

# A general theorem of existence of quasi absolutely minimal Lipschitz extensions\*

Matthew J. Hirn · Erwan Y. Le Gruyer

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later – © Springer-Verlag 2014

**Abstract.** In this paper we consider a wide class of generalized Lipschitz extension problems and the corresponding problem of finding absolutely minimal Lipschitz extensions. We prove that if a minimal Lipschitz extension exists, then under certain other mild conditions, a quasi absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension must exist as well. Here we use the qualifier “quasi” to indicate that the extending function in question nearly satisfies the conditions of being an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension, up to several factors that can be made arbitrarily small.

*Mathematics Subject Classification (2000):* 54C20, 58C25, 46T20, 49-XX, 39B05

---

## 1. Introduction

In this paper we attempt to generalize Aronsson’s result on absolutely minimal Lipschitz extensions for scalar valued functions to a more general setting that includes a wide class of functions. The main result is the existence of a “quasi-AMLE,” which intuitively is a function that nearly satisfies the conditions of absolutely minimal Lipschitz extensions.

Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be Lipschitz continuous, so that

$$\text{Lip}(f; E) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x, y \in E \\ x \neq y}} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|} < \infty.$$

---

MATTHEW J. HIRN  
École normale supérieure  
Département d’Informatique  
45 rue d’Ulm  
75005 Paris, France  
e-mail: matthew.hirn@ens.fr

Erwan Y. Le Gruyer  
Institut National des Sciences Appliquées de Rennes & IRMAR  
20, Avenue des Buttes de Coësmes  
CS 70839 F - 35708 Rennes Cedex 7, France  
e-mail: Erwan.Le-Gruyer@insa-rennes.fr

\* *Mathematische Annalen*, volume 359, issue 3-4, pages 595-628, August 2014.  
arXiv:1211.5700.

The original Lipschitz extension problem then asks the following question: is it possible to extend  $f$  to a function  $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= f(x), \text{ for all } x \in E, \\ \text{Lip}(F; \mathbb{R}^d) &= \text{Lip}(f; E). \end{aligned}$$

By the work of McShane [11] and Whitney [22] in 1934, it is known that such an  $F$  exists and that two extensions can be written explicitly:

$$\Psi(x) \triangleq \inf_{y \in E} (f(y) + \text{Lip}(f; E) \|x - y\|), \quad (1)$$

$$\Lambda(x) \triangleq \sup_{y \in E} (f(y) - \text{Lip}(f; E) \|x - y\|). \quad (2)$$

In fact, the two extensions  $\Psi$  and  $\Lambda$  are extremal, so that if  $F$  is an arbitrary minimal Lipschitz extension of  $f$ , then  $\Lambda \leq F \leq \Psi$ . Thus, unless  $\Lambda \equiv \Psi$ , the extension  $F$  is not unique, and so one can search for an extending function  $F$  that satisfies additional properties.

In a series of papers in the 1960's [2–4], Aronsson proposed the notion of an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension (AMLE), which is essentially the “locally best” Lipschitz extension. His original motivation for the concept was in conjunction with the infinity Laplacian and infinity harmonic functions. We first define the property of absolute minimality independently of the notion of an extension. A function  $u : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , is absolutely minimal if

$$\text{Lip}(u; V) = \text{Lip}(u; \partial V), \quad \text{for all open } V \subset\subset D, \quad (3)$$

where  $\partial V$  denotes the boundary of  $V$ ,  $V \subset\subset D$  means that  $\bar{V}$  is compact in  $D$ , and  $\bar{V}$  is the closure of  $V$ . A function  $U$  is an AMLE for  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  if  $U$  is a Lipschitz extension of  $f$ , and furthermore, if it is also absolutely minimal on  $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E$ . That is:

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) &= f(x), \text{ for all } x \in E, \\ \text{Lip}(U; \mathbb{R}^d) &= \text{Lip}(f; E), \\ \text{Lip}(U; V) &= \text{Lip}(U; \partial V), \text{ for all open } V \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus E. \end{aligned}$$

The existence of an AMLE was proved by Aronsson, and in 1993 Jensen [7] proved that AMLEs are unique under certain conditions (see also [6, 1]).

Since the work of Aronsson, there has been much research devoted to the study of AMLEs and problems related to them. For a discussion on many of these ideas, including self contained proofs of existence and uniqueness, we refer the reader to [5].

There are, though, several variants to the classical Lipschitz extension problem. A general formulation is the following: let  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$  be two metric spaces, and define the Lipschitz constant of a function  $f : E \rightarrow Z$ ,  $E \subset \mathbb{X}$ , as:

$$\text{Lip}(f; E) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x, y \in E \\ x \neq y}} \frac{d_Z(f(x), f(y))}{d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)}.$$

Given a fixed pair of metric spaces  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$ , as well as an arbitrary function  $f : E \rightarrow Z$  with  $\text{Lip}(f; E) < \infty$ , one can ask if it is possible to extend  $f$  to a function  $F : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow Z$  such that  $\text{Lip}(F; \mathbb{X}) = \text{Lip}(f; E)$ . This is known as the isometric Lipschitz extension problem (or property, if it is known for a pair of metric spaces). Generally speaking it does not hold, although certain special cases beyond  $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $Z = \mathbb{R}$  do exist. For example, one can take  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  to be an arbitrary metric space and  $Z = \mathbb{R}$  (simply adapt (1) and (2)). Another, more powerful generalization comes from the work of Kirszbraun [10] (and later, independently by Valentine [19]). In his paper in 1934, he proved that if  $\mathbb{X}$  and  $Z$  are arbitrary Hilbert spaces, then they have the isometric Lipschitz extension property. Further examples exist; a more thorough discussion of the isometric Lipschitz extension property can be found in [21].

For pairs of metric spaces with the isometric Lipschitz extension property, one can then try to generalize the notion of an AMLE. Given that an AMLE should locally be the best possible such extension, the appropriate generalization for arbitrary metric spaces is the following. Let  $E \subset \mathbb{X}$  be closed, and suppose we are given a function  $f : E \rightarrow Z$  and a minimal Lipschitz extension  $U : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow Z$  such that  $\text{Lip}(U; \mathbb{X}) = \text{Lip}(f; E)$ . The function  $U$  is an AMLE if for every open subset  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus E$  and every Lipschitz mapping  $\tilde{U} : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow Z$  that coincides with  $U$  on  $\mathbb{X} \setminus V$ , we have

$$\text{Lip}(U; V) \leq \text{Lip}(\tilde{U}; V). \quad (4)$$

When  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is path connected, (4) is equivalent to the Aronsson condition that

$$\text{Lip}(U; V) = \text{Lip}(U; \partial V), \quad \text{for all open } V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus E. \quad (5)$$

When  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is an arbitrary length space and  $Z = \mathbb{R}$ , there are several proofs of existence of AMLE's [12, 8, 17] (some under certain conditions). The proof of uniqueness in this scenario is given in [15].

Extending results on AMLE's to non scalar valued functions presents many difficulties, which in turn has limited the number of results along this avenue. Two recent papers have made significant progress, though. In [14], the authors consider the case when  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is a locally compact length space, and  $(Z, d_Z)$  is a metric tree; they are able to prove existence and uniqueness of AMLE's for this pairing. The case of vector valued functions with  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}}) = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $(Z, d_Z) = \mathbb{R}^m$  is considered in [16]. In this case an AMLE is not necessarily

unique, so the authors propose a stronger condition called tightness for which they are able to get existence and uniqueness results in some cases.

In this paper we seek to add to the progress on the theory of non scalar valued AMLE's. We propose a generalized notion of an AMLE for a large class of isometric Lipschitz extension problems, and prove a general theorem for the existence of what we call a quasi-AMLE. A quasi-AMLE is, essentially, a minimal Lipschitz extension that comes within  $\varepsilon$  of satisfying (4). We work not only with general metric spaces, but also a general functional  $\Phi$  that replaces the specific functional  $\text{Lip}$ . In our setting  $\text{Lip}$  is an example of the type of functionals we consider, but others exist as well.

One such example is given in [18]. If we consider the classic Lipschitz extension problem as the zero-order problem, then for the first order problem we would want an extension that minimizes  $\text{Lip}(\nabla F; \mathbb{R}^d)$ . In this case, one is given a subset  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and a 1-field  $\mathcal{P}_E = \{P_x\}_{x \in E} \subset \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ , consisting of first order polynomials mapping  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  that are indexed by the elements of  $E$ . The goal is to extend  $\mathcal{P}_E$  to a function  $F \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that two conditions are satisfied: 1.) for each  $x \in E$ , the first order Taylor polynomial  $J_x F$  of  $F$  at  $x$  agrees with  $P_x$ ; and 2.)  $\text{Lip}(\nabla F; \mathbb{R}^d)$  is minimal. By a result of Le Gruyer [18], such an extension is guaranteed to exist with Lipschitz constant  $\Gamma^1(\mathcal{P}_E)$ , assuming that  $\Gamma^1(\mathcal{P}_E) < \infty$  (here  $\Gamma^1$  is a functional defined in [18]). The functional  $\Gamma^1$  can be thought of as the Lipschitz constant for 1-fields. By the results of this paper, one is guaranteed the existence of a quasi-AMLE for this setting as well.

## 2. Setup and the main theorem

### 2.1. Metric spaces

Let  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$  be metric spaces. We will consider functions of the form  $f : E \rightarrow Z$ , where  $E \subset \mathbb{X}$ . For the range, we require:

1.  $(Z, d_Z)$  is a complete metric space.

For the domain,  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$ , we require some additional geometrical properties:

1.  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is complete and proper (i.e., closed balls are compact).
2.  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is midpoint convex. Recall that this means that for any two points  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $x \neq y$ , there exists a third point  $m(x, y) \in \mathbb{X}$  for which

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, m(x, y)) = d_{\mathbb{X}}(m(x, y), y) = \frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y).$$

Such a point  $m(x, y)$  is called the midpoint and  $m : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$  is called the midpoint map. Since we have also assumed that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is complete, this implies that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is a geodesic (or strongly intrinsic) metric space. By definition then, every two points  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$  are joined by a geodesic curve with finite length equal to  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$ .

3.  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is distance convex, so that for all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $x \neq y$ ,

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(m(x, y), z) \leq \frac{1}{2}(d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, z) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, z)).$$

Note that this implies that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is ball convex, which in turn implies that every ball in  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is totally convex. By definition, this means that for any two points  $x, y$  lying in a ball  $B \subset \mathbb{X}$ , the geodesic connecting them lies entirely in  $B$ . Ball convexity also implies that the midpoint map is unique, and, furthermore, since  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is also complete, that the geodesic between two points is unique.

We remark that the  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is path connected by these assumptions, and so (4) is equivalent to (5) for all of the cases that we consider here.

## 2.2. Notation

Set  $\mathbb{N} \triangleq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}^* \triangleq \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ , and  $\mathbb{R}^+ \triangleq [0, \infty)$ . Let  $S$  be an arbitrary subset of  $\mathbb{X}$ , i.e.,  $S \subset \mathbb{X}$ , and let  $\overset{\circ}{S}$  and  $\bar{S}$  denote the interior of  $S$  and the closure of  $S$ , respectively. For any  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  and  $S \subset \mathbb{X}$ , set

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, S) \triangleq \inf\{d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) \mid y \in S\}.$$

For each  $x \in \mathbb{X}$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $B(x; r)$  denote the open ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $x$ :

$$B(x; r) \triangleq \{y \in \mathbb{X} \mid d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) < r\}.$$

We will often utilize a particular type of ball: for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ , define

$$B_{1/2}(x, y) \triangleq B\left(m(x, y); \frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)\right).$$

By  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ , we denote the space of functions mapping subsets of  $\mathbb{X}$  into  $Z$ :

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z) \triangleq \{f : E \rightarrow Z \mid E \subset \mathbb{X}\}.$$

If  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ , set  $\text{dom}(f)$  to be the domain of  $f$ . We use  $E = \text{dom}(f)$  interchangeably depending on the situation. We also set  $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{X})$  to be the set of all compact subsets of  $\mathbb{X}$ .

### 2.3. General Lipschitz extensions

**Definition 1.** Given  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$ , a function  $F \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  is an extension of  $f$  if

$$\text{dom}(f) \subset \text{dom}(F) \quad \text{and} \quad F(x) = f(x), \text{ for all } x \in \text{dom}(f).$$

We shall be interested in arbitrary functionals  $\Phi$  with domain  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z}) &\rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}) \\ f &\mapsto \Phi(f) : \text{dom}(f) \times \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to simplify the notation slightly, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  and  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$ , we set

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \triangleq \Phi(f)(x, y).$$

We also extend the map  $\Phi(f)$  to subsets  $D \subset \text{dom}(f)$  as follows:

$$\Phi(f; D) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x, y \in D \\ x \neq y}} \Phi(f; x, y).$$

The map  $\Phi$  serves as a generalization of the standard Lipschitz constant  $\text{Lip}(f; D)$  first introduced in Section 1. As such, one can think of it in the context of minimal extensions. Let  $\mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z}) \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  denote those functions in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  for which  $\Phi$  is finite, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z}) \triangleq \{f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z}) \mid \Phi(f; \text{dom}(f)) < \infty\}.$$

We then have the following definition.

**Definition 2.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  and let  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  be an extension of  $f$ . We say  $F$  is a minimal extension of the function  $f$  if

$$\Phi(F; \text{dom}(F)) = \Phi(f; \text{dom}(f)). \quad (6)$$

One can then generalize the notion of an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension (AMLE) in the following way:

**Definition 3.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  with  $\text{dom}(f)$  closed and let  $U \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  be a minimal extension of  $f$  with  $\text{dom}(U) = \mathbb{X}$ . Then  $U$  is an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension of  $f$  if for every open set  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f)$  and every  $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  with  $\text{dom}(\tilde{U}) = \mathbb{X}$  that coincides with  $U$  on  $\mathbb{X} \setminus V$ ,

$$\Phi(U; V) \leq \Phi(\tilde{U}; V).$$

Alternatively, we can extend Aronsson's original definition of AMLEs:

**Definition 4.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(f)$  closed and let  $U \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  be a minimal extension of  $f$  with  $\text{dom}(U) = \mathbb{X}$ . Then  $U$  is an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension of  $f$  if

$$\Phi(U; V) = \Phi(U; \partial V), \quad \text{for all open } V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f). \quad (7)$$

In fact, since we have assumed that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is path connected, Definitions 3 and 4 are equivalent; see Appendix A for the details.

In this paper we prove the existence of a function  $U$  that is a minimal extension of  $f$ , and that “nearly” satisfies (7). In order to make this statement precise, we first specify the properties that  $\Phi$  must satisfy, and then formalize what we mean by “nearly.” Before we get to either task, though, we first define the following family of curves.

**Definition 5.** For each  $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ ,  $x \neq y$ , let  $\Gamma(x, y)$  denote the set of curves

$$\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y),$$

such that  $\gamma(0) = x$ ,  $\gamma(1) = y$ ,  $\gamma$  is continuous, and  $\gamma$  is monotone in the following sense:

$$\text{If } 0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq 1, \text{ then } d_{\mathbb{X}}(\gamma(0), \gamma(t_1)) < d_{\mathbb{X}}(\gamma(0), \gamma(t_2)).$$

The required properties of  $\Phi$  are the following (note that  $(P_1)$  has already been stated as a definition):

$(P_0)$   $\Phi$  is symmetric and nonnegative:

For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  and for all  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$ ,

$$\Phi(f; x, y) = \Phi(f; y, x) \geq 0.$$

$(P_1)$  Pointwise evaluation:

For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  and for all  $D \subset \text{dom}(f)$ ,

$$\Phi(f; D) = \sup_{\substack{x, y \in D \\ x \neq y}} \Phi(f; x, y).$$

$(P_2)$   $\Phi$  is minimal:

For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  and for all  $D \subset \mathbb{X}$  such that  $\text{dom}(f) \subset D$ , there exists an extension  $F : D \rightarrow Z$  of  $f$  such that

$$\Phi(F; D) = \Phi(f; \text{dom}(f)).$$

$(P_3)$  Chasles’ inequality:

For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  and for all  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$ ,  $x \neq y$ , such that  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y) \subset \text{dom}(f)$ , there exists a curve  $\gamma \in \Gamma(x, y)$  such that

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \max \{ \Phi(f; x, \gamma(t)), \Phi(f; \gamma(t), y) \}.$$

(P<sub>4</sub>) Continuity of  $\Phi$ :

Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ . For each  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$ ,  $x \neq y$ , and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon, d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) > 0$  such that

$$\text{For all } z \in B(y; \eta) \cap \text{dom}(f), \quad |\Phi(f; x, y) - \Phi(f; x, z)| < \varepsilon.$$

(P<sub>5</sub>) Continuity of  $f$ :

If  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ , then  $f : \text{dom}(f) \rightarrow Z$  is a continuous function.

*Remark 1.* Property (P<sub>3</sub>) is named after French mathematician Michel Chasles.

#### 2.4. Examples of the metric spaces and the functional $\Phi$

Before moving on, we give some examples of the metric spaces  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$  along with the functional  $\Phi$ .

*2.4.1. Scalar valued Lipschitz extensions* The scalar valued case discussed at the outset is one example. Indeed, one can take  $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) = \|x - y\|$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Euclidean distance. For the range, set  $Z = \mathbb{R}$  and  $d_Z(a, b) = |a - b|$ . For any  $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $E \subset \mathbb{X}$ , define  $\Phi$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(f; x, y) &= \text{Lip}(f; x, y) \triangleq \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|}, \\ \Phi(f; E) &= \text{Lip}(f; E) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x, y \in E \\ x \neq y}} \text{Lip}(f; x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly (P<sub>0</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub>) are satisfied. By the work of McShane [11] and Whitney [22], (P<sub>2</sub>) is also satisfied. (P<sub>3</sub>) is satisfied with  $\gamma(t) = (1-t)x + ty$ , and (P<sub>4</sub>) and (P<sub>5</sub>) are easy to verify.

*2.4.2. Lipschitz mappings between Hilbert spaces* More generally, one can take  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}}) = \mathcal{H}_1$  and  $(Z, d_Z) = \mathcal{H}_2$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  are Hilbert spaces (note, since we assume that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is proper, there are some restrictions on  $\mathcal{H}_1$ ). Then for any  $f : E \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_2$ , with  $E \subset \mathcal{H}_1$ , define  $\Phi$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(f; x, y) &= \text{Lip}(f; x, y) \triangleq \frac{\|f(x) - f(y)\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}}{\|x - y\|_{\mathcal{H}_1}}, \\ \Phi(f; E) &= \text{Lip}(f; E) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x, y \in E \\ x \neq y}} \text{Lip}(f; x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly (P<sub>0</sub>) and (P<sub>1</sub>) are satisfied. By the work of Kirszbraun [10] and later Valentine [19], (P<sub>2</sub>) is also satisfied. (P<sub>3</sub>) is satisfied with  $\gamma(t) = (1-t)x + ty$ , and (P<sub>4</sub>) and (P<sub>5</sub>) are easy to verify.



**2.4.3. Lipschitz mappings between metric spaces** More generally still, one can take any pair of metric spaces  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$  satisfying the assumptions of Section 2.1. Clearly  $(P_0)$ ,  $(P_1)$ ,  $(P_4)$ , and  $(P_5)$  are satisfied. For  $(P_3)$ , we can take  $\gamma \in \Gamma(x, y)$  to be the unique geodesic between  $x$  and  $y$ . All that remains to check, then, is  $(P_2)$ , the existence of a minimal extension. Such a condition is not satisfied between two metric spaces in general, although examples beyond those already mentioned do exist. For example, one can take  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  to be any metric space and  $(Z, d_Z) = \ell_n^\infty$ , where  $\ell_n^\infty$  denotes  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with the norm  $\|x\|_\infty \triangleq \max\{|x_j| \mid j = 1, \dots, n\}$ . See [21], Theorem 11.2, Chapter 3, as well as the discussion afterwards. See also [13, 9].

**2.4.4. 1-fields** Let  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}}) = \mathbb{R}^d$  endowed with the Euclidean metric. Set  $\mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  to be the set of first degree polynomials (affine functions) mapping  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . We take  $Z = \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ , and write each  $P \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  in the following form:

$$P(a) = p_0 + D_0 P \cdot a, \quad p_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad D_0 P \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

For any  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ , we then define  $d_Z$  as:

$$d_Z(P, Q) \triangleq |p_0 - q_0| + \|D_0 P - D_0 Q\|,$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is just the absolute value, and  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Euclidean distance on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

For a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ , we use the following notation (note, as usual,  $E \subset \mathbb{X}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} f : E &\rightarrow \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}) \\ x &\mapsto f(x)(a) = f_x + D_x f \cdot (a - x), \end{aligned}$$

where  $f_x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D_x f \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the evaluation variable of the polynomial  $f(x)$ . Define the functional  $\Phi$  as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(f; x, y) &= \Gamma^1(f; x, y) \triangleq 2 \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x)(a) - f(y)(a)|}{\|x - a\|^2 + \|y - a\|^2}, \\ \Phi(f; E) &= \Gamma^1(f; E) \triangleq \sup_{\substack{x, y \in E \\ x \neq y}} \Gamma^1(f; x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Using the results contained in [18], one can show that for these two metric spaces and for this definition of  $\Phi$ , that properties  $(P_0)$ - $(P_5)$  are satisfied; the full details are given in Appendix B. In particular, there exists an extension  $U : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $U(x)(a) = U_x + D_x U \cdot (a - x)$ , such that  $U(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in E$  and  $\Phi(U; \mathbb{R}^d) = \Phi(f; E)$ . Furthermore, define the function  $F : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $F(x) = U_x$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Note that  $F \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , and set for each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $J_x F(a) \triangleq F(x) + \nabla F(x) \cdot (a - x) \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  to be the first order Taylor expansion of  $F$  around  $x$ . Then  $F$  satisfies the following properties:

1.  $J_x F = f(x)$  for all  $x \in E$ .
2.  $\text{Lip}(\nabla F) = \Gamma^1(f; E)$ .
3. If  $\tilde{F} \in C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  also satisfies  $J_x \tilde{F} = f(x)$  for all  $x \in E$ , then  $\text{Lip}(\nabla F) \leq \text{Lip}(\nabla \tilde{F})$ .

Thus  $F$  is the extension of the 1-field  $f$  with minimum Lipschitz derivative (see [18] for the proofs and a complete explanation). The 1-field  $U$  is the corresponding set of jets of  $F$ . For an explicit construction of  $F$  when  $E$  is finite we refer the reader to [20].

**2.4.5.  $m$ -fields** A similar result for  $m$ -fields, where  $m \geq 2$ , is an open problem. In particular, it is unknown what the correct corresponding functional  $\Phi = \Gamma^m$  is. It seems plausible, though, that such a functional will satisfy the properties  $(P_0)$ - $(P_5)$ .

### 2.5. Main theorem

The AMLE condition (7) is for any open set off of the domain of the initial function  $f$ . In our analysis, we look at subfamily of open sets that approximates the family of all open sets. In particular, we look at finite unions of open balls. The number of balls in a particular union is capped by a universal constant, and furthermore, the radius of each ball must also be larger than some constant. For any  $\rho > 0$  and  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , define such a collection as:

$$\mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0) \triangleq \left\{ \Omega = \bigcup_{n=1}^N B(x_n; r_n) \mid x_n \in \mathbb{X}, r_n \geq \rho, N \leq N_0 \right\}.$$

Note that as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  and  $N_0 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$  contains all open sets if  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is compact. We shall always use  $\Omega$  to denote sets taken from  $\mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$ . For any such set, we use  $\mathcal{R}(\Omega)$  to denote the collection of balls that make up  $\Omega$ :

$$\mathcal{R}(\Omega) = \left\{ B(x_n; r_n) \mid n = 1, \dots, N, \Omega = \bigcup_{n=1}^N B(x_n; r_n) \right\}.$$

We also define, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ , any open  $V \subset \text{dom}(f)$ ,  $V \neq \mathbb{X}$ , and any  $\alpha > 0$ , the following approximation of  $\Phi(f; V)$ :

$$\Psi(f; V; \alpha) \triangleq \sup \{ \Phi(f; x, y) \mid B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) \subset V, d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \partial V) \geq \alpha \}.$$

Using these two approximations, our primary result is the following:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$  be metric spaces satisfying the assumptions of Section 2.1, let  $\Phi$  be a functional satisfying properties  $(P_0)$ - $(P_5)$ , and let  $X \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{X})$ . Given  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(X, Z)$ ,  $\rho > 0$ ,  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sigma_0 > 0$ , there exists  $U = U(f, \rho, N_0, \alpha, \sigma_0) \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(X, Z)$  such that*

1.  $U$  is a minimal extension of  $f$  to  $X$ ; that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{dom}(U) &= X, \\ U(x) &= f(x), \text{ for all } x \in \operatorname{dom}(f), \\ \Phi(U; X) &= \Phi(f; \operatorname{dom}(f)).\end{aligned}$$

2. The following quasi-AMLE condition is satisfied on  $X$ :

$$\Psi(U; \Omega; \alpha) - \Phi(U; \partial\Omega) < \sigma_0, \quad \text{for all } \Omega \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0), \quad \Omega \subset X \setminus \operatorname{dom}(f). \quad (8)$$

We call such extensions quasi-AMLEs, and view them as a first step toward proving the existence of AMLEs under these general conditions. We note that there are essentially four areas of approximation. The first is that we extend to an arbitrary, but fixed compact set  $X \subset \mathbb{X}$  as opposed to the entire space. The second was already mentioned; rather than look at all open sets, we look at those belonging to  $\mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$ . Since  $X$  is compact, as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  and  $N_0 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$  will contain all open sets in  $X$ . Third, we allow ourselves a certain amount of error with the parameter  $\sigma_0$ . As  $\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ , the values of the Lipschitz constants on  $\Omega$  and  $\partial\Omega$  should coincide. The last part of the approximation is the use of the functional  $\Psi$  to approximate  $\Phi$  on each  $\Omega \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$ . While this may at first not seem as natural as the other areas of approximation, the following proposition shows that in fact  $\Psi$  works rather well in the context of the AMLE problem.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ . For any open  $V \subset \operatorname{dom}(f)$ ,  $V \neq \mathbb{X}$ , and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , let us define*

$$V_\alpha \triangleq \{x \in V \mid d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \partial V) \geq \alpha\}.$$

Then for all  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$\Phi(f; V_\alpha) \leq \max\{\Psi(f; V; \alpha), \Phi(f; \partial V_\alpha)\}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\Phi(f; V) = \max\{\Psi(f; V; 0), \Phi(f; \partial V)\}. \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* See Appendix C.

Proposition 1, along with the discussion immediately preceding it, seems to indicate that if one were able to pass through the various limits to obtain  $U(f, \rho, N_0, \alpha, \sigma_0) \rightarrow U(f)$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ ,  $N_0 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ , then one would have a general theorem of existence of AMLEs for suitable pairs of metric spaces and Lipschitz-type functionals. Whether such a procedure is in fact possible, though, is yet to be determined.

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 3, with the relevant lemmas stated and proved in Section 4. The main ideas of the proof are as follows. Using  $(P_2)$ ,

we can find a minimal extension  $U_0 \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  of  $f$  with  $\text{dom}(U_0) = X$ . If such an extension also satisfies (8), then we take  $U = U_0$  and we are finished. If, on the other hand,  $U_0$  does not satisfy (8), then there must be some  $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$ ,  $\Omega_1 \subset X \setminus \text{dom}(f)$ , for which  $\Psi(U_0; \Omega_1; \alpha) - \Phi(U_0; \partial\Omega_1) \geq \sigma_0$ . We derive a new minimal extension  $U_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  of  $f$  from  $U_0$  by correcting  $U_0$  on  $\Omega_1$ . To perform the correction, we restrict ourselves to  $U_0|_{\partial\Omega_1}$ , and extend this function to  $\Omega_1$  using once again  $(P_2)$ . We then patch this extension into  $U_0$ , giving us  $U_1$ . We then ask if  $U_1$  satisfies (8). If it does, we take  $U = U_1$  and we are finished. If it does not, we repeat the procedure just outlined. The main work of the proof goes into showing that the repetition of such a procedure must end after a finite number of iterations.

It is also interesting to note that the extension procedure itself is a “black box.” We do not have any knowledge of the behavior of the extension outside of  $(P_0)$ - $(P_5)$ , only that it exists. We then refine this extension by using local extensions to correct in areas that do not satisfy the quasi-AMLE condition. The proof then is not about the extension of functions, but rather the refinement of such extensions.

*Remark 2.* The procedure outlined above seems to indicate that the proof can be adapted numerically for applications in which one needs to compute a generalized AMLE to within some tolerance. Indeed, if one is able to numerically compute the corrections efficiently, then by the proof, one is guaranteed to have an algorithm with finite stopping time for any set of prescribed tolerances  $\rho$ ,  $N_0$ ,  $\alpha$ , and  $\sigma_0$ .

### 3. Proof of Theorem 1: Existence of quasi-AMLE’s

In this section we outline the key parts of the proof of Theorem 1. We begin by defining a local correction operator that we will use repeatedly.

#### 3.1. Definition of the correction operator $H$

**Definition 6.** Let  $X \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{X})$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$ , and  $\Omega \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$  with  $\overline{\Omega} \subset \text{dom}(f)$ . By  $(P_2)$  there exists an  $F \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(F) = \overline{\Omega}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) &= f(x), \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \Phi(F; \Omega) &= \Phi(f; \partial\Omega). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Given such an  $f$  and  $\Omega$ , define the operator  $H$  as:

$$H(f; \Omega)(x) \triangleq F(x), \text{ for all } x \in \Omega. \tag{12}$$

### 3.2. A sequence of total, minimal extensions

Fix the metric spaces  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$ , the Lipschitz functional  $\Phi$ , the compact domain  $X \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{X})$ , as well as  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(X, Z)$ ,  $\rho > 0$ ,  $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\sigma_0 > 0$ . Set:

$$K \triangleq \Phi(f; \text{dom}(f)).$$

Using  $(P_2)$ , let  $U_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(X, Z)$  be a minimal extension of  $f$  to all of  $X$ ; recall that this means:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom}(U_0) &= X, \\ U_0(x) &= f(x), \text{ for all } x \in \text{dom}(f), \\ \Phi(U_0; X) &= \Phi(f; \text{dom}(f)). \end{aligned}$$

We are going to recursively construct a sequence  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of minimal extensions of  $f$  to  $X$ . First, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$\Delta_n \triangleq \{\Omega \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0) \mid \Psi(U_n; \Omega; \alpha) - \Phi(U_n; \partial\Omega) \geq \sigma_0, \Omega \subset X \setminus \text{dom}(f)\}.$$

The set  $\Delta_n$  contains all admissible open sets for which the extension  $U_n$  violates the quasi-AMLE condition. If  $\Delta_n = \emptyset$ , then we can take  $U = U_n$  and we are finished.

If, on the other hand,  $\Delta_n \neq \emptyset$ , then to obtain  $U_{n+1}$  we take  $U_n$  and pick any  $\Omega_{n+1} \in \Delta_n$  and set

$$U_{n+1}(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} H(U_n; \Omega_{n+1})(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega_{n+1}, \\ U_n(x) & \text{if } x \in X \setminus \Omega_{n+1}, \end{cases}$$

where  $H$  was defined in Section 3.1. Thus, along with  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we also have a sequence of refining sets  $\{\Omega_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  such that  $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$ ,  $\Omega_n \subset X \setminus \text{dom}(f)$ , and  $\Omega_n \in \Delta_{n-1}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ .

Since  $\text{dom}(U_0) = X$ , and since  $\Omega_n \subset X \setminus \text{dom}(f)$ , we see by construction that  $\text{dom}(U_n) = X$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the arguments in Section 4.1 and Lemma 3 contained within, we see that each of the functions  $U_n$  is also a minimal extension of  $f$ .

### 3.3. Reducing the Lipschitz constant on the refining sets $\{\Omega_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$

Since each of the functions  $U_n$  is a minimal extension of  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(X, Z)$ , we have

$$\Phi(U_n; X) = K, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, since  $\Omega_{n+1} \in \Delta_n$ , we have by definition,

$$\Psi(U_n; \Omega_{n+1}; \alpha) - \Phi(U_n; \partial\Omega_{n+1}) \geq \sigma_0. \quad (14)$$

Using the definition of the operator  $H$  and (14), we also have for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ ,

$$\Phi(U_n; \Omega_n) = \Phi(H(U_{n-1}; \Omega_n); \Omega_n) = \Phi(U_{n-1}; \partial\Omega_n) \leq \Psi(U_{n-1}; \Omega_n; \alpha) - \sigma_0. \quad (15)$$

Furthermore, combining (13) and (15), and using property  $(P_1)$  as well as the definition of  $\Psi$ , one can arrive at the following:

$$\Phi(U_n; \Omega_n) \leq K - \sigma_0, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}^*. \quad (16)$$

Thus we see that locally on  $\Omega_n$ , the total, minimal extension  $U_n$  is guaranteed to have Lipschitz constant bounded by  $K - \sigma_0$ . In fact we can say much more.

**Lemma 1.** *The following property holds true for all  $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$ :*

$$\exists M_p \in \mathbb{N}^* : \forall n > M_p, \quad \Phi(U_n; \Omega_n) < K - p \frac{\sigma_0}{2}. \quad (\mathbf{Q}_p)$$

The property  $(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  is enough to prove Theorem 1. Indeed, if  $\Delta_n \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then by  $(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  one will have  $\Phi(U_n; \Omega_n) < 0$  for  $n$  sufficiently large. However, by the definition of  $\Phi$  one must have  $\Phi(U_n; \Omega_n) \geq 0$ , and so we have arrived at a contradiction. Now for the proof of Lemma 1.

*Proof.* We prove  $(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  by induction. By (16), it is clearly true for  $p = 1$ . Let  $p \geq 2$  and suppose that  $(\mathbf{Q}_{p-1})$  is true; we wish to show that  $(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  is true as well. Let  $M_{p-1}$  be an integer satisfying  $(\mathbf{Q}_{p-1})$  and assume that  $\Delta_{M_{p-1}} \neq \emptyset$ . Let us define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{p,n} &\triangleq \bigcup \{ \Omega_m \mid M_{p-1} < m \leq n \}, \\ \mathcal{A}_{p,\infty} &\triangleq \bigcup \{ \Omega_m \mid M_{p-1} < m \}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{A}_{p,\infty}) &\triangleq \{ B(x; r) \mid \exists m > M_{p-1} \text{ with } B(x; r) \in \mathcal{R}(\Omega_m) \}. \end{aligned}$$

The closure of each set  $\mathcal{A}_{p,n}$  is compact and the sequence  $\{\mathcal{A}_{p,n}\}_{n > M_{p-1}}$  is monotonic under inclusion and converges to  $\mathcal{A}_{p,\infty}$  in Hausdorff distance as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N_p > M_{p-1}$  such that

$$\delta(\mathcal{A}_{p,N_p}, \mathcal{A}_{p,\infty}) \leq \varepsilon,$$

where  $\delta$  is the Hausdorff distance.

Now apply the Geometrical Lemma 4 (see Section 4.2) to the sets  $\mathcal{A}_{p,n}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{p,\infty}$  with  $\beta = \alpha - \varepsilon$ . One obtains  $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\forall B(x; r), \text{ if } r \geq \alpha - \varepsilon \text{ and } B(x; r) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p,\infty}, \text{ then } B(x; r - \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p,N_\varepsilon}. \quad (17)$$

Take  $M_p \triangleq \max\{N_p, N_\varepsilon\}$ . One can then obtain the following lemma, which is essentially a corollary of (17).

**Lemma 2.** For all  $n > M_p$  and for all  $B(x; r) \subset \Omega_n$  with  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \partial\Omega_n) \geq \alpha$  and  $r < \alpha$ , we have

$$\text{if } B(x; r) \not\subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}, \text{ then } r \geq \alpha - \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Let  $B(x; r)$  be a ball that satisfies the hypothesis of the lemma and suppose  $B(x; r) \not\subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ . Since  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \partial\Omega_n) \geq \alpha$  and  $B(x; r) \subset B(x; \alpha) \subset \Omega_n$ , we have  $B(x; \alpha) \not\subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ . On the other hand,  $B(x; \alpha) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p, \infty}$  and (trivially)  $\alpha \geq \alpha - \varepsilon$ , so by (17),  $B(x; \alpha - \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ . Therefore  $r \geq \alpha - \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

Now let us use the inductive hypothesis ( $\mathbf{Q}_{p-1}$ ). Let  $n > M_p$  and let  $x, y \in \Omega_n$  such that  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) \subset \Omega_n$  with  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \partial\Omega_n) \geq \alpha$ .

*Case 1.* Suppose that  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ . In this case we apply the Customs Lemma (Lemma 6) with  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{p, n-1}$  (see Section 4.3). Since  $n > M_p > M_{p-1}$ , we are assured by the inductive hypothesis that

$$\Phi(U_j; \Omega_j) < K - (p-1) \frac{\sigma_0}{2}, \quad \text{for all } j = M_{p-1} + 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Thus we can conclude from the Customs Lemma that

$$\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y) \leq K - (p-1) \frac{\sigma_0}{2}. \quad (18)$$

That completes the first case.

*Case 2.* Suppose that  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) \not\subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ . By Lemma 2, we know that  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) \geq \alpha - \varepsilon$ . Thus, by (17), we have  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) - 2\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ .

Let  $\gamma \in \Gamma(x, y)$  be the curve satisfying ( $P_3$ ) and set

$$y_1 \triangleq \partial B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) - 2\varepsilon) \cap \gamma.$$

Write  $\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y)$  in the form:

$$\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y) = \Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y) - \Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y_1) + \Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y_1).$$

Using ( $P_4$ ) and the fact that  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) \geq \alpha - \varepsilon$ , there exists a constant  $C(\varepsilon, \alpha)$  satisfying  $C(\varepsilon, \alpha) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y) - \Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y_1) \leq C(\varepsilon, \alpha). \quad (19)$$

Moreover, since  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_1)) \subset \mathcal{A}_{p, M_p}$ , we can apply the Customs Lemma along with the inductive hypothesis ( $\mathbf{Q}_{p-1}$ ) (as in the first case) to conclude that

$$\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y_1) \leq K - (p-1) \frac{\sigma_0}{2}. \quad (20)$$

Combining (19) and (20) we obtain

$$\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y) \leq K - (p-1) \frac{\sigma_0}{2} + C(\varepsilon, \alpha).$$

Since we can choose  $\varepsilon$  such that  $C(\varepsilon, \alpha) \leq \sigma_0/2$ , we have

$$\Phi(U_{n-1}; x, y) \leq K - p \frac{\sigma_0}{2} + \sigma_0. \quad (21)$$

That completes the second case.

Now using (18) in the first case and (21) in the second case we obtain

$$\Psi(U_{n-1}; \Omega_n; \alpha) \leq K - p \frac{\sigma_0}{2} + \sigma_0. \quad (22)$$

Combining (15) with (22) we can complete the proof:

$$\Phi(U_n; \Omega_n) \leq \Psi(U_{n-1}; \Omega_n; \alpha) - \sigma_0 \leq K - p \frac{\sigma_0}{2}.$$

□

## 4. Lemmas used in the proof Theorem 1

### 4.1. The operator $H$ preserves the Lipschitz constant

In this section we prove that the sequence of extensions  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  constructed in Section 3.2 are all minimal extensions of the original function  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$ . Recall that by construction,  $U_0$  is a minimal extension of  $f$ , and each  $U_n$  is an extension of  $f$ , so it remains to show that each  $U_n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , is minimal. In particular, if we show that the construction preserves or lowers the Lipschitz constant of the extension from  $U_n$  to  $U_{n+1}$  then we are finished. The following lemma does just that.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(F_0) = X$  and let  $\Omega \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0)$ . Define  $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  as:*

$$F_1(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} H(F_0; \Omega)(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ F_0(x), & \text{if } x \in X \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$\Phi(F_1; X) \leq \Phi(F_0; X).$$

*Proof.* We utilize properties  $(P_1)$  and  $(P_3)$ . By  $(P_1)$ , it is enough to consider the evaluation of  $\Phi(F_1; x, y)$  for an arbitrary pair of points  $x, y \in X$ . We have three cases:

*Case 1.* If  $x, y \in X \setminus \Omega$ , then by the definition of  $F_1$  and  $(P_1)$  (applied to  $F_0$ ) we have:

$$\Phi(F_1; x, y) = \Phi(F_0; x, y) \leq \Phi(F_0; X).$$



*Case 2.* If  $x, y \in \Omega$ , then by the definition of  $F_1$ , the definition of  $H$ , and property  $(P_1)$ , we have:

$$\Phi(F_1; x, y) = \Phi(H(F_0; \Omega); x, y) \leq \Phi(F_0; \partial\Omega) \leq \Phi(F_0; X).$$

*Case 3.* Suppose that  $x \in X \setminus \Omega$  and  $y \in \Omega$ . Assume, for now, that  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y) \subset X$ . By  $(P_3)$  there exists a curve  $\gamma \in \Gamma(x, y)$  such that

$$\Phi(F_1; x, y) \leq \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \max\{\Phi(F_1; x, \gamma(t)), \Phi(F_1; \gamma(t), y)\}.$$

Let  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$  be such that  $\gamma(t_0) \in \partial\Omega$ . Then, utilizing  $(P_3)$ , the definition of  $F_1$ , the definition of  $H$ , and  $(P_1)$ , one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(F_1; x, y) &\leq \max\{\Phi(F_1; x, \gamma(t_0)), \Phi(F_1; \gamma(t_0), y)\} \\ &= \max\{\Phi(F_0; x, \gamma(t_0)), \Phi(H(F_0; \Omega); \gamma(t_0), y)\} \\ &\leq \Phi(F_0; X). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y) \not\subset X$ , then we can replace  $X$  by a larger compact set  $\tilde{X} \subset \mathbb{X}$  that does contain  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y)$ . By  $(P_2)$ , extend  $F_0$  to a function  $\tilde{F}_0$  with  $\text{dom}(\tilde{F}_0) = \tilde{X}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_0(x) &= F_0(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in X, \\ \Phi(\tilde{F}_0; \tilde{X}) &= \Phi(F_0; X). \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\tilde{F}_1$  analogously to  $F_1$ :

$$\tilde{F}_1(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} H(\tilde{F}_0; \Omega)(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega, \\ \tilde{F}_0(x), & \text{if } x \in \tilde{X} \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\tilde{F}_1|_X \equiv F_1$ , and furthermore, the analysis just completed at the beginning of case three applies to  $\tilde{F}_0$ ,  $\tilde{F}_1$ , and  $\tilde{X}$  since  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y) \subset \tilde{X}$ . Therefore,

$$\Phi(F_1; x, y) = \Phi(\tilde{F}_1; x, y) \leq \Phi(\tilde{F}_0; \tilde{X}) = \Phi(F_0; X).$$

□

#### 4.2. Geometrical Lemma

**Lemma 4.** Fix  $\rho > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  with  $\beta < \rho$ . Let  $\{B(x_n; r_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a set of balls contained in  $X$ . Suppose that  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r_n > \rho$ . For  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , let us define

$$\mathcal{A}_N \triangleq \bigcup_{n \leq N} B(x_n; r_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_\infty \triangleq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B(x_n; r_n).$$

Then  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall B(x; r)$ , with  $r \geq \beta$  and  $B(x; r) \subset \mathcal{A}_\infty$ , we have

$$B(x; r - \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Let us define for all  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$I_N \triangleq \{a \mid B(a; \beta - 2\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_N\} \quad \text{and} \quad I_\infty \triangleq \{b \mid B(b; \beta - 2\varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_\infty\}.$$

We remark that  $r_n > \rho > \beta - 2\varepsilon$  implies that

$$\mathcal{A}_N = \bigcup_{a \in I_N} B(a; \beta - 2\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_\infty = \bigcup_{b \in I_\infty} B(b; \beta - 2\varepsilon).$$

Let us define

$$\mathcal{A}_N^{\varepsilon/2} \triangleq \bigcup_{a \in I_N} B(a; \frac{\varepsilon}{2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_\infty^{\varepsilon/2} \triangleq \bigcup_{b \in I_\infty} B(b; \frac{\varepsilon}{2}).$$

The sequence  $\{\mathcal{A}_N^{\varepsilon/2}\}_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$  is monotonic under inclusion and converges to  $\mathcal{A}_\infty^{\varepsilon/2}$  in Hausdorff distance as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $\varepsilon/2 > 0$  there exists  $N_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\delta(\mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon/2}, \mathcal{A}_\infty^{\varepsilon/2}) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (23)$$

Choose any ball  $B(x; r) \subset \mathcal{A}_\infty$  with  $r \geq \beta$  and define

$$J(x) \triangleq \{c \mid B(c; \beta - 3\varepsilon) \subset B(x; r - \varepsilon)\}.$$

We note, similar to earlier, that  $r > \beta - 2\varepsilon$  implies we have  $B(x; r - \varepsilon) = \bigcup_{c \in J(x)} B(c; \beta - 3\varepsilon)$ . We will show that  $B(x; r - \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}$ .

Let  $y \in B(x; r - \varepsilon)$  and choose  $c \in J(x)$  such that  $y \in B(c; \beta - 3\varepsilon)$ . Since  $B(c; \beta - 3\varepsilon) \subset B(x; r - \varepsilon)$  and  $B(x; r) \subset \mathcal{A}_\infty$  we have

$$B(c; \beta - 2\varepsilon) \subset B(x; r) \subset \mathcal{A}_\infty.$$

Thus  $c \in I_\infty$  and  $c \in \mathcal{A}_\infty^{\varepsilon/2}$ . Since  $c \in \mathcal{A}_\infty^{\varepsilon/2}$ , using (23), choose  $z \in \mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon/2}$  which satisfies

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(c, z) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (24)$$

Moreover since  $z \in \mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon/2}$ , choose  $a \in I_{N_\varepsilon}$  which satisfies  $z \in B(a; \varepsilon/2)$ . We have

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(z, a) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (25)$$

By (24) and (25),

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(c, a) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(c, z) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(z, a) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (26)$$

Since  $y \in B(c; \beta - 3\varepsilon)$  we obtain

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, a) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(y, c) + d_{\mathbb{X}}(c, a) \leq \beta - 3\varepsilon + \varepsilon \leq \beta - 2\varepsilon. \quad (27)$$

Since  $a \in I_{N_\varepsilon}$  we conclude that  $y \in \mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}$ . Therefore  $B(x; r - \varepsilon) \subset \mathcal{A}_{N_\varepsilon}$  and the result is proved.  $\square$

### 4.3. Customs Lemma

In this section we prove the Customs Lemma, which is vital to the proof of the property  $(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  from Lemma 1. Throughout this section we shall make use of the construction of the sequence of extensions  $\{U_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , which we repeat here.

Let  $U_0 \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(U_0) = X$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ . Set

$$\Lambda \triangleq \{\Omega_j \mid \Omega_j \in \mathcal{O}(\rho, N_0), \quad j = 1, \dots, n\},$$

and define:

$$\mathcal{A} \triangleq \bigcup_{j=1}^n \Omega_j.$$

Let  $\{U_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathcal{F}_\Phi(X, Z)$  be a collection of functions defined as:

$$U_{j+1}(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} H(U_j; \Omega_{j+1})(x), & \text{if } x \in \Omega_{j+1}, \\ U_j(x), & \text{if } x \in X \setminus \Omega_{j+1}, \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } j = 0, \dots, n-1.$$

We shall need the following lemma first.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $x \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then there exists  $\sigma > 0$  so that  $B(x; \sigma) \subset \mathcal{A}$ , and for each  $b \in B(x; \sigma)$ , there exists  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $x, b \in \Omega_j$ ,  $U_n(x) = U_j(x)$ , and  $U_n(b) = U_j(b)$ .*

*Proof.* To begin, set

$$\eta_1 \triangleq \sup\{r > 0 \mid B(x; r) \subset \mathcal{A}\},$$

noting that  $\mathcal{A}$  is open and so  $\eta_1 > 0$ . Define the following two sets of indices:

$$I^+ \triangleq \{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid x \in \Omega_j\},$$

$$I^- \triangleq \{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid x \notin \Omega_j\}.$$

The set  $I^+$  is nonempty since  $x \in \mathcal{A}$ . So we can additionally define

$$j^+ \triangleq \max_{j \in I^+} j.$$

On the other hand,  $I^-$  may be empty. If it is not, then we define  $\ell_j \triangleq d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \Omega_j)$  for each  $j \in I^-$ , and set

$$\eta_2 \triangleq \frac{1}{2} \min\{\ell_j \mid j \in I^-\}.$$

Finally, we take  $\eta$  to be:

$$\eta \triangleq \begin{cases} \min\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}, & \text{if } I^- \neq \emptyset, \\ \eta_1, & \text{if } I^- = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\eta > 0$ ; we also have:

$$B(x; \eta) \cap \bigcup_{j \in I^-} \Omega_j = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad B(x; \eta) \subset \bigcup_{j \in I^+} \Omega_j. \quad (28)$$

Now let

$$J \triangleq \{j \in I^+ \mid U_n(x) = U_j(x)\}.$$

Clearly  $j^+ \in J$ , and so this set is nonempty. We use it to define the following:

$$\Sigma \triangleq \{b \in B(x; \eta) \mid \exists j \in J : U_n(b) = U_j(b), \ b \in \Omega_j\}.$$

The set  $\Sigma$  is nonempty since  $B(x; \eta) \cap \Omega_{j^+} \subset \Sigma$ .

To prove the lemma, it is enough to show that  $x \in \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ . Indeed, if  $x \in \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ , then there exists a  $\sigma > 0$  such that  $B(x; \sigma) \subset \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ . Then for each  $b \in B(x; \sigma)$ , there exists  $j \in J$  such that  $U_n(b) = U_j(b)$  (by the definition of  $\Sigma$ ) and  $U_n(x) = U_j(x)$  (by the definition of  $J$ ).

We prove that  $x \in \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$  by contradiction. Suppose that  $x \notin \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ . Let  $\{z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence which converges to  $x$  that satisfies the following property:

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \ z_k \notin \Sigma \text{ and } z_k \in B(x; \eta).$$

Define:

$$I_k^+ \triangleq \{j \in I^+ \mid z_k \in \Omega_j\}, \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By the remark given in (28) we see that  $I_k^+$  is nonempty for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus we can define

$$j_k \triangleq \max_{j \in I_k^+} j.$$

Since  $I^+ \setminus J$  has a finite number of elements, there exists  $i_0 \in I^+ \setminus J$  and a subsequence  $\{z_{\phi(k)}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \{z_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  that converges to  $x$  such that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \ j_{\phi(k)} = i_0.$$

By the definition of  $I_k^+$  and using the fact that  $i_0$  is the largest element of  $I_{\phi(k)}^+$  for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \ U_n(z_{\phi(k)}) = U_{i_0}(z_{\phi(k)}) \text{ and } z_{\phi(k)} \in \Omega_{i_0}.$$

Since the functions  $U_j$  are continuous by  $(P_5)$ , we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} U_n(z_{\phi(k)}) = U_n(x),$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} U_{i_0}(z_{\phi(k)}) = U_{i_0}(x).$$

Thus

$$U_n(x) = U_{i_0}(x).$$

But then  $i_0 \in J$ , which in turn implies that  $z_{\phi(k)} \in \Sigma$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus we have a contradiction, and so  $x \in \overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6 (Customs Lemma).** *If there exists some constant  $C \geq 0$  such that*

$$\Phi(U_j; \Omega_j) \leq C, \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, n,$$

*then for all  $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) \subset \mathcal{A}$ ,*

$$\Phi(U_n; x, y) \leq C.$$

*Remark 3.* We call the lemma the ‘‘Customs Lemma’’ as it calls to mind traveling from  $x$  to  $y$  through the ‘‘countries’’  $\{\Omega_j\}_{j=1}^n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathcal{A}$  and define

$$\mathcal{A}(x) \triangleq \{y \in \mathcal{A} \mid B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)) \subset \mathcal{A}\}.$$

The set  $\mathcal{A}(x)$  is a ball centered at  $x$ . Furthermore, using Lemma 5, there exists a  $\sigma > 0$  and a corresponding ball  $B(x; \sigma) \subset \mathcal{A}$  such that

$$\Phi(U_n; x, b) \leq C, \quad \text{for all } b \in B(x; \sigma).$$

In particular, we have

$$\Phi(U_n; x, y) \leq C, \quad \text{for all } y \in B(x; \sigma) \cap \mathcal{A}(x). \quad (29)$$

Consider the set

$$\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x) \triangleq \mathcal{A}(x) \setminus (B(x; \sigma) \cap \mathcal{A}(x)).$$

The set  $\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)$  contains those points  $y \in \mathcal{A}(x)$  for which we do not yet have an upper bound for  $\Phi(U_n; x, y)$ . Let

$$M \triangleq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)} \Phi(U_n; x, y).$$

If we can show that  $M \leq C$ , then we are finished since we took  $x$  to be an arbitrary point of  $\mathcal{A}$ . By  $(P_4)$ , the function  $y \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma(x) \mapsto \Phi(U_n; x, y)$  is continuous. Thus,

$$M = \sup_{y \in \overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)}} \Phi(U_n; x, y).$$

Since  $X$  is compact,  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)}$  is compact as well, and so the set

$$\mathcal{S} \triangleq \{y \in \overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)} \mid \Phi(U_n; x, y) = M\}$$

is nonempty. We select  $y_0 \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_0) \leq d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y), \quad \text{for all } y \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (30)$$

Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed and a subset of  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)}$ , it is also compact. Furthermore, the function  $y \in \mathcal{S} \mapsto d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$  is continuous, and so the point  $y_0$  must exist. It is, by definition, the point in  $\overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)}$  that not only achieves the maximum value of

the function  $y \in \overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)} \mapsto \Phi(U_n; x, y)$ , but also, amongst all such points, it is the one closest to  $x$ . Thus we have reduced the problem to showing that  $M = \Phi(U_n; x, y_0) \leq C$ .

We claim that it is sufficient to show the following: there exists a point  $y_1 \in \mathcal{A}(x)$  such that  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_1) < d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_0)$ , and furthermore satisfies:

$$M = \Phi(U_n; x, y_0) \leq \max\{\Phi(U_n; x, y_1), C\}. \quad (31)$$

Indeed, if such a point were to exist, then we could complete the proof in the following way. If  $C$  is the max of the right hand side of (31), then clearly we are finished. If, on the other hand,  $\Phi(U_n; x, y_1)$  is the max, then we have two cases to consider. If  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_1) < \sigma$ , then  $y_1 \in B(x; \sigma) \cap \mathcal{A}(x)$ , and so by (29) we know that  $\Phi(U_n; x, y_1) \leq C$ . Alternatively, if  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_1) \geq \sigma$ , then  $y_1 \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)$  and by the definition of  $M$  we have  $\Phi(U_n; x, y_1) \leq M$ , which by (31) implies that  $\Phi(U_n; x, y_1) = M$ . But  $y_0$  is the closest point to  $x$  for which the function  $y \in \overline{\mathcal{A}_\sigma(x)} \mapsto \Phi(U_n; x, y)$  achieves the maximum  $M$ . Thus we have arrived at a contradiction.

Now we are left with the task of showing the existence of such a point  $y_1$ . Apply Lemma 5 to the point  $y_0$  to obtain a radius  $\sigma'$  such that  $B(y_0; \sigma') \subset \mathcal{A}$  and for each  $b \in B(y_0; \sigma')$ , one has  $\Phi(U_n; y_0, b) \leq C$ . Since  $y_0 \in \mathcal{A}_\sigma(x) \subset \mathcal{A}(x)$ , we also know that  $B(x; d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_0)) \subset \mathcal{A}(x) \subset \mathcal{A}$ . Therefore  $\overline{B}_{1/2}(x, y_0) \subset \mathcal{A}(x)$ . Let  $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \overline{B}_{1/2}(x, y_0)$  be the curve guaranteed to exist by  $(P_3)$ , and take  $y_1$  to be the intersection point of  $\gamma$  with  $\partial B(y_0; \sigma')$ . Clearly  $y_1 \in \overline{B}_{1/2}(x, y_0) \subset \mathcal{A}(x)$ , and furthermore it satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(U_n; x, y_0) &\leq \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \max\{\Phi(U_n; x, \gamma(t)), \Phi(U_n; \gamma(t), y_0)\} \\ &\leq \max\{\Phi(U_n; x, y_1), \Phi(U_n; y_1, y_0)\} \\ &\leq \max\{\Phi(U_n; x, y_1), C\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the monotonicity property of the curve  $\gamma$ , we see that  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_1) < d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y_0)$ .  $\square$

## 5. Open questions and future directions

From here, there are several possible directions. The first was already mentioned earlier, and involves the behavior of the quasi-AMLE  $U(f, \rho, N_0, \alpha, \sigma_0)$  as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ ,  $N_0 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ , and  $\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ . For the limits in  $\alpha$  and  $\sigma_0$  in particular, it seems that either more understanding or further exploitation of the geometrical relationship between  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$  is necessary. Should something of this nature be resolved, though, it would prove the existence of an AMLE under this general setup.

One may also wish to relax the assumptions on  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$ . The most general domain possible in other results is when  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is a length space. Of course then there are far greater restrictions on the range, and the results only hold for  $\Phi = \text{Lip}$ . It would seem that the case of 1-fields (Section 2.4.4), in which  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  can actually be any Hilbert space, would be a good specific case in which to work on both this point and the previous one.

A final possible question concerns the property  $(P_2)$ . This property requires that an isometric extension exist for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ ; that is, that the Lipschitz constant is preserved perfectly. What if, however, one had the weaker condition that the Lipschitz constant be preserved up to some constant? In other words, suppose that we replace  $(P_2)$  with the following weaker condition:

$(P'_2)$  Isomorphic Lipschitz extension:

For all  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(X, Z)$  and for all  $D \subset X$  such that  $\text{dom}(f) \subset D$ , there exists an extension  $F : D \rightarrow Z$  such that

$$\Phi(F; D) \leq C \cdot \Phi(f; \text{dom}(f)), \quad (32)$$

where  $C$  depends on  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$ .

Suppose then we wish to find an  $F$  satisfying (32) that also satisfies the AMLE condition to within a constant factor? The methods here, in which we correct locally, would be hard to adapt given that with each correction, we would lose a factor of  $C$  in (32).

## 6. Acknowledgements

E.L.G. is partially supported by the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) through HJnet projet ANR-12-BS01-0008-01. M.J.H. would like to thank IRMAR (The Institute of Research of Mathematics of Rennes) for supporting his visit in 2011, during which time the authors laid the foundation for this paper. Both authors would like to acknowledge the Fields Institute for hosting them for two weeks in 2012, which allowed them to complete this work.

Both authors would also like to thank the anonymous reviewer for his or her helpful comments.

## A. Equivalence of AMLE definitions

In this appendix we prove that the two definitions for an AMLE with a generalized functional  $\Phi$  are equivalent so long as the domain  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is path connected. First recall the two definitions:

**Definition 7.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(f)$  closed and let  $U \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  be a minimal extension of  $f$  with  $\text{dom}(U) = \mathbb{X}$ . Then  $U$  is an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension of  $f$  if for every open set  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f)$  and every  $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(\tilde{U}) = \mathbb{X}$  that coincides with  $U$  on  $\mathbb{X} \setminus V$ ,

$$\Phi(U; V) \leq \Phi(\tilde{U}; V).$$

**Definition 8.** Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(f)$  closed and let  $U \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  be a minimal extension of  $f$  with  $\text{dom}(U) = \mathbb{X}$ . Then  $U$  is an absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension of  $f$  if

$$\Phi(U; V) = \Phi(U; \partial V), \quad \text{for all open } V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f).$$

**Proposition 2.** Suppose that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is path connected. Then Definition 7 is equivalent to Definition 8.

*Proof.* Since  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  is path connected, the only sets that are both open and closed are  $\emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{X}$ . Let  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f)$ . The case  $V = \emptyset$  is vacuous for both definitions, and since  $\text{dom}(f) \neq \emptyset$ , the case  $V = \mathbb{X}$  is impossible. Thus every open set  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f)$  is not also closed; in particular,  $\partial V \neq \emptyset$ .

We first prove that Definition 7 implies Definition 8. Let  $U \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  be an AMLE for  $f$  satisfying the condition of Definition 7, and suppose by contradiction that  $U$  does not satisfy the condition of Definition 8. That would mean, in particular, that there exists an open set  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f)$  such that  $\Phi(U; \partial V) < \Phi(U; V)$ . We can then define a new minimal extension  $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  as follows:

$$\tilde{U}(x) \triangleq \begin{cases} H(U; V)(x), & \text{if } x \in V, \\ U(x), & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{X} \setminus V, \end{cases}$$

where  $H$  is the correction operator defined in Definition 6. But then  $\tilde{U}$  coincides with  $U$  on  $\mathbb{X} \setminus V$  and  $\Phi(\tilde{U}; V) = \Phi(U; \partial V) < \Phi(U; V)$ , which is a contradiction.

For the converse, suppose  $U \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  satisfies Definition 8 but does not satisfy Definition 7. Then there exists an open set  $V \subset \mathbb{X} \setminus \text{dom}(f)$  and a function  $\tilde{U} \in \mathcal{F}_\Phi(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  with  $\text{dom}(\tilde{U}) = \mathbb{X}$  that coincides with  $U$  on  $\mathbb{X} \setminus V$  such that  $\Phi(\tilde{U}; V) < \Phi(U; V)$ . Since  $U$  and  $\tilde{U}$  coincide on  $\mathbb{X} \setminus V$ ,  $\Phi(\tilde{U}; \partial V) = \Phi(U; \partial V)$ . On the other hand,  $\Phi(\tilde{U}; \partial V) \leq \Phi(\tilde{U}; V) < \Phi(U; V) = \Phi(U; \partial V)$ . Thus we have a contradiction.  $\square$

## B. Proof that $(P_0)$ - $(P_5)$ hold for 1-fields

In this appendix we consider the case of 1-fields and the functional  $\Phi = \Gamma^1$  first defined in Section 2.4.4. Recall that  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}}) = \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) = \|x - y\|$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Euclidean distance. The range  $(Z, d_Z)$  is taken to be  $\mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ , with elements  $P \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  given by  $P(a) = p_0 + D_0 p \cdot a$ , with  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D_0 p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,



and  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . The distance  $d_Z$  is defined as:  $d_Z(P, Q) \triangleq |p_0 - q_0| + \|D_0p - D_0q\|$ . For a function  $f \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ , we use the notation  $x \in \text{dom}(f) \mapsto f(x)(a) = f_x + D_x f \cdot (x - a)$ , where  $f_x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D_x f \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and once again  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Note that  $f(x) \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ . The functional  $\Phi$  is defined as:

$$\Phi(f; x, y) = \Gamma^1(f; x, y) \triangleq 2 \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|f(x)(a) - f(y)(a)|}{\|x - a\|^2 + \|y - a\|^2}. \quad (33)$$

Rather than  $\Phi$ , we shall write  $\Gamma^1$  throughout the appendix. The goal is to show that the properties  $(P_0)$ - $(P_5)$  hold for  $\Gamma^1$  and the metric spaces  $(\mathbb{X}, d_{\mathbb{X}})$  and  $(Z, d_Z)$ .

### B.1. $(P_0)$ and $(P_1)$ for $\Gamma^1$

The property  $(P_0)$  (symmetry and nonnegative) is clear from the definition of  $\Gamma^1$  in (33). The property  $(P_1)$  (pointwise evaluation) is by definition.

### B.2. $(P_2)$ for $\Gamma^1$

The property  $(P_2)$  (existence of a minimal extension to  $\mathbb{X}$  for each  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ ) is the main result of [18]. We refer the reader to that paper for the details.

### B.3. $(P_3)$ for $\Gamma^1$

Showing property  $(P_3)$ , Chasles' inequality, requires a detailed study of the domain of uniqueness for a bipunctual 1-field (i.e., when  $\text{dom}(f)$  consists of two points). Let  $\mathcal{P}^m(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  denote the space of polynomials of degree  $m$  mapping  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

For  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  and  $x, y \in \text{dom}(f)$ ,  $x \neq y$  we define

$$A(f; x, y) \triangleq \frac{2(f_x - f_y) + (D_x f + D_y f) \cdot (y - x)}{\|x - y\|^2}$$

and

$$B(f; x, y) \triangleq \frac{\|D_x f - D_y f\|}{\|x - y\|}. \quad (34)$$

Using [18], Proposition 2.2, we have for any  $D \subset \text{dom}(f)$ ,

$$\Gamma^1(f; D) = \sup_{\substack{x, y \in D \\ x \neq y}} \left( \sqrt{A(f; x, y)^2 + B(f; x, y)^2} + |A(f; x, y)| \right). \quad (35)$$

For the remainder of this section, fix  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$ , with  $\text{dom}(f) = \{x, y\}$ ,  $x \neq y$ ,  $f(x) = P_x$ ,  $f(y) = P_y$ , and set

$$M \triangleq \Gamma^1(f; \text{dom}(f)). \quad (36)$$

Also, for an arbitrary pair of points  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $[a, b]$  denote the closed line segment with end points  $a$  and  $b$ .

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $F$  be an extension of  $f$  such that  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y) \subset \text{dom}(F)$ . Then there exists a point  $c \in \bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y)$  that depends only on  $f$  such that*

$$\Gamma^1(F; x, y) \leq \max\{\Gamma^1(F; x, a), \Gamma^1(F; a, y)\}, \text{ for all } a \in [x, c] \cup [c, y]. \quad (37)$$

*Remark 4.* Proposition 3 implies that the operator  $\Gamma^1$  satisfies the Chasles' inequality (property  $(P_3)$ ). In particular, consider an arbitrary 1-field  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  with  $x, y \in \text{dom}(g)$  such that  $\bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y) \subset \text{dom}(g)$ . Then  $g$  is trivially an extension of the 1-field  $g|_{\{x, y\}}$ , and so in particular satisfies (37). But this is the Chasles' inequality with  $\gamma = [x, c] \cup [c, y]$ .

To prove proposition 3 we will use the following lemma.

**Lemma 7.** *There exists  $c \in \bar{B}_{1/2}(x, y)$  and  $s \in \{-1, 1\}$  such that*

$$M = 2s \frac{P_x(c) - P_y(c)}{\|x - c\|^2 + \|y - c\|^2}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{x + y}{2} + s \frac{D_x f - D_y f}{2M}, \\ P_x(c) - s \frac{M}{2} \|x - c\|^2 &= P_y(c) + s \frac{M}{2} \|y - c\|^2, \\ D_x f + sM(x - c) &= D_y f - sM(y - c). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Moreover, all minimal extensions of  $f$  coincide at  $c$ .

The proof of Lemma 7 uses [18], Propositions 2.2 and 2.13. The details are omitted. Throughout the remainder of this section, let  $c$  denote the point which satisfies Proposition 7.

**Lemma 8.** *Define  $\tilde{P}_c \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  as*

$$\tilde{P}_c(z) \triangleq \tilde{f}_c + D_c \tilde{f} \cdot (z - c), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_c \triangleq P_x(c) - s \frac{M}{2} \|x - c\|^2,$$

and

$$D_c \tilde{f} \triangleq D_x f + sM(x - c).$$

If  $A(f; x, y) = 0$ , then the following polynomial

$$F(z) \triangleq \tilde{P}_c(z) - s \frac{M [(z - c) \cdot (x - c)]^2}{2 \|x - c\|^2} + s \frac{M [(z - c) \cdot (y - c)]^2}{2 \|y - c\|^2}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

is a minimal extension of  $f$ .

If  $A(f; x, y) \neq 0$ , let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and set  $p(z) \triangleq (x - c) \cdot (z - c)$  and  $q(z) \triangleq (y - c) \cdot (z - c)$ . We define

$$F(z) \triangleq \begin{cases} \tilde{P}_c(z) - s \frac{M [(z - c) \cdot (x - c)]^2}{2 \|x - c\|^2}, & \text{if } p(z) \geq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \leq 0, \\ \tilde{P}_c(z) + s \frac{M [(z - c) \cdot (y - c)]^2}{2 \|y - c\|^2}, & \text{if } p(z) \leq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \geq 0, \\ \tilde{P}_c(z), & \text{if } p(z) \leq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \leq 0, \\ \tilde{P}_c(z) - s \frac{M [(z - c) \cdot (x - c)]^2}{2 \|x - c\|^2} + s \frac{M [(z - c) \cdot (y - c)]^2}{2 \|y - c\|^2}, & \text{if } p(z) \geq 0 \text{ and } q(z) \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Then  $F$  is a minimal extension of  $f$ .

*Remark 5.* The function  $F$  is an extension of the 1-field  $f$  in the following sense.  $F$  defines a 1-field via its first order Taylor polynomials; in particular, define the 1-field  $U$  with  $\text{dom}(U) = \text{dom}(F)$  as:

$$U(a) \triangleq J_a F, \quad a \in \text{dom}(F),$$

where  $J_a F$  is the first order Taylor polynomial of  $F$ . We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) &= f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad U(y) = f(y), \\ \Gamma^1(U; \text{dom}(U)) &= \Gamma^1(f; \text{dom}(f)). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* After showing that the equality  $A(f; x, y) = 0$  implies that  $(x - c) \cdot (c - y) = 0$ , the proof is easy to check. Suppose that  $A(f; x, y) = 0$ . By (33) and (36) we have  $M = B(f; x, y)$ . By (38) we have

$$\|2c - (x + y)\| = \frac{\|D_x f - D_y f\|}{M} = \|x - y\|.$$

Therefore  $(x - c) \cdot (c - y) = 0$ . □

The proof of the following lemma is also easy to check.

**Lemma 9.** Let  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Z})$  such that for all  $a \in \text{dom}(g)$ ,  $g(a) = Q_a \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ , with  $Q_a(z) = g_a + D_a g \cdot (z - a)$ , where  $g_a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D_a g \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Suppose there exists  $P \in \mathcal{P}^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$P(a) = g_a, \quad \nabla P(a) = D_a g, \text{ for all } a \in \text{dom}(g).$$

Then

$$A(g; a, b) = 0, \text{ for all } a, b \in \text{dom}(g).$$

*Proof.* Omitted.

**Lemma 10.** All minimal extensions of  $f$  coincide on the line segments  $[x, c]$  and  $[c, y]$ .

*Proof.* First, let  $F$  be the minimal extension of  $f$  defined in Lemma 8, and let  $U$  be the 1-field corresponding to  $F$  that was defined in remark 5. In particular, recall that we have:

$$U(a)(z) = J_a F(z) = F(a) + \nabla F(a) \cdot (z - a), \quad a \in \text{dom}(F).$$

Now Let  $W$  be an arbitrary minimal extension of  $f$  such that for all  $a \in \text{dom}(W)$ ,  $W(a) = Q_a \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$ , with  $Q_a(z) = W_a + D_a W \cdot (z - a)$ , where  $W_a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D_a W \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We now restrict our attention to  $[x, c] \cup [c, y]$ . For any  $a \in [x, c] \cup [c, y]$ , we write  $W(a) = Q_a$  in the following form:

$$Q_a(z) = F(a) + \nabla F(a) \cdot (z - a) + \delta_a + \Delta_a \cdot (z - a), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $\delta_a \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\Delta_a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_a &= F(a) + \delta_a, \\ D_a W &= \nabla F(a) + \Delta_a. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $U$  is a minimal extension of  $f$ , it is enough to show that  $\delta_a = 0$  and  $\Delta_a = 0$  for  $a \in [x, c] \cup [c, y]$ . By symmetry, without lost generality let us suppose that  $a \in [x, c]$ . Since  $W$  is a minimal extension of  $f$ , we have  $W_x = F(x) = f_x$ , and by Lemma 7,  $W_c = F(c)$ . Using (35) and (36), and once again since  $W$  is a minimal extension of  $f$ , the following inequality must be satisfied:

$$|A(W; e, a)| + \frac{B(W; e, a)^2}{2M} \leq \frac{M}{2}, \quad e \in \{x, c\}. \quad (39)$$

Using Lemma 9 for  $U$  restricted to  $\{x, a, c\}$  we have

$$A(U; e, a) = 0, \quad e \in \{x, c\}. \quad (40)$$

Therefore

$$A(W; e, a) = \frac{|-2\delta_a + \Delta_a \cdot (e - a)|}{\|e - a\|^2}, \quad e \in \{x, c\}. \quad (41)$$

Since  $a \in [x, c]$ , we can write  $a = c + \alpha(x - c)$  with  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . Using (39) and (40), the definition of  $U$ , and after simplification,  $\delta_a$  and  $\Delta_a$  must satisfy the following inequalities:

$$-2\delta_a + \alpha(1+s)\Delta_a \cdot (c-x) + \frac{\|\Delta_a\|^2}{2M} \leq 0, \quad (42)$$

$$2\delta_a + \alpha(-1+s)\Delta_a \cdot (c-x) + \frac{\|\Delta_a\|^2}{2M} \leq 0, \quad (43)$$

$$-2\delta_a - (1-\alpha)(1+s)\Delta_a \cdot (c-x) + \frac{\|\Delta_a\|^2}{2M} \leq 0, \quad (44)$$

$$2\delta_a - (1-\alpha)(-1+s)\Delta_a \cdot (c-x) + \frac{\|\Delta_a\|^2}{2M} \leq 0. \quad (45)$$

The inequality  $(1-\alpha)((42) + (43)) + \alpha((44) + (45))$  implies that  $\Delta_a = 0$ . Furthermore, the inequalities (42) and (43) imply that  $\delta_a = 0$ . Now the proof is complete.  $\square$

We finish this appendix by proving Proposition 3. Let us use the notations of Proposition 3 where  $c$  satisfies Lemma 7. By Lemma 10, the extension  $U$  (defined in Remark 5) of  $f$  is the unique minimal extension of  $f$  on the restriction to  $[x, c] \cup [c, y]$ . Moreover, we can check that

$$\Gamma^1(f; x, y) = \max\{\Gamma^1(U; x, a), \Gamma^1(U; a, y)\}, \text{ for all } a \in [x, c] \cup [c, y]. \quad (46)$$

Let  $W$  be an extension of  $f$ . By contradiction suppose that there exists  $a \in [x, c] \cup [c, y]$  such that

$$\Gamma^1(f; x, y) > \max\{\Gamma^1(W; x, a), \Gamma^1(W; a, y)\}. \quad (47)$$

Using [18], Theorem 2.6, for the 1-field  $g \triangleq \{f(x), W(a), f(y)\}$  of domain  $\{x, a, y\}$  there exists an extension  $G$  of  $g$  such that

$$\Gamma^1(G; \text{dom}(G)) \leq \Gamma^1(f; x, y). \quad (48)$$

Therefore  $G$  is a minimal extension of  $f$ . By Lemma (10) and the definition of  $G$  we have  $W(a) = G(a) = U(a)$ . But then by (46), (47), and (48) we obtain a contradiction. Now the proof of the Proposition 3 is complete.  $\square$

#### B.4. $(P_4)$ for $\Gamma^1$

Property  $(P_4)$  (continuity of  $\Gamma^1$ ) can be shown using (35), and a series of elementary calculations. We omit the details.

### B.5. $(P_5)$ for $\Gamma^1$

To show property  $(P_5)$  (continuity of  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ ), we first recall the definition of  $d_Z$ . For  $P \in \mathcal{P}^1(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R})$  with  $P(a) = p_0 + D_0P \cdot a$ ,  $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $D_0P \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we have

$$d_Z(P, Q) = |p_0 - q_0| + \|D_0P - D_0Q\|.$$

Recall also that for a 1-field  $f : E \rightarrow Z$ ,  $E \subset \mathbb{X}$ , we have:

$$x \in E \mapsto f(x)(a) = f_x + D_x f \cdot (a - x) = (f_x - D_x f \cdot x) + D_x f \cdot a, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

To show continuity of  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Gamma^1}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$  at  $x \in \mathbb{X}$ , we need the following: for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that if  $\|x - y\| < \delta$ , then  $d_Z(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon$ . Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d_Z(f(x), f(y)) &= |f_x - D_x f \cdot x - f_y + D_y f \cdot y| + \|D_x f - D_y f\| \\ &\leq |f_x - f_y| + |D_x f \cdot x - D_y f \cdot y| + \|D_x f - D_y f\|. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

We handle the three terms (49) separately and in reverse order.

For the third term, recall the definition of  $B(f; x, y)$  in (34), and define  $B(f; E)$  accordingly; we then have:

$$\|D_x f - D_y f\| \leq B(f; E) \|x - y\| \leq \Gamma^1(f; E) \|x - y\|. \quad (50)$$

Since  $\Gamma^1(f; E) < \infty$ , that completes this term.

For the second term:

$$\begin{aligned} |D_x f \cdot x - D_y f \cdot y| &\leq |D_x f \cdot (x - y)| + |(D_x f - D_y f) \cdot y| \\ &\leq \|D_x f\| \|x - y\| + \|D_x f - D_y f\| \|y\| \end{aligned}$$

Using (50), we see that this term can be made arbitrarily small using  $\|x - y\|$  as well.

For the first term  $|f_x - f_y|$ , define  $g : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as  $g(x) = f_x$  for all  $x \in E$ . By Proposition 2.5 of [18], the function  $g$  is continuous. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## C. Proof of Proposition 1

We prove Proposition 1, which we restate here:

**Proposition 4 (Proposition 1).** *Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\Phi}(\mathbb{X}, Z)$ . For any open  $V \subset \text{dom}(f)$ ,  $V \neq \mathbb{X}$ , and  $\alpha \geq 0$ , let us define*

$$V_\alpha \triangleq \{x \in V \mid d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, \partial V) \geq \alpha\}.$$

Then for all  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$\Phi(f; V_\alpha) \leq \max\{\Psi(f; V; \alpha), \Phi(u; \partial V_\alpha)\}, \quad (51)$$

and

$$\Phi(f; V) = \max\{\Psi(f; V; 0), \Phi(f; \partial V)\}. \quad (52)$$

*Proof.* For the first statement fix  $\alpha > 0$  and an open set  $V \subset \mathbb{X}$ ,  $V \neq \mathbb{X}$ . For proving (51), it is sufficient to prove that for all  $x \in \overset{\circ}{V}_\alpha$  and for all  $y \in V_\alpha$  we have

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \max\{\Psi(f; V; \alpha), \Phi(f; \partial V_\alpha)\}. \quad (53)$$

Fix  $x \in \overset{\circ}{V}_\alpha$ . Let  $B(x; r_x) \subset V$  be a ball such that  $r_x$  is maximized and define

$$M(x) \triangleq \sup\left\{\Phi(f; x, y) \mid y \in \overline{V_\alpha \setminus B(x; r_x)}\right\},$$

as well as

$$\Delta(x) \triangleq \left\{y \in \overline{V_\alpha \setminus B(x; r_x)} \mid \Phi(f; x, y) = M(x)\right\},$$

and

$$\delta(x) \triangleq \inf\{d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) \mid y \in \Delta(x)\}.$$

We have three cases:

*Case 1.* Suppose  $M(x) \leq \sup\{\Phi(f; x, y) \mid y \in B(x; r_x)\}$ . Since  $B(x; r_x) \subset V$  with  $r_x \geq \alpha$  we have

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \Psi(f; V; \alpha), \quad \forall y \in B(x; r_x).$$

Therefore  $M(x) \leq \Psi(f; V; \alpha)$ . That completes the first case.

For cases two and three, assume that  $M(x) > \sup\{\Phi(f; x, y) \mid y \in B(x; r_x)\}$  and select  $y \in \Delta(x)$  with  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y) = \delta(x)$ .

*Case 2.* Suppose  $y \in \text{int}(V_\alpha \setminus B(x; r_x))$ . Let  $B(y; r_y) \subset V$  be a ball such that  $r_y$  is maximal. Consider the curve  $\gamma \in \Gamma(x, y)$  satisfying  $(P_3)$ . Let  $m \in \gamma \cap B(y; r_y) \cap V_\alpha$ ,  $m \neq x, y$ . Using  $(P_3)$ , we have

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \max\{\Phi(f; x, m), \Phi(f; m, y)\}. \quad (54)$$

Using the monotonicity of  $\gamma$  we have  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, m) < d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$ . Using the minimality of the distance of  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$  and since  $m \in V_\alpha$  we have  $\Phi(f; x, m) < \Phi(f; x, y)$ . Therefore

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \Phi(f; m, y). \quad (55)$$

Since  $m \in B(y; r_y)$  with  $r_y \geq \alpha$ , using the definition of  $\Psi$  we have  $\Phi(f; m, y) \leq \Psi(f; V; \alpha)$ . Therefore  $M(x) \leq \Psi(f; V; \alpha)$ .

*Case 3.* Suppose  $y \in \partial V_\alpha \setminus B(x; r_x)$ . As in case two, let  $B(y; r_y) \subset V$  be a ball such that  $r_y$  is maximal and consider the curve  $\gamma \in \Gamma(x, y)$  satisfying  $(P_3)$ . Let  $m \in \gamma \cap B(y; r_y) \cap V_\alpha$ . If there exists  $m \neq y$  in  $V_\alpha$ , we can apply the same reasoning as in case two and we have  $M(x) \leq \Psi(f; V; \alpha)$ .

If  $m = y$  is the only element of  $\gamma \cap B(y; r_y) \cap V_\alpha$ , then there still exists  $m' \in \gamma \cap \partial V_\alpha$  with  $m' \neq y$ . Using  $(P_3)$  we have

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \max\{\Phi(f; x, m'), \Phi(f; m', y)\}. \quad (56)$$

Using the monotonicity of  $\gamma$  we have  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, m') < d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$ . Using the minimality of distance of  $d_{\mathbb{X}}(x, y)$  and since  $m' \in V_\alpha$  we have  $\Phi(f; x, m') < \Phi(f; x, y)$ . Therefore

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \Phi(f; m', y). \quad (57)$$

Since  $m', y \in \partial V_\alpha$ , we obtain the following majoration

$$\Phi(f; x, y) \leq \Phi(f; m', y) \leq \Phi(f; \partial V_\alpha), \quad (58)$$

which in turn gives:

$$M(x) \leq \Phi(f; \partial V_\alpha).$$

The inequality (51) is thus demonstrated.

For the second statement, we note that by the definition of  $\Psi$  we have

$$\max\{\Psi(f; V; 0), \Phi(f; \partial V)\} \leq \Phi(f; V).$$

Using (51), to show (52) it is sufficient to prove

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \Phi(f; V_\alpha) = \Phi(f; V). \quad (59)$$

Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exists  $x_\varepsilon \in V$  and  $y_\varepsilon \in \bar{V}$  such that

$$\Phi(f; V) \leq \Phi(f; x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) + \varepsilon.$$

Set  $r_\varepsilon = d_{\mathbb{X}}(x_\varepsilon, \partial V)$ . If  $y_\varepsilon \in V$ , there exists  $\tau_1$  with  $0 < \tau_1 \leq r_\varepsilon$  such that for all  $\alpha$ ,  $0 < \alpha \leq \tau_1$ ,  $(x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \in V_\alpha \times V_\alpha$ . Therefore

$$\Phi(f; x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \leq \Phi(f; V_\alpha), \quad \forall \alpha, \quad 0 < \alpha \leq \tau_1.$$

If, on the other hand,  $y_\varepsilon \in \partial V$ , using  $(P_4)$  there exists  $\tau_2$  with  $0 < \tau_2 \leq \min\{r_\varepsilon, \tau_1\}$ , such that

$$|\Phi(f; x_\varepsilon, m) - \Phi(f; x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon)| \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall m \in B(y_\varepsilon; \tau_2).$$

By choosing  $m \in B(y_\varepsilon; \tau_2) \cap V_{\tau_2}$ , we obtain

$$\Phi(f; x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon) \leq \Phi(f; V_\alpha) + \varepsilon, \quad \forall \alpha, \quad 0 < \alpha \leq \tau_2.$$

Therefore  $\Phi(f; V) \leq \Phi(f; V_\alpha) + 2\varepsilon$ , for all  $\alpha$  such that  $0 < \alpha \leq \tau_2$  and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Thus (59) is true.  $\square$



## References

1. Armstrong, S.N., Smart, C.K.: As easy proof of Jensen's theorem on the uniqueness of infinity harmonic functions. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations* **37**(3-4), 381–384 (2010)
2. Aronsson, G.: Minimization problems for the functional  $\sup_x f(x, f(x), f'(x))$ . *Arkiv för Matematik* **6**, 33–53 (1965)
3. Aronsson, G.: Minimization problems for the functional  $\sup_x f(x, f(x), f'(x))$  II. *Arkiv för Matematik* **6**, 409–431 (1966)
4. Aronsson, G.: Extension of functions satisfying Lipschitz conditions. *Arkiv för Matematik* **6**, 551–561 (1967)
5. Aronsson, G., Crandall, M.G., Juutinen, P.: A tour of the theory of absolutely minimizing functions. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **41**, 439–505 (2004)
6. Barles, G., Busca, J.: Existence and comparison results for fully nonlinear degenerate elliptic equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations* **26**(11–12), 2323–2337 (2001)
7. Jensen, R.: Uniqueness of Lipschitz extensions: Minimizing the sup norm of the gradient. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis* **123**(1), 51–74 (1993)
8. Juutinen, P.: Absolutely minimizing Lipschitz extensions on a metric space. *Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ Mathematica* **27**, 57–67 (2002)
9. Kelley, J.L.: Banach spaces with the extension property. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **72**(2), 323–326 (1952)
10. Kirszbraun, M.D.: Über die zusammenziehende und Lipschitzsche Transformationen. *Fundamenta Mathematicæ* **22**, 77–108 (1934)
11. McShane, E.J.: Extension of range of functions. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **40**(12), 837–842 (1934)
12. Milman, V.A.: Absolutely minimal extensions of functions on metric spaces. *Matematicheskii Sbornik* **190**(6), 83–110 (1999)
13. Nachbin, L.: A theorem of the Hahn-Banach type for linear transformations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **68**(1), 28–46 (1950)
14. Naor, A., Sheffield, S.: Absolutely minimal Lipschitz extension of tree-valued mappings. *Mathematische Annalen* **354**(3), 1049–1078 (2012)
15. Peres, Y., Schramm, O., Sheffield, S., Wilson, D.B.: Tug-of-war and the infinity Laplacian. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **22**(1), 167–210 (2009)
16. Sheffield, S., Smart, C.K.: Vector-valued optimal Lipschitz extensions. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **65**(1), 128–154 (2012)
17. Le Gruyer, E.: On absolutely minimizing Lipschitz extensions and PDE  $\Delta_\infty(u) = 0$ . *NoDEA: Nonlinear Differential Equations and Applications* **14**(1-2), 29–55 (2007)
18. Le Gruyer, E.: Minimal Lipschitz extensions to differentiable functions defined on a Hilbert space. *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **19**(4), 1101–1118 (2009)
19. Valentine, F.A.: A Lipschitz condition preserving extension for a vector function. *American Journal of Mathematics* **67**(1), 83–93 (1945)
20. Wells, J.C.: Differentiable functions on Banach spaces with Lipschitz derivatives. *Journal of Differential Geometry* **8**, 135–152 (1973)
21. Wells, J.H., Williams, L.R.: *Embeddings and Extensions in Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York Heidelberg Berlin (1975)
22. Whitney, H.: Analytic extensions of differentiable functions defined in closed sets. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **36**(1), 63–89 (1934)