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Abstract. We use bicombings on arcwise connected metric spaces to give definitions of convex sets and extremal points. These notions coincide with the customary ones in the classes of normed vector spaces and geodesic metric spaces which are convex in the usual sense. A rather straightforward modification of the standard proof of the Kreĭn-Mil’man Theorem yields the result that in a large class of metric spaces every compact convex set is the closed convex hull of its extremal points. The result appears to be new even for CAT (0)-spaces.

Definition. Let \((X, d)\) be a metric space. A convex bicombing on \(X\) is a map \(X \times X \to C([0, 1], X), (x, y) \mapsto [x, y](\cdot)\) satisfying

(i) For all \(x, y \in X\), one has \([x, y](0) = x\) and \([x, y](1) = y\). Moreover, \([x, x] \equiv x\).

(ii) For all \(x, y, x', y' \in X\) the function \(t \mapsto d([x, y](t), [x', y'](t))\) is a convex function on \([0, 1]\).

Examples. We are interested in the following two special cases:

(i) Let \((X, d)\) be a convex metric space in the sense that any two points of \(X\) are connected by a geodesic and that the inequality

\[d(c(t), c'(t)) \leq (1 - t)d(c(0), c'(0)) + td(c(1), c'(1))\]

holds for all linearly parameterized geodesics \(c, c' : [0, 1] \to X\) and all \(t \in [0, 1]\). It is easy to see that such a space is uniquely geodesic and that the map associating to \(x, y \in X\) the unique linearly parameterized geodesic \([x, y]\) connecting \(x\) to \(y\) is a convex bicombing. Observe that the class of convex metric spaces contains in particular all CAT (0)-spaces.

(ii) If \((X, \| \cdot \|)\) is a normed vector space then by setting \([x, y](t) = (1 - t)x + ty\) for all \(x, y \in X\) one obtains a convex bicombing on \(X\).

Throughout this note, \(X\) stands as a shorthand for a metric space \((X, d, [\cdot, \cdot])\) with a convex bicombing. The choice of a bicombing in a metric space yields notions of convexity and extremity as follows: A subset \(C \subset X\) is called convex if \(x, y \in C\) implies \([x, y] \subset C\). A function \(\phi : A \to \mathbb{R}\) on a subset \(A\) of \(X\) is called convex if \(t \mapsto \phi([x, y](t))\) is a convex function on the interval \([0, 1]\) for all \(x, y \in A\) with \([x, y] \subset A\). The (closed) convex hull of a subset \(A\) of \(X\) is the smallest (closed) convex set containing \(A\).

Definition. Let \(C \subset X\) be a convex set. A closed non-empty subset \(E \subset C\) is called extremal if for all \(x, y \in C\) for which there exists some \(t \in (0, 1)\) with \([x, y](t) \in E\) one has \([x, y] \subset E\). A point \(p \in C\) is called extremal if \(\{p\}\) is an extremal set.

We can now state the Kreĭn-Mil’man Theorem:

Theorem. If \(C\) is a compact and convex subset of a metric space \(X\) with convex bicombing then \(C\) is the closed convex hull of the set of its extremal points.
Consider the family of extremal subsets of $C$ and order it by inclusion. This family is non-empty since it contains $C$ and by compactness of $C$ the intersection of a decreasing family of extremal sets is non-empty, hence it is an extremal set. Zorn’s lemma applies and yields:

**Lemma 1.** Every extremal subset of $C$ contains a minimal extremal subset. \(\square\)

The next step is to prove:

**Lemma 2.** Every minimal extremal subset is a one-point set.

Before giving the proof, we record the following:

**Lemma 3.** Let $E$ be an extremal subset of $C$ and let $\phi : E \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and convex. Then $E_\phi = \{ e \in E : \phi(e) = \max \phi \}$ is an extremal subset of $C$.

**Proof of Lemma 3.** Since $E$ is compact and $\phi$ is continuous, the set $E_\phi$ is closed and non-empty. Let $x, y \in C$ and $t \in (0, 1)$ be such that $[x, y](t) \in E_\phi$. Since $E$ is extremal, we have $[x, y] \subset E$. Now notice that $t \mapsto \phi([x, y](t))$ is convex on $[0, 1]$ (by convexity of the bicombing) and assumes its maximum at some point $t \in (0, 1)$, hence it is constant and thus $[x, y] \subset E_\phi$. \(\square\)

**Proof of Lemma 2.** Let $E$ be a minimal extremal subset of $C$ and let $e \in E$. Consider the function $\phi : x \mapsto d(x, e)$ which is convex by the convexity of the bicombing and the assumption $[x, x] \equiv x$. By Lemma 3 the set $E_\phi$ is an extremal subset of $C$. If there exists a point $e' \in E$ distinct from $e$, then $\phi$ is not constant, hence $E_\phi$ is a proper extremal subset of $E$ contradicting the minimality of $E$. \(\square\)

We need one more fact before we can finish the proof of the Kreĭn-Mil’man Theorem.

**Lemma 4.** For a compact and convex set $K \subset X$ put $d_K(x) = \min_{k \in K} d(k, x)$. The function $d_K : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and convex.

**Proof.** It follows from the triangle inequality that $d_K$ is 1-Lipschitz, hence continuous. Let $x, y \in X$ be arbitrary points and pick points $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in K$ such that $d(x, \bar{x}) = d_K(x)$ and $d(y, \bar{y}) = d_K(y)$. By convexity of the bicombing the function $t \mapsto d([x, y](t), [\bar{x}, \bar{y}](t))$ is convex and by convexity of $K$, we have $[\bar{x}, \bar{y}] \subset K$, so $d_K([x, y](t)) \leq d([x, y](t), [\bar{x}, \bar{y}](t)) \leq (1-t)d(x, \bar{x}) + td(y, \bar{y}) = (1-t)d_K(x) + td_K(y)$ and it follows that $d_K$ is convex. \(\square\)

**Proof of the Theorem.** Let $K$ be the closed convex hull of the set of extremal points of $C$. By Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, $K$ is non-empty and by convexity of $C$ we have $K \subset C$. By Lemma 4 the function $\phi = d_K$ is continuous and convex on $C$, so by Lemma 3 $E_\phi$ is an extremal set, and it contains an extremal point of $C$ by Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, so $E_\phi \cap K$ is non-empty. If there existed a point $p \in C \setminus K$ then $\phi$ would be non-constant, so $E_\phi$ would have to be disjoint from $K$, a contradiction. \(\square\)
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