)$ does not work ☹

Motivation

Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open.

Classical question: Does there exist $E\colon W^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded with $Ef = f$ on O?

Negative answer: not always, for example $O = B(0,1) \setminus [0,1)$ does not work ☹

Positive answer: OK with some regularity: Lipschitz boundary, (ε, δ)-domain, ... ☺

Motivation

Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open.

Classical question: Does there exist $E\colon W^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded with $Ef = f$ on O?

Negative answer: not always, for example $O = B(0,1) \setminus [0,1)$ does not work ☹

Positive answer: OK with some regularity: Lipschitz boundary, (ε, δ)-domain, … ☺

Question

What happens if we impose a Dirichlet boundary condition?

Motivation

Define $W_0^{1,p}(O)$ as closure of $C_0^\infty(O)$-functions in $W^{1,p}(O)$.

$\Longrightarrow$ $E\colon W_0^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded always exists: Just extend by zero!

Motivation

Define $W_0^{1,p}(O)$ as closure of $C_0^\infty(O)$-functions in $W^{1,p}(O)$.

$\Longrightarrow$ $E\colon W_0^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded always exists:
Just extend by zero!

Question

What happens in between natural and Dirichlet boundary conditions?

Motivation

Define $W_0^{1,p}(O)$ as closure of $C_0^\infty(O)$-functions in $W^{1,p}(O)$.

$\implies$ $E\colon W_0^{1,p}(O) \to W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ linear & bounded always exists: Just extend by zero!

Question

What happens in between natural and Dirichlet boundary conditions?

That is to say: functions stay away from some boundary part $D \subseteq \partial O$.
Which sharp geometric condition to impose in $N = \partial O \setminus D$.

Outline

Let $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ open, $D \subseteq \partial O$ closed.

1. Construction of a $W^{1,p}_D(O)$ extension operator with condition in the spirit of Jones. Joint work R.M. Brown, R. Haller, and P. Tolksdorf. Submitted 2021.
2. construction of a $W^{s,p}_D(O)$ extension operator, $s \in (0,1)$, using a density condition. Appeared in Archiv der Mathematik in 2021.

Part 1: extension operator for $W_D^{1,p}(O)$

Review of Jones' result

Setup:

- Whitney decomposition of O and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}$
  $\rightsquigarrow$ interior cubes W_i and exterior cubes W_e

For simplicity: assume O unbounded and connected

Review of Jones' result

Setup:

- Whitney decomposition of O and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}$
  $\rightsquigarrow$ interior cubes W_i and exterior cubes W_e
- associate suitable reflected cube $Q^* \in W_i$ with $Q \in W_e$

For simplicity: assume O unbounded and connected

Review of Jones' result

Setup:

- Whitney decomposition of O and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}$
  $\rightsquigarrow$ interior cubes W_i and exterior cubes W_e
- associate suitable reflected cube $Q^* \in W_i$ with $Q \in W_e$
- $\{\varphi_Q\}_{Q \in W_e}$ partition of unity of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}$

For simplicity: assume O unbounded and connected

Review of Jones' result

Setup:

- Whitney decomposition of O and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}$
  $\rightsquigarrow$ interior cubes W_i and exterior cubes W_e
- associate suitable reflected cube $Q^* \in W_i$ with $Q \in W_e$
- $\{\varphi_Q\}_{Q \in W_e}$ partition of unity of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}$

Then define E via

$$Ef = \sum_{Q \in W_e} (f)_{Q^*} \varphi_Q \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{O}.$$

For simplicity: assume O unbounded and connected

Review of Jones' result

Crucial estimate (Gradient estimate):

Review of Jones' result

Crucial estimate (Gradient estimate):

Let $R \in W_e$. Expand:

$$Ef = \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \emptyset}} (f)_{Q^*} \varphi_Q = \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \emptyset}} \big[(f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*} \big] \varphi_Q + (f)_{R^*} \quad \text{on } R.$$

Review of Jones' result

Crucial estimate (Gradient estimate):

Let $R \in W_e$. Expand:

$$Ef = \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \varnothing}} (f)_{Q^*} \varphi_Q = \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \varnothing}} \Big[(f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*} \Big] \varphi_Q + (f)_{R^*} \quad \text{on } R.$$

Implies

$$\|\nabla Ef\|_{p,R} \leq \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \varnothing}} \|(f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*}\|_{p,R} \qquad \underbrace{\ell(Q)^{-1}}_{\text{need to compensate}}.$$

Review of Jones' result

Crucial estimate (Gradient estimate):

Let $R \in W_e$. Expand:

$$Ef = \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \emptyset}} (f)_{Q^*} \varphi_Q = \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \emptyset}} \Big[(f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*} \Big] \varphi_Q + (f)_{R^*} \quad \text{on } R.$$

Implies

$$\| \nabla Ef \|_{p,R} \leq \sum_{\substack{Q \in W_e \\ Q \cap R \neq \emptyset}} \| (f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*} \|_{p,R} \quad \underbrace{\ell(Q)^{-1}}_{\text{need to compensate}}.$$

Idea

Use Poincaré type estimate for $\| (f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*} \|_{p,R}$.

Review of Jones' result

Definition

Call O an (ε, δ)-domain, if all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in O satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \partial O) \geq \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

Review of Jones' result

Definition

Call O an (ε, δ)-domain, if all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in O satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \partial O) \geq \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

Consequence: $Q, R \in W_e$ with $Q \cap R \neq \emptyset$ implies Q^* and R^* can be connected by chain of interior cubes of bounded length!

Review of Jones' result

Definition

Call O an (ε, δ)-domain, if all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in O satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \partial O) \geq \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

Consequence: $Q, R \in W_e$ with $Q \cap R \neq \varnothing$ implies Q^* and R^* can be connected by chain of interior cubes of bounded length!

Poincaré over this chain implies

$$\|(f)_{Q^*} - (f)_{R^*}\|_{p,R} \lesssim \ell(Q)\|\nabla f\|_{p,\text{chain}} \checkmark$$

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in O satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \partial O) \geq \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in O satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \leq \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \cancel{\partial O}\ N) \geq \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x-y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in $\cancel{O}$ $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \le \varepsilon^{-1}|x-y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \cancel{\partial O}\ N) \ge \frac{\varepsilon|x-z||y-z|}{|x-y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x-y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in ~~O~~ $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \le \varepsilon^{-1}|x-y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \cancel{\partial O}\ N) \ge \frac{\varepsilon |x-z||y-z|}{|x-y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

This poses some problems:

- Paths are adapted to a different Whitney decomposition

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in ~~O~~ $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \le \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \cancel{\partial O}\ N) \ge \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

This poses some problems:

- Paths are adapted to a different Whitney decomposition

Question

Use Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ as interior cubes W_i?

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in ~~O~~ $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \le \varepsilon^{-1}|x-y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \cancel{\partial O}\ N) \ge \frac{\varepsilon|x-z||y-z|}{|x-y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

This poses some problems:

- Paths are adapted to a different Whitney decomposition

Question

Use Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ as interior cubes W_i?

- metric properties of interior and exterior cubes become incompatible!

Towards mixed boundary conditions

Assumption

Assume that all $x, y \in O$ with $|x - y| < \delta$ can be connected by path γ in $\cancel{O}$ $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ satisfying

$$(a)\ len(\gamma) \le \varepsilon^{-1}|x - y| \quad (b)\ d(z, \cancel{\partial O}\ N) \ge \frac{\varepsilon|x - z||y - z|}{|x - y|} \quad z \in \gamma.$$

This poses some problems:

- Paths are adapted to a different Whitney decomposition

Question

Use Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus N$ as interior cubes W_i?

- metric properties of interior and exterior cubes become incompatible!
- path condition gives no information on interior cubes outside O...

New definition of exterior cubes

Put

$$W_{e,\mathrm{new}} = \{Q \in W_e : d(Q,N) < Bd(Q,D)\}$$

Heuristic: exterior cubes form sector around N

New definition of exterior cubes

Put

$$W_{e,\text{new}} = \{Q \in W_e : d(Q,N) < Bd(Q,D)\}$$

Heuristic: exterior cubes form sector around N

$\implies$ size of cubes comparable to distance to N ✓

New definition of exterior cubes

Put

$$W_{e,\text{new}} = \{Q \in W_e : d(Q, N) < Bd(Q, D)\}$$

Heuristic: exterior cubes form sector around N

$\implies$ size of cubes comparable to distance to N ✓

New problem

How to treat boundary cubes of sector?

New definition of exterior cubes

Put

$$W_{e,\text{new}} = \{Q \in W_e : d(Q,N) < Bd(Q,D)\}$$

Heuristic: exterior cubes form sector around N

$\implies$ size of cubes comparable to distance to N ✓

New problem

How to treat boundary cubes of sector?

- $R \in W_e$ with $d(R,N) \geq Bd(R,D)$: there is no R^* to smuggle in for Poincaré. . . ☹

New definition of exterior cubes

Put

$$W_{e,\text{new}} = \{Q \in W_e : d(Q,N) < Bd(Q,D)\}$$

Heuristic: exterior cubes form sector around N

$\implies$ size of cubes comparable to distance to N ✓

New problem

How to treat boundary cubes of sector?

- $R \in W_e$ with $d(R,N) \geq Bd(R,D)$: there is no R^* to smuggle in for Poincaré. . . ☹
- B large $\rightsquigarrow$ angle between sector and D small

New definition of exterior cubes

Put

$$W_{e,\text{new}} = \{Q \in W_e : d(Q,N) < Bd(Q,D)\}$$

Heuristic: exterior cubes form sector around N

$\implies$ size of cubes comparable to distance to N ✓

New problem

How to treat boundary cubes of sector?

- $R \in W_e$ with $d(R,N) \geq Bd(R,D)$: there is no R^* to smuggle in for Poincaré… ☹
- B large $\rightsquigarrow$ angle between sector and D small
- upshot: use Dirichlet Poincaré instead ☺

Reflected cubes disjoint to O

Whitney cube disjoint to $O \rightsquigarrow$ no information from Assumption ☹

Reflected cubes disjoint to O

Whitney cube disjoint to $O \rightsquigarrow$ no information from Assumption ☹

Better definition of interior cubes: need to intersect O.

Reflected cubes disjoint to O

Whitney cube disjoint to O $\rightsquigarrow$ no information from Assumption ☹

Better definition of interior cubes: need to intersect O.

Question

So what if path from Assumption runs out of O?

Reflected cubes disjoint to O

Whitney cube disjoint to $O \rightsquigarrow$ no information from Assumption ☹

Better definition of interior cubes: need to intersect O.

Question

So what if path from Assumption runs out of O?

- Introduce "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition".

Reflected cubes disjoint to O

Whitney cube disjoint to $O \rightsquigarrow$ no information from Assumption ☹

Better definition of interior cubes: need to intersect O.

Question

So what if path from Assumption runs out of O?

- Introduce "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition".
- Consequence: Can go back to O in an "efficient" way.

Reflected cubes disjoint to O

Whitney cube disjoint to $O \rightsquigarrow$ no information from Assumption ☹

Better definition of interior cubes: need to intersect O.

Question

So what if path from Assumption runs out of O?

- Introduce "quasi-hyperbolic distance condition".
- Consequence: Can go back to O in an "efficient" way.
- Can always construct interior cubes intersecting O this way ☺

Part 2: extension operator for $W^{s,p}_D(O)$, where $s \in (0,1)$

Fractional Sobolev spaces – pure Neumann

Let $s \in (0,1)$. The space $W^{s,p}(O)$ consists of f measurable with

$$\|f\|_{s,p}^p = \|f\|_p^p + \int_{\substack{x,y \in O \\ |x-y|<1}} \left| \frac{f(x)-f(y)}{|x-y|^s} \right|^p \frac{dx\,dy}{|x-y|^d} < \infty.$$

Fractional Sobolev spaces – pure Neumann

Let $s \in (0,1)$. The space $W^{s,p}(O)$ consists of f measurable with

$$\|f\|_{s,p}^p = \|f\|_p^p + \int_{\substack{x,y \in O \\ |x-y|<1}} \left| \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{|x-y|^s} \right|^p \frac{dx\,dy}{|x-y|^d} < \infty.$$

Zhou's result

There exists linear extension operator $\iff$ O satisfies interior thickness condition

Here, call O *interior thick*, if

$$\exists C > 0\ \forall x \in O\ \forall r \in (0,1]: \quad |B(x,r) \cap O| \geq C|B(x,r)|.$$

Fractional Sobolev spaces – mixed BC

Define subspace $W_D^{s,p}(O)$ of $W^{s,p}(O)$ using condition

$$\int_{x \in O} \left| \frac{f(x)}{d(x, D)^{s}} \right|^{p} dx < \infty.$$

Fractional Sobolev spaces – mixed BC

Define subspace $W_D^{s,p}(O)$ of $W^{s,p}(O)$ using condition

$$\int_{x \in O} \left| \frac{f(x)}{d(x,D)^s} \right|^p dx < \infty.$$

Goal

Construct linear extension operator $W_D^{s,p}(O) \to W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})$ using *only* geometric quality in N.

Fractional Sobolev spaces – mixed BC

Define subspace $W_D^{s,p}(O)$ of $W^{s,p}(O)$ using condition

$$\int_{x \in O} \left| \frac{f(x)}{d(x,D)^{s}} \right|^{p} dx < \infty.$$

Goal

Construct linear extension operator $W_D^{s,p}(O) \to W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})$ using *only* geometric quality in N.

Observation: interior thickness condition can be defined with $x \in \partial O$.

Fractional Sobolev spaces – mixed BC

Define subspace $W^{s,p}_D(O)$ of $W^{s,p}(O)$ using condition

$$\int_{x \in O} \left| \frac{f(x)}{d(x,D)^s} \right|^p dx < \infty.$$

Goal

Construct linear extension operator $W^{s,p}_D(O) \to W^{s,p}(\mathbb{R})$ using *only* geometric quality in N.

Observation: interior thickness condition can be defined with $x \in \partial O$.
$\rightsquigarrow$ assume *thickness condition in N* as follows:

$$\exists C > 0 \; \forall x \in N \; \forall r \in (0,1]: \quad |B(x,r) \cap O| \geq C|B(x,r)|.$$

Strategy for our construction

Idea: Want to reduce to Zhou's result.

Strategy for our construction

Idea: Want to reduce to Zhou's result.

- Construct suitable $\mathbf{O} \supseteq O$ interior thick
  $\rightsquigarrow$ use thickness in N

Strategy for our construction

Idea: Want to reduce to Zhou's result.

- Construct suitable $\mathbf{O} \supseteq O$ interior thick
  $\rightsquigarrow$ use thickness in N
- Extend from O to $\mathbf{O}$ by zero
  $\rightsquigarrow$ use fractional Hardy term

Strategy for our construction

Idea: Want to reduce to Zhou's result.

- Construct suitable $\mathbf{O} \supseteq O$ interior thick
  $\rightsquigarrow$ use thickness in N
- Extend from O to $\mathbf{O}$ by zero
  $\rightsquigarrow$ use fractional Hardy term
- Use Zhou's result on $\mathbf{O}$.

Construction of $\mathbf{O}$

Question

Are Whitney cubes still our friend?

Construction of **O**

Question

Are Whitney cubes still our friend?

Yes!

Construction of **O**

Question

Are Whitney cubes still our friend?

Yes!

Let $\{Q_j\}_j$ Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$. Put $\Sigma = \{Q_j : Q_j \text{ touches } O\}$.

Define $\mathbf{O} = O \cup \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \Sigma} Q \setminus D\right)$. Claim: **O** is interior thick.

Construction of $\mathbf{O}$

Question

Are Whitney cubes still our friend?

Yes!

Let $\{Q_j\}_j$ Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$. Put $\Sigma = \{Q_j : Q_j \text{ touches } O\}$.

Define $\mathbf{O} = O \cup \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \Sigma} Q \setminus D \right)$. Claim: $\mathbf{O}$ is interior thick.

- Only need to check in new boundary.

Construction of **O**

Question

Are Whitney cubes still our friend?

Yes!

Let $\{Q_j\}_j$ Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$. Put $\Sigma = \{Q_j : Q_j \text{ touches } O\}$.

Define $\mathbf{O} = O \cup \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \Sigma} Q \setminus D\right)$. Claim: **O** is interior thick.

- Only need to check in new boundary.
- r small compared to size of Q ✓

Construction of $\mathbf{O}$

Question

Are Whitney cubes still our friend?

Yes!

Let $\{Q_j\}_j$ Whitney decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{N}$. Put
$\Sigma = \{Q_j : Q_j$ touches $O\}$.

Define $\mathbf{O} = O \cup \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \Sigma} Q \setminus D \right)$. Claim: $\mathbf{O}$ is interior thick.

- Only need to check in new boundary.
- r small compared to size of Q ✓
- r large compared to size of Q: Whitney $\implies$ ball intersects N ✓

Extension by zero

Let $f \in W_D^{s,p}(O)$ and F its zero extension to $\mathbf{O}$.

Need to estimate

$$\|F\|_{s,p}^p = \|f\|_{s,p}^p + 2 \int_{\substack{x \in O, y \in (\mathbf{O} \setminus O) \\ |x-y|<1}} \left| \frac{f(x)}{|x-y|^s} \right|^p \frac{dx\,dy}{|x-y|^d} + 0.$$

Extension by zero

Let $f \in W_D^{s,p}(O)$ and F its zero extension to $\mathbf{O}$.

Need to estimate

$$\|F\|_{s,p}^p = \|f\|_{s,p}^p + 2 \int_{\substack{x \in O, y \in (\mathbf{O} \setminus O) \\ |x-y|<1}} \left| \frac{f(x)}{|x-y|^s} \right|^p \frac{dx\,dy}{|x-y|^d} + 0.$$

Claim: One has $|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Extension by zero

Let $f \in W^{s,p}_D(O)$ and F its zero extension to $\mathbf{O}$.

Need to estimate

$$\|F\|^p_{s,p} = \|f\|^p_{s,p} + 2\int_{\substack{x\in O, y\in(\mathbf{O}\setminus O)\\ |x-y|<1}} \left|\frac{f(x)}{|x-y|^s}\right|^p \frac{dx\,dy}{|x-y|^d} + 0.$$

Claim: One has $|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{2}d(x,D)$. Then:

$$\int_{\substack{x\in O, y\in\mathbf{O}\\ |x-y|<1}} \left|\frac{f(x)}{|x-y|^s}\right|^p \lesssim \int_{x\in O} \left|\frac{f(x)}{d(x,D)^s}\right|^p dx \;\checkmark$$

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 1: $|x - y| < diam(Q)$.

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 1: $|x - y| < diam(Q)$.

- Fix $z \in \partial O$ on line segment from x to y.

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 1: $|x - y| < diam(Q)$.

- Fix $z \in \partial O$ on line segment from x to y.
- $z \in N$ implies

$$d(Q, N) \leq |y - z| \leq |x - y| < diam(Q) \leq d(Q, N). \lightning$$

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 1: $|x - y| < diam(Q)$.

- Fix $z \in \partial O$ on line segment from x to y.
- $z \in N$ implies

$$d(Q, N) \leq |y - z| \leq |x - y| < diam(Q) \leq d(Q, N). \lightning$$

- Hence $z \in D$ and $|x - y| \geq |x - z| \geq d(x, D)$. ✓

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 2: $|x - y| \geq diam(Q)$.

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 2: $|x - y| \geq diam(Q)$.

- Can pick $z \in Q \cap D$.

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 2: $|x - y| \geq diam(Q)$.

- Can pick $z \in Q \cap D$.
- Estimate

$$|x - z| \leq |x - y| + |y - z| \leq |x - y| + diam(Q) \leq 2|x - y|.$$

A last lemma (found on the way back from Jena in 2020)

Let $x \in O$ and $y \in Q \setminus O$, where $Q \in \Sigma$.

Want to show: $|x - y| \geq \frac{1}{2} d(x, D)$.

Case 2: $|x - y| \geq diam(Q)$.

- Can pick $z \in Q \cap D$.
- Estimate

$$|x - z| \leq |x - y| + |y - z| \leq |x - y| + diam(Q) \leq 2|x - y|.$$

- Conclude $d(x, D) \leq |x - z| \leq 2|x - y|$.

Thanks for your attention!

A digital version of this presentation can be found here: