

Singularities of minimal submanifolds

LEON SIMON

Abstract

After quick survey of some key results and open questions about the structure of singularities of minimal surfaces, we discuss recent work [Sim23] on singularities of stable minimal hypersurfaces, including some simplifications of the main technical discussion in [Sim23].

Introductory Remarks and Main Theorem

The most general notion (at least in the natural setting where multiplicities are assumed to be integer-valued) of an n -dimensional minimal submanifold of U , U open in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} , is the “integer multiplicity stationary varifold” i.e. a countably n -rectifiable set M of locally finite n -dimensional Hausdorff measure in U , equipped with a locally bounded density function θ which is positive integer valued \mathcal{H}^n -a.e. on M (and 0 on $U \setminus M$) such that the first variation of the area $\mu(M) = \int_M d\mu$ vanishes in U , where $d\mu = \theta d\mathcal{H}^n$; thus

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \int_{\Psi_t(M)} \theta \circ \Psi_t^{-1}(x) d\mathcal{H}^n = 0,$$

where $\Psi_t(x) = x + tX(x)$, where $X = (X^1, \dots, X^{n+k})$ is any C^1 vector field on U with compact support in U . Via a straightforward computation using the area formula, 1.1 is equivalent to the first variation identity

$$1.2 \quad \int_M \operatorname{div}_M X d\mu = 0,$$

where $\operatorname{div}_M X$ is the tangential divergence, computed at points $x \in M$ by the formula $\operatorname{div}_M X = \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i \cdot D_{\tau_i} X$, where τ_1, \dots, τ_n is any orthonormal basis of $T_x M$, the approximate tangent space of M at x (which exist for \mathcal{H}^n -a.e. $x \in M$).

In view of the well-known monotonicity of $(\omega_n \rho^n)^{-1} \mu(B_\rho(x))$ ($\omega_n =$ volume of unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n), for each $x \in U$ we can replace θ with the preferred representative $\Theta^n(x) = \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} (\omega_n \rho^n)^{-1} \mu(B_\rho(x)) (= \theta(x) \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^n\text{-a.e. } x)$ and replace M by $\{x \in U : \Theta^n(x) \geq 1\}$, which is a closed set because Θ^n is upper semi-continuous on U , again by the monotonicity of $\rho^{-n} \mu(B_\rho(x))$.

So the general integer multiplicity stationary setting in an open set U reduces to the case when M is a closed rectifiable subset of U with locally finite \mathcal{H}^n -measure

such that M , with multiplicity $\Theta^n(x) = \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} (\omega_n \rho^n)^{-1} \int_{M \cap B_\rho(x)} \theta d\mathcal{H}^n$ (which exists everywhere in U and $= 0$ on $U \setminus M$), Θ^n is upper semi-continuous, and the area functional (with measure $d\mu = \Theta^n d\mathcal{H}^n$ on M) is stationary with respect to compactly supported deformations of the identity in the ambient space U .

As usual we define

$$1.3 \quad \operatorname{reg} M = \text{regular set,}$$

i.e. the set of $x \in M$ such that $M \cap B_\rho(x)$ is a smooth embedded submanifold for some $\rho > 0$, and

$$1.4 \quad \operatorname{sing} M = M \setminus \operatorname{reg} M,$$

so $\operatorname{sing} M$ is by definition a closed subset of U .

In this general setting not a lot is known about the singular set. Intuitively one would perhaps expect that $\operatorname{sing} M$ should have n -dimensional measure zero, but remarkably such a basic question has remained open since Almgren’s initial development in the 1960’s of the theory of varifolds, a theory later fully developed by Allard in his famous 1972 paper [All72].

The best that is known in this general setting is that

$$1.5 \quad \operatorname{sing} M \text{ is nowhere dense in } M,$$

i.e. $\operatorname{reg} M$ is dense in M , which is clear, because the Allard regularity theorem guarantees that any point where Θ^n is a local minimum must be a regular point—and every open ball intersecting M contains points where $\Theta^n (= \text{integer a.e.})$ is a minimum in that ball. Thus

$$1.6 \quad M = \overline{\operatorname{reg} M}$$

and (by the constancy theorem) the density function Θ^n is a constant positive integer on each connected component of $\operatorname{reg} M$.

The situation is much better for special classes of minimal submanifolds M :

Due to pioneering work of De Giorgi, Reifenberg, Federer, Almgren, and James Simons, it is known that codimension 1 minimizing $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ cannot have singularities if dimension $M \leq 6$, singularities are discrete for $n = 7$, and the dimension of the singular set is $\leq n - 7$ for $n \geq 8$, and in codimension ≥ 2 the singular set of mod-2 minimizers is discrete in case $n = 2$ and has dimension $\leq n - 2$ in case $n \geq 3$.

The above results for codimension 1 minimizers were extended to stable M in [SSY75] and [SS81].

It was shown in [Sim93], [Sim95] that in all the above cases the singular set is rectifiable.

The case of oriented minimizing M (as distinct from mod 2 minimizers) in codimension ≥ 2 is much more difficult (due to branching), and Almgren in the early 1980's finally proved that the singular set of M has dimension $\leq n - 2$. Almgren's proof was simplified and shortened by De Lellis-Spadaro [DelS14a], [DelS14b], [DelS14c]. Finally Krummel-Wickramasekera and (independently) De Lellis-Minter-Skorobogatova in 2023 proved that the singular set is $(n - 2)$ -rectifiable.

Thus for all the special classes mentioned above, up to a set of measure zero in the appropriate dimension, the singular set $K = \text{sing } M$ can be decomposed into a countable union of pieces, each of which is contained in an embedded C^1 submanifold of the ambient space.

The obvious question then is: what do these pieces look like? e.g. do they typically have positive measure in the C^1 submanifold, or can they be fractional dimensional?

In high enough dimensions it has recently been established there are in fact examples where the singular set can be very bad (e.g. fractional dimensional): indeed with respect to a suitable smooth metric for $\mathbb{R}^{n+1+\ell}$, $n \geq 7$, $\ell \geq 1$, there are complete stable minimal hypersurfaces $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1+\ell}$ with $\text{sing } M = K$, K any preassigned closed subset of $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$; more precisely

Main Theorem ([Sim23]). *Suppose $n \geq 7$, $\ell \geq 1$, $K \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ is an arbitrary closed subset, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is a smooth metric $g = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n+1+\ell} g_{ij} dx^i dx^j$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1+\ell}$ with $|g_{ij} - \delta_{ij}| < \varepsilon$ and $|D^k g_{ij}| < C_k \varepsilon$ for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and such that there is a smooth embedded hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1+\ell}$ which is minimal and stable with respect to the ambient metric g and which has $\text{sing } M = \{0\} \times K$.*

Whether or not such phenomena can happen with respect to real analytic metrics g (or the Euclidean metric) is open, although Gábor Székelyhidi [Szk22] shows that all the non-isolated singularity examples of the type discussed here cannot occur in case the metric is the standard Euclidean metric.

In lower dimensions (dimension $M \geq 3$ and codimension at least 3) Zhenhua Liu [Liu23] has proved using calibration methods that there are examples of M which are area minimizing with respect to a smooth metric and which have fractional dimensional singular sets K which have pieces representing the various ‘‘Almgren strata’’ in all the appropriate dimensions, and M minimizes relative to a suitable smooth metric. For any point $x \in K$, for small enough $\rho > 0$, $M \cap B_\rho(x)$ has the form $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$, $\text{sing } \Sigma_1 = \text{sing } \Sigma_2 = \emptyset$, Σ_1, Σ_2 touch tangentially along $K \cap B_\rho(x) = \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2$, so $\text{sing } M \cap B_\rho(x) = \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 (= K \cap B_\rho(x))$.

We are here going to outline the main details of the proof of the Main Theorem which was originally given in [Sim23]. For simplicity of notation in the remainder of the present discussion we take $\ell = 1$, and in §2 we also make some simplifications of the existence discussion for solutions of the Symmetric Minimal Surface Equation (SME), which is a key part of the proof in [Sim23].

The proof to be outlined here uses the cylindrical cone

$$1.7 \quad \mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R},$$

where \mathbb{C}_0 is the ‘‘James Simons cone’’

$$\mathbb{C}_0 = \{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} : |\eta| = |\xi|\},$$

In [Sim23] we allowed \mathbb{C}_0 to be any one of the cones $\{(\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : n|\xi|^2 = m|\eta|^2\}$ with $m, n \geq 2$ and $m+n \geq 6$, but the argument outlined here for the special case of Simons cone involves only notational changes from this more general setting.

2 Special Smoothing of $\text{sing } \mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2m+2} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K)$

Initially we assume that $R > 1$ (large), and the indicator function χ_K of K is $2R$ -periodic. Eventually, at the end of the discussion, we let $R \rightarrow \infty$ to handle the general case of arbitrary closed K .

Let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ be a C^∞ function with $h > 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$ and $h = 0$ on K , and h periodic with period $2R$.

We can smooth out the singularities of $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ along $\{0\} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K)$ by using surfaces with cusps at end points of the intervals of $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$; more specifically let Ω be the domain in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\Omega = \{(\xi, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R} : |\xi| < h(y)\},$$

and let u be a non-negative $C^0(\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R})$ function, $2R$ -periodic in the y variable, which is positive and C^∞ on $(\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus (\{0\} \times K)))$, and $u(\xi, y) = |\xi|$ on $(\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus \Omega$. We then make an m -fold rotation of graph u to give a hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$; that is, we replace graph u by the *symmetric graph* $SG(u)$, where

$$SG(u) = \{(\xi, \eta, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R} : |\eta| = u(\xi, y)\}.$$

$SG(u)$ is then a hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{sing } SG(u) = \{0\} \times \{0\} \times K$. We aim to choose u so that $SG(u)$ is stationary (i.e. has zero first variation of area) with respect to some smooth metric for $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ to be determined; for this procedure to succeed we need some special properties (2.41, 2.42 below) of u .

As a preliminary to this discussion we need to make some remarks about the possibility that a symmetric graph $SG(v)$, where v is positive and C^∞ on an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$, can be a minimal hypersurface with respect to the standard Euclidean metric for $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$. Such minimality would require that the area of $SG(v)$ (i.e. $\mathcal{H}^{2m+2}(SG(v))$) is stationary with respect to ambient compactly supported deformations of $SG(v)$. By the area formula, applied to the map

$\{(\xi, \omega, y) : (\xi, y) \in U, \omega \in \mathbb{S}^m\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ which takes (ξ, ω, y) to $(\xi, v(\xi, y)\omega, y)$, we have

$$2.1 \quad \mathcal{H}^{2m+2}(SG(v)) = \sigma_m \int_U \sqrt{1 + |Dv|^2} v^m d\xi dy,$$

where σ_m is the volume of the unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Minimality of $SG(v)$ is thus equivalent to the requirement that v satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional on the right of 2.1.

The Euler-Lagrange equation, which we call the Symmetric Minimal Surface Equation (SME), is in fact $\mathcal{M}(v) = 0$, where

$$2.2 \quad \mathcal{M}(v) = \sqrt{1 + |Dv|^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} D_{\xi^i} \left(\frac{D_{\xi^i} v}{\sqrt{1 + |Dv|^2}} \right) + D_y \left(\frac{D_y v}{\sqrt{1 + |Dv|^2}} \right) \right) - \frac{m}{v}.$$

Notice in particular this ensures

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m+1} D_{\xi^i} \left(\frac{D_{\xi^i} v}{\sqrt{1 + |Dv|^2}} \right) + D_y \left(\frac{D_y v}{\sqrt{1 + |Dv|^2}} \right) \right) > 0,$$

for positive solutions of the SME, so such solutions satisfy the strict maximum principle; in particular v cannot attain an a local maximum at an interior point of the domain of v .

Notice that for functions $v(\xi, y) = \varphi(|\xi|) > 0$ (i.e. positive functions which are independent of the y variable and which can be expressed as a function of the single variable $r = |\xi|$) the functional in 2.1, assuming $U = \{(\xi, y) \mid |\xi| < \rho, |y| < \rho\}$, can be written

$$2.3 \quad 2\rho\sigma_m \int_0^\rho \sqrt{1 + (\varphi')^2} \varphi^m r^m dr dy,$$

and in this case $\mathcal{M}(\varphi) = \frac{\varphi''(r)}{1 + (\varphi'(r))^2} + \frac{m}{r} \varphi'(r) - \frac{m}{\varphi(r)}$, so the SME is just the ODE

$$2.4 \quad \frac{\varphi''(r)}{1 + (\varphi'(r))^2} + \frac{m}{r} \varphi'(r) - \frac{m}{\varphi(r)} = 0,$$

and $SG(\varphi)$ is a cylinder (i.e. independent of the y -variable) lying on one side of the Simons cylinder $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$. As shown in [Sim23], such a φ is convex, has a positive minimum (which by scaling we can, and we shall, assume to be 1) at $r = 0$, and is asymptotic to r at ∞ . In fact by some ODE manipulations (as in [Sim23]),

$$2.5 \quad \begin{cases} \varphi''(r) > 0 \quad \forall r \geq 0, & r < \varphi(r) < 1 + r, & 0 < \varphi'(r) < 1 \quad \forall r > 0 \\ \varphi(r) - r \sim \kappa r^{-\gamma}, & \varphi(r) - r\varphi'(r) \sim \kappa(1 + \gamma)r^{-\gamma}, & \varphi''(r) \sim \kappa\gamma(\gamma + 1)r^{-\gamma-2} \end{cases}$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$, where $\kappa = \kappa(m)$ is a positive constant and

$$\gamma = (m - \frac{1}{2}) - \sqrt{(m - \frac{1}{2})^2 - 2m} \quad (= 2 \text{ when } m = 3, > 1 \text{ when } m > 3).$$

Also, since $\frac{d}{dr}(\varphi(r) - r\varphi'(r)) = -r\varphi''(r) < 0$, we see that $\varphi(r) - r\varphi'(r)$ is strictly decreasing and hence, since $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty}(\varphi - r\varphi') = 0$ by 2.5,

$$2.6 \quad 0 < \varphi(r) - r\varphi'(r) < \varphi(0) = 1 \text{ for all } r > 0.$$

Also, all the geometric rescalings

$$2.7 \quad \varphi_\tau(r) = \tau\varphi(r/\tau), \quad \tau > 0,$$

also satisfy 2.4, and $\varphi_\tau(r) > r$, $\varphi_\tau(r) \downarrow \varphi_0(r)$ as $\tau \downarrow 0$, where $\varphi_0(r) = r$, which has symmetric graph equal to the Simons cylinder $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$. Thus the family $SG(\varphi_\tau)$, $\tau > 0$, foliates all of the volume $|\eta| > |\xi|$ on one side of the Simons cylinder. Also

$$2.8 \quad \varphi_\tau(r) - r < \tau,$$

because $\varphi_\tau(r) - r = \tau\varphi(r/\tau) - r < \tau(r/\tau + 1) - r = \tau$ by the second inequality in 2.5.

Using the fact that the Simons cone \mathbb{C}_0 is strictly stable and strictly minimizing (see [HS85] for discussion), one can check, as in [Sim23], that $SG(\varphi)$ and the rescalings $SG(\varphi_\tau)$ are strictly stable and hence also the cylinders

$$2.9 \quad SG(\varphi) \times \mathbb{R} \text{ and the rescalings } SG(\varphi_\tau) \times \mathbb{R} \text{ are strictly stable,}$$

meaning that there is a fixed $\lambda > 0$ such that the first eigenvalue of the linearization at $u = \varphi_\tau$ of the SME operator $\mathcal{M}(u)$ on any bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ (with respect to zero Dirichlet boundary data) is $\geq \lambda$ (independent of τ).

By applying all of the above discussion to solutions $\tilde{\varphi}$ of the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional

$$2.10 \quad \int_0^\rho \sqrt{1 + (\tilde{\varphi}')^2} \tilde{\varphi}^{\tilde{m}} r^{\tilde{m}} dr dy$$

(instead of the original area functional in 2.3), where $\tilde{m} = m/(1 + \eta)$ with $\eta > 0$ small, we obtain in place of φ the function $\tilde{\varphi}$ which satisfies all the properties in 2.5 with \tilde{m} in place of m and with $\tilde{\gamma}$ in place of γ , where

$$\tilde{\gamma} = (\tilde{m} - \frac{1}{2}) - \sqrt{(\tilde{m} - \frac{1}{2})^2 - 2\tilde{m}} \quad (> \gamma),$$

and $\tilde{\varphi}$ also satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional in 2.10 and hence

$$(1 + \eta) \frac{\tilde{\varphi}''(r)}{1 + (\tilde{\varphi}'(r))^2} + \frac{m}{r} \tilde{\varphi}'(r) - \frac{m}{\tilde{\varphi}(r)} = 0,$$

giving

$$2.11 \quad \mathcal{M}(\tilde{\varphi}) = -\frac{\eta}{1 + (\tilde{\varphi}')^2} \tilde{\varphi}'' < -\frac{\eta}{2} \tilde{\varphi}'' < 0.$$

Notice also that with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, where $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(m) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small, we have

$$2.12 \quad \varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}(r) \leq \tilde{\varphi}_\varepsilon(r), \quad \forall r \leq 1,$$

provided we take $\alpha > \frac{\tilde{\gamma}+1}{\gamma+1} (> 1)$. Since we can take \tilde{m} as close to m as we please, this effectively means we can take any $\alpha > 1$.

The inequality 2.11 enables us to construct a family of supersolutions of the SME on any of the domains Ω_ε ,

$$2.13 \quad \Omega_\varepsilon = \{(\xi, y) : |\xi| < h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}\}, \quad \varepsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{2}].$$

For any $v = v(r, y)$ on Ω_ε ($r = |\xi|$),

$$2.14 \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(v) &= \frac{1+v_y^2}{1+v_r^2+v_y^2}v_{rrr} + \frac{1+v_r^2}{1+v_r^2+v_y^2}v_{yy} - 2\frac{v_r v_y v_{ry}}{1+v_r^2+v_y^2} + m\left(\frac{v_r}{r} - \frac{1}{v}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1+v_r^2}v_{rrr} + m\left(\frac{v_r}{r} - \frac{1}{v}\right) + \frac{v_r^2 v_y^2}{(1+v_r^2+v_y^2)(1+v_r^2)}v_{rr} \\ &\quad + \frac{1+v_r^2}{1+v_r^2+v_y^2}v_{yy} - 2\frac{v_r v_y v_{ry}}{1+v_r^2+v_y^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1+v_r^2}v_{rrr} + m\left(\frac{v_r}{r} - \frac{1}{v}\right) + |v_y||v_{rr}| + |v_{yy}| + |v_{ry}|. \end{aligned}$$

We select v to have the special form

$$2.15 \quad v(r, y) = \psi(y)\tilde{\varphi}(r/\psi(y))$$

with $\psi > 0$ on \mathbb{R} ; then

$$\begin{aligned} v_r &= \tilde{\varphi}'(r/\psi), \quad v_y = \psi' b, \quad v_{yy} = (r^2(\psi')^2/\psi^2)\psi^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi) + \psi'' b, \\ v_{rr} &= \psi^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi), \quad v_{ry} = -(r\psi'/\psi)\psi^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi), \end{aligned}$$

where $b = \tilde{\varphi}(r/\psi) - (r/\psi)\tilde{\varphi}'(r/\psi) = (\tilde{\varphi}(t) - t\tilde{\varphi}'(t))|_{t=r/\psi}$.

Evidently $0 < b < 1$ by 2.6, and since $\tilde{\varphi}(t) - t\tilde{\varphi}'(t) \leq b_0(1+t^2)\tilde{\varphi}''(t)$ for suitable constant b_0 by 2.5, we also have $b \leq b_0(1+r^2/\psi^2)\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi)$. Using these facts together with 2.11 in 2.14, with the choice of v in 2.15, we obtain

$$2.16 \quad \mathcal{M}(v) \leq \left(-\frac{\eta}{2} + |\psi'| + r^2(\psi')^2/\psi^2 + b_0(1+r^2/\psi^2)\psi|\psi''| + (r|\psi'|/\psi)\right)\psi^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi).$$

Henceforth we make the additional assumptions that, with $\beta \in (0, 2^{-7}]$ to be chosen (small), $\sqrt{h} \in C^\infty$ and

$$2.17 \quad \sqrt{\varepsilon} + |\sqrt{h}|_{C^1} + |h|_{C^2} \leq \beta, \quad |D^k h| \leq C_k \beta, \quad k \geq 3$$

(which of course we can arrange by simply taking a new function h equal to the square of the original function and then multiply by a suitable factor), and select $\psi = \psi_s$, where $s \geq \varepsilon$ and

$$2.18 \quad \psi_s(y) = \begin{cases} s + \beta e^{-(\sqrt{s}+h(y))^{-1/2}}, & s < 1 \\ \sqrt{s} + \beta e^{-(\sqrt{s}+h(y))^{-1/2}}, & s \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Also let v_s be the corresponding v ; that is,

$$2.19 \quad v_s(r, y) = \psi_s(y)\tilde{\varphi}(r/\psi_s(y)).$$

Notice that by 2.6 (with $\tilde{\varphi}$ in place of φ) this is an increasing function of s so in particular

$$2.20 \quad v_s \geq v_\varepsilon, \quad s \geq \varepsilon.$$

With $\psi = \psi_s$ as in 2.18, we have

$$\psi'' = \beta \left(\left(-\frac{3}{4}(h+\sqrt{s})^{-5/2} + \frac{1}{4}(h+\sqrt{s})^{-3} \right) (h')^2 + \frac{1}{2}(h+\sqrt{s})^{-3/2} |h''| \right) e^{-(h+\sqrt{s})^{-1/2}}$$

For $s \geq 1$ we use $\psi \leq 2(h+\sqrt{s})$, and $\psi|\psi''| \leq 3\beta((h')^2 + |h''|) \leq \beta$, while if $s \in (0, 1)$ we have $\psi < 2$ and

$$|\psi|\psi''| \leq 2|\psi''| \leq 2\beta\left(\frac{3}{4}x^5 + \frac{1}{4}x^6 + \frac{1}{2}x^3\right)e^{-x}((h')^2 + |h''|) \leq 4\beta,$$

where $x = (h(y) + \sqrt{s})^{-1/2}$ and we used $\beta \leq 2^{-7}$, $\max_{x>0} x^6 e^{-x} = (6/e)^6 < 125$, $\max_{x>0} x^5 e^{-x} = (5/e)^5 < 22$, and $\max_{x>0} x^3 e^{-x} = (3/e)^3 < 2$.

Also, since $r < h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq h(y) + \sqrt{s}$ in Ω_ε ,

$$\begin{aligned} r^2|\psi''|/\psi &\leq 2h^{-1}(h')^2 + |h''| \leq 8|(h^{1/2})'|^2 + |h''| \leq 8\beta \\ r|\psi'|/\psi &\leq \frac{1}{2}h^{-1/2}|h'| = |(h^{1/2})'| \leq \beta \end{aligned}$$

by 2.17.

Using the above inequalities in 2.16 we then have

$$\mathcal{M}(v_s) \leq \left(-\frac{\eta}{2} + (9b_0 + 4)\beta\right)\psi^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi),$$

and hence by taking $\beta < \eta/(36b_0 + 16)$ we obtain

$$2.21 \quad \mathcal{M}(v_s) \leq -\frac{\eta}{4}\psi^{-1}\tilde{\varphi}''(r/\psi) < 0, \quad s \geq \varepsilon.$$

Also by 2.8 with $\tilde{\varphi}$ in place of φ ,

$$2.22 \quad v_\varepsilon - r \leq \varepsilon + \beta e^{-(h(y)+\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}}.$$

Next we want to construct solutions $u_{t,\varepsilon}$ of the SME on Ω_ε which are $2R$ -periodic in the y -variable and which have boundary data given by

$$2.23 \quad u_{t,\varepsilon}(r, y) = \varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}(r) + t(v_\varepsilon(r, y) - \varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}(r)) \text{ on } \partial\Omega_\varepsilon,$$

where α is as in 2.12.

Since $\varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}(r)$ is a solution of the SME when $t = 0$ and $SG(\varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha})$ is strictly stable, we see that the linearization of the SME at $\varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}$ does not have a zero eigenvalue with respect to zero Dirichlet data on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$, so by the Implicit Function Theorem (IFT) there is a positive solution $u_{t,\varepsilon} = u_{t,\varepsilon}(|\xi|, y)$ of the SME for small $t > 0$ which is $2R$ -periodic in y . In fact notice that

$$2.24 \quad \varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha} \leq u_{t,\varepsilon} \leq v_\varepsilon \text{ on } \Omega_\varepsilon \text{ whenever } u_{t,\varepsilon} \text{ exists,}$$

because $\{\varphi_s\}_{0 < s < \varepsilon^\alpha}$ are all solutions of the SME which are $\leq u_{t,\varepsilon}$ on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$, so if $u_{t,\varepsilon} < \varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}$ at some point of Ω_ε then we can pick s such that $\varphi_s \leq u_{t,\varepsilon}$ with equality at some point of Ω , which contradicts the maximum principle. Similarly $\{v_s\}_{\varepsilon \leq s}$ are all supersolutions with $u_{t,\varepsilon} \leq v_s$ on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ (by 2.20), so a similar maximum principle argument ensures that $u_{t,\varepsilon}$ remains less than v_ε whenever $u_{t,\varepsilon}$ exists.

Also, by 2.22 and 2.24,

$$2.25 \quad 0 < u_{t,\varepsilon} - r \leq v_\varepsilon - r \leq \varepsilon + \beta e^{-(h(y)+\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}}, \quad r < h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

For later reference we note that, since $u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(r, y) \geq \varphi_{\varepsilon^\alpha}(r) > r$ and $u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(r, y) \leq v_\varepsilon(r, y)$ (so $u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(0, r) < v_\varepsilon(0, y) = \varepsilon + \beta e^{-(h(y)+\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}}$) by 2.24, we have

$$2.26 \quad \begin{aligned} u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}, y)/u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(0, y) &\geq (h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})/u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(0, y) \\ &\geq (h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})/(\varepsilon + \beta e^{-(h(y)+\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \min\{1/\beta, 1/\sqrt{\varepsilon}\}, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality proved by considering, for each y , the alternatives $\beta e^{-(h(y)+\sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}}$ greater or less than ε and using $\min_{x>0} x^2 e^{x^{-1}} = e^2/4 > 1$ in case of the first alternative.

Working in the set of positive $C^2(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon})$ functions $u = u(r, y)$ ($r = |\xi|$) which are $2R$ -periodic in the y variable, we use the ‘‘method of continuity.’’ For $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\sigma > 0$ we consider the possibility of finding solutions $u_{t,\varepsilon}$ of the SME as in 2.23 and 2.24 which satisfy the additional conditions

$$2.27 \quad \begin{cases} \sup |D_y u_{t,\varepsilon}| < \sigma \\ |D(u_{t,\varepsilon}(r, y) - r)| < 1, \quad \frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ \text{The linearized SME at } u_{t,\varepsilon} \text{ has first eigenvalue positive.} \end{cases}$$

The first eigenvalue here is with respect the space of $C^2(\overline{\Omega_\varepsilon})$ functions with zero Dirichlet data on $\partial\Omega_\varepsilon$ and which are $2R$ -periodic in the y -variable.

As we already mentioned, the IFT guarantees such a solution exists for all small enough t , so we let $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon, \beta) > 0$ be defined by

$$2.28 \quad t_0 = \sup \{ \tau \in (0, 1] : u_{t,\varepsilon} \text{ exists and 2.27 holds for all } t \in [0, \tau) \}.$$

By [Sim76, Example 4.1] (which is applicable here because of the lower and upper bounds 2.24), we have a bound on the gradient $Du_{t,\varepsilon}$ for $r < \frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})$ and by the second inequality in 2.27 there is similarly a bound in $\frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, so in fact

$$2.29 \quad |Du_{t,\varepsilon}(r, y)| < C, \quad (r, y) \in \overline{\Omega_\varepsilon},$$

with C independent of t (but possibly depending on ε) for $t < t_0$.

2.29 enables us to use standard local *a priori* interior and boundary quasilinear elliptic estimates to bound all the derivatives of $u_{t,\varepsilon}(r, y)$ (again independent of t but possibly depending on ε). Hence we conclude that $u_{t_0,\varepsilon} = \lim u_{t_k,\varepsilon}$ must exist as a C^2 limit for some sequence $t_k \uparrow t_0$. Furthermore, if 2.27 holds with $t = t_0$ and if $t_0 < 1$, then we could use the IFT again to show that, for some $\delta > 0$, $u_{t,\varepsilon}$ exists and 2.27 holds for all $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \delta)$, contradicting the definition of t_0 . So to show $t_0 = 1$ we just have to show neither possibility $\sup |D_y u_{t_0,\varepsilon}| = \sigma$ nor first eigenvalue of the linearization of the SME at $u_{t_0,\varepsilon}$ zero nor $|Du_t(r, y)| = 1$ can occur with $\frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

We are going to prove this in case β, ε are small enough.

So let $t_0 = t_0(\varepsilon, \beta) \in (0, 1]$ be as in 2.28. We claim that if $\delta > 0$, if ε, β are sufficiently small, depending on δ , then for any $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$2.30 \quad \begin{aligned} (1+r)^{-1}(\tilde{u}_{t_0,\varepsilon}(r, y) - \varphi(r)) + |D(\tilde{u}_{t_0,\varepsilon}(r, y) - \varphi(r))| \\ + (1+r)|D^2(\tilde{u}_{t_0,\varepsilon}(r, y) - \varphi(r))| \leq \delta \text{ for } |y| < 1+r \end{aligned}$$

and for $r < (h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})/u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(0, y_0)$, where $\tilde{u}_{t_0,\varepsilon}(r, y) = s_{y_0}^{-1} u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(s_{y_0} r, y_0 + s_{y_0} y)$, $s_{y_0} = u_{t_0,\varepsilon}(0, y_0)$. Geometrically this says that, in the appropriately scaled sense, $SG(\tilde{u}_{t_0,\varepsilon})$ is C^2 close to $SG(\varphi)$ in the region $|y| < 1+r$.

Before beginning the proof of this we establish two general principles about sequences v_k of solutions of the SME which satisfy $v_k(\xi, y) > |\xi|$ on balls $B_{R_k}(0, 0) \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ with $R_k \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e. $SG(v_k|_{B_{R_k}(0, 0)})$ lies in the region $|\eta| > |\xi|$ on one side of $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R} = SG(r)$): We claim that for any such sequence and for any $R_0 > 0$

$$2.31 \quad \begin{aligned} |(\xi_k, y_k)| \leq R_0 \text{ and } \sup_k v_k(\xi_k, y_k) < \infty \\ \Rightarrow \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{B_R(0,0)} v_k < \infty \text{ for each } R > R_0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$2.32 \quad \begin{aligned} |(\xi_k, y_k)| \leq R_0 \text{ and } \inf_k (v_k(\xi_k, y_k) - |\xi_k|) > 0 \\ \Rightarrow \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \min_{B_R} (v_k(\xi, y) - |\xi|) > 0 \text{ for each } R > R_0. \end{aligned}$$

Both 2.31, 2.32 are proved using the maximum principles of Solomon-White [SW89] and Ilmanen [Ilm96]. For example if 2.31 fails then there are bounded sequences

$(\xi_k, y_k), (\tau_k, z_k)$ with $v_k(\xi_k, y_k)$ bounded and $v_k(\tau_k, z_k) \rightarrow \infty$. Let $S_k \subset SG(v_k)$ be defined by $S_k = \{(t\xi_k + (1-t)\tau_k, v_k(t\xi_k + (1-t)\tau_k, ty_k + (1-t)z_k)\omega, ty_k + (1-t)z_k) : t \in [0, 1], \omega \in \mathbb{S}^m\}$. Since $v_k(\tau_k, z_k) \rightarrow \infty$ and $R_k \rightarrow \infty$, we can pick $\rho_k \rightarrow \infty$ with $\rho_k^{-1}v_k(\tau_k, z_k) \rightarrow \infty$ and $\rho_k^{-1}R_k \rightarrow \infty$, and we rescale v_k to give $\tilde{v}_k(\xi, y) = \rho_k^{-1}v_k(\rho_k\xi, \rho_k y)$.

By [FS20, Lemma 2.3], $SG(\tilde{v}_k) (= \rho_k^{-1}SG(v_k))$ has locally bounded volume in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$, so the Allard compactness theorem is applicable and hence some subsequence of $SG(\tilde{v}_k)$ converges in the varifold sense and locally in the Hausdorff distance sense in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ to a stationary integer multiplicity varifold V with $(0, 0) \in \text{spt } V \subset \{(\xi, \eta, y) : |\eta| \geq |\xi|\}$. The maximum principle [Ilm96] ensures that $\text{spt } V \cap (\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}) \subset \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ is impossible, so we must have $\text{spt } V \cap ((\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R})) \neq \emptyset$, and then, by [SW89], $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R} \subset \text{spt } V$. Let $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ be the minimum n such that V has density n on a set T of positive measure in $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$. But then $W = V - V_1$ is stationary, where V_1 is $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ equipped with multiplicity identically n , and $V = V_1 + W$ and hence density $V(\xi, \eta, y) = \text{density } V_1(\xi, \eta, y) + \text{density } W(\xi, \eta, y)$ for all (ξ, η, y) , hence density $W(\xi, \eta, y) = 0$ for $(\xi, \eta, y) \in T$. Since the density function of a stationary varifold is upper semi-continuous, $\text{spt } W = \{(\xi, y, \eta) : \text{density } W \geq 1\}$, and this excludes the set of positive measure $T \subset \mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$, so it is not true that $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R} \subset \text{spt } W$. But, $(0, 0) \in \text{spt } W$ (because the limit points of the sets $\rho_k^{-1}S_k$ include all the points $\{(0, s\omega, 0) : s > 0, \omega \in \mathbb{S}^m\}$, all of which are in $\text{spt } W$), so we can repeat all of the above argument with W in place of V , thus concluding on the contrary that $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R} \subset \text{spt } W$. This completes the proof of 2.31.

The proof of 2.32 is similar and in fact a little simpler, because the maximum principles of [SW89] and [Ilm96] are applied directly to $V = \lim_k G(v_k)$ without the necessity of scaling, after supposing for contradiction that there is a bounded sequence (τ_k, z_k) with $v_k(\tau_k, z_k) - |\tau_k| \rightarrow 0$. Then the limit points of $S_k = \{(t\xi_k + (1-t)\tau_k, v_k(t\xi_k + (1-t)\tau_k, ty_k + (1-t)z_k)\omega, ty_k + (1-t)z_k) : t \in [0, 1], \omega \in \mathbb{S}^m\}$ for any subsequence of k includes a set $S \subset \{(\xi, \eta, y) : |\eta| > |\xi|\}$ with $\bar{S} \cap (\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}) \neq \emptyset$, so we can apply [SW89] and [Ilm96] as in the above proof of 2.31 to again give a contradiction.

We now prove 2.30. If 2.30 fails for arbitrarily small choices of β, ε then there would be a sequences $\beta_k, \varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$ and y_k^0, y_k, r_k with $r_k < (h(y_k) + \sqrt{\varepsilon_k})/u_{t_0}(0, y_k^0)$, $|y_k| < 1 + r_k$, and

$$2.33 \quad (1 + r_k)^{-1}(u_k(r_k, y_k) - \varphi(r_k)) + |(Du_k)(r_k, y_k) - (D\varphi)(r_k)| \\ + (1 + r_k)|(D^2u_k)(r_k, y_k) - (D^2\varphi)(r_k)| \geq \delta,$$

where

$$2.34 \quad u_k(r, y) = s_k^{-1}u_{t_k, \varepsilon_k}(s_k r, y_k^0 + s_k y), \quad s_k = u_{t_k, \varepsilon_k}(0, y_k^0), \quad t_k = t_0(\varepsilon_k, \beta_k).$$

By 2.26 the domain of u_k contains balls $B_{R_k}(0, 0)$ with $R_k \rightarrow \infty$, so, since $u_k(0, 0) = 1$, 2.31, 2.32 are both applicable and imply that $u_k - r$ is bounded above and below by

fixed positive constants on each ball $B_R(0, 0)$ for all sufficiently large k (depending on R). Then, by [Sim76, Example 4.1], $|Du_k|$ is bounded on each ball $B_R(0, 0)$ so a subsequence of u_k converges locally in C^2 on all of $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ to a positive solution u of the SME with $u(r, y) > r$ at every point (r, y) .

Let $\rho_k \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\rho_k^{-1}u(\rho_k r, \rho_k y) > r$ and $\rho_k^{-1}u(0, 0) \rightarrow 0$, so 2.31 is again applicable, so we have local upper and lower bounds in $r > 0$, and hence gradient estimates locally in $\{(r, y) : r > 0\}$. Hence a subsequence of $\rho_k^{-1}u(\rho_k r, \rho_k y)$ converges locally smoothly in $r > 0$. By 2.32 we see that in fact the limit must be r for $r > 0$, otherwise there is a bounded sequence of points (s_k, z_k) with $\inf_k \rho_k^{-1}u(\rho_k s_k, \rho_k z_k) - s_k > 0$ and then $\rho_k^{-1}u(0, 0) \rightarrow 0$ contradicts 2.32.

So the tangent cone of $SG(u)$ at ∞ is $\mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ with multiplicity 1 and $|D_y u| \leq \sigma$ (σ as in 2.27), so taking $\sigma < \varepsilon_0$, with ε_0 as in the Liouville-type theorem [Sim21, Corollary 1.13], and using the fact that $u(0, 0) = 1 = \varphi(0, 0)$, we conclude that $SG(u) = SG(\varphi)$; i.e. $u(r, y) = \varphi(r)$. In particular then 2.33 implies $r_k \rightarrow \infty$. Since then $r_k^{-1}u_k(0, 0) = r_k^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, 2.32 implies $r_k^{-1}u_k(r_k r, r_k y) - r$ converges uniformly to 0 in $B_R(0, 0)$ for each $R > 1$, otherwise there is a bounded sequence (s_k, z_k) with $\inf_k r_k^{-1}u_k(r_k s_k, r_k z_k) > 0$ and then by 2.32 $\inf_k \inf_{B_R(0, 0)} (r_k^{-1}u_k(r_k r, r_k y) - r) > 0$, contradicting $r_k^{-1}u_k(0, 0) \rightarrow 0$. In particular we have local gradient estimates for $r_k^{-1}u_k(r_k r, r_k y) - r$ in $\{(r, y) \in B_2(0, 0) : r \geq \frac{1}{8}\}$, hence smooth convergence to 0 of $r_k^{-1}u_k(r_k r, r_k y) - r$ in $\{(r, y) \in B_2(0, 0) : r \geq \frac{1}{4}\}$, so

$$r_k^{-1}u_k(r_k r, r_k y) - r + |(Du_k)(r_k r, r_k y) - Dr| + r_k|(D^2u_k)(r_k r, r_k y) - D^2r| \rightarrow 0$$

for $(r, y) \in B_2(0, 0)$, $r \geq \frac{1}{4}$. Since $(1, y_k/r_k) \in \{(r, y) \in B_2(0, 0) : r \geq \frac{1}{2}\}$ we can take $(r, y) = (1, y_k/r_k)$ here, showing that the left side of 2.33 converges to 0, a contradiction. So 2.30 is proved.

$SG(\varphi)$ is strictly stable, so 2.30 ensures each slice $SG(u_{t_0, \varepsilon}) \cap (\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \{y_0\})$ satisfies a strict stability inequality, and then by integrating with respect to y_0 and using the coarea formula together with the fact that $|D_y u_{t_0, \varepsilon}| \leq \sigma$ (small) we conclude that $SG(u_{t_0, \varepsilon})$ is strictly stable; for the details of this part of the argument we refer to [Sim21, §6].

Since we can choose δ in 2.30 to be $< \min\{\frac{1}{2}, \sigma\}$, 2.30 then also ensures that $\sup |D_y u_{t_0, \varepsilon}(r, y)| \leq \delta < \sigma$ for all $r < h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and $|D(u_{t_0, \varepsilon}(r, y) - r)| < 1$ for $\frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, so we have checked 2.27 at $t = t_0$, and hence $t_0 = 1$ for all sufficiently small ε, β as claimed.

Because $|D\varphi| < 1$, 2.30 (with $t_0 = 1$) also implies

$$2.35 \quad \sup_{0 \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} |Du_{1, \varepsilon}| < 1 + \delta < 1 + \sigma.$$

Because of 2.35 and 2.25 we can apply standard local quasilinear elliptic interior and boundary estimates to bound the derivatives of the difference $u_{1, \varepsilon}(r, y) - r$ in regions $\theta(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}$; preparatory to this observe that if $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [-4, 4]$ then $h(y + t(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})) - h(y) = th'(y + s(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}))(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})$

for some s between 0 and t , so, for $|y - z| \leq 4(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})$,

$$2.36 \quad \frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq (1 - 4\beta)(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq h(z) + \sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq (1 + 4\beta)(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq 2(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

So in particular, using the right hand inequality,

$$2.37 \quad e^{-(h(z) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}}, \quad |y - z| \leq 4(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}),$$

and using 2.35, 2.25, 2.37 and standard elliptic estimates for the difference $u_{1,\varepsilon} - r$, we have, for any $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$,

$$2.38 \quad |D^k(u_{1,\varepsilon}(r, y) - r)| \leq C_k \theta^{-k} (h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-k} (\varepsilon + \beta e^{-\frac{1}{2}(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon})^{-1/2}})$$

for $\theta(h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \leq r \leq h(y) + \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, with C_k independent of θ .

Up to this point all the constructions have been made assuming the function $h = h_R$ and $K = K_R$ are $2R$ -periodic, where $R > 1$ was fixed, and correspondingly then $u_{1,\varepsilon} = u_{1,\varepsilon,R}$ also depends on R . Suppose now that we have an arbitrary closed $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ and arbitrary non-negative C^∞ h satisfying 2.17 with $\beta/3$ in place of β and with $K = \{y : h(y) = 0\}$. Let $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be C^∞ with $\zeta(y) = 0$ for $|y| \geq \frac{7}{8}$, $\zeta(y) > 0$ for $|y| < \frac{7}{8}$, $\zeta(y) = 1$ for $|y| < \frac{1}{2}$, and then let $\zeta_R(y) = \zeta(y/R)$, and $h_R =$ the $2R$ -periodic extension of $\zeta_R^2 h|_{[-R, R]}$. Then, for all R sufficiently large, 2.17 holds for h_R (possibly with new constants C_k , but C_k independent of R), and so the constants C_k in 2.38 can also be chosen independent of R .

So let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ and $R = R_k \rightarrow \infty$. Since the gradient estimate 2.35 and the derivative estimates in 2.38 are independent of ε and R , some subsequence of u_{1,ε_k,R_k} converges uniformly in $\bar{\Omega}$ and locally smoothly in $\bar{\Omega} \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R})$ to some u_1 which has bounded gradient in Ω and is smooth in $\Omega \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R})$ with $u_1(r, y) \geq r$; but by the Hopf maximum principle applied to the difference $u_1 - r$ (which is the difference of two solutions of the SME) we see that strict inequality $u_1(r, y) > r$ must hold in $\Omega \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbb{R})$, because by construction $u_1(r, y) = \beta e^{-h^{-1/2}(y)} \tilde{\varphi}(h(y)/\beta e^{-h^{-1/2}}) > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. $SG(u_1)$ is stationary and contained in $\{(\xi, \eta, y) : |\eta| > |\xi|\} \cup (\{0\} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K))$, so the maximum principle [Ilm96] implies $SG(u_1) \cap (\mathbb{C}_0 \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K)) = \emptyset$, so in fact u_{1,ε_k} is bounded below by a fixed positive constant on each compact subset $\Gamma \subset \Omega$, hence u_{1,ε_k,R_k} to u_1 locally in $C^\infty(\Omega)$, and u_1 is positive and smooth on all of Ω with

$$2.39 \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{M}(u_1)(r, y) = 0, & |Du_1(r, y)| < 1 + \sigma, & (r, y) \in \Omega \\ 0 < u_1(r, y) - r \leq \beta e^{-h^{-1/2}(y)}, & (r, y) \in \Omega & \text{(by 2.25)} \\ u_1(h(y), y) = \beta e^{-h(y)^{-1/2}} \tilde{\varphi}(h(y)/\beta e^{-h(y)^{-1/2}}), & y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus K. \end{cases}$$

Also, by 2.38 with $\theta = \frac{1}{4}$,

$$2.40 \quad |D^k(u_1(r, y) - r)| \leq C_{k,\ell} \beta h(y)^\ell, \quad \frac{1}{4}h(y) \leq r \leq h(y), \quad k, \ell = 1, 2, \dots$$

Now take a C^∞ function $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\zeta(t) = 0$ for $t \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \zeta(t) < 1$, $t \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ and $\zeta(t) = 1$ for $t \geq 1$, and for $(r, y) \in [0, \infty) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K)$ define

$$u(r, y) = \zeta(r/h(y))r + (1 - \zeta(r/h(y)))u_1(r, y) = u_1(r, y) - \zeta(r/h(y))(u_1(r, y) - r).$$

Thus $u(r, y) - r = (u_1(r, y) - r)(1 - \zeta(r/h(y)))$ ($= u_1$ for $r < \frac{1}{2}h(y)$) and hence by 2.39 and 2.40 $u(r, y)$, for $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus K$, has the properties (with new constants $C_{k,\ell}$)

$$2.41 \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{M}(u)(r, y) = 0, & r < \frac{1}{2}h(y), & 0 < u(r, y) - r \leq \beta e^{-h^{-1/2}(y)}, & r < h(y), \\ u(r, y) = r, & r \geq h(y) \\ |D_{r,y}^k(u - r)| \leq C_{k,\ell} \beta h(y)^\ell, & \frac{1}{4}h(y) < r, & k, \ell = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases}$$

Also the above estimates enable us to extend u to be C^∞ on all of $(\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}) \setminus (\{0\} \times \{0\} \times K)$ by taking

$$2.42 \quad u(r, y) = r, \quad y \in K,$$

and then clearly $\text{sing } G(u) = \{0\} \times \{0\} \times K$.

Finally we remark that the slicing argument used to check strict stability of $SG(u_{1,\varepsilon})$ (hence $SG(u_1)$) extends without change to $SG(u)$, because for each $y_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus K$, u evidently satisfies an inequality like the inequality for $u_{1,\varepsilon}$ in 2.30 for all $r \geq 0$.

3 Construction of a Metric for $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$

With u as in 2.41 and 2.42, we can now discuss how to find a metric g with respect to which $SG(u)$ is minimal.

We look for a metric g of the form

$$3.1 \quad g|_{(\xi,\eta,y)} = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} d\xi_i^2 + f(\xi, y) \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} d\eta_j^2 + dy^2,$$

where f is smooth, close to 1 everywhere, and equal to 1 on $\mathbb{R} \times K$; also we shall construct f so that it is a function of $|\xi|, y$, so henceforth we consider only functions $f = f(r, y)$, $r = |\xi|$. Applying the area formula, except that now we use the metric g of 3.1 rather than the standard Euclidean metric, the area functional is then

$$3.2 \quad \mu_g(SG(v)) = \sigma_m \int_V \sqrt{1 + f|Dv|^2} f^{m/2} v^m d\xi dy$$

for any positive C^2 function v on a domain $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$, where μ_g denotes $(2m+2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure with respect to the metric g for $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$ and σ_m is the volume of the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^m in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} . Thus the Euler-Lagrange

equation for the functional on the right of 3.2 is equivalent to the statement that the symmetric graph $SG(v)$ is a minimal (zero mean curvature) hypersurface relative to the metric g for $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}$.

By direct computation, the Euler-Lagrange equation is

$$\frac{1}{2}(m+1 + \frac{1}{1+\bar{f}|Dv|^2}) Df \cdot Dv = -f(\Delta v - f \frac{v_r^2 v_{rr} + v_y^2 v_{yy} + 2v_r v_y v_{ry}}{1+\bar{f}|Dv|^2}) + \frac{m}{v}.$$

At points where $Dv \neq 0$ this is a non-degenerate first-order PDE for f , and we can impose the initial condition

$$3.3 \quad f = 1 \text{ on the hypersurface } |\xi| = \frac{1}{2}h(y),$$

i.e. $f = 1$ on inner boundary of the transition region.

We want to show that we can choose f so that this holds with the choice $v = u$, u as in 2.41, 2.42. With such a choice of v and with $\bar{f} = 1 - f$, the equation for f can be rewritten

$$\frac{1}{2}(m+1 + \frac{1}{1+|Du|^2 - \bar{f}|Du|^2}) Du \cdot D\bar{f} = \mathcal{M}(u) - E(u, \bar{f})\bar{f},$$

$$E(u, \bar{f}) = \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times \mathbb{R}} u - \frac{2+|Du|^2 - \bar{f}(1+|Du|^2)}{(1+|Du|^2 - \bar{f}|Du|^2)(1+|Du|^2)} (u_r^2 u_{rr} + u_y^2 u_{yy} + 2u_r u_y u_{ry}).$$

The inhomogeneous term in this equation is $\mathcal{M}(u)$ which is zero in $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}h(y)$ by 2.41, so we must have \bar{f} identically zero on $\frac{1}{4}h(y) \leq |\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2}h(y)$ (by the uniqueness theorem for quasilinear first order PDE's); also, since $E(r, \bar{f}) = m/r$ and $\mathcal{M}(r) = 0$ ($r = |\xi|$), the above implies

$$\frac{1}{2}(m+1 + \frac{1}{1+|Du|^2(1-\bar{f})}) Du \cdot D\bar{f} = -\frac{m}{r}\bar{f} + (\mathcal{M}(u) - \mathcal{M}(r)) - (E(u, \bar{f}) - E(r, \bar{f}))\bar{f},$$

and, since $Du = Dr + D(u-r) = r^{-1}\xi + a$ with $a = D(u-r)$, by 2.41 this can be written

$$3.4 \quad \frac{1}{2}(m+1 + \frac{1}{1+(1+|a|^2 - 2a \cdot \xi/r)(1-\bar{f})}) (r^{-1}\xi + a(\xi, y)) \cdot D\bar{f} = -m\bar{f}/r + b(\xi, y, \bar{f})\bar{f} + c(\xi, y, \bar{f})$$

with

$$3.5 \quad |a(\xi, y)| \leq \beta (< \frac{1}{2}), \quad r \geq \frac{1}{4}h(y),$$

provided we take β in 2.17 and 2.41 small enough, thus ensuring that 3.4 is uniformly non-degenerate in the region $r > \frac{1}{4}h(y)$, and, again by 2.41,

$$3.6 \quad |D_{\xi, y}^k a(\xi, y)| + \sup_{|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}} (|D_{\xi, y, z}^k b(\xi, y, z)| + |D_{\xi, y, z}^k c(\xi, y, z)|) \leq C_{k, \ell} \beta h(y)^\ell,$$

for $r \geq \frac{1}{4}h(y)$ and $k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, with constants $C_{k, \ell}$ independent of β .

Then using 3.5 and 3.6 together with standard estimates for non-degenerate first order PDE's (as discussed in [Sim23]), we have

$$3.7 \quad |D_{r, y}^k \bar{f}(r, y)| \leq C_{k, \ell} \beta h(y)^\ell, \quad k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

$\frac{1}{4}h(y) \leq r \leq h(y)$, with suitable constants $C_{k, \ell}$ depending only on k, ℓ (and not depending on β).

Also, since $u = r$ for $r \geq h(y)$ (so $a = b = c = 0$ for $r \geq h(y)$), the PDE for \bar{f} can be written for $r \geq h(y)$ as the ODE

$$(m+1 + (2 - \bar{f})^{-1}) \bar{f}_r = -2m\bar{f}/r,$$

which can be integrated to give

$$(2 - \bar{f}(r, y))^{-\kappa_1} \bar{f}(r, y) = (2 - \bar{f}(h(y), y))^{-\kappa_1} \bar{f}(h(y), y) (h(y)/r)^{\kappa_2}, \quad r \geq h(y),$$

where $\kappa_1 = \frac{1}{2m+3}$, $\kappa_2 = \frac{4m}{2m+3}$, and hence the inequalities 3.7 are also valid (with possibly different constants $C_{k, \ell}$) for $r > h(y)$.

Thus 3.7 holds for $r > \frac{1}{4}h(y)$, and since f is identically 1 on $\frac{1}{4}h(y) \leq r \leq \frac{1}{2}h(y)$, we can extend f to be identically 1 in the region $0 \leq r < \frac{1}{2}h(y)$. So f exists and is smooth and positive on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K)$ and $|D_{r, y}^k \bar{f}(r, y)| \leq C_{k, \ell} \beta h(y)^\ell$, $(r, y) \in [0, \infty) \times (\mathbb{R} \setminus K)$, $k, \ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and so we can extend f to be C^∞ on all of \mathbb{R}^{m+1} by taking $f = 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^{m+1} \times K$.

References

- [All72] W.K. Allard, *On the first variation of a varifold*, Annals of Math. **95** (1972), 417–491.
- [DelS14a] De Lellis, Camillo; Spadaro, Emanuele, *Regularity of area minimizing currents I: gradient L_p estimates*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **24** (2014), 1831–1884.
- [DelS14b] ——— *Regularity of area minimizing currents II: center manifold*, Ann. of Math. **183** (2016), 499–575.
- [DelS14c] ——— *Regularity of area minimizing currents III: blow-up*, Ann. of Math. **183** (2016), 577–617.
- [FS20] K. Fouladgar and L. Simon, *The symmetric minimal surface equation*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **69** (2020), 331–366.
- [HS85] R. Hardt and L. Simon, *Area minimizing hypersurfaces with isolated singularities*, J. Reine u. Angew. Math. **362** (1985), 102–129.

- [Ilm96] T. Ilmanen, *A strong maximum principle for singular minimal hypersurfaces*, Calc. Var. and PDE **4** (1996), 443–467.
- [Liu23] Zhenhua Liu, *On a conjecture of Almgren: area-minimizing surfaces with fractal singularities*, arXiv:2110.13137
- [SSY75] R. Schoen, L. Simon, and S.-T. Yau, *Curvature estimates for minimal hypersurfaces*, Acta Math. **134** (1975), 276–288.
- [SS81] R. Schoen and L. Simon, *Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces*, Comm. Pure and Appl. Math **34** (1981), 741–797.
- [Sim76] L. Simon, *Interior gradient bounds for non-uniformly elliptic equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **25** (1976), 821–855.
- [Sim93] ———, *Cylindrical tangent cones and the singular set of minimal submanifolds*, Journal of Differential Geometry **38** (1993), 585–652.
- [Sim95] ———, *Rectifiability of the singular sets of multiplicity 1 minimal surfaces and energy minimizing maps*, Surveys in Differential Geom. **II** (1995), 246–305.
- [Sim21] ———, *A Liouville-type theorem for stable minimal hypersurfaces*, Ars Inveniendi Analytica. arXiv:2101.06404v2 **Paper No. 5** (2021), 35pp.
- [Sim23] ———, *Stable minimal hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{N+1+\ell}$ with singular set an arbitrary closed $K \subset \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$* , Annals of Math. **197** (2023), 1205–1234.
- [SW89] B. Solomon and B. White, *A strong maximum principle for varifolds that are stationary with respect to even parametric functionals*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **38** (1989), 683–691.
- [Szk22] Gábor Székelyhidi, *Minimal hypersurfaces with cylindrical tangent cones*, arXiv:2107.14786

Mathematics Department, Stanford University
Stanford CA 94305, USA
lsimon@stanford.edu