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## General problem

## Problem

For a given compact set $M \subset R^{2}$ and $r>0$ find a connected set $\Sigma$ of minimal length such that

$$
\operatorname{dist}(\Sigma, M) \leq r
$$

or, equivalently, $M \subset \overline{B_{r}(\Sigma)}$.
It is known that:

- a solution $\Sigma$ exists;
- any solution $\Sigma$ has no cycles.


## Main result

## Theorem

Let $M$ be a rectangle, $0<r<r_{0}(M)$. Then maximal distance minimizer is unique (up to symmetries of $M$ ). It is depicted below (the right part of the picture contains enlarged fragment of the minimizer; the labeled angle tends to $\frac{11 \pi}{12}$ with $r \rightarrow 0$ ).


Figure: The minimizer for rectangle $M$ and $r<r_{0}(M)$.

## Steiner problem

In fact our problem can be considered as follows: to connect $r$-neighborhoods of all the points from $M$.

The Steiner problem is that of finding a set $S$ with minimal length such that $S \cup A$ is connected, where $A$ is a given planar compact subset.

It is known that
(i) a solution $S$ exists;
(ii) $S$ has no cycles;
(iii) $S \backslash A$ consists of line segments;
(iv) a point $x \in S \backslash A$ belongs to 1 or 3 line segments;
(v) the angle between two segments adjacent to the same vertex is greater or equal to $2 \pi / 3$.

A set $S^{\prime}$, which corresponds to the mentioned properties and connects $A$ (but probably is too long) is called local solution for $A$.

## Energetic points

## Definition

A point $x \in \Sigma$ is called energetic, if for all $\rho>0$ the set $\Sigma \backslash B_{\rho}(x)$ does not cover $M$ i.e.

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(M, \Sigma \backslash B_{\rho}(x)\right)>r .
$$

It is known that

$$
\Sigma=G_{\Sigma} \sqcup S_{\Sigma},
$$

where $G_{\Sigma}$ is the set of all energetic points and $S_{\Sigma}$ is Steiner part which means that $\Sigma$ is a local solution of Steiner problem for $G_{\Sigma}$.

For every point $x \in G_{\Sigma}$ there exists a point $y(x) \in M$ (possibly non unique) such that $\operatorname{dist}(x, y(x))=r$ and $B_{r}(y(x)) \cap \Sigma=\emptyset$.

## Strategy of the proof

First, we show that that $\Sigma \backslash B_{5 r}(V E R T I C E S)$ consists of 5 line segments.
Then we prove that the path between $\Sigma \cap \partial B_{5 r}\left(A_{1}\right)$ contain two energetic points $W_{1}$, $W_{2}$ of degree 2 and one branching point $V$ between $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$.


## Strategy of the proof II

Since $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ are energetic, $\partial B_{r}\left(y\left(W_{1}\right)\right) \cap \Sigma=\partial B_{r}\left(y\left(W_{1}\right)\right) \cap \Sigma=\emptyset$, so the neighborhoods of $y\left(W_{1}\right)$ and $y\left(W_{2}\right)$ should be covered by other points (say, $Q_{1}$ and $\left.Q_{2}\right)$. Also $\partial B_{r}\left(A_{1}\right)$ should contain a point from $\Sigma$, say, $Q$. Then

$$
|\Sigma \cap A N G L E| \geq \operatorname{St}\left(Q_{1}, Q_{2}, Q, V\right)+\left|Z_{2} W_{2}\right|+\left|W_{2} V\right|+\left|V W_{1}\right|+\left|W_{1} Z_{1}\right| .
$$

Then we use computer calculations to show that $x, y$ and $\alpha$ should be close to the corresponding parameters of the optimal $\Sigma$.

Finally we show that for such $x, y$ and $\alpha$ there is no competitor corresponds to the following properties:

- $\operatorname{St}\left(Q_{1}, Q_{2}, Q, V\right)$ has the proper direction at $V$;
- the whole picture is optimal up to small changing of $y\left(W_{1}\right)$ and $y\left(W_{2}\right)$.


## Related results and open problems

## Theorem

For every closed convex curve $M$ with minimal radius of curvature $R$ and for every $r<R / 5$ the set of minimizers contains only horseshoes.


Figure: Horseshoe.

This theorem partially proves the conjecture Miranda, Paolini and Stepanov: for M being the circumference $\partial B(O)$ the set of minimizers contains only horseshoes.

## Related results and open problems II

Define a stadium as the boundary of $R$-neighborhood of a segment. The following example shows that the previous theorem does not hold without the assumption on $R / r$.


Figure: A horseshoe is not optimal for long enough stadium if $R<1.75 r$.
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