

# GEOMETRIC INEQUALITIES INVOLVING MEAN CURVATURE FOR CONVEX SURFACES

TATSUYA MIURA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we obtain some geometric inequalities for closed surfaces in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Motivated by Gage's inequality for convex curves, we prove that for convex surfaces the Willmore energy is bounded below by a quantity arising from the time-derivative of the isoperimetric ratio under mean curvature flow. In particular we find that there exists a convex mean curvature flow that increases the isoperimetric ratio locally-in-time. Our inequality also implies an optimal scaling law between the Willmore energy and the isoperimetric ratio under convexity. As a byproduct we prove that Topping's conjecture relating diameter and total mean curvature holds true for every convex surface, and also for every simply-connected axisymmetric surface.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A classical isoperimetric inequality by Gage [6] asserts that

$$(1.1) \quad \int_{\gamma} \kappa^2 \geq \pi \frac{L}{A}$$

holds for every convex Jordan curve  $\gamma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $\kappa$ ,  $L$ ,  $A$  denote the curvature, the length, and the enclosed area, respectively. The equality is attained only by a round circle. Inequality (1.1) multiplied by  $L$  relates the normalized bending energy and the isoperimetric ratio, which are different order measurements of roundness, as both are scale invariant and minimized by round circles. As a corollary we deduce that *every curve shortening flow of convex curves decreases the isoperimetric ratio*. This is a direct consequence of (1.1) and the derivative formula along a curve shortening flow  $\{\gamma_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ :

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{L^2}{A} \right) = -2 \frac{L}{A} \left( \int_{\gamma_t} \kappa^2 - \pi \frac{L}{A} \right).$$

The convexity assumption in (1.1) is necessary due to a dumbbell-like curve with a long thin neck, for which the length can be solely large. See also recent progress [1, 5] in which a weaker inequality is established even for nonconvex curves.

In this paper we aim at extending Gage's inequality to convex closed surfaces in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . To this end we first look at the behavior of the isoperimetric ratio under mean curvature flow, namely a one-parameter family of smooth closed surfaces  $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$

---

*Date:* April 6, 2020.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 49Q10, 52A15, 52A40, 53A05, 53C42.

*Key words and phrases.* Willmore energy, Total mean curvature, Convex surface, Diameter, Isoperimetric ratio, Mean curvature flow.

whose normal velocity coincides with the mean curvature. Standard first variation formulae imply that the isoperimetric ratio  $I = A^{\frac{3}{2}}/V$  satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{dI}{dt} = -\frac{A^{\frac{1}{2}}}{V} \left( 3 \int_{\Sigma_t} H^2 - \frac{A}{V} \int_{\Sigma_t} H \right),$$

where  $A$  denotes the surface area,  $V$  the enclosed volume, and  $H$  the inward mean curvature scalar, defined by the *average* of principle curvatures so that  $H \equiv 1$  for the unit sphere. Note that for round spheres the right-hand side of (1.2) is always zero, and this is compatible with the fact that round spheres are self-shrinkers.

Our main result ensures that for convex surfaces the so-called Willmore energy  $\int H^2$  can be related with the remaining term  $\frac{A}{V} \int H$  in a similar way to (1.1).

**Theorem 1.1.** *There exists a universal constant  $C \geq 4$  such that*

$$(1.3) \quad C \int_{\Sigma} H^2 \geq \frac{A}{V} \int_{\Sigma} H$$

*holds for every smooth closed convex surface  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . In addition, for every  $C < 4$  there exists a convex surface for which (1.3) does not hold.*

We thus obtain a higher dimensional version of Gage's inequality up to a universal constant (for example, we can take  $C = 108\pi$ ). On the other hand, we also discover the necessary lower bound  $C \geq 4$  due to a *cigar-like surface*  $\Sigma_\varepsilon$ , namely a cylinder of radius  $\varepsilon \ll 1$  and height 1 capped by hemispheres, which satisfies

$$\int_{\Sigma_\varepsilon} H^2 \approx \left(\frac{\varepsilon^{-1}}{2}\right)^2 2\pi\varepsilon = \frac{\pi}{2\varepsilon}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A}{V} \int_{\Sigma_\varepsilon} H \approx \frac{2\pi\varepsilon}{\pi\varepsilon^2} \left(\left(\frac{\varepsilon^{-1}}{2}\right)2\pi\varepsilon\right) = \frac{2\pi}{\varepsilon}.$$

In particular,  $C = 3$  is not allowable; this fact with (1.2) highlights the significant difference from curve shortening flow that *there exists a convex mean curvature flow that increases the isoperimetric ratio in a short time interval*. This should be also compared with classical well-known results by Huisken [8], which give several evidences that ‘‘convex mean curvature flows become spherical’’; namely, every convex initial surface retains convexity before shrinking to a point in finite time, and a normalized flow converges to a round sphere. In addition, we should also recall that under mean curvature flow the isoperimetric difference  $A^{\frac{3}{2}} - 6\sqrt{\pi}V$  always monotonically decreases, see e.g. [21, 17].

Since it turned out that an ‘‘optimal shape’’ for (1.3) is not a round sphere, we are now lead to seek another form that is potentially optimized by a sphere. From this point of view it is worth mentioning that, combining (1.3) with Minkowski's inequality (see e.g. (24) in [2, §20], or [16, Notes for Section 6.2]):

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\Sigma} H \geq \sqrt{4\pi A} \quad \text{for convex } \Sigma,$$

we can directly relate the Willmore energy and the isoperimetric ratio  $I = A^{\frac{3}{2}}/V$ .

**Corollary 1.2.** *There exists a universal constant  $C' \geq 3/(2\sqrt{\pi})$  such that*

$$(1.5) \quad C' \int_{\Sigma} H^2 \geq I$$

*holds for every smooth closed convex surface  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ . For  $C' < 3/(2\sqrt{\pi})$  a round sphere does not satisfy (1.5).*

The lower bound of  $C'$  is due to a round sphere, in contrast to  $C$ . In fact, we expect that the nature of (1.5) is quite different from that of (1.3) in view of the optimal constants  $C = \sup_{\Sigma} E$  and  $C' = \sup_{\Sigma} E'$ , where  $E := (\frac{A}{V} \int H)(\int H^2)^{-1}$  and  $E' := I(\int H^2)^{-1}$ , in the framework of convex surfaces  $\Sigma$ . One reason is that for a cigar-like surface  $\Sigma_{\varepsilon}$  with  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ , we already know  $E(\Sigma_{\varepsilon}) \approx 4 > 3 = E(\mathbb{S}^2)$ , while  $E'(\Sigma_{\varepsilon}) = O(\varepsilon^{1/2}) \rightarrow 0$ . The optimal values of  $C$  and  $C'$  are both left open. At this time, only  $E'$  has potential to be optimized by a round sphere.

Both estimates (1.3) and (1.5) are optimal in view of scaling law. Indeed, for a *pancake-like surface*  $\Sigma_{\varepsilon}$  with  $\varepsilon \ll 1$ , namely the surface surrounding the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood of a flat disk, both sides in (1.5) (and hence (1.3)) diverge as  $O(\varepsilon^{-1})$ .

The convexity assumption in (1.3) and (1.5) is unremovable as in Gage's result. Indeed, for a well-known example of a nearly double-sphere connected by a catenoid, the left-hand sides in (1.3) and (1.5) diverge, while the Willmore energy remains less than  $8\pi$ , cf. [18, 10].

Estimate (1.5) is meaningful only in the large-deviation regime ( $I \gg 1$ ), although Gage's inequality is optimal even for nearly round curves. A kind of small-deviation counterpart of (1.5) is already obtained by Röger-Schätzle [15]. They show that every closed surface  $\Sigma$  with  $I(\Sigma) - I(\mathbb{S}^2) \leq \sigma$  (not necessarily convex) satisfies

$$(1.6) \quad \bar{C} \left( \int_{\Sigma} H^2 - \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} H^2 \right) \geq I(\Sigma) - I(\mathbb{S}^2) \quad \text{for some } \bar{C}(\sigma) > 0.$$

The presence of  $\sigma > 0$  is in general necessary due to nearly double-spheres, but Corollary 1.2 now implies that if we assume that  $\Sigma$  is convex, then (1.6) holds for some universal constant  $\bar{C}$  (not depending on  $\sigma$ ).

The main difficulty of Theorem 1.1 is how to relate the Willmore energy and other quantities. Röger-Schätzle's idea in [15] is to use de Lellis-Müller's rigidity estimate for nearly umbilical spheres [4], and hence not applicable to our large-deviation regime. In addition, although many inequalities involving total mean curvature are known for convex surfaces, e.g. by using the mean-width representation (cf. [2]), much less is known about the Willmore energy. In particular, we cannot obtain our estimates via the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality  $\int H^2 \geq A^{-1}(\int H)^2$  since this is not sharp for pancake-like surfaces.

Our key idea is to bridge between the Willmore energy and other quantities by the "degeneracy"  $\mathcal{D}$  of a surface (defined in Section 2), which is a scale invariant quantity measuring a certain degree of collapse. In terms of degeneracy  $\mathcal{D}$ , we establish a key estimate for convex surfaces of the form

$$(1.7) \quad \text{diam}(\Sigma)^{p-2} \int_{\Sigma} H^p > c_p \mathcal{D}^{p-1}, \quad \text{where } 1 \leq p < \infty,$$

where  $\text{diam}(\Sigma)$  denotes the extrinsic diameter. Theorem 1.1 then follows by (1.7) with  $p = 2$  and by the additional estimate that  $\mathcal{D} \gtrsim \frac{A}{V} \int H$ . The proof of (1.7) is based on a slicing argument with the help of geometric restriction due to convexity. As a key ingredient we also use the general scaling law  $\int |\kappa|^p \gtrsim r^{1-p}$  for each cross section plane curve, where  $r$  is the minimal width of the curve.

We finally remark that our explicit choice of  $c_p$  in (1.7) is not optimal in general but sharp as  $p \rightarrow 1$ , and in particular  $c_1 = \pi$  agrees with the optimal constant in a conjecture of Topping posed in 1998:

**Conjecture** (Topping [21]). *Let  $\Sigma$  be a connected closed surface smoothly immersed into  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then*

$$(1.8) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |H| > \pi \operatorname{diam}(\Sigma).$$

The constant  $\pi$  cannot be improved due to cigar-like surfaces. In [22] Topping himself already proves a modified version of (1.8), which weakens  $\pi$  to  $\frac{\pi}{32}$  but strengthens  $\operatorname{diam}(\Sigma)$  to the intrinsic diameter (and also deals with higher dimensions). Concerning the exact form of (1.8), to the best of our knowledge, the only known case is for constant mean curvature (CMC) surfaces [20]; for CMC surfaces even  $\int |H| \geq 2\pi \operatorname{diam}(\Sigma)$  holds true, with equality only for a round sphere, and hence this class does not contain optimal shapes.

Our estimate (1.7) with  $p = 1$  directly verifies Topping's conjecture for convex surfaces. This class would be reasonable to consider since it includes optimal cigar-like surfaces. However, this convex case is fairly easier from a technical point of view, and in fact follows by the co-area formula with a simple estimate (as opposed to the case of  $p > 1$ ). Of more interest is when such an argument is not directly applicable. The simplest example would be a dumbbell-shaped surface. Indeed, even if a dumbbell is so long that the diameter is attained in the neck-direction, the co-area formula in that direction may involve a part where the mean curvature vanishes, so that we cannot directly extract the diameter and do need to think of more nontrivial quantitative competition. In this paper we take into further consideration and prove Topping's conjecture also for certain axisymmetric surfaces (including dumbbells).

**Theorem 1.3.** *Topping's conjecture (1.8) holds true if  $\Sigma$  is convex, or if  $\Sigma$  is simply-connected and axisymmetric.*

In the proof, given an axisymmetric  $\Sigma$ , we construct a comparison convex surface  $\Sigma'$  such that  $\int_{\Sigma} |H| \geq \int_{\Sigma'} |H|$  and  $\operatorname{diam}(\Sigma') \geq \operatorname{diam}(\Sigma)$  by using a rearrangement argument introduced in [3], in which Minkowski's inequality (1.4) is extended to certain axisymmetric surfaces. Since the total mean curvature is already well studied in [3], our main contribution in this argument is concerning the diameter, which possesses substantial difficulties due to its pointwise nature.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove estimate (1.7) involving degeneracy. In Section 3 we relate several geometric quantities with degeneracy, and in particular complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

## 2. DEGENERACY ESTIMATE

We first define the degeneracy of a convex surface  $\Sigma$ . For a unit vector  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  the width (breath) of  $\Sigma$  in the direction  $\omega$  is defined by

$$b_{\Sigma}(\omega) := \max\{(q - q') \cdot \omega \mid q, q' \in \Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3\},$$

where  $\cdot$  denotes the inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The extrinsic diameter of  $\Sigma$  is given by

$$\operatorname{diam}(\Sigma) := \max\{b_{\Sigma}(\omega) \mid \omega \in \mathbb{S}^2\}.$$

Then we define the *degeneracy*  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $\Sigma$  by

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{D}(\Sigma) := \max \left\{ \frac{b_{\Sigma}(\omega_0)}{b_{\Sigma}(\omega)} \mid \begin{array}{l} \omega, \omega_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2, \omega \cdot \omega_0 = 0, \\ b_{\Sigma}(\omega_0) = \operatorname{diam}(\Sigma) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Note that the degeneracy  $\mathcal{D}$  is comparable with the ratio (diameter)/(minimal width) up to universal constants, but slightly different as  $\omega$  is taken from the orthogonal complement of a diameter-direction  $\omega_0$ . Here we adopt this  $\mathcal{D}$  for computational simplicity.

Now we are in a position to state (1.7) rigorously. For later use in Section 4, we deal with surfaces of class  $C^{1,1}$ , for which the curvature energy is still well defined as the class  $C^{1,1}$  is identified by the Sobolev one  $W^{2,\infty}$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Every convex surface  $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  of class  $C^{1,1}$  satisfies*

$$(2.2) \quad \text{diam}(\Sigma)^{p-2} \int_{\Sigma} H^p > c_p \mathcal{D}^{p-1},$$

where  $c_p$  is a positive constant depending only on  $p$ . In particular, we can take

$$c_p = 2 \left( \int_0^{\infty} (1+t^2)^{\frac{1-3p}{2p}} dt \right)^p \left( 2 \int_0^{1/2} (1+t^{-2})^{\frac{1-p}{2}} dt \right).$$

*Remark 2.2.* The above choice yields the optimal constant  $c_1 = \pi$  only for  $p = 1$ . In the case of  $p = 2$ , we have  $c_2 = 2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \text{B} \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4} \right) \right)^2 (\sqrt{5} - 2) = 0.6777700\dots \geq \frac{2}{3}$ , where B denotes the beta function.

Our proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on a slicing argument, and hence it is important to gain scale-analytic insight into the curvature energy for plane curves; such a point of view played important roles in previous variational studies of elastic curves, see e.g. [12, 13, 14]. In this paper we use the fact that each cross section curve of a convex surface has a lower bound (also valid for nonconvex curves).

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $p \geq 1$ . For an immersed closed plane curve  $\gamma$  of class  $C^{1,1}$  bounded by two parallel lines of distance  $r > 0$ , we have*

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{\gamma} |\kappa|^p ds \geq \tilde{c}_p r^{1-p},$$

where  $\kappa$  denotes the curvature and  $s$  the arclength parameter of  $\gamma$ , and

$$\tilde{c}_p = 2 \left( 2 \int_0^{\infty} (1+t^2)^{\frac{1-3p}{2p}} dt \right)^p = 2 \left( \text{B} \left( \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2p-1}{2p} \right) \right)^p.$$

*Proof.* Up to rescaling we may assume that  $r = 1$ . In addition, up to a rigid motion, we may assume that  $\gamma$  lies in the strip region  $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$ . Then the curve  $\gamma$  contains at least two disjoint graph curves represented by functions  $u_i : (a_i, b_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) with  $0 \leq a_i \leq b_i \leq 1$  such that  $u_i'(c_i) = 0$  at some  $c_i \in (a_i, b_i)$ , and  $|u_i(x)| \rightarrow \infty$  both as  $x \downarrow a_i$  and as  $x \uparrow b_i$ ; indeed, such graphs are found near the maximum and minimum of  $\gamma$  in the vertical direction. Dropping the index  $i$ , we now prove for the graph curve  $G_u := \{(x, u(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in [a, b]\}$  that

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{G_u} |\kappa|^p ds \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_p}{2},$$

which implies (2.3) after addition with respect to the two graphs.

We begin with the direct computation that

$$\int_{G_u} |\kappa|^p ds = \int_a^b \left( \frac{|u''|}{(1+|u'|^2)^{3/2}} \right)^p \sqrt{1+|u'|^2} dx = \int_a^b \left| (f(u'))' \right|^p dx,$$

where  $f(t) := \int_0^t (1 + \tau^2)^{\frac{1-3p}{2p}} d\tau$ . Applying the Hölder inequality to the right-hand side, and recalling that  $b - a \leq 1$ , we have

$$\int_{G_u} |\kappa|^p ds \geq \left( \int_a^b |(f(u'))'| dx \right)^p.$$

Now for (2.4) it suffices to prove

$$\int_a^b |(f(u'))'| dx \geq 2 \int_0^\infty f'(t) dt = \left( \frac{\tilde{c}_p}{2} \right)^{1/p}.$$

This follows by decomposing the left-hand side's integration interval at  $c \in (a, b)$  (where  $u'(c) = 0$ ) and by using, for each of the two integrals, the triangle inequality  $\int |(f(u'))'| \geq |\int (f(u'))'|$ , the boundary conditions  $|u'(a+0)| = |u'(b-0)| = \infty$  and  $u'(c) = 0$ , and also the oddness of  $f$ .  $\square$

In the case of  $p = 2$ , the same kind of lemma is obtained in [13, Lemma 4.3]. In addition, Henrot-Mounjid [7] study a closely related problem, which minimizes the same curvature energy with  $p = 2$  among convex curves of prescribed inradius  $r_{\text{in}}$ ; the inradius is always bounded by the half-width  $r/2$ . The constants in both [7, 13] are represented by using  $\cos \theta$ , but they are in fact same as our constant  $\tilde{c}_p$  with  $p = 2$  after a change of variables. In view of this, we can also represent  $\tilde{c}_p$  as

$$\tilde{c}_p = 2 \left( 2 \int_0^{\pi/2} (\cos \theta)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} d\theta \right)^p.$$

*Remark 2.4* (Optimality of  $\tilde{c}_p$ ). Compared to  $c_p$  in Theorem 2.1, the value of  $\tilde{c}_p$  is more important because of its optimality. Below we briefly argue the optimality, assuming  $p > 1$ ; the case of  $p = 1$  is trivial. Let  $f$  be as in the proof of Lemma 2.3. Let  $u : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the primitive function of the increasing function  $f^{-1}(Ax)$ , where  $A := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) \in (0, \infty)$ , such that  $u(0) = 0$ . Then  $u$  is a symmetric convex function such that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm 1} |u'(x)| = \infty$ , and also  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm 1} |u(x)|$  is defined as a finite value because for  $x \in (0, 1)$  we have

$$u(x) = \int_0^x f^{-1}(Ay) dy = \frac{1}{A} \int_0^{f^{-1}(Ax)} z f'(z) dz,$$

and  $z f'(z) \sim z^{\frac{1-2p}{p}}$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$ , where the exponent  $\frac{1-2p}{p}$  is strictly less than  $-1$ . In addition, we have the identity  $(f(u'))' \equiv A$  so that in view of the Hölder inequality in the proof of Lemma 2.3, it is straightforward to check that a closed convex curve made by connecting the graph curve of  $u$  and its vertical reflection attains the equality in (2.3) for  $r = 2$ . Notice that the resulting closed curve is not only of class  $C^{1,1}$  but also  $C^2$ ; the only nontrivial point is whether the curvature is well defined where the two graph curves are connected, but in fact the curvature vanishes there since  $(f(u'))' = |\kappa|^p \sqrt{1 + |u'|^2}$  is constant while  $|u'(x)| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $|x| \rightarrow 1$ . We finally remark that when  $p = 2$ , the graph curve of  $u$  corresponds to the so-called rectangular elastica, and our closed curve coincides with the one constructed by Henrot-Mounjid.

Now we turn to the proof of Theorem 2.1.

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* Up to rescaling we may assume that  $\text{diam}(\Sigma) = 1$  and only need to prove that

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\Sigma} H^p > c_p \mathcal{D}^{p-1}.$$

Choose one direction  $\omega \in \mathbb{S}^2$  such that  $b_{\Sigma}(\omega) = 1$  ( $= \text{diam}(\Sigma)$ ). Up to a rigid motion, we may assume that the height function  $h(q) := q \cdot \omega$  maps  $\Sigma$  to  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\Sigma_t$  denote the cross section  $\{q \in \Sigma \mid h(q) = t\}$  for  $t \in (0, 1)$ . In addition, let  $\theta_{\omega} \in [0, \pi]$  denote the angle between  $\omega$  and the outer unit normal  $\nu$  of  $\Sigma$ , so that  $\cos \theta_{\omega} = \nu \cdot \omega$ . Note that  $\sin \theta_{\omega} > 0$  for  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Then the co-area formula yields

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{\Sigma} H^p d\mathcal{H}^2 = \int_0^1 \int_{\Sigma_t} \frac{H^p}{\sin \theta_{\omega}} d\mathcal{H}^1 dt,$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^d$  denotes the  $d$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. Moreover, at any point  $q \in \Sigma$  such that  $t = h(q) \in (0, 1)$  and such that the surface is twice differentiable, let  $k_{\Sigma_t}$  be the inward curvature of the cross section curve  $\Sigma_t$ , and let  $\kappa_{\omega}$  be the inward curvature of a (unique) curve contained in  $\Sigma$  and the plane  $P := q + \text{span}\{\nu(q), \omega\}$ . Then from a simple geometric calculation we deduce

$$(2.7) \quad 2H = k_{\Sigma_t} \sin \theta_{\omega} + \kappa_{\omega}.$$

Note that this holds for  $\mathcal{H}^2$ -a.e. point in  $\Sigma$ , e.g. by the Alexandrov theorem. Therefore, inserting (2.7) into (2.6), and using the fact that  $(X + Y)^p \geq X^p$  for  $X, Y \geq 0$  with equality only for  $Y = 0$ , we obtain

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{\Sigma} H^p d\mathcal{H}^2 > \frac{1}{2^p} \int_0^1 \int_{\Sigma_t} k_{\Sigma_t}^p (\sin \theta_{\omega})^{p-1} d\mathcal{H}^1 dt.$$

The strict positivity follows since otherwise  $\kappa_{\omega} \equiv 0$  a.e. but this contradicts the fact that  $\Sigma$  is closed e.g. in view of the Gauss-Bonnet theorem.

In what follows we deduce (2.5) from (2.8) by first estimating  $\sin \theta_{\omega}(q)$  only in terms of  $t = h(q)$ , and then using Lemma 2.3. (Notice that if  $p = 1$ , then (2.5) directly follows by (2.8) in view of  $\int_{\Sigma_t} k_{\Sigma_t} = 2\pi$ , but this case is also included in the general proof below.)

We first prove that for every  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $q \in \Sigma$  with  $t = h(q)$ ,

$$(2.9) \quad \sin \theta_{\omega}(q) \geq g(t) := \left(1 + \left(\frac{1}{2} - |t - \frac{1}{2}|\right)^{-2}\right)^{-1/2}.$$

By symmetry we only need to argue for  $t \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and prove that

$$(2.10) \quad \sin \theta_{\omega}(q) \geq (1 + t^{-2})^{-1/2}.$$

Fix  $q \in \Sigma$  (and hence also  $t = h(q) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ). Up to a rigid motion, we may assume that the maximum (resp. minimum) of the height function  $h$  is attained by  $(1, 0, 0)$  (resp.  $(0, 0, 0)$ ), so that  $\omega = (1, 0, 0)$  in particular, and also that there is some function

$$(2.11) \quad f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \text{ concave, } f(0) = f(1) = 0,$$

such that  $q \in G_f \subset \Sigma$ , where  $G_f := \{(x, 0, f(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x \in [0, 1]\}$ . Note that the upper bound  $f \leq 1$  follows since  $\text{diam}(\Sigma) = 1$ . Then an elementary geometry implies that  $\sin \theta_{\omega} \geq \sin \theta'_{\omega}$  for the angle  $\theta'_{\omega}$  between  $\omega$  and the normal  $(-f'(t), 0, 1)$  of  $f$ , that is,

$$(2.12) \quad \sin \theta_{\omega}(q) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |f'(t)|^2}}.$$

In addition, by the geometric restriction (2.11) of  $f$ , we have for  $t \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ,

$$(2.13) \quad |f'(t)| \leq \frac{1}{t}.$$

Indeed,  $f'(t) \leq 1/t$  holds since otherwise  $f'(x) > 1/t$  for  $x \in (0, t)$  by concavity but this contradicts  $f \leq 1$  and  $f(0) = 0$ ; by symmetry, using  $f(1) = 0$ , we also obtain  $f'(t) \geq 1/(1-t)$ ; since  $t \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , these two estimates imply (2.13). From (2.12) and (2.13) we deduce the desired (2.10).

Inserting (2.9) into (2.8), we now obtain

$$(2.14) \quad \int_{\Sigma} H^p d\mathcal{H}^2 > \frac{1}{2^p} \int_0^1 g(t)^{p-1} \int_{\Sigma_t} k_{\Sigma_t}^p d\mathcal{H}^1 dt.$$

By definition of  $\mathcal{D}$  (and  $\text{diam}(\Sigma) = 1$ ), we can apply Lemma 2.3 with  $r = 1/\mathcal{D}$  to  $\Sigma_t$  to the effect that

$$(2.15) \quad \int_{\Sigma_t} k_{\Sigma_t}^p d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq \tilde{c}_p \mathcal{D}^{p-1},$$

where the right-hand side does not depend on  $t$ . Therefore, inserting (2.15) to (2.14), we obtain the desired (2.5) for  $c_p := 2^{-p} \tilde{c}_p (\int_0^1 g(t)^{p-1} dt)$ ; this constant agrees with the one in the statement of Theorem 2.1 after simple calculations.  $\square$

### 3. RELATING DEGENERACY WITH OTHER GEOMETRIC QUANTITIES

In this section we relate the degeneracy  $\mathcal{D}$ , cf. (2.1), by other lower order quantities, and in particular prove Theorem 1.1. A key fact we use is the following scaling law (whose prefactor is not optimal).

**Lemma 3.1.** *For a convex surface  $\Sigma$ , we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \text{diam}(\Sigma) \frac{A}{V} \leq 36\mathcal{D}.$$

*Proof.* Up to rescaling we may assume that  $\text{diam}(\Sigma) = 1$ . Let  $r := 1/\mathcal{D}$  for notational simplicity. Fixing a diameter direction  $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{S}^2$  such that  $b_{\Sigma}(\omega_0) = 1$ , we let  $\rho_1 \in [r, 1]$  denote the maximal width among all directions orthogonal to  $\omega_0$ , that is,  $\rho_1 := \max\{b_{\Sigma}(\omega) \mid \omega \cdot \omega_0 = 0\}$ , and  $\omega_1 \in \mathbb{S}^2$  be a maximizer so that  $b_{\Sigma}(\omega_1) = \rho_1$  and  $\omega_1 \cdot \omega_0 = 0$ . We now separately prove

$$(3.2) \quad A(\Sigma) \leq 6\rho_1 \quad \text{and} \quad V(\Sigma) \geq \frac{r\rho_1}{6},$$

which immediately imply  $A/V \leq 36/r = 36\mathcal{D}$ .

To this end we use the fact that there exists a rectangular (convex body)  $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  containing  $\Sigma$  such that each side is perpendicular to one of  $\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2$ , where  $\omega_2 \in \mathbb{S}^2$  is chosen to be orthogonal to both  $\omega_0$  and  $\omega_1$ , and such that the side-lengths of  $Q$  are  $1, \rho_1, \rho_2$ , where  $\rho_2 := b_{\Sigma}(\omega_2) \in [r, \rho_1]$ . Then the first estimate in (3.2) follows by the area-monotonicity of convex surfaces that  $\Sigma \subset Q \Rightarrow A(\Sigma) \leq A(\partial Q)$ , which combined with  $\rho_2 \leq \rho_1 \leq 1$  implies that  $A(\Sigma) \leq A(\partial Q) = 2(\rho_2 + \rho_1 + \rho_1\rho_2) \leq 6\rho_1$ . For the second estimate in (3.2) we further use the fact that  $\Sigma$  touches all sides of  $Q$ . More precisely, assuming without loss of generality that  $\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2$  form the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and that  $Q = [0, 1] \times [0, \rho_1] \times [0, \rho_2]$ , we can find points in  $\Sigma \cap \partial Q$  of the form

$$(3.3) \quad (0, a_1, a_2), (1, a'_1, a'_2), (a_3, 0, a_4), (a'_3, \rho, a'_4), (a_5, a_6, 0), (a'_5, a'_6, r) \in \Sigma \cap \partial Q.$$



In addition, since  $\omega_0$  and  $\omega_1$  are defined via maximization, we have

$$(3.4) \quad a_i = a'_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 4.$$

Then the polyhedron  $P$  defined by the convex hull of the points in (3.3) is enclosed by  $\Sigma$ , and in addition under the constraint (3.4) we deduce from a direct computation that the enclosed volume of  $P$  is  $\rho_2\rho_1/6$ , so that  $V(\Sigma) \geq \rho_2\rho_1/6 \geq r\rho_1/6$ . The proof is complete.  $\square$

We are now in a position to complete the proof of our main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* By Theorem 2.1 with  $p = 2$  and Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$\text{diam}(\Sigma) \frac{A}{V} \leq \frac{36}{c_2} \int_{\Sigma} H^2.$$

In addition, since the total mean curvature of a convex surface can be represented by the mean width, namely  $\int_{\Sigma} H = 2\pi B$ , where  $B = \frac{1}{|\mathbb{S}^2|} \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} b_{\Sigma}(\nu) dS(\nu)$  (cf. (19) & (22) in [2, Chapter 4]), and since  $b_{\Sigma}(\nu) \leq \text{diam}(\Sigma)$  in every direction  $\nu$  by definition of diameter, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \int_{\Sigma} H \leq 2\pi \text{diam}(\Sigma),$$

completing the proof with  $C = 72\pi/c_2$ . (As  $c_2 \geq 2/3$ , we can take  $C = 108\pi$ .)  $\square$

In the rest of this section we briefly observe that  $\mathcal{D}$  can be also related with other scale invariant quantities with optimal exponents. Throughout this part we implicitly assume the convexity of a surface. In addition, we introduce the notation  $f \lesssim g$ , meaning that  $f \leq Cg$  holds up to a universal constant  $C > 0$ ; we also define  $f \gtrsim g$  similarly and use  $f \sim g$  in the sense that both  $f \lesssim g$  and  $f \gtrsim g$  hold. Finally, for notational simplicity, we let  $d := \text{diam}(\Sigma)$  and  $M := \int_{\Sigma} H$ .

We begin with indicating that in fact the converse of Lemma 2.3 also holds, i.e.,

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{D} \sim d \frac{A}{V} \sim M \frac{A}{V}.$$

Indeed, again letting  $d = 1$ ,  $r = 1/\mathcal{D}$ , and  $\omega_0$  be such that  $b_{\Sigma}(\omega_0) = 1$ , if we choose  $\omega_2$  to be attaining the minimal width so that  $b_{\Sigma}(\omega_2) = r =: \rho_2$ , and  $\omega_1$  to be orthogonal to both  $\omega_0$  and  $\omega_2$ , and write  $\rho_1 = b_{\Sigma}(\omega_1)$ , and in addition if we similarly take a rectangular  $Q$  and a polyhedron  $P$  to the proof of Lemma 2.3, then we have  $A(\Sigma) \geq A(\partial P) \gtrsim \rho_1$  and  $V(\Sigma) \leq V(\partial Q) \lesssim \rho_1\rho_2 = \rho_1r$  so that  $A/V \gtrsim 1/r$ . Therefore, after retrieving  $d$  and combining with Lemma 2.3, we obtain the first relation in (3.6). The second one follows by the fact that  $d \sim M$  holds under convexity; in fact, Topping's inequality [22] implies  $d \lesssim M$  in general, while (3.5) means  $M \lesssim d$  under convexity.

Next we focus on the isoperimetric ratio  $I = A^{\frac{3}{2}}/V$ , for which we have

$$(3.7) \quad I \lesssim \mathcal{D} \lesssim I^2.$$

The first one is already observed, cf. (3.6) and (1.4), while the second one follows since  $3VM \leq A^2$  (cf. [2, p.145]). Note that both sides in (3.7) are optimal because for a pancake-like (resp. cigar-like) surface  $\Sigma_{\varepsilon}$ , we have  $I = O(\varepsilon^{-1}) \sim \mathcal{D}$  (resp.  $I^2 = O(\varepsilon^{-1}) \sim \mathcal{D}$ ).

We finally indicate that the ratio  $R := r_{\text{out}}/r_{\text{in}}$ , where  $r_{\text{out}}$  and  $r_{\text{in}}$  are the circumradius and the inradius, respectively, is completely comparable with  $\mathcal{D}$ :

$$(3.8) \quad R \sim \mathcal{D}.$$

Indeed, assuming that  $d = 1$  up to rescaling, we obviously have  $r_{\text{out}} \sim 1$  and  $r_{\text{in}} \leq 1/\mathcal{D}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{D} \lesssim R$ ; in addition, since the polyhedron  $P$  in the proof of Lemma 2.3 encloses a ball of radius  $\sim 1/\mathcal{D}$ , we also have  $\mathcal{D} \gtrsim 1/r_{\text{in}} \sim R$ .

#### 4. TOPPING'S CONJECTURE

In this final section we prove Theorem 1.3. Since the convex case is already proved in Theorem 2.1, we only need to consider immersed simply-connected axisymmetric closed surfaces  $\Sigma$  of class  $C^{1,1}$ . Therefore, we may hereafter assume the following

**Hypothesis 4.1** (Simply-connected axisymmetric surface). A surface  $\Sigma$  is represented by using an immersed  $C^{1,1}$  plane curve  $\gamma = (x, z) : [0, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  as

$$\Sigma = \left\{ (x(s) \cos \phi, x(s) \sin \phi, z(s)) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \leq s \leq L, 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi \right\},$$

where  $\gamma$  is parametrized by the arclength  $s \in [0, L]$ , and satisfies  $x(0) = z(0) = x(L) = 0$ ,  $z(L) \geq 0$ ,  $\gamma_s(0) = (1, 0)$ ,  $\gamma_s(L) = (-1, 0)$ , and also  $x(s) > 0$  for any  $s \in (0, L)$ . For such a surface, throughout this section, we let  $\theta : [0, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote a unique Lipschitz function such that for  $s \in [0, L]$ ,

$$x(s) = \int_0^s \cos \theta(t) dt, \quad y(s) = \int_0^s \sin \theta(t) dt,$$

and such that  $\theta(0) = 0$ . Note that  $\theta(L) \in \pi + 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ .

Our strategy is to construct, for a given  $\Sigma$  satisfying Hypothesis 4.1, a comparison axisymmetric convex closed surface  $\Sigma'$  such that

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |H| \geq \int_{\Sigma'} |H|, \quad \text{diam}(\Sigma') \geq \text{diam}(\Sigma),$$

so that from Theorem 2.1 with  $p = 1$  we deduce that  $\int_{\Sigma} |H| > \text{diam}(\Sigma)$ . To this end, following the strategy in [3], we perform two kinds of rearrangement.

**First rearrangement.** Given  $\theta$  as in Hypothesis 4.1, we define  $\theta^*$  by

$$(4.2) \quad \theta^*(s) := \text{dist}(\theta(s), 2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \quad \text{for } s \in [0, L],$$

so that  $\theta^*([0, L]) = [0, \pi]$ . Notice that  $\theta^*$  is Lipschitz,  $\theta^*(0) = 0$  and  $\theta^*(L) = \pi$ , and that the corresponding curve  $\gamma_* = (x_*, z_*)$  satisfies  $x_*(L) = 0$  as  $\cos \theta^* = \cos \theta$ , and  $z_*(L) > 0$  as  $\sin \theta^* \geq 0$  and  $\sin \theta^* \not\equiv 0$ . Hence the corresponding surface  $\Sigma_*$  still satisfies Hypothesis 4.1. Then we prove (4.1) with  $\Sigma_*$  playing the role of  $\Sigma'$ .

**Second rearrangement.** Given  $\theta$  as in Hypothesis 4.1 such that  $\theta([0, L]) = [0, \pi]$ , we define  $\theta^* : [0, L] \rightarrow [0, \pi]$  by the standard nondecreasing rearrangement of  $\theta$ :

$$(4.3) \quad \theta^*(s) = \sup\{c \in [0, \pi] \mid s \geq L - m(\{\theta \geq c\})\} \quad \text{for } s \in [0, L],$$

where  $m(\{\theta \geq c\})$  means the Lebesgue measure of  $\{s \in [0, L] \mid \theta(s) \geq c\}$  (see e.g. [9] for details of the rearrangement argument). Then the corresponding surface  $\Sigma_*$  also satisfies Hypothesis 4.1; indeed, thanks to well-known properties of the rearrangement, the function  $\theta^*$  inherits the Lipschitz continuity of  $\theta$  [9, Lemma 2.3],

and the corresponding curve  $\gamma_* = (x_*, z_*)$  satisfies the completely same boundary condition as the original curve  $\gamma$ , i.e.,

$$(4.4) \quad \theta^*(0) = \theta(0) = 0, \quad \theta^*(L) = \theta(L) = \pi, \quad \gamma_*(0) = \gamma(0), \quad \gamma_*(L) = \gamma(L),$$

where in particular the last condition follows by the integration-preserving property:  $\int_0^L f(\theta(s))ds = \int_0^L f(\theta^*(s))ds$  for any continuous function  $f$  [9, p.22, (C)]. In addition,  $\Sigma_*$  is obviously convex in view of the monotonicity of  $\theta^*$ . Then we again prove (4.1) with  $\Sigma_*$  playing the role of  $\Sigma'$ .

*Remark 4.2.* It is now clear why we weaken the regularity of  $\Sigma$  to  $C^{1,1}$  in Theorem 2.1: The best regularity retained in these rearrangement procedures is Lipschitz continuity for  $\theta$ , that is  $C^{1,1}$ -regularity for  $\Sigma$ .

In both of the rearrangement procedures, the first estimate in (4.1) involving total mean curvature follows by the arguments in [3] (see Remark 4.4 for completion). Therefore, the remaining task is to prove the estimate involving diameter for both the rearrangements. In addition, the first rearrangement is in fact easy to handle in view of diameter; hence, the only delicate issue is now the diameter estimate in the second rearrangement. Here we prove the following

**Lemma 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\theta([0, L]) = [0, \pi]$ . Then the convex surface  $\Sigma_*$  (obtained by the second rearrangement) encloses the original surface  $\Sigma$ , in the sense that the corresponding inner regions  $\Omega_*$  and  $\Omega$  satisfy the inclusion  $\Omega \subset \Omega_*$ . In particular,  $\text{diam}(\Sigma_*) \geq \text{diam}(\Sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a unique point  $\bar{s} \in [0, L]$  such that  $\theta^*(\bar{s}) = \pi/2$  and such that  $\theta^*(s) < \pi/2$  for every  $s < \bar{s}$ ; in other words,  $\bar{s}$  is the first point where  $x_*$  attains the maximum. Then we can represent the convex curve  $\gamma_*$  (corresponding to  $\Sigma_*$ ) on the restricted interval  $[0, \bar{s}]$  by a graph curve, namely,

$$(4.5) \quad \text{there is a nondecreasing convex function } U_* \text{ such that} \\ \gamma_*([0, \bar{s}]) = G_* := \{(x, U_*(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in [0, x_*(\bar{s})]\}.$$

Notice that by symmetry it is sufficient for Lemma 4.3 to prove that the image of  $\gamma$  is included in the epigraph of  $U_*$ :

$$(4.6) \quad \gamma([0, L]) \subset G_*^+ := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \geq U_*(x), x \in [0, x_*(\bar{s})]\}.$$

Indeed, since the procedures of rearrangement and vertical reflection are commutative, if we establish (4.6), then using (4.6) also for the reflected curve  $\tilde{\gamma}(s) = (x(L-s), y(L) - y(L-s))$ , we find that the same kind of inclusion as (4.6) also holds for the subgraph of the upper-part of  $\gamma_*$ , so that the desired assertion holds.

Now we fix an arbitrary  $s_\dagger \in [0, L]$  and prove that  $(x(s_\dagger), z(s_\dagger)) \in G_*^+$ . Let  $\theta^\dagger := (\theta|_{[0, s_\dagger]})^*$ , i.e., the nondecreasing rearrangement of the restriction  $\theta|_{[0, s_\dagger]}$ . Let  $\gamma_\dagger = (x_\dagger, z_\dagger)$  be the corresponding convex curve, which in particular satisfies

$$(4.7) \quad \gamma_\dagger(0) = (0, 0), \quad \gamma_\dagger(s_\dagger) = \gamma(s_\dagger),$$

by the integration-preserving property of rearrangement.

In what follows we prove the stronger assertion that  $\gamma_\dagger([0, s_\dagger]) \subset G_*^+$ . For later use we first put down the elementary geometric property of  $G_*^+$ , cf. (4.5):

$$(4.8) \quad (x, z) \in G_*^+ \implies (0 \leq x' \leq x, z' \geq z \implies (x', z') \in G_*^+).$$

Now we notice that as the general property of rearrangement,

$$(4.9) \quad \theta^\dagger(s) \geq \theta^*(s) \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, s_\dagger].$$

since letting  $\varphi := \theta\chi_{[0, s_\dagger]} + \pi\chi_{(s_\dagger, L]}$ , where  $\chi$  denotes the characteristic function, we have  $\varphi \geq \theta$  on  $[0, L]$  and hence  $\varphi^* \geq \theta^*$  by the order-preserving property [9, p.21, (M1)], and also  $\theta^\dagger(s) = \varphi^*(s)$  for  $s \in [0, s_\dagger]$ . Using (4.9), we prove that

$$(4.10) \quad 0 \leq x_\dagger(s) \leq x_*(s) \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, s_\dagger].$$

Indeed, since  $\cos \theta$  is decreasing on  $[0, \pi]$ , and since  $\theta^\dagger$  is nondecreasing on  $[0, s_\dagger]$  and valued into  $[0, \pi]$ , the function  $x_\dagger(s) = \int_0^s \cos \theta^\dagger$  is concave on  $[0, s_\dagger]$  and hence  $x_\dagger(s) \geq \min\{x_\dagger(0), x_\dagger(s_\dagger)\} \geq 0$ , cf. (4.7); in addition, thanks to (4.9), we have  $x_\dagger(s) = \int_0^s \cos \theta^\dagger \leq \int_0^s \cos \theta^* = x_*(s)$ , completing the proof of (4.10). We now turn to the relation between  $z_*$  and  $z_\dagger$ . This is more delicate, so below we separately consider the two intervals  $[0, \sigma_\dagger]$  and  $[\sigma_\dagger, s_\dagger]$ , where  $\sigma_\dagger \in [0, s_\dagger]$  denotes the maximal  $s \in [0, s_\dagger]$  such that  $\theta_\dagger(s) \leq \pi/2$ . (Note that  $\sigma_\dagger$  may coincide with  $s_\dagger$ .) Concerning the first interval  $[0, \sigma_\dagger]$ , we have

$$(4.11) \quad z_\dagger(s) \geq z_*(s) \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, \sigma_\dagger].$$

Indeed, if  $s \leq \sigma_\dagger$ , then  $\theta^*([0, s]) \subset \theta^\dagger([0, s]) \subset [0, \pi/2]$  by (4.9) and by definition of  $\sigma_\dagger$ ; hence, by (4.9) and by the fact that  $\sin \theta$  is increasing on  $[0, \pi/2]$ , we obtain  $z_\dagger(s) = \int_0^s \sin \theta^\dagger \geq \int_0^s \sin \theta^* = z_*(s)$ , completing the proof of (4.11). Therefore, by using (4.10), (4.11), and the obvious inclusion  $\gamma_*([0, \sigma_\dagger]) \subset G_*^+$ , we deduce from the geometric property (4.8) that

$$(4.12) \quad \gamma_\dagger([0, \sigma_\dagger]) \subset G_*^+.$$

Concerning the remaining part  $[\sigma_\dagger, s_\dagger]$ , since  $\theta^\dagger([\sigma_\dagger, s_\dagger]) \subset [\pi/2, \pi]$  by definition of  $\sigma_\dagger$ , we have  $(x_\dagger)_s = \cos \theta^\dagger \leq 0$  and  $(z_\dagger)_s = \sin \theta^\dagger \geq 0$  on  $[\sigma_\dagger, s_\dagger]$ , and hence

$$x_\dagger(s) \leq x_\dagger(\sigma_\dagger), \quad z_\dagger(s) \geq z_\dagger(\sigma_\dagger) \quad \text{for every } s \in [\sigma_\dagger, s_\dagger].$$

Using this property with the facts that  $x_\dagger \geq 0$ , cf. (4.10), and that  $(x_\dagger(\sigma_\dagger), z_\dagger(\sigma_\dagger)) \in G_*^+$ , cf. (4.12), we deduce from the geometric property (4.8) that  $\gamma_\dagger([\sigma_\dagger, s_\dagger]) \subset G_*^+$ . This combined with (4.12) implies that  $\gamma_\dagger([0, s_\dagger]) \subset G_*^+$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

With this lemma at hand, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* As is discussed throughout this section, it now suffices to prove (4.1) for each of the two rearrangement procedures (4.2) and (4.3). Concerning the first rearrangement (4.2), we have  $\int_{\Sigma_*} |H| = \int_\Sigma |H|$  by Remark 4.4, and hence only need to discuss the diameter estimate. Notice the general fact for an axisymmetric surface that

$$\text{diam}(\Sigma) = \max_{s_1, s_2 \in [0, L]} \text{dist}\left(\left(x(s_1), z(s_1)\right), \left(-x(s_2), z(s_2)\right)\right).$$

As we have  $x \equiv x_*$  since  $\cos \theta \equiv \cos \theta^*$  by definition of the first rearrangement, it now suffices to show that

$$|z_*(s_2) - z_*(s_1)| \geq |z(s_2) - z(s_1)| \quad \text{for } 0 \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq L.$$

This follows by the fact that  $\sin \theta^* = |\sin \theta|$  so that

$$|z_*(s_2) - z_*(s_1)| = \left| \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \sin \theta^* \right| = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} |\sin \theta| \geq \left| \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \sin \theta \right| = |z(s_2) - z(s_1)|.$$

Therefore we have  $\text{diam}(\Sigma_*) \geq \text{diam}(\Sigma)$ , completing the proof of (4.1) for the first rearrangement. Concerning the second rearrangement (4.3), we have  $\int_{\Sigma_*} |H| \leq \int_{\Sigma} |H|$  by Remark 4.4, and also  $\text{diam}(\Sigma_*) \geq \text{diam}(\Sigma)$  by Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

*Remark 4.4* (Total mean curvature for rearranged surfaces). We briefly recall how the estimates used above for the total mean curvature follow by the arguments in [3]. We first prove that in the first rearrangement the total mean curvature does not change. A direct computation yields the representation

$$(4.13) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |H| = \pi \int_0^L |\sin \theta(s) + \theta_s(s)x(s)| ds.$$

As is already observed in the above proof, we have

$$(4.14) \quad x_*(s) = x(s) \quad \text{for every } s \in [0, L],$$

and in addition that  $|\sin \theta| = \sin \theta^*$ ; more precisely,

$$(4.15) \quad \sin \theta^*(s) = \pm \sin \theta(s) \quad \text{for } s \in S_{\pm},$$

where  $S_+ := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} [2k\pi, (2k+1)\pi]$  and  $S_- := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} [(2k-1)\pi, 2k\pi]$ . Furthermore, since  $\theta^* = f \circ \theta$ , where both  $f := \text{dist}(\cdot, 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$  and  $\theta$  are Lipschitz continuous, we have the chain rule  $\theta_s^* = (f' \circ \theta)\theta_s$  with the understanding that  $[(f' \circ \theta)\theta_s](s) = 0$  whenever  $\theta_s(s) = 0$  (cf. [11, Corollary 3.66]). Directly computing the derivative of  $f$ , we thus obtain

$$(4.16) \quad \theta_s^*(s) = \pm \theta_s(s) \quad \text{for } s \in S_{\pm}.$$

Inserting (4.14), (4.15), and (4.16) into the representation (4.13), we deduce that  $\int_{\Sigma_*} |H| = \int_{\Sigma} |H|$ . We now turn to the second rearrangement and prove that  $\int_{\Sigma_*} |H| \leq \int_{\Sigma} |H|$ . Since  $\int_{\Sigma_*} |H| = \int_{\Sigma_*} H$  by convexity of  $\Sigma_*$ , in view of the triangle inequality it suffices show that  $\int_{\Sigma_*} H = \int_{\Sigma} H$ . By a direction computation and an integration by parts, using that  $x(0) = x(L) = 0$ , we have the representation

$$\int_{\Sigma} H = \pi \int_0^L (\sin \theta(s) + \theta_s(s)x(s)) ds = \pi \int_0^L g(\theta(s)) ds,$$

where  $g(\theta) := \sin \theta - \theta \cos \theta$ . The same representation  $\int_{\Sigma_*} H = \pi \int_0^L g(\theta^*(s)) ds$  also holds for the rearranged surface  $\Sigma_*$  since  $x_*(0) = x_*(L) = 0$ . We then deduce the desired identity  $\int_{\Sigma_*} H = \int_{\Sigma} H$  from these representations and the integration-preserving property of rearrangement.

We finally recall that Topping's conjecture is also related to finding the optimal constant in Simon's inequality of the form

$$A^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\Sigma} H^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \text{diam}(\Sigma).$$

The constant  $\pi/2$  is explicitly obtained by Topping [21] following Simon's original strategy [19]. It is also conjectured that  $\pi/2$  can be replaced with  $\pi$  by the same reason as Topping's conjecture. Since Simon's inequality is implied by Topping's inequality via the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, our result also gives the optimal constant for Simon's one under the same assumption as in Theorem 1.3.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dorin Bucur and Antoine Henrot, *A new isoperimetric inequality for elasticae*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **19** (2017), no. 11, 3355–3376. MR 3713042
- [2] Yurii D. Burago and Viktor A. Zalgaller, *Geometric inequalities*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 285, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988, Translated from the Russian by A. B. Sosinskiĭ, Springer Series in Soviet Mathematics. MR 936419
- [3] Jeremy Dalphin, Antoine Henrot, Simon Masnou, and Takéo Takahashi, *On the minimization of total mean curvature*, J. Geom. Anal. **26** (2016), no. 4, 2729–2750. MR 3544938
- [4] Camillo De Lellis and Stefan Müller, *Optimal rigidity estimates for nearly umbilical surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **69** (2005), no. 1, 75–110. MR 2169583
- [5] Vincenzo Ferone, Bernd Kawohl, and Carlo Nitsch, *The elastica problem under area constraint*, Math. Ann. **365** (2016), no. 3–4, 987–1015. MR 3521079
- [6] Michael E. Gage, *An isoperimetric inequality with applications to curve shortening*, Duke Math. J. **50** (1983), no. 4, 1225–1229. MR 726325
- [7] Antoine Henrot and Othmane Mounjid, *Elasticae and inradius*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **108** (2017), no. 2, 181–196. MR 3605064
- [8] Gerhard Huisken, *Flow by mean curvature of convex surfaces into spheres*, J. Differential Geom. **20** (1984), no. 1, 237–266. MR 772132
- [9] Bernhard Kawohl, *Rearrangements and convexity of level sets in PDE*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1150, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985. MR 810619
- [10] Ernst Kuwert and Yuxiang Li, *Asymptotics of Willmore minimizers with prescribed small isoperimetric ratio*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **50** (2018), no. 4, 4407–4425. MR 3842922
- [11] Giovanni Leoni, *A first course in Sobolev spaces*, second ed., Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 181, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. MR 3726909
- [12] Tatsuya Miura, *Singular perturbation by bending for an adhesive obstacle problem*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55** (2016), no. 1, Art. 19, pp. 24. MR 3456944
- [13] ———, *Overhanging of membranes and filaments adhering to periodic graph substrates*, Phys. D **355** (2017), 34–44. MR 3683120
- [14] ———, *Elastic curves and phase transitions*, Math. Ann. (2019), pp. 46 (in press).
- [15] Matthias Röger and Reiner Schätzle, *Control of the isoperimetric deficit by the Willmore deficit*, Analysis (Berlin) **32** (2012), no. 1, 1–7. MR 2905072
- [16] Rolf Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 44, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR 1216521
- [17] Felix Schulze, *Nonlinear evolution by mean curvature and isoperimetric inequalities*, J. Differential Geom. **79** (2008), no. 2, 197–241. MR 2420018
- [18] Johannes Schygulla, *Willmore minimizers with prescribed isoperimetric ratio*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **203** (2012), no. 3, 901–941. MR 2928137
- [19] Leon Simon, *Existence of surfaces minimizing the Willmore functional*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **1** (1993), no. 2, 281–326. MR 1243525
- [20] Peter Topping, *The optimal constant in Wente’s  $L^\infty$  estimate*, Comment. Math. Helv. **72** (1997), no. 2, 316–328. MR 1470094
- [21] ———, *Mean curvature flow and geometric inequalities*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **503** (1998), 47–61. MR 1650335
- [22] ———, *Relating diameter and mean curvature for submanifolds of Euclidean space*, Comment. Math. Helv. **83** (2008), no. 3, 539–546. MR 2410779

TOKYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 2-12-1 OOKAYAMA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO 152-8551, JAPAN  
*E-mail address*: miura@math.titech.ac.jp