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#### Abstract

For every interval $[a, b]$, we denote by $\left(x_{A}, y_{A}\right)$ and $\left(x_{L}, y_{L}\right)$ the geometric centroid of the area under à catenary curve $\bar{y}=$ $k \cosh ((x-c) k)$ defined on this interval and the centroid of the curve itself, rdspectively. Then it is well-known that $x_{L}=x_{A}$ and $y_{L}=2 y_{A}$.
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In this paper, we fix an end point, say 0 , and we show that $\bar{y}_{L} / \bar{x}_{L}=$ $2 \bar{y}_{A} / \bar{x}_{A}$ for every interval with an end point 0 characterizes the family of catenaries among nonconstant positive $C^{2}$ functions.

## 1. Introduction

A well-known property of the catenary curve $y=k \cosh ((x-c) / k)$, $k>0$ is that the ratio of the area under the curve to the arc length of the curve is independent of the interval over which these quantities are concurrently measured. For a positive $C^{1}$ function $f(x)$ defined on an interval $I$ and an interval $[a, b] \subset I$, we consider the area $A(a, b)$ over the interval $[a, b]$ and the arc length $L(a, b)$ of the graph of $f(x)$. Then the catenary curve $y=k \cosh ((x-c) / k), k>0$ satisfies for every interval $[a, b] \subset I, \quad A(a, b)=k L(a, b)$. This property characterizes the family of catenaries $y=k \cosh ((x-c) / k)$ among nonconstant $C^{2}$ functions [14]. Thus, we have the following:

Proposition 1.1. For a nonconstant positive $C^{2}$ function $f(x)$ defined on an interval $I$, the following are equivalent:
(1) There exists a positive constant $k$ such that for every interval $[a, b] \subset I, A(a, b)=k L(a, b)$.
(2) The function $f(x)$ satisfies $f(x)=k \sqrt{1+y^{\prime}(x)^{2}}$, where $k$ is $a$ positive constant.
(3) For some $k>0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
f(x)=k \cosh \left(\frac{x-c}{k}\right) .
$$

Two higher dimensional generalizations of Proposition 1.1 were established in [2]. For a positive $C^{1}$ function $f(x)$ defined on an interval $I$
and an interval $[a, b] \subset I$, we denote by $\left(\bar{x}_{A}, \bar{y}_{A}\right)=\left(\bar{x}_{A}(a, b), \bar{y}_{A}(a, b)\right)$ and $\left(\bar{x}_{L}, \bar{y}_{L}\right)=\left(\bar{x}_{L}(a, b), \bar{y}_{L}(a, b)\right)$ the geometric centroid of the area under the graph of $f(x)$ defined on this interval and the centroid of the graph itself, respectively. Then, for a catenary curve, we have the following [14]:

Proposition 1.2. A catenary curve $y=k \cosh ((x-c) / k)$ satisfies the following:
(1) For every interval $[a, b] \subset I, \bar{x}_{L}(a, b)=\bar{x}_{A}(a, b)$.
(2) For every interval $[a, b] \subset I, \bar{y}_{L}(a, b)=2 \bar{y}_{A}(a, b)$.

In this paper, we consider intervals with a fixed end point, say 0 . For a nonzero real number $x$, we denote by $I_{X}$ the interval defined by

$$
I_{x}= \begin{cases}{[0, x],} & \text { if } x>0  \tag{1.1}\\ {[x, 0],} & \text { if } x<0\end{cases}
$$

We also denote by $A(x), L(x),\left(\bar{x}_{A}(x), \bar{y}_{A}(x)\right)$ and $\left(\bar{x}_{L}(x), \bar{y}_{L}(x)\right)$ the area under the graph of $f(x)$, the arc length of the graph of $f(x)$, the geometric centroid of the area under the graph of $f(x)$ and the centroid of the graph itself over the interval $I_{X}$, respectively.

Recently, the following characterization was established [5, 11]. See also the recent paper [1].

Proposition 1.3. For a nonconstant positive $C^{2}$ function $f(x)$ defined on an interval I containing 0 , the following are equivalent:
(1) For every nonzero real number $x \in I, \bar{x}_{L}(x)=\bar{x}_{A}(x)$.
(2) For every nonzero real number $x \in I, \bar{y}_{L}(x)=2 \bar{y}_{A}(x)$.
(3) For some $k>0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
f(x)=k \cosh \left(\frac{x-c}{k}\right) .
$$

In Section 3, we prove the following characterization theorem for catenary curves:

Theorem 1.4. For a nonconstant positive $C^{2}$ function $y=f(x)$ defined on an open interval I containing $0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the following are equivalent:
(1) For every nonzero real number $x \in I$,

$$
\frac{\bar{y}_{L}(x)}{\bar{x}_{L}(x)}=2 \frac{\bar{y}_{A}(x)}{\bar{x}_{A}(x)} .
$$

(2) For some $k>0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
f(x)=k \cosh \left(\frac{x-c}{k}\right) .
$$

Remark 1.5. Suppose that a continuous positive function $y=f(x)$ defined on an open interval $I$ containing $0 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following for every nonzero real number $x \in I$ :

$$
\frac{\bar{y}_{L}(x)}{\bar{x}_{L}(x)}=\lambda \frac{\bar{y}_{A}(x)}{\bar{x}_{A}(x)},
$$

where $\lambda$ is a constant. Then, for the function $w(x)=\sqrt{1+f^{\prime}(x)^{2}}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t}{\int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t}=\frac{\int_{0}^{x} f(t) w(t) d t}{\int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By putting $x \rightarrow 0$, we get $\lambda=2$.
In order to find the centroid of polygons, see [4]. For the perimeter centroid of a polygon, we refer [3]. In [12], mathematical definitions of centroid of planar bounded domains were given. For various centroids of higher dimensional simplexes, see [13]. The relationships between various centroids of a quadrangle were given in $[7,10]$.

Archimedes proved the area properties of parabolic sections and then formulated the centroid of parabolic sections [15]. Some characterizations of parabolas using these properties were given in $[6,8,9]$.

## 2. Some Lemmas

In this section, we prove a lemma which is useful in the proof of Theorem 1.4 stated in Section 1. We consider a positive $C^{2}$ function $f(x)$ and a positive $C^{1}$ function $w(x)$ which are defined on an interval $I$ containing $0 \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $k(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ the functions defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
k(x)=\frac{f(x)}{w(x)} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(x)=\int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t-l(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t, \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $l(x)=f(x) / x$ defined on the open set $I_{0}=I \backslash\{0\}$.
Lemma 2.1. We consider a positive $C^{2}$ function $f(x)$ and a positive $C^{1}$ function $w(x)$ which are defined on an interval I containing $0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $f(x)$ and $w(x)$ satisfy the following:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t}{\int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t}=\frac{\int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t}{\int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t}, \quad x \in I, \quad x \neq 0 \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, on the open $I_{2}=\left\{x \in I_{0} \mid k^{\prime}(x) \neq 0, \phi(x) \neq 0\right\}$, we have $l^{\prime}(x)=0$.
Proof. Suppose that $f(x)$ and $w(x)$ satisfy (2.3). Then, for all $x \in I$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t \int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t=\int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t \int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

By differentiating (2.4) with respect to the variable $x$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& x f(x) \int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t+w(x) f(x) \int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t \\
= & x w(x) \int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t+f(x)^{2} \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t . \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

The function $k(x)$ given in (2.1) is a $C^{1}$ function on the interval $I$. It follows from (2.5) that for the function $l(x)=f(x) / x$ on the open set $I_{0}=I \backslash\{0\}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& k(x) \int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t+l(x) \int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t \\
= & \int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t+k(x) l(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$

On the open set $I_{0}$, differentiating (2.6) with respect to $x$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t+l^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t=(k(x) l(x))^{\prime} \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Together with (2.1), this shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
k^{\prime}(x) \phi(x)=\psi(x) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \phi(x)=\int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t-l(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t \\
& \psi(x)=k(x) l^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t-l^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t \tag{2.9}
\end{align*}
$$

It follows from (2.8) that on the open set $I_{1}$ defined by $I_{1}=\{x \in$ $\left.I_{0} \mid \phi(x) \neq 0\right\}, \quad k^{\prime}(x)$ is given by $k^{\prime}(x)=\psi(x) / \phi(x)$, and hence on the open
set $I_{1}, k^{\prime}(x)$ is a $C^{1}$ function. That is, $k(x)$ is a $C^{2}$ function on the open set $I_{1}$.

First, suppose that the open set $I_{2}$ defined by $I_{2}=\left\{x \in I_{1} \mid k^{\prime}(x) \neq 0\right\}$ is nonempty. Then, on the open set $I_{2}$, from (2.7), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t+\eta(x) \int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t=\delta(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t, \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta(x)=\frac{l^{\prime}(x)}{k^{\prime}(x)}, \quad \delta(x)=\frac{(k(x) l(x))^{\prime}}{k^{\prime}(x)} \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $\eta(x)$ and $\delta(x)$ are $C^{1}$ functions on $I_{2}$. By differentiating (2.10) with respect to $x$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\eta^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t=\delta^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t, \quad x \in I_{2} . \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, suppose that the open set $I_{3}$ defined by $I_{3}=\left\{x \in I_{2} \mid \eta^{\prime}(x) \neq 0\right\}$ is nonempty. Then, on the open set $I_{3}$, from (2.12), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t=h(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t, \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(x)=\frac{\delta^{\prime}(x)}{\eta^{\prime}(x)} . \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from (2.13) that the function $h(x)$ is a $C^{2}$ function on the open set $I_{3}$. Differentiating (2.13) with respect to $x$ shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x f(x)-x h(x) w(x)=h^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t . \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, suppose that the open set $I_{4}$ defined by $I_{4}=$ $\left\{x \in I_{3} \mid h^{\prime}(x) \neq 0\right\}$ is nonempty. Then, on the open set $I_{4}$, from (2.15), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
(x j(x) w(x))^{\prime}=x w(x) \tag{2.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(x)=\frac{k(x)-h(x)}{h^{\prime}(x)} . \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from (2.15) that the function $j(x)$ is a $C^{1}$ function on the open set $I_{4}$.

On the other hand, together with (2.13), (2.3) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t=h(x) \int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t, \quad x \in I_{3}, \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h(x)$ is given in (2.14). Differentiating (2.18) with respect to $x$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)^{2}-h(x) w(x) f(x)=h^{\prime}(x) \int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t . \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, as in the discussions above, on the open set $I_{4}$, from (2.19), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
(j(x) w(x) f(x))^{\prime}=w(x) f(x) \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j(x)$ is defined in (2.17) and we use (2.1).
On the open set $I_{4}$, it follows from (2.16) and (2.20) that for the function $l(x)=f(x) / x$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(x) w(x)\left(f^{\prime}(x)-l(x)\right)=0, \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence we have from $w(x)>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(x)\left(f^{\prime}(x)-l(x)\right)=0 . \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $f^{\prime}(x)-l(x)=x l^{\prime}(x)$, it follows from (2.22) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(x) l^{\prime}(x)=0 . \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, we claim that the derivative $l^{\prime}(x)$ of the function $l(x)$ vanishes on $I_{4}$. Otherwise, on a nonempty open set $I_{5}$ contained in $I_{4}$, the function $j(x)$ vanishes. Then it follows from (2.20) that on $I_{5}, w(x) f(x)=0$, which is a contradiction. This contradiction completes the proof of the claim. Since $I^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes on $I_{4}$, (2.11) implies that $\eta(x)=0$ on $I_{4}$, which contradicts to the hypothesis on $I_{3}$. This contradiction shows that $I_{4}$ must be empty, that is, $h^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes on the open set $I_{3}$.

Since $h^{\prime}(x)=0$ on the open set $I_{3}$, it follows from (2.1) and (2.15) that $k=h$, and hence $k^{\prime}(x)$ also vanishes on $I_{3}$. This contradiction shows that the open set $I_{3}$ must be empty, that is, $\eta^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes on the open set $I_{2}$.

Together with (2.12), the vanishing of $\eta^{\prime}(x)$ on the open set $I_{2}$ shows that on any fixed connected component $I_{2}^{0}$ of the open set $I_{2}, \eta(x)=a$ and $\delta(x)=b$ for some constants $a$ and $b$. Hence, (2.11) yields that on the connected component $I_{2}^{0}$ for some constants $c$ and $d$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
l(x)=a k(x)+c, \quad k(x) l(x)=b k(x)+d . \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies that $k(x)$ is a root of the quadratic polynomial $q(t)=a t^{2}+$ $(c-b) t-d$. If the quadratic polynomial $q(t)$ is nontrivial, then the ratio $k(x)$ must be constant on the connected component $I_{2}^{(0)}$. This contradiction shows that $q(t)$ is trivial. That is, we have $a=0, b=c$ and $d=0$, and hence from (2.24), we see that on any fixed connected component $I_{2}^{0}$ of the open set $I_{2}$ the function $l(x)$ is constant. This shows that on the open set $I_{2}, l^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.4

In this section, with the help of Lemma 2.1 in Section 2, we prove Theorem 1.4 stated in Section 1.

Suppose that a nonconstant positive $C^{2}$ function $f(x)$ defined on an interval $I$ containing $0 \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies for every nonzero real number $x \in I$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\bar{y}_{L}(x)}{\bar{x}_{L}(x)}=2 \frac{\bar{y}_{A}(x)}{\bar{x}_{A}(x)} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for all $x \in I_{0}=I \backslash\{0\}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\int_{0}^{x} f(t) w(t) d t}{\int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t}=\frac{\int_{0}^{x} f(t)^{2} d t}{\int_{0}^{x} t f(t) d t} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
w(x)=\sqrt{1+f^{\prime}(x)^{2}} . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the ratio $k(x)=f(x) / w(x)$, the function $\phi(x)$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(x)=\int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t-l(x) \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t, \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $l(x)=f(x) / x$ for $x \in I_{0}$, we consider the following open set:

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{2}=\left\{x \in I_{0} \mid k^{\prime}(x) \neq 0, \phi(x) \neq 0\right\} . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that the open set $I_{2}$ is nonempty. Then it follows from Lemma 2.1 that on the open set $I_{2}$, we have $l^{\prime}(x)=0$. Hence, on any fixed connected component $I_{2}^{0}$ of the open set $I_{2}$, we have for some constant $a$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
l(x)=a, \quad f(x)=a x, \quad w(x)=\sqrt{1+a^{2}} . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, together with (2.11), this implies that $\eta(x)=0$ and $\delta(x)=a$.
Hence, we get from (2.10) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{x} w(t) f(t) d t=a \int_{0}^{x} t w(t) d t . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

This shows that on the connected component $I_{2}^{0}, \phi(x)=0$, which contradicts to the definition of $I_{2}$. This contradiction shows that the open set $I_{2}$ must be empty. That is, on the open set $J=\left\{x \in I \mid k^{\prime}(x) \neq 0\right\}$, the function $\phi(x)$ vanishes.

We consider two cases as follows:
Case 1. $\boldsymbol{J}$ is empty. Then, on the whole interval $I$, the ratio $k(x)$ is constant. Hence, for some constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $f(x)=k w(x)$. Therefore, Proposition 1.1 implies that for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=k \cosh \left(\frac{x-c}{k}\right) \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Case 2. $\boldsymbol{J}$ is nonempty. Then, it follows from the discussions above, we see that on $J, \phi(x)$ vanishes. Differentiating $\phi(x)$ in (3.4) shows that on the open set $J, I^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes. Hence, on any fixed connected component $J^{0}$ of $J, f^{\prime}(x)=a$ for some nonzero constant $a$. In particular, on $J, f^{\prime \prime}(x)$ vanishes.

Suppose that the complement $J^{c}$ of the open set $J$ has nonempty interior $K$. Then, on the nonempty interior $K, k^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes. Hence, on any fixed connected component $K^{0}$ of the nonempty interior $K$, Proposition 1.1 shows that the function $f(x)$ is a constant or a function given by (3.8) for some constants $k>0$ and $c$. This yields that on $K, f(x)$ satisfies either $f^{\prime}(x)=0$ or $f^{\prime \prime}(x) \geq 1 / k>0$, which contradicts to the properties of $f$ on $J$ because $f(x)$ is a $C^{2}$ function. This contradiction shows that the complement $J^{c}$ of
the open set $J$ has empty interior. That is, the open set $J$ is an open dense set contained in the domain I.

Since $l^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes on $J$ and $J$ is dense in the domain $I$, we see that on the whole interval $I$, the derivative $l^{\prime}(x)$ vanishes. Hence, for some constant $k \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $f(x)=k x$. But, such function cannot be positive on the open interval $I$ containing $0 \in \mathbb{R}$. This contradiction shows that $J$ must be nonempty.

Combining the above two cases completes the proof of $(1) \Rightarrow(2)$.
Conversely, it follows from Proposition 1.2 that (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4.
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