RADIAL LIMITS OF NONPARAMETRIC PMC SURFACES WITH INTERMEDIATE BOUNDARY CURVATURE
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ABSTRACT. We investigate the boundary behavior of the variational solution $f$ of a Dirichlet problem for a prescribed mean curvature equation in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ near a point $O \in \partial \Omega$ under different assumptions about the curvature of $\partial \Omega$ on each side of $O$. We prove that the radial limits at $O$ of $f$ exist under different assumptions about the Dirichlet boundary data $\phi$, depending on the curvature properties of $\partial \Omega$ near $O$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega$ be a locally Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and define $Nf = \nabla \cdot Tf = \text{div} (Tf)$, where $f \in C^2(\Omega)$ and $Tf = \frac{\nabla f}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla f|^2}}$. Let $H \in C^{1,\lambda}(\bar{\Omega})$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and satisfy the condition

$$\left| \int_\Omega H \eta \ dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega |D\eta| \ dx$$

for all $\eta \in C^1_c(\Omega)$ (e.g. [14, (16.60)], [15]). Here and throughout the paper, we adopt the sign convention that the curvature of $\Omega$ is nonnegative when $\Omega$ is convex. Consider the Dirichlet problem

(1) \quad Nf = 2H in $\Omega$

(2) \quad $f = \phi$ on $\partial \Omega$.

Understanding the boundary behavior of a solution of (1)-(2) has been the goal of many authors.

The geometry of $\Omega$ plays a critical role with regard to the existence of functions $f \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C^0(\bar{\Omega})$ which satisfy (1) and (2) (i.e. classical solutions of (1)-(2)). For some choices of domain $\Omega$ and boundary data $\phi$, no classical solution of (1)-(2) exists; when $H \equiv 0$, much of the history (up to 1985) of this topic can be found in Nitsche’s book [24] (e.g. \S 285, 403–418) and, for general $H$, one might consult [20]. (Appropriate “smallness of $\phi$” conditions can imply the existence of classical solutions when $\Omega$ is not convex in the $H \equiv 0$ case (e.g. [24, \S 285 & \S 412] and [17, 25, 27, 28]) or when $\partial \Omega$ does not satisfy appropriate curvature conditions in the general case (e.g. [1, 10, 22]; however see [24, \S 411].) Different notions of “generalized” solutions of (1)-(2) exist, such as Perron solutions (e.g. [14, 24, \S 416]) and variational solutions (e.g. [12, 24, \S 417-418]); we shall focus on variational solutions.
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The most extreme case (for locally Lipschitz domains in the plane) occurs when \(\partial \Omega\) has a corner (or corners) and understanding the boundary behavior of solutions of (1) near a corner is best investigated by understanding the radial limits of \(f\) at the corner. The existence of radial limits when \(H \equiv 0\) was established in \[18\] (see also \[6, 8, 19\]) and this was extended to general \(H\) in \[7\] (see also \[21\]).

Let us assume that \(O = (0,0) \in \partial \Omega\) and there exist \(\delta_0 > 0\) and \(\alpha, \beta \in (-\pi, \pi)\) such that \(B_{\delta_0}(O) \cap \partial \Omega \setminus \{O\}\) consists of two components, \(\partial^- \Omega\) and \(\partial^+ \Omega\), which are smooth (i.e. \(C^{2,\lambda}\) for some \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\)) curves, the rays \(\theta = \alpha\) and \(\theta = \beta\) are tangent rays to \(\partial \Omega\) at \(O\), \(\partial^- \Omega\) has a corner at \(O\) of size \(\beta - \alpha \in (0, 2\pi)\) and

\[
\{r(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) : 0 < r < \epsilon(\theta), \alpha < \theta < \beta\} \subset \Omega \cap B_{\delta_0}(O)
\]

for some function \(\epsilon(\cdot) : (\alpha, \beta) \rightarrow (0, \delta_0)\); here \((r, \theta)\) represents polar coordinates about \(O\) and \(B_{\delta_0}(O) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - O| < \delta\}\). We assume \(\partial^- \Omega\) is tangent to the ray \(\theta = \alpha\), \(\partial^+ \Omega\) is tangent to the ray \(\theta = \beta\) at \(O\), \(\partial^- \Omega\) is an (open) subset of a \(C^{2,\lambda}\)-curve \(\Sigma^-\) which contains \(O\) as an interior point and \(\partial^+ \Omega\) is an (open) subset of a \(C^{2,\lambda}\)-curve \(\Sigma^+\) which contains \(O\) as an interior point; if \(\beta - \alpha = \pi\), we assume \(\Sigma^- = \Sigma^+\) (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. \(\Sigma^\pm\) when \(\beta - \alpha > \pi\) (left) \(\Sigma^\pm\) when \(\beta - \alpha < \pi\) (right)](image)

Let \(f \in BV(\Omega) \cap C^2(\Omega)\) minimize the functional

\[
J(h) = \int_{\Omega} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} + \int_{\Omega} 2Hhdx + \int_{\partial \Omega} |u - \phi|dH_1
\]

for \(h \in BV(\Omega)\), so that \(f\) is the variational solution of (1)-(2). Let \(Rf(\theta)\) denote the radial limit of \(f\) at \(O\) in the direction \(\theta \in (\alpha, \beta)\),

\[
Rf(\theta) = \lim_{r \downarrow 0} f(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta),
\]

and set \(Rf(\alpha) = \lim_{\theta \downarrow \alpha \Omega \ni x \rightarrow O} f^*(x)\) and \(Rf(\beta) = \lim_{\theta \uparrow \Omega \ni x \rightarrow O} f^*(x)\) when these limits exist, where \(f^*\) denotes the trace of \(f\) on \(\partial \Omega\). In \[9\] (together with \[3\]), the following two results were proven.

**Proposition 1.** (\[9\] Theorem 1; \[5\]) Let \(f \in C^2(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)\) satisfy (1) and suppose \(\beta - \alpha > \pi\). Then for each \(\theta \in (\alpha, \beta)\), \(Rf(\theta)\) exists and \(Rf(\cdot)\) is a continuous function on \((\alpha, \beta)\) which behaves in one of the following ways:

(i) \(Rf\) is a constant function and all nontangential limits of \(f\) at \(O\) exist.

(ii) There exist \(\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [\alpha, \beta]\) with \(\alpha_1 < \alpha_2\) such that

\[
Rf(\theta) = \begin{cases} 
\text{constant} & \text{for } \alpha < \theta \leq \alpha_1 \\
\text{strictly monotonic} & \text{for } \alpha_1 \leq \theta \leq \alpha_2 \\
\text{constant} & \text{for } \alpha_2 \leq \theta < \beta.
\end{cases}
\]
(iii) There exist $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ and $\theta_0$ with $\alpha \leq \alpha_1 < \theta_0 < \theta_0 + \pi < \alpha_2 \leq \beta$ such that

\[
Rf(\theta) = \begin{cases}
\text{constant} & \text{for } \alpha < \theta \leq \alpha_1 \\
\text{strictly increasing} & \text{for } \alpha_1 \leq \theta \leq \theta_0 \\
\text{constant} & \text{for } \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_0 + \pi \\
\text{strictly decreasing} & \text{for } \theta_0 + \pi \leq \theta \leq \alpha_2 \\
\text{constant} & \text{for } \alpha_2 \leq \theta < \beta.
\end{cases}
\]

(iv) There exist $\alpha_1$, $\alpha_2$ and $\theta_0$ with $\alpha \leq \alpha_1 < \theta_0 < \theta_0 + \pi < \alpha_2 \leq \beta$ such that

\[
Rf(\theta) = \begin{cases}
\text{constant} & \text{for } \alpha < \theta \leq \alpha_1 \\
\text{strictly decreasing} & \text{for } \alpha_1 \leq \theta \leq \theta_0 \\
\text{constant} & \text{for } \theta_0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_0 + \pi \\
\text{strictly increasing} & \text{for } \theta_0 + \pi \leq \theta \leq \alpha_2 \\
\text{constant} & \text{for } \alpha_2 \leq \theta < \beta.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proposition 2.** ([3] Theorem 2; [5]) Let $f \in C^2(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy (1) and suppose $m = \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \Omega^m f(x)$ exists. Then for each $\theta \in (\alpha, \beta)$, $Rf(\theta)$ exists and $Rf(\cdot)$ is a continuous function on $[\alpha, \beta]$, where $Rf(\alpha) \equiv m$. If $\beta - \alpha \leq \pi$, $Rf$ can behave as in (i) or (ii) in Proposition [7]. If $\beta - \alpha > \pi$, $Rf$ can behave as in (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) in Proposition [7].

The necessity of assuming the existence of $\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \Omega^m f(x)$ when $\beta - \alpha \leq \pi$ in Proposition [2] is illustrated by the use of the “gliding hump” construction in [20] and [21] Theorem 3], where examples of $\Omega$ (with $\beta - \alpha = \pi$), $\phi$ and $H$ are presented such that $f$ is discontinuous at $\mathcal{O}$ and none of the radial limits of $f$ at $\mathcal{O}$ exist. This same construction can be used to obtain examples of $\Omega$, $\phi$ and $H$ with $0 < \beta - \alpha < \pi$ such that $f$ is discontinuous at $\mathcal{O}$ and none of the radial limits of $f$ at $\mathcal{O}$ exist.

Thus the size $\beta - \alpha$ of the angle made by $\partial \mathcal{O}$ at the corner $\mathcal{O}$ is a primary determinant of the existence of radial limits $Rf(\theta)$, as Proposition [1] shows that $Rf(\theta)$ exists for $\alpha < \theta < \beta$ for any solution $f \in C^2(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ of (1) when $\beta - \alpha > \pi$, without regard to the behavior of (the trace of) $f$ on $\partial \mathcal{O}$. An important question is “Does a solution of (1)-(2) actually satisfy the boundary condition (2) near a specific point (e.g. a corner) $\mathcal{O} \in \partial \mathcal{O}$?” In particular, [18] and [7] require the answer to this question to be “yes.” The answer to this question depends largely on the curvature of $\partial \mathcal{O}$ on each side of $\mathcal{O}$ and this is a secondary determinant of the existence of radial limits $Rf(\theta)$ when $\beta - \alpha \leq \pi$.

To illustrate the importance of curvature conditions on the possible behaviors of solutions of (1)-(2), suppose $\delta > 0$, $B_\delta(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}$ is smooth (so $\beta - \alpha = \pi$), $\kappa(x)$ is the curvature of $\partial \mathcal{O}$ at $x \in B_\delta(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}$, $\phi \in L^\infty(\partial \mathcal{O})$ and $f$ is the variational solution of (1)-(2). In [11] Theorem 1.1], the authors proved the existence of radial limits $Rf(\theta), \theta \in (\alpha, \beta)$, when $\kappa(x) < -2|H(x)|$ for $x \in B_\delta(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial \mathcal{O}$, without regard to the behavior of $\phi$ on $\partial \mathcal{O}$.

Our goals here are, in Theorem [1] to extend the results in [11] to the “remaining case” noted there in which $\partial \mathcal{O}$ is smooth and $\kappa$ satisfies

\[ -2|H(x)| \leq \kappa(x) \leq 2|H(x)| \text{ for } x \in B_\delta(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial \mathcal{O} \]

and, in Theorem [2] to extend the results in [11] to actual corners (i.e. $\beta - \alpha \neq \pi$).
2. Theorems

**Theorem 1.** Let \( f \) be the variational solution of (1)-(2). Suppose \( \Gamma \subset \partial \Omega \) is a \( C^{2,\lambda} \) (open) curve for some \( \lambda \in (0,1) \), \( \Omega \subset \Gamma \), \( H \) is non-negative or non-positive in a neighborhood of \( \Omega \) and \( \kappa(\Omega) < 2|H(\Omega)| \). Then \( Rf(\theta) \) exists for each \( \theta \in (\alpha, \beta) \), \( Rf \in C^0([\alpha, \beta]) \) and \( Rf \) can behave as in (i) or (ii) in Proposition 1. Further, if \( \kappa(\Omega) < -2|H(\Omega)| \), then \( Rf(\alpha) \) and \( Rf(\beta) \) both exist, \( Rf \in C^0([\alpha, \beta]) \), and, in case (i) in Proposition 1 \( f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega \cup \{ \partial \}) \).

**Theorem 2.** Suppose \( H \) is non-negative or non-positive in a neighborhood of \( \Omega \),

\[
\limsup_{\partial \Omega \ni x \to \Omega} (\kappa(x) - 2|H(x)|) < 0
\]

and, if \( \beta - \alpha < \pi \), \( m = \lim_{x \to \partial \Omega \ni x \to \Omega} f(x) \) exists. Then \( Rf(\theta) \) exists for each \( \theta \in (\alpha, \beta) \) and \( Rf \in C^0([\alpha, \beta]) \).

1. If \( \beta - \alpha \leq \pi \), \( Rf \) behaves as in (i) or (ii) in Proposition 1.
2. If \( \beta - \alpha > \pi \), \( Rf \) behaves as in (i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) in Proposition 1.

If, in addition, \( \limsup_{\partial \Omega \ni x \to \Omega} (\kappa(x) + 2|H(x)|) < 0 \), then \( Rf(\alpha) \) and \( Rf(\beta) \) both exist, \( Rf \in C^0([\alpha, \beta]) \), and, in case (i) in Proposition 1 \( f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\Omega \cup \{ \partial \}) \).

We note that the “gliding hump” construction (which depends on the existence of classical solutions of (1)-(2)) cannot be successfully used when \( \beta - \alpha > \pi \); however it remains an open question if radial limits of \( f \) always exist without regard to the behavior of (the trace of) \( f \) on \( \partial \Omega \) when (5) holds and \( \beta - \alpha < \pi \) (see Remark 1).

3. Proofs

Let \( Q \) be the operator on \( C^2(\Omega) \) given by

\[
Qf(x) \equiv Nf(x) - 2H(x), \quad x \in \Omega.
\]

Let \( \nu \) be the exterior unit normal to \( \partial \Omega \), defined almost everywhere on \( \partial \Omega \). At every point \( y \in \partial \Omega \) for which \( \partial \Omega \) is a C^1 curve in a neighborhood of \( y \), \( \nu(x) \) denotes a continuous extension of \( \nu \) to a neighborhood of \( y \). Finally we adopt the convention used in [3, p. 178] with regard to the meaning of phrases like “\( T \psi(y) \cdot \nu(y) = 1 \) at a point \( y \in \partial \Omega \)” and the notation, definitions and conventions used in [11], including upper and lower Bernstein pairs \((U^+, \psi^+)\), which we quote below.

**Definition 1.** Given a locally Lipschitz domain \( \Omega \), an **upper Bernstein pair** \((U^+, \psi^+)\) for a curve \( \Gamma \subset \partial \Omega \) and a function \( H \) in (6) is a domain \( U^+ \) and a function \( \psi^+ \in C^2(U^+) \cap C^0(\bar{U^+}) \) such that \( \Gamma \subset \partial U^+ \), \( \nu \) is the exterior unit normal to \( \partial U^+ \) at each point of \( \Gamma \) (i.e. \( U^+ \) and \( \Omega \) lie on the same side of \( \Gamma \)), \( Q\psi^+ \leq 0 \) in \( U^+ \), and \( T\psi^+ \cdot \nu = 1 \) almost everywhere on \( \Gamma \) in the same sense as in [3]; that is, for almost every \( y \in \Gamma \),

\[
\lim_{U^+ \ni x \to y} \frac{\nabla \psi^+(x) \cdot \nu(x)}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \psi^+(x)|^2}} = 1.
\]

**Definition 2.** Given a domain \( \Omega \) as above, a **lower Bernstein pair** \((U^-, \psi^-)\) for a curve \( \Gamma \subset \partial \Omega \) and a function \( H \) in (6) is a domain \( U^- \) and a function
Let \( \psi : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^2 \) such that \( \Gamma \subset \partial U^- \), \( \nu \) is the exterior unit normal to \( \partial U^- \) at each point of \( \Gamma \) (i.e. \( U^- \) and \( \Omega \) lie on the same side of \( \Gamma \), \( Q\psi^- \geq 0 \) in \( U^- \), and \( T\psi^- \cdot \nu = -1 \) almost everywhere on \( \Gamma \) (in the same sense as above).

The argument which establishes \cite{14} Corollary 14.13, together with boundary regularity results (e.g. \cite{2} \cite{23}), are noted in \cite{11} Remark 1 and imply the following

**Lemma 1.** Suppose \( \Delta \) is a \( C^{2,\lambda} \) domain in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) for some \( \lambda \in (0,1) \), \( y \in \partial \Omega \) and \( \Lambda(y) < 2|H(y)| \), where \( \Lambda(y) \) denotes the curvature of \( \partial \Delta \) at \( y \). If \( H \) is non-negative in \( U \cap \Omega \) for some neighborhood \( U \) of \( y \), then there exist \( \tau > 0 \) and an upper Bernstein pair \((U^+ , \psi^+)\) for \((\Gamma,H)\), where \( \Gamma = B_r(y) \cap \partial \Omega \) and \( U^+ = B_r(y) \cap \Omega \). If \( H \) is non-positive in \( U \cap \Omega \) for some neighborhood \( U \) of \( y \), then there exist \( \tau > 0 \) and a lower Bernstein pair \((U^-, \psi^-)\) for \((\Gamma,H)\), where \( \Gamma = B_r(y) \cap \partial \Omega \) and \( U^- = B_r(y) \cap \Omega \).

**Proof of Theorem 1.** We note, as in \cite{21}, that the conclusion of Theorem 1 is a local one and we may assume \( \Omega \) is a bounded domain. The claims in the last sentence of the theorem follow from \cite{11} Theorem 1.1. We may assume that \( f \in C^0(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \{O\}) \) (i.e. \( f \in C^2(\Omega) \)) and, if necessary, we could replace \( \Omega \) by a set \( U \subset \Omega \) such that \( \partial U \cap \partial \Omega = \{O\} \), \( \partial U \) has the same tangent rays at \( O \) as does \( \partial \Omega \) and the curvature \( \kappa^* \) of \( \partial U \) satisfies \( \kappa^*(O) < 2|H(O)| \).

Let \( z_1 = \lim \inf_{\Omega \ni \mathbf{x} \to O} f(x) \) and \( z_2 = \lim \sup_{\Omega \ni \mathbf{x} \to O} f(x) \); if \( z_1 = z_2 \), then (i) of Proposition 1 holds and thus we assume \( z_1 < z_2 \). Set \( S_0 = \{(\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x})) : \mathbf{x} \in \Omega\} \). Since \( f \) minimizes \( J \) in (3), we see that the area of \( S_0 \) is finite; let \( M_0 \) denote this area. For \( \delta \in (0,1) \), set

\[
p(\delta) = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi M_0}{\ln \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}}.
\]

Let \( E = \{(u,v) : u^2 + v^2 < 1\} \). As in \cite{13} \cite{21}, there is a parametric description of the surface \( S_0 \),

\[
Y(u,v) = (a(u,v), b(u,v), c(u,v)) \in C^2(E : \mathbb{R}^3),
\]

which has the following properties:

(a1) \( Y \) is a diffeomorphism of \( E \) onto \( S_0 \).

(a2) Set \( G(u,v) = (a(u,v), b(u,v)) \). Then \( G \in C^0(E : \mathbb{R}^2) \).

(a3) Set \( \sigma(O) = G^{-1}(\partial O \setminus \{O\}) \); then \( \sigma(O) \) is a connected (open) arc of \( \partial E \) and \( Y \) maps \( \sigma(O) \) onto \( \partial E \setminus \{O\} \). We may assume the endpoints of \( \sigma(O) \) are \( \mathbf{o}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{o}_2 \). (Note that \( \mathbf{o}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{o}_2 \) are not assumed to be distinct.)

(a4) \( Y \) is conformal on \( E \): \( Y_u \cdot Y_v = 0, Y_u \cdot Y_u = Y_v \cdot Y_v \) on \( E \).

(a5) \( \Delta Y := Y_{uu} + Y_{vv} = 2H(Y)Y_u \times Y_v \) on \( E \).

Let \( \zeta(O) = \partial E \setminus \sigma(O) \); then \( G(\zeta(O)) = \{O\} \) and \( \mathbf{o}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{o}_2 \) are the endpoints of \( \zeta(O) \).

Suppose first that \( \mathbf{o}_1 \neq \mathbf{o}_2 \). From the Courant-Lebesgue Lemma (e.g. Lemma 3.1 in \cite{4}), we see that there exists \( \rho = \rho(\delta, \mathbf{w}) \) in \( (\delta, \sqrt{\delta}) \) such that the arclength \( l_{\rho} = l_{\rho(\delta, \mathbf{w})} \) of \( Y(C_{\rho(\delta, \mathbf{w})}(\mathbf{w})) \) is less than \( p(\delta) \), for each \( \delta \in (0,1) \) and \( \mathbf{w} \in \partial E \); where \( C_r(\mathbf{w}) = \{(u,v) \in E : |(u,v) - \mathbf{w}| = r\} \). Set \( E_r(\mathbf{w}) = \{(u,v) \in E : |(u,v) - \mathbf{w}| < r\} \), \( E'_r(\mathbf{w}) = G(E_r(\mathbf{w})) \) and \( C'_r(\mathbf{w}) = G(C_r(\mathbf{w})) \). Choose \( \delta_1 > 0 \) such that \( 2\sqrt{\delta_1} < |\mathbf{o}_1 - \mathbf{o}_2| \). Let \( \mathbf{w}_0 \in \zeta(O) \) be the “midpoint” of \( \mathbf{o}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{o}_2 \), so that \( \sqrt{\delta_1} < |\mathbf{w}_0 - \mathbf{o}_1| =
non-negative in a neighborhood of $O$. The general comparison principle ([12, Theorem 5.1]) implies that if each $\Omega : r > 6$ and so extends to a continuous function on the closure of $E_{p(\delta, w)}(w_0)$. From Steps 2, 4 and 5 of [21] and with [5] replacing Step 3 of [21], we see that there exist $\alpha_0, \beta_0 \in [\alpha, \beta]$ with $\alpha_0 < \beta_0$ such that

$$r(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) : 0 < r < e_0(\theta), \alpha_0 < \theta < \beta_0 \in \Omega \cap B_{\delta_0}(O)$$

for some function $e_0(\cdot) : (\alpha, \beta) \to (0, \delta_0)$ and the radial limits $Rf(\theta)$ of $f$ at $O$ exist for $\alpha_0 \leq \theta \leq \beta_0$. Since $\partial \Omega$ is $(C^2, \nu)$ smooth near $O$, we have $\beta - \alpha = \pi$ and so $\beta_0 - \alpha_0 \leq \pi$. (We note that $z_0 = z_b$ when $o_1 \neq o_2$ and $\beta_0 - \alpha_0 \leq \pi$ implies $f \in C^0(\Omega)$, a contradiction, and so $z_0 \neq z_b$.) The existence of $Rf(\cdot)$ on $(\alpha, \beta)$ now follows from two applications of [9, Theorem 2], one in the domain $(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) \in \Omega : r > 0, (\alpha_0 + \beta_0)//2 < \theta < \beta$ and one in the domain $(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) \in \Omega : r > 0, \alpha < \theta < (\alpha_0 + \beta_0)/2$.

Suppose second that $o = o_1 = o_2$ and $\zeta(O) = \{o\}$. Let us assume that $H$ is non-negative in a neighborhood of $O$; here $H(Y(u, v))$ means $H(a(u, v), b(u, v))$. From Lemma 1 we see that an upper Bernstein pair $(U^+, \psi^+)$ for $(\Gamma_1, H)$ exists, where $U^+ = \Omega \cap B_{\tau}(O)$ and $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \cap B_{\tau}(O)$ for some $\tau > 0$; let $q$ denote a modulus of continuity for $\psi^+$. Then $T\psi^+ \cdot \nu = +1$ (in the sense of [23]) on $\Gamma_1$ and, for each $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, $Q(\psi^+ + C) = Q(\psi^+) \leq 0$ on $\Omega \cap U^+$ or equivalently

$$N(\psi^+ + C)(x) \leq 2H(x) = Nf(x) \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega \cap U^+. \tag{9}$$

From the Courant-Lebesgue Lemma, we see that there exists $\rho = \rho(\delta, w) \in (\delta, \sqrt{\delta})$ such that the arclength $l_\rho = l_{p(\delta, w)}$ of $Y(C_{p(\delta, w)}(w))$ is less than $p(\delta)$, for each $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $w \in \partial E$.

Let us assume that $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is small enough that $p(\delta) < \tau$, so that $G(w) \in U^+$ for each $w \in E$ with $|w - o| \leq \sqrt{\delta}$ and $G(w) \in \Gamma_1$ for each $w \in \partial E$ with $|w - o| \leq \sqrt{\delta}$. Now $\psi^+ - \psi^+(x) \leq q(p(\delta))$ in $E_{p(\delta, o)}(o)$ for any $x \in E_{p(\delta, o)}(o)$ and the general comparison principle ([12, Theorem 5.1]) implies that if $U \subseteq E_{p(\delta, o)}(o)$ is an open set, then

$$f \leq \sup_{\Omega \cap \partial U} f + \psi^+ - \inf_{\Omega \cap \partial U} \psi^+ \leq \sup_{\Omega \cap \partial U} f + q(p(\delta)) \quad \text{in} \quad U. \tag{10}$$

Set

$$k(\delta) = \inf_{u \in C_{p(\delta, o)}(o)} c(u) = \inf_{x \in C_{p(\delta, o)}(o)} f(x).$$

Now $f \leq k(\delta) + p(\delta)$ on $C_{p(\delta, o)}(o)$ and $\psi^+ - \inf_{C_{p(\delta, o)}(o)} \psi^+ \leq q(p(\delta))$ in $E_{p(\delta, o)}(o)$ and so (10) implies

$$f \leq k(\delta) + p(\delta) + \psi^+ - \inf_{C_{p(\delta, o)}(o)} \psi^+ \leq k(\delta) + p(\delta) + q(p(\delta))$$

or

$$\sup_{E_{p(\delta, o)}(o)} f \leq \inf_{C_{p(\delta, o)}(o)} f + p(\delta) + q(p(\delta)). \tag{11}$$
Since \( \sup_{E_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o)} f \geq z_2 \),

\[
(12) \quad \inf_{C_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o)} f \geq z_2 - p(\delta) - q(p(\delta)) = z_2 - o(\delta) \quad \text{for each } \delta > 0.
\]

Let \( z(\delta) = z_2 - 2p(\delta) - q(p(\delta)) \) and

\[ M(\delta) = \{ x \in \Omega \cap E_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o) : f(x) > z(\delta) \}. \]

(Recall \( f \in C^0(\Omega \setminus \{ o \}) \) and \( c \in C^0(\mathbb{E} \setminus \{ o \}) \).) Then for each \( \delta \in (0, p^{-1}(\tau)), \) \( (12) \) implies \( f \geq z_2 - 2p(\delta) - q(p(\delta)) > z(\delta) \) on \( C_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o) \) and so

\[ C_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o) \subset M(\delta) \quad \text{and} \quad O \in \overline{M(\delta)}, \]

Let \( V(\delta) \) denote the component of \( M(\delta) \) which contains \( C_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o) \). We claim that \( O \in \overline{V(\delta)}. \) Suppose otherwise; then there is a curve \( I \) in \( E_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o) \) (with endpoints \( x^- \in \partial^- \Omega \) and \( x^+ \in \partial^+ \Omega \) such that \( f \leq z(\delta) \) on \( I \). Let \( \Omega(I) \) be the component of \( \Omega \setminus I \) whose closure contains \( O \). Then \( (10) \) implies that

\[ f \leq \sup_I f + q(p(\delta)) \leq z(\delta) + q(p(\delta)) = z_2 - 2p(\delta) \quad \text{in } \Omega(I) \]

and so \( \limsup_{E_{\rho(\delta, o)}(o)} c(w) \leq z_2 - 2p(\delta) < z_2 \), which is a contradiction; hence no such curve \( I \) exists and \( O \in \overline{V(\delta)}. \)

Now \( f \geq z(\delta) \) in \( V(\delta) \) for each \( \delta \in (0, p^{-1}(\tau)). \) Let \( C \) be any curve in \( \Omega \) which starts at a point \( x_0 \in C_{\rho(\rho^{-1}(\tau), o)}(o) \) and ends at \( O \) such that

\[ C \subset V(\delta) \quad \text{for each } \delta \in (0, p^{-1}(\tau)). \]

Since \( \liminf_{C \ni x \to O} f(x) \geq \lim_{\delta \to 0} z(\delta) = z_2 \) and \( z_2 = \limsup_{\Omega \ni x \to O} f(x) \), we see that

\[
(13) \quad \lim_{C \ni x \to O} f(x) = z_2.
\]

We may, if we wish, extend \( C \) by adding to \( C \) a curve from \( x_0 \) to a point on \( \partial \Omega \setminus E_{\rho(\rho^{-1}(\tau), o)}(o) \).

Now we modify the argument in the proof of \([3] \) Theorem 2] to show that \( Rf(\theta) = z_2 \) for all \( \theta \in (\alpha, \beta) \); that is, we shall show that the nontangential limit of \( f \) at \( O \) exists and equals \( z_2 \). Let \( \alpha' \), \( \beta' \in (\alpha, \beta) \) with \( \alpha' < \beta' \).

**Figure 2.** \( \Omega, A_- \) and \( C \) (left) \( \Omega_2 \) (right)

Let \( H_0 = \sup_{B_{r_0}(O) \cap \Omega} \) and fix \( c_0 \in \left( -\frac{1}{4c_0H_0}, 0 \right) \). Set \( r_1 = \frac{1-\sqrt{1+4c_0H_0}}{2H_0} \) and \( r_2 = \frac{1+\sqrt{1+4c_0H_0}}{2H_0} \) (see \([21] \) p. 171), \([13] \). Let \( A_\pm \) be annuli with inner boundaries \( \partial_\pm A_\pm \) with equal radii \( r_1 \) and outer boundaries \( \partial_\pm A_\pm \) with equal radii \( r_2 \) such that \( O \in \partial_1 A_+ \cap \partial_1 A_- \), \( \partial_1 A_+ \) is tangent to the ray \( \theta = \beta' \) at \( O \), \( \partial_1 A_- \) is tangent to
the ray $\theta = \alpha'$ at $\partial$ and $\partial A_\pm \cap \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : 0 < r < \delta_0, \alpha' < \theta < \beta'\} = \emptyset$ (see Figure 2). Let $h_\pm = h(\hat{r}_\pm)$ denote unduloid surfaces defined respectively on $A_\pm$ with constant mean curvature $-H_0$ which become vertical at $\hat{r}_\pm = r_1, r_2$ and make contact angles of $\pi$ and $0$ with the vertical cylinders $\hat{r}_\pm = r_2$ and $\hat{r}_\pm = r_1$ respectively, where $\hat{r}_+(x) = |x - c_+|$, $\hat{r}_-(x) = |x - c_-|$, $c_+$ denotes the center of the annulus $A_+$ and $c_-$ denotes the center of the annulus $A_-$. With respect to the upward direction, the graphs of $h_\pm$ over $A_\pm$ have constant mean curvature $-H_0$ and the graphs of $-h_\pm$ over $A_\pm$ have constant mean curvature $H_0$.

Set $\tau_1 = \min\{r_1, r_2 - r_1\}$. Let $\delta \in (0, p^{-1}(\tau_1))$. Since $C$ is a curve in $\Omega$ with $\partial$ as an endpoint, there exists $x(\delta) \in C \cap C_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}(\partial)$ such that the portion $C(\delta)$ of $C$ between $\partial$ and $x(\delta)$ lies in $E_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}(\partial)$ and divides $E_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}(\partial)$ into two components. Let $U_+$ be the component of $E'_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}(\partial) \setminus C(\delta)$ whose closure contains a portion of $\partial^+ \Omega$ and $U_-$ be the component of $E'_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}(\partial) \setminus C(\delta)$ whose closure contains a portion of $\partial^- \Omega$ (see Figure 3 with $C_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}'(\partial)$ (green) and $C$ (red)).

**Figure 3. Left: $U_+$ (yellow), $U_-$ (blue); Right: $C(\delta)$ (red)**

Since $C(\delta) \subset V(\delta)$,

$$f(x) \geq z(\delta) \quad \text{for} \quad x \in C(\delta)$$

and, in particular, $f(x(\delta)) \geq z(\delta)$. Since $|f(x(\delta)) - f(y)| \leq l(\rho(\delta, \alpha)) < \rho(\delta)$, we see that

$$f \geq z(\delta) - \rho(\delta) \quad \text{on} \quad C_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}'(\partial) \cup C(\delta).$$

Let $q_2$ denote a modulus of continuity of $-h(\hat{r}_+)$. Then

$$f \geq z(\delta) - \rho(\delta) - q_2(\rho(\delta)) \quad \text{in} \quad U_+ \setminus \overline{B_{r_1}(c_+)}. $$

Thus

$$\liminf_{U_+ \setminus \overline{B_{r_1}(c_+)} \to \partial} f(x) \geq z_2.$$

If we set $\Omega_1 = U_+ \setminus \overline{B_{r_1}(c_+)}$ and recall that $z_2 = \limsup_{\Omega \to \partial} f(x)$, we have

$$\lim_{\Omega_1 \to \partial} f(x) = z_2. \quad (14)$$

(We note that $\Omega_1$ might not be connected (see Figure 4) and might even have an infinite number of components but one sees that this does not affect the comparison argument which establishes (14).) In a similar manner, we see that

$$\lim_{\Omega_2 \to \partial} f(x) = z_2, \quad (15)$$

where $\Omega_2 = U_\setminus \overline{B_{r_1}(c_-)}$. Since $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup C(\delta) = E'_{\rho(\delta, \alpha)}(\partial) \setminus (\overline{B_{r_1}(c_+) \cup B_{r_1}(c_-)})$, we see that $Rf(\theta) = z_2$ for each $\theta \in (\alpha', \beta')$. Since $\alpha'$ and $\beta'$ are arbitrary (with $\alpha < \alpha' < \beta' < \beta$), Theorem 3 is proven. \qed
Remark 1. If $\beta - \alpha < \pi$, then the existence of the one-sided barrier $\psi^+$ is uncertain and so the proof that a curve (i.e. $C$) in $\Omega$ with $\mathcal{O}$ as an endpoint such that (13) holds is uncertain.

Proof of Theorem 2: All of the claims in the theorem except those in the last sentence follow from [9, Theorem 1] and [5] (when $\beta - \alpha > \pi$) and [9, Theorem 2] and [5] (when $\beta - \alpha < \pi$). (When $\beta - \alpha = \pi$, all of the claims follow from Theorem 1 and [11].) The claims follow once we prove that the results of [11] hold under the assumptions of Theorem 2. Let us assume

\begin{equation}
\limsup_{\partial^+ \Omega \ni x \to \mathcal{O}} (\kappa(x) + 2|H(x)|) < 0.
\end{equation}

Suppose $\beta - \alpha > \pi$. Let $\delta_1 > 0$ be small enough that $B_{\delta_1}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \Omega \setminus \Sigma^+$ has two components. Let $\Omega^+$ be the component whose closure contains $B_{\delta_1}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial^+ \Omega$ and notice that the tangent directions to $\partial \Omega^+$ at $\mathcal{O}$ are $\alpha' = \beta - \pi$ and $\beta$ and the curvature $\kappa_+(\mathcal{O})$ of $\partial \Omega^+$ at $\mathcal{O}$ satisfies

$$\kappa_+(\mathcal{O}) < -2H(\mathcal{O})$$

since $\kappa_+(x) = \kappa(x)$ for $x \in B_{\delta_1}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial^+ \Omega$ and (16) implies

$$\kappa_+(\mathcal{O}) = \limsup_{\partial^+ \Omega \ni x \to \mathcal{O}} \kappa_+(x) < -2|H(\mathcal{O})|.$$ 

By restricting $f$ to $\Omega^+$, we see that the existence of $Rf(\beta)$ follows from [11]. A similar argument implies $Rf(\alpha)$ also exists.

Suppose $\beta - \alpha < \pi$. Then $Rf(\alpha)$ exists and equals $m$. Let $\delta_1 > 0$ be small enough that $B_{\delta_1}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \Omega \setminus \Sigma^+$ has two components and let $\Omega^+$ be the component which contains $B_{\delta_1}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \Omega$. Then the tangent directions to $\partial \Omega^+$ at $\mathcal{O}$ are $\alpha' = \beta - \pi$ and $\beta$ and, as before, the curvature $\kappa_+(\mathcal{O})$ of $\partial \Omega^+$ at $\mathcal{O}$ satisfies $\kappa_+(\mathcal{O}) < -2H(\mathcal{O})$. Thus upper and lower Bernstein pairs $(U^+, \psi^+)$ exist for $\Gamma = B_{\delta_2}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \partial \Omega^+$ and $H$ when $\delta_2 \in (0, \delta_1)$ is sufficiently small and $U^+ = B_{\delta_2}(\mathcal{O}) \cap \Omega^+$. We may parametrize $S_1 = S_0 \cap (B_{\delta_2}(\mathcal{O}) \times \mathbb{R})$ in isothermal coordinates

\begin{equation}
Y(u, v) = (a(u, v), b(u, v), c(u, v)) \in C^2(E : S_1)
\end{equation}

as in [11] with the properties noted there (e.g. $a_1, \ldots, a_5$) and prove in essentially the same manner as in [11] that $Y$ is uniformly continuous on $E$ and so extends to a continuous function on $E$. (Notice the similarity of methods used in [9] and [11].) The existence of $Rf(\beta)$ then follows as in [11]. \qed
Figure 5. $\Omega_+$ when $\beta - \alpha > \pi$ (left) $\Omega_+$ when $\beta - \alpha < \pi$ (right)
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