

Projectability of stable, partially free \mathcal{H} -surfaces in the non-perpendicular case

Frank Müller*

January 21, 2022

Abstract

A projectability result is proved for surfaces of prescribed mean curvature (shortly called \mathcal{H} -surfaces) spanned in a partially free boundary configuration. Hereby, the \mathcal{H} -surface is allowed to meet the support surface along its free trace non-perpendicularly. The main result generalizes known theorems due to Hildebrandt-Sauvigny and the author himself and is in the spirit of the well known projectability theorems due to Radó and Kneser. A uniqueness and an existence result are included as corollaries.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2020: 53A10, 35C20, 35R35, 49Q05

1 Introduction

Let us write $B^+ := \{w = (u, v) = u + iv : |w| < 1, v > 0\}$ for the upper unit half disc in the plane. Its boundary is divided into

$$\partial B^+ = I \cup J, \quad I := (-1, 1), \quad J := \partial B^+ \setminus I = \{w \in \overline{B^+} : |w| = 1\}.$$

In the present paper, a *surface of prescribed mean curvature* $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$ or, shortly, an *\mathcal{H} -surface* is a mapping $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(w) : B^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \in C^2(B^+, \mathbb{R}^3)$, which solves the system

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{x} &= 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v \quad \text{in } B^+, \\ |\mathbf{x}_u| &= |\mathbf{x}_v|, \quad \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_v = 0 \quad \text{in } B^+. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Here, $\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{z}$ and $\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{z}$ denote the cross product and the standard scalar product in \mathbb{R}^3 , respectively.

Observe that an \mathcal{H} -surface is not supposed to be a regular surface, that means, it may possess *branch points* $w_0 \in B^+$ with $\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v(w_0) = \mathbf{0}$.

We consider \mathcal{H} -surfaces spanned in a projectable, partially free boundary configuration, which means the following:

Definition 1. (Projectable boundary configuration)

Let $S = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be an embedded cylinder surface over the planar closed Jordan arc $\Sigma = \pi(S)$ of class C^3 ; here π denotes the orthogonal projection onto

*Frank Müller, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Duisburg-Essen, 45117 Essen, e-mail: frank.mueller@uni-due.de

the x^1, x^2 -plane. Furthermore, let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a closed Jordan arc which can be represented as a C^3 -graph over the planar closed C^3 -Jordan arc $\underline{\Gamma} = \pi(\Gamma)$. Finally, assume $\underline{\Gamma} \cap \Sigma = \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$, where π_1, π_2 are the distinct end points of $\underline{\Gamma}$ as well as Σ , and Γ and S meet with a positive angle at the respective points $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Gamma \cap S$ correlated by $\pi_j = \pi(\mathbf{p}_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. Then we call $\{\Gamma, S\}$ a projectable (partially free) boundary configuration.

To be precise, in Definition 1, the phrase " Γ and S meet with a positive angle at the respective points $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2 \in \Gamma \cap S$ " means that the tangential vector of Γ is not an element of the tangential plane of S at these points.

A *partially free \mathcal{H} -surface* is a solution $\mathbf{x} \in C^2(B^+, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0(\overline{B^+}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ of (1.1), which satisfies the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(w) &\in S \quad \text{for all } w \in I, \\ \mathbf{x}|_J &: J \rightarrow \Gamma \text{ strictly monotonic,} \\ \mathbf{x}(-1) &= \mathbf{p}_1, \quad \mathbf{x}(+1) = \mathbf{p}_2 \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

for a given projectable boundary configuration $\{\Gamma, S\}$. Roughly speaking, we aim to show that any such partially free \mathcal{H} -surface is itself projectable. This is in the spirit of the famous projectability result for minimal surfaces by Radó and Kneser and will be proved under additional assumptions on the \mathcal{H} -surface and the configuration $\{\Gamma, S\}$, namely: The boundary configuration shall be *R-admissible* in the sense of Definition 2 below and the \mathcal{H} -surface shall be Hölder-continuous on $\overline{B^+}$, stationary w.r.t. some energy functional $E_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and stable w.r.t. the corresponding generalized area functional $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Here \mathbf{Q} is a given vector field which satisfies a natural smallness condition and which possesses a suitable normal component w.r.t. S as well as the divergence $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{Q} = 2\mathcal{H}$; see Section 2 for details.

The first results of this type were given by Hildebrandt-Sauvigny [HS1]-[HS3]. They considered the special case of minimal surfaces; a generalization to F -minimal surfaces can be found in [MW]. Concerning partially free \mathcal{H} -surfaces the only projectability result known to the author was proved in [M3]. There, the above mentioned vector field \mathbf{Q} was supposed to be tangential along the *support surface* S , which forces the corresponding stationary \mathcal{H} -surface to meet S perpendicularly along its *free trace* $\mathbf{x}|_I$. This condition was essential at many points of the proof in [M3], in particular, while deriving the second variation formula for $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and establishing a boundary condition for the third component of the surface normal of our \mathcal{H} -surface. One motivation for writing the present paper was to drop this restriction and to study \mathcal{H} -surfaces which meet S non-perpendicularly.

Methodically, we orientate on [M3] which in turn is based on the work of Hildebrandt and Sauvigny in [HS3] and on Sauvigny's paper [S1], where a corresponding projectability result for stable \mathcal{H} -surfaces subject to Plateau type boundary conditions has been proven.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we fix notations, specify our assumptions and state the main projectability result, Theorem 1, as well as some preliminary results on the \mathcal{H} -surface and its normal. The consequential unique solvability of the studied partially free problem is captured in Corollary 1. In Section 3 we derive the second variation formula for the functional $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$ allowing boundary perturbations on the free trace $\mathbf{x}|_I$. Then, Section 4 contains the

crucial boundary condition for the third component of the surface normal and the proof of Theorem 1. We close with an exemplary application of Theorem 1 to the existence question for a mixed boundary value problem for the non-parametric \mathcal{H} -surface equation, Corollary 2.

2 Notations and main result

We start by specifying our additional assumptions on the boundary configuration: Let $\{\Gamma, S\}$ be a projectable boundary configuration in the sense of Definition 1. Let $\sigma = \sigma(s)$, $s \in [0, s_0]$, parametrize $\Sigma = \pi(S)$ by arc length, that is,

$$\sigma \in C^3([0, s_0], \mathbb{R}^2), \quad |\sigma'| \equiv 1 \text{ on } [0, s_0], \quad \text{and} \quad s_0 = \text{length}(\Sigma) > 0.$$

Setting $\mathbf{e}_3 := (0, 0, 1)$ we define C^2 -unit tangent and normal vector fields \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n} on S as follows:

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{p}) := (\sigma'(s), 0), \quad \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p}) := \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{p}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_3 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{p} \in \{\sigma(s)\} \wedge \mathbb{R}, \quad s \in [0, s_0]. \quad (2.1)$$

Furthermore, we can write $\Gamma = \{(x^1, x^2, \gamma(x^1, x^2)) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (x^1, x^2) \in \underline{\Gamma}\}$, where $\underline{\Gamma} = \pi(\Gamma)$ is a closed C^3 -Jordan arc and $\gamma \in C^3(\underline{\Gamma})$ is the *height function*. For the end points $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$ of Γ we assume to have representations

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = (\sigma(0), \gamma(\sigma(0))), \quad \mathbf{p}_2 = (\sigma(s_0), \gamma(\sigma(s_0))).$$

The set $\underline{\Gamma} \cup \Sigma$ bounds a simply connected domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, that is, $\partial G = \underline{\Gamma} \cup \Sigma$, and we have $\underline{\Gamma} \cap \Sigma = \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$ with $\pi_j = \pi(\mathbf{p}_j)$, $j = 1, 2$. With $\alpha_j \in (0, \pi)$ we denote the interior angle between $\underline{\Gamma}$ and Σ at π_j w.r.t. G ($j = 1, 2$). Finally, we assume that Σ is parametrized such that $\nu := \pi(\mathbf{n})$ points to the exterior of G along Σ .

Definition 2. A projectable boundary configuration $\{\Gamma, S\}$ is called R -admissible, if the following hold:

- (i) $\Gamma \cup S \subset Z := \{(p^1, p^2, p^3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |(p^1, p^2)| < R\}$ for some $R > 0$.
- (ii) G is $\frac{1}{R}$ -convex, i.e., for any point $\xi \in \partial G$ there is an open disc $D_\xi \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of radius R such that $G \subset D_\xi$ and $\xi \in \partial D_\xi$.

For a given R -admissible boundary configuration $\{\Gamma, S\}$, we define the class $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ of mappings $\mathbf{x} \in H_2^1(B^+, \overline{Z})$, which satisfy the boundary conditions (1.2) weakly, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(w) &\in S \quad \text{for a.a. } w \in I, \\ \mathbf{x}|_J &: J \rightarrow \Gamma \text{ continuously and weakly monotonic,} \\ \mathbf{x}(-1) &= \mathbf{p}_1, \quad \mathbf{x}(+1) = \mathbf{p}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

For arbitrary $\mu \in [0, 1)$, we additionally define its subsets

$$\mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z}) := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z}) : \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{x} \in C^\mu(\overline{B^+}, \overline{Z}), \\ \mathbf{x}|_J : J \rightarrow \Gamma \text{ strictly monotonic} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Now let $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}) \in C^1(\overline{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be a vector field satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{p} \in \overline{Z}} |\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p})| &< 1, \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}) &= 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{p} \in \overline{Z}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Here the function $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p})$ belongs to $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{Z})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and fulfills

$$\sup_{\mathbf{p} \in \overline{Z}} |\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p})| \leq \frac{1}{2R}. \quad (2.5)$$

We introduce the functional

$$E_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}) := \iint_{B^+} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} |\nabla \mathbf{x}(w)|^2 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v(w) \right\} du dv, \quad \mathbf{x} \in H_2^1(B^+, \overline{Z}), \quad (2.6)$$

and consider the variational problem

$$E_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \min, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z}). \quad (2.7)$$

The following lemma collects some well known results concerning the existence and regularity of solutions of (2.7) as well as stationary points of $E_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Lemma 1. (Heinz, Hildebrandt, Tomi)

Let $\{\Gamma, S\}$ be an R -admissible boundary configuration $\{\Gamma, S\}$ and assume $\mathbf{Q} \in C^1(\overline{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $H \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{Z})$ to satisfy (2.4) and (2.5). Then there exists a solution $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(w)$ of (2.7). \mathbf{x} belongs to the class $\mathcal{C}_{\mu}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z}) \cap C^{3,\alpha}(B^+, Z)$ for some $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and satisfies the system (1.1), i.e., \mathbf{x} is a partially free \mathcal{H} -surface.

More generally, any stationary point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ of $E_{\mathbf{Q}}$ solves (1.1) and belongs to the class $C^{3,\alpha}(B^+, Z)$. Here, stationarity means

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \{E_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}_{\varepsilon}) - E_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x})\} \geq 0$$

for all inner and outer variations $\mathbf{x}_{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$, $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0)$ with sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$; see Definition 2 in [DHT] Section 5.4 for the definition of inner and outer variations.

We also associate the *generalized area functional* to \mathbf{Q} :

$$A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}) := \iint_{B^+} \left\{ |\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v| + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v(w) \right\} du dv, \quad \mathbf{x} \in H_2^1(B^+, \overline{Z}). \quad (2.8)$$

A stationary, partially free \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ is called *stable*, if it is stable w.r.t. $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$, that means, the second variation $\frac{d^2}{d\varepsilon^2} A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon))|_{\varepsilon=0}$ of $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is nonnegative for all outer variations $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon) \in \mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$, $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, for which this quantity exists; note that \mathbf{x} has its image $\mathbf{x}(\overline{B^+})$ in Z , according to Lemma 1. Since the first variation of $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$ w.r.t. such variations $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ vanishes for stationary \mathbf{x} , any relative minimizer of $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$ in $\mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ is stable. In Definition 4 below, we give an exact definition of stability, which is used in the present paper and which is somewhat less stringent than the above mentioned requirement.

We are now in a position to state our main result:

Theorem 1. *Let $\{\Gamma, S\}$ be an admissible boundary configuration and let $\mathbf{Q} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ be chosen such that (2.4) is fulfilled with some $\mathcal{H} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{Z})$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, satisfying (2.5). In addition, we assume*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p^3} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{p} \in \overline{Z} \quad (2.9)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{p}) &= (\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n})(p^1, p^2, 0) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{p} = (p^1, p^2, p^3) \in S, \\ |(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{p}_j)| &< \cos \alpha_j, \quad j = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Then any stable \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, possesses a graph representation over \overline{G} . More precisely, \mathbf{x} is immersed and can be represented as the graph of some function $\zeta : \overline{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \in C^{3,\alpha}(G) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{G} \setminus \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}) \cap C^0(\overline{G})$, which satisfies the mixed boundary value problem

$$\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\nabla \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \zeta|^2}} \right) = 2\mathcal{H}(\cdot, \zeta) \quad \text{in } G, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\frac{\nabla \zeta \cdot \nu}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \zeta|^2}} = \psi \quad \text{on } \Sigma \setminus \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}, \quad \zeta = \gamma \quad \text{on } \underline{\Gamma}. \quad (2.12)$$

Here $\nu = \pi(\mathbf{n})$ denotes the exterior unit normal on Σ w.r.t. G and we defined $\psi := \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n}|_\Sigma \in C^1(\Sigma)$.

As a consequence of Theorem 1 we obtain the following

Corollary 1. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be satisfied. Then, apart from reparametrization, there exists exactly one stable \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ with some $\mu \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. The existence of a stable \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ for some $\mu \in (0, 1)$ - namely the solution of (2.7) - is assured by Lemma 1. According to Theorem 1, we can represent \mathbf{x} as a graph over G , and the height function ζ solves the boundary value problem (2.11), (2.12).

If there would exist another stable \mathcal{H} -surface $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ with some $\tilde{\mu} \in (0, 1)$ and if $\tilde{\zeta}$ denotes the height function of its graph representation, which also solves (2.11), (2.12) by Theorem 1, we consider the difference function $g := \zeta - \tilde{\zeta}$. As is well known, g solves a linear elliptic differential equation in G , which is subject to the maximum principle according to assumption (2.9); cf. [S2] Chap. VI, § 2. Consequently, g assumes its maximum and minimum on $\partial G = \Sigma \cup \underline{\Gamma}$.

Assume that g has a positive maximum at $p_0 \in \Sigma \setminus \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$. Then Hopf's boundary point lemma implies

$$\nabla g(p_0) = (\nabla g(p_0) \cdot \nu(p_0))\nu(p_0) \quad \text{with} \quad \nabla g(p_0) \cdot \nu(p_0) > 0.$$

On the other hand, the first boundary condition in (2.12) yields $(M(p_0)\nabla g(p_0)) \cdot \nu(p_0) = 0$, where we abbreviated

$$M(p) := \int_0^1 Dh(t\nabla \zeta(p) + (1-t)\nabla \tilde{\zeta}(p)) dt, \quad p \in \Sigma,$$

with $h(z) := \frac{z}{\sqrt{1+|z|^2}}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$. If we further note

$$(Dh(z)\xi) \cdot \xi = \frac{|\xi|^2(1+|z|^2) - (\xi \cdot z)^2}{(1+|z|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} > 0, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

we deduce that M is positive definite on Σ and arrive at the contradiction

$$0 = (M(p_0)\nabla g(p_0)) \cdot \nu(p_0) = (\nabla g(p_0) \cdot \nu(p_0))(M(p_0)\nu(p_0)) \cdot \nu(p_0) > 0.$$

Hence, we conclude $g \leq 0$ on \overline{G} and, similarly, one proves $g \geq 0$ on \overline{G} . This gives $\zeta \equiv \tilde{\zeta}$ on \overline{G} , which yields $\mathbf{x} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \circ \omega$ with some positively oriented parameter transformation $\omega : B^+ \rightarrow \overline{B^+}$. This proves the corollary. \square

We complete this section with a preparatory lemma, which collects some analytical and geometrical regularity results and preliminary informations towards the projectability of our \mathcal{H} -surfaces:

Lemma 2. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be satisfied and let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(w) \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ be an \mathcal{H} -surface which is stationary w.r.t. $E_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then there follow:*

(i) $\mathbf{x} \in C^{3,\alpha}(B^+, Z) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}, Z)$, and there holds

$$(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u)(w) \perp T_{\mathbf{x}(w)}S \quad \text{for all } w \in I, \quad (2.13)$$

where $T_{\mathbf{p}}S$ denotes the tangential plane of S at the point $\mathbf{p} \in S$.

(ii) $f(\overline{B^+}) \subset \overline{G}$ for the projected mapping $f := \pi(\mathbf{x})$.

(iii) $\nabla \mathbf{x}(w) \neq \mathbf{0}$ for all $w \in \partial B^+ \setminus \{-1, +1\}$, and $\nabla \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ for at most finitely many points in B^+ .

(iv) Set $W := |\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v|$, $B' := \{w \in B^+ : W(w) > 0\}$, and define the surface normal $\mathbf{N}(w) := W^{-1}\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v(w)$ as well as the Gaussian curvature $K = K(w)$ of \mathbf{x} for points $w \in B'$. Then \mathbf{N} and KW can be extended to mappings

$$\mathbf{N} \in C^{2,\alpha}(B^+, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}, \mathbb{R}^3) \cap C^0(\overline{B^+}, \mathbb{R}^3),$$

$$KW \in C^{1,\alpha}(B^+),$$

and \mathbf{N} satisfies the differential equation

$$\Delta \mathbf{N} + 2(2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})^2 - K - (\nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N}))W\mathbf{N} = -2W\nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } B^+. \quad (2.14)$$

Proof. (ii) Due to Lemma 1, \mathbf{x} is a stationary, partially free \mathcal{H} -surface of class $C^{3,\alpha}(B^+, Z)$. In addition, we have $f(\partial B^+) = \partial G$ due to the geometry of our boundary configuration. An inspection of the proof of Hilfssatz 4 of [S1] shows, that this boundary condition, the smallness condition (2.5) and the $\frac{1}{R}$ -convexity of G imply $f(\overline{B^+}) \subset \overline{G}$ according to the maximum principle.

(i), (iii) A well known regularity result due to E. Heinz [He] implies that $\mathbf{x} \in C^{2,\alpha}(B^+ \cup J, Z)$. And from Theorem 1 in [M6] we obtain $\mathbf{x} \in C^{1,\frac{1}{2}}(B^+ \cup I, Z)$. Setting

$$I' := \{w \in I : f(w) = (\pi \circ \mathbf{x})(w) \notin \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}\},$$

the stationarity yields the natural boundary condition (2.13) on I' .

Due to (ii), the arguments from Satz 2 in [S1] yield $\nabla \mathbf{x}(w) \neq \mathbf{0}$ for all $w \in J$. Assume that $w_0 \in I$ is a branch point of \mathbf{x} and set $B_\delta^+(w_0) := \{w \in B^+ : |w - w_0| < \delta\}$. Then the asymptotic expansion from Theorem 2 in [M6] imply that $\mathbf{x}|_{B_\delta^+(w_0)}$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$, looks like a whole perturbed disc. Consequently, the projection $f|_{B_\delta^+(w_0)}$ would meet the complement of \overline{G} , in contrast to $f(\overline{B}) \subset \overline{G}$. Indeed, for $w_0 \in I'$ this effects from the natural boundary condition (2.13), which can be rewritten as $(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{x}) = -\mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ on I' ; see Remark 1 below. And for $w_0 \in I \setminus I'$, i.e. $f(w_0) \in \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$, this is trivial by geometry. Consequently, we have a contradiction and $\nabla \mathbf{x}(w) \neq \mathbf{0}$ for $w \in I$ follows; this completes the proof of the first part of (iii).

Next we show $I' = I$, i.e. $f(I) = \Sigma \setminus \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$. From [HJ] or [M5] we then obtain $\mathbf{x} \in C^{2,\alpha}(B^+ \cup I, Z)$ and (2.13) holds on I ; this will complete the proof of (i).

Assume there exists $w^* \in I$ with $f(w^*) = \pi_1$. Then there would be a maximal point $w_0 \in I$ with $f(w_0) = \pi_1$ and $f(w) \in \Sigma \setminus \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$ for $w \in (w_0, w_0 + \varepsilon) \subset I$, $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Consequently, the boundary condition (2.13) holds on $(w_0, w_0 + \varepsilon)$ and, in particular, we get

$$(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \quad \text{on } (w_0, w_0 + \varepsilon). \quad (2.15)$$

By continuity, (2.15) remains valid for $w = w_0$. In addition, the geometry of S yields $\mathbf{x}_u = \pm |\mathbf{x}_u| \mathbf{e}_3$ in w_0 . This and the relation $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{t} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3$ on S imply

$$\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}) = \pm |\mathbf{x}_u| \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{in } w_0. \quad (2.16)$$

According to the conformality relations and $\nabla \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ on I , we have $|\mathbf{x}_u| = |\mathbf{x}_v| \neq 0$ in w_0 . Denote the angle between $\mathbf{x}_v(w_0)$ and $\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x}(w_0))$ by β_1 . Then (2.16) and condition (2.10) imply

$$|\cos \beta_1| = |\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}(w_0)) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}(w_0))| < \cos \alpha_1 \quad \text{or} \quad \beta_1 \in (\alpha_1, \pi - \alpha_1),$$

where $\alpha_1 \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ denotes the interior angle between $\underline{\Gamma}$ and Σ at π_1 w.r.t. G . A simple application of the mean-value theorem then yields a contradiction to the inclusion $f(\overline{B}^+) \subset \overline{G}$. Analogously, one shows that there cannot exist $w^{**} \in I$ with $f(w^{**}) = \pi_2$. In conclusion, we have $I' = I$ and (i) is proved.

We finally show the finiteness of branch points in B^+ , completing the proof of (iii): Hildebrandt's asymptotic expansions at interior branch points [Hi] imply the isolated character of these points. By $\nabla \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ on $I \cup J$, the only points where branch points could accumulate are the corner points $w = \pm 1$. But this is impossible, too, according to the asymptotic expansions near these points proven in [M4] Theorem 2.2; see Corollary 7.1 there. We

emphasize that the cited result is applicable, since Γ and S meet with positive angles $\gamma_j \in (0, \alpha_j]$ at \mathbf{p}_j by Definition 1, and since we assume

$$|\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}_j) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p}_j)| < \cos \alpha_j \leq \cos \gamma_j, \quad j = 1, 2.$$

(Note that a simple reflection of S can be used to assure $\{\Gamma, S\}$ and \mathbf{x} to fulfill the assumptions of [M4] Corollary 7.1.)

- (iv) The interior regularity $\mathbf{N} \in C^{2,\alpha}(B^+, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $KW \in C^{1,\alpha}(B^+)$ as well as equation (2.14) were proven by F. Sauvigny in [S1] Satz 1. The global regularity $\mathbf{N} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ follows from (i) and (iii). Finally, the continuity of \mathbf{N} up to the corner points $w = \pm 1$ was proven in [M4] Theorem 5.4; see the remarks above concerning the applicability of this result. \square

Remark 1. By taking the cross product with $\mathbf{x}_u \in T_{\mathbf{x}}S$, the natural boundary condition (2.13) can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) = -\mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{on } I. \quad (2.17)$$

This relation describes the well known fact that the normal component of \mathbf{Q} w.r.t. to S prescribes the contact angle between a stationary \mathcal{H} -surface and the support surface S . Due to the smallness condition on \mathbf{Q} in (2.4), it particularly follows that the \mathcal{H} -surface \mathbf{x} meets S non-tangentially along its free trace $\mathbf{x}|_I$.

3 The second variation of $A_{\mathbf{Q}}$, stable \mathcal{H} -surfaces

Let us choose an \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mu}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, which is stationary w.r.t. $E_{\mathbf{Q}}$ (and thus belongs to $C^{3,\alpha}(B^+, Z) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}, Z)$ according to Lemma 2 (i)). Consider a one-parameter family $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon)$, which belongs to the class $C^{\mu}(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z}) \cap C^2(\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$ and which depends smoothly on ε together with its first and second derivatives w.r.t. u, v . We call $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ an *admissible perturbation* of \mathbf{x} , if we have:

- (i) $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, 0) = \mathbf{x}(w)$ for all $w \in \overline{B^+}$,
- (ii) $\text{supp}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon) - \mathbf{x}) \subset B^+ \cup I$ for all $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$,
- (iii) $\mathbf{y} := \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$, $\mathbf{z} := \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0} \in C_c^1(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$.

The *direction* $\mathbf{y} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon)|_{\varepsilon=0}$ of an admissible perturbation $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{y}(w) \in T_{\mathbf{x}(w)}S \quad \text{for all } w \in I. \quad (3.1)$$

On the other hand, choosing an arbitrary vector-field $\mathbf{y} \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$ with the property (3.1), one may construct an admissible perturbation $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ as described above by using a flow argument (compare, e.g., [DHT] pp. 32–33).

In the present section, we compute the second variation $\frac{d^2}{d\varepsilon^2} A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon))|_{\varepsilon=0}$ for admissible perturbations. To this end, we have to examine the quantity

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v| + \mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0}. \quad (3.2)$$

We first compute (3.2) in the regular set $B' \cup I$ with

$$B' = \{w \in B^+ : W(w) > 0\}, \quad W = |\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v| = |\mathbf{x}_u|^2 = |\mathbf{x}_v|^2,$$

and then observe that the resulting formula can be extended continuously to $B^+ \cup I$; note that \mathbf{x} possesses no branch points on I according to Lemma 2 (iii).

We start with the first addend on the right-hand side of (3.2):

Proposition 1. *Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ be an admissible perturbation of a stationary \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S, \overline{Z})$ as described above. Define $\varphi := \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{N} \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$. Then there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= |\nabla \varphi|^2 + 2KW\varphi^2 - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) \\ &\quad + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})[\varphi(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y}_u) + \varphi(\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y}_v) + (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_u + (\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_v] \\ &\quad - [\varphi(\mathbf{N}_u + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{y}]_u - [\varphi(\mathbf{N}_v + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}_v) \cdot \mathbf{y}]_v \\ &\quad + [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\ &\quad - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) + (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}_u)_u + (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}_v)_v \quad \text{on } B', \end{aligned}$$

where K denotes the Gaussian curvature of \mathbf{x} .

Proof. 1. We start by noting the relation

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} = \frac{1}{2W} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|^2) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} - \frac{1}{4W^3} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|^2) \right]^2 \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \quad (3.3)$$

on B' . Expanding $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ w.r.t. ε , we infer

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon) = \mathbf{x} + \varepsilon \mathbf{y} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \mathbf{z} + o(\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{on } B^+ \quad (3.4)$$

and, consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v &= W\mathbf{N} + \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}(\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z}_v + \mathbf{z}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) + o(\varepsilon^2) \quad \text{on } B' \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|^2 &= W^2 + 2\varepsilon W\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 |\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v|^2 + 2\varepsilon^2 W\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 W\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z}_v + \mathbf{z}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) + o(\varepsilon^2). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Combining (3.3) with (3.6) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= W^{-1} |\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v|^2 + 2\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z}_v + \mathbf{z}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\ &\quad - W^{-1} [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v)]^2 \\ &= (\mathbf{y}_u \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + (\mathbf{y}_v \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + 2\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z}_v + \mathbf{z}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v). \end{aligned}$$

And since \mathbf{x} is a conformally parametrized \mathcal{H} -surface, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z}_v + \mathbf{z}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) &= \mathbf{z}_v \cdot \mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{z}_u \cdot \mathbf{x}_u \\ &= (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}_u)_u + (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}_v)_v - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})W\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{N} \quad \text{on } B',\end{aligned}$$

arriving at

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v|) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= (\mathbf{y}_u \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + (\mathbf{y}_v \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + 2\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) \\ &\quad + (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}_u)_u + (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{x}_v)_v - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})W\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{N} \quad \text{on } B'.\end{aligned}\tag{3.7}$$

2. In the following, we sometimes write $u^1 := u$, $u^2 := v$ and use Einstein's convention summing up tacitly over sub- and superscript latin indices from 1 to 2. Furthermore, we set $\lambda^j := W^{-1}\mathbf{x}_{u^j} \cdot \mathbf{y}$ for $j = 1, 2$ obtaining

$$\mathbf{y} = \lambda^j \mathbf{x}_{u^j} + \varphi \mathbf{N} \quad \text{on } B'.$$

Writing $g_{jk} := \mathbf{x}_{u^j} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{u^k}$, g^{jk} , Γ_{jk}^l , and $h_{jk} := \mathbf{x}_{u^j u^k} \cdot \mathbf{N} = -\mathbf{x}_{u^j} \cdot \mathbf{N}_{u^k}$ for the coefficients of the first fundamental form, its inverse and Christoffel symbols, and the coefficients of the second fundamental form, respectively, we then infer

$$\mathbf{y}_{u^k} = (\lambda_{u^k}^j + \lambda^l \Gamma_{lk}^j - \varphi h_{kl} g^{lj}) \mathbf{x}_{u^j} + (\lambda^j h_{jk} + \varphi_{u^k}) \mathbf{N} \quad \text{on } B'.\tag{3.8}$$

Due to the conformal parametrization of the \mathcal{H} -surface \mathbf{x} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}g_{jk} &= W\delta_{jk}, \quad g^{jk} = \frac{\delta^{jk}}{W}, \\ \Gamma_{11}^1 &= -\Gamma_{22}^1 = \Gamma_{12}^2 = \Gamma_{21}^2 = \frac{W_u}{2W}, \\ \Gamma_{22}^2 &= -\Gamma_{11}^2 = \Gamma_{21}^1 = \Gamma_{12}^1 = \frac{W_v}{2W},\end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

$$h_{11} + h_{22} = 2W\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}), \quad h_{11}h_{22} - (h_{12})^2 = W^2K \quad \text{on } B',$$

where $\delta_{jk} = \delta^{jk}$ denotes the Kronecker delta.

3. We now evaluate the first line of the right-hand side in (3.7): Using (3.8) and (3.9), the first two terms can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{y}_u \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + (\mathbf{y}_v \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 &= (\lambda^1 h_{11} + \lambda^2 h_{12} + \varphi_u)^2 + (\lambda^1 h_{12} + \lambda^2 h_{22} + \varphi_v)^2 \\ &= |\nabla \varphi|^2 + [(\lambda^1)^2 + (\lambda^2)^2](h_{12})^2 + (\lambda^1)^2(h_{11})^2 + (\lambda^2)^2(h_{22})^2 \\ &\quad + 4\lambda^1 \lambda^2 h_{12} W\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) + 4(\lambda^1 \varphi_u + \lambda^2 \varphi_v) W\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &\quad + 2(\lambda^2 h_{12} - \lambda^1 h_{22}) \varphi_u + 2(\lambda^1 h_{12} - \lambda^2 h_{11}) \varphi_v \quad \text{on } B'.\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

We next write the third term on the right-hand side of (3.7) as

$$\begin{aligned}2\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) &= [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\ &\quad - \mathbf{N}_u \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) - \mathbf{N}_v \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{on } B'.\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

Using the relations $\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u = \mathbf{x}_v$, $\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{x}_v = -\mathbf{x}_u$, we get from (3.8):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_{u^k} &= -\varphi(\lambda_{u^k}^2 + \lambda^1 \Gamma_{1k}^2 + \lambda^2 \Gamma_{2k}^2 - \varphi h_{k2} W^{-1}) \mathbf{x}_u \\ &\quad + \varphi(\lambda_{u^k}^1 + \lambda^1 \Gamma_{1k}^1 + \lambda^2 \Gamma_{2k}^1 - \varphi h_{k1} W^{-1}) \mathbf{x}_v \\ &\quad + \lambda^2 (\lambda^1 h_{1k} + \lambda^2 h_{2k} + \varphi_{u^k}) \mathbf{x}_u \\ &\quad - \lambda^1 (\lambda^1 h_{1k} + \lambda^2 h_{2k} + \varphi_{u^k}) \mathbf{x}_v + (\dots) \mathbf{N} \quad \text{on } B', \end{aligned}$$

where $(\dots) \mathbf{N}$ denotes the normal part of $\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_{u^k}$. This identity, formula (3.9), and the Weingarten equations $\mathbf{N}_{u^j} = -h_{jk} g^{kl} \mathbf{x}_{u^l}$ on B' yield

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathbf{N}_u \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) - \mathbf{N}_v \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}) &= W^{-1} [(h_{11} \mathbf{x}_u + h_{12} \mathbf{x}_v) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) - (h_{21} \mathbf{x}_u + h_{22} \mathbf{x}_v) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_u)] \\ &= 2(\varphi)^2 WK + (\lambda^1 h_{22} - \lambda^2 h_{12}) \varphi_u - (\lambda^1 h_{12} - \lambda^2 h_{11}) \varphi_v \\ &\quad + \varphi [\lambda_v^1 h_{12} - \lambda_u^1 h_{22} - \lambda^1 W_u \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})] - \varphi [\lambda_v^2 h_{11} - \lambda_u^2 h_{12} + \lambda^2 W_v \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})] \\ &\quad + [(\lambda^1)^2 + (\lambda^2)^2] [h_{11} h_{22} - (h_{12})^2] \quad \text{on } B'. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

According to the Codazzi-Mainardi equations

$$h_{21,v} - h_{22,u} + W_u H = 0, \quad h_{11,v} - h_{12,u} - W_v H = 0,$$

we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_v^1 h_{12} - \lambda_u^1 h_{22} - \lambda^1 W_u \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) &= (\lambda^1 h_{12})_v - (\lambda^1 h_{22})_u, \\ \lambda_v^2 h_{11} - \lambda_u^2 h_{12} + \lambda^2 W_v \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) &= (\lambda^2 h_{11})_v - (\lambda^2 h_{12})_u \quad \text{on } B'. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting these identities into (3.12) and the resulting relation into (3.11), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} 2\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) &= [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\ &\quad + 2(\varphi)^2 WK + (\lambda^1 h_{22} - \lambda^2 h_{12}) \varphi_u - (\lambda^1 h_{12} - \lambda^2 h_{11}) \varphi_v \\ &\quad - \varphi (\lambda^1 h_{22} - \lambda^2 h_{12})_u + \varphi (\lambda^1 h_{12} - \lambda^2 h_{11})_v \\ &\quad + [(\lambda^1)^2 + (\lambda^2)^2] [h_{11} h_{22} - (h_{12})^2] \quad \text{on } B'. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Adding (3.10) and (3.13) we now find

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{y}_u \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + (\mathbf{y}_v \cdot \mathbf{N})^2 + 2\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v) &= |\nabla \varphi|^2 + 2(\varphi)^2 KW + [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\ &\quad - [\varphi (\lambda^1 h_{22} - \lambda^2 h_{12})]_u + [\varphi (\lambda^1 h_{12} - \lambda^2 h_{11})]_v \\ &\quad + 2W \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) [(\lambda^1)^2 h_{11} + (\lambda^2)^2 h_{22} + 2\lambda^1 \lambda^2 h_{12} + 2(\lambda^1 \varphi_u + \lambda^2 \varphi_v)] \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

on B' . Finally, we calculate via the Weingarten equations and (3.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^1 h_{22} - \lambda^2 h_{12} &= W^{-1} (h_{22} \mathbf{x}_u - h_{12} \mathbf{x}_v) \cdot \mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{N}_u + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{y}, \\ \lambda^1 h_{12} - \lambda^2 h_{11} &= W^{-1} (h_{12} \mathbf{x}_u - h_{11} \mathbf{x}_v) \cdot \mathbf{y} = -(\mathbf{N}_v + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}_v) \cdot \mathbf{y} \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\lambda^1)^2 h_{11} + (\lambda^2)^2 h_{22} + 2\lambda^1 \lambda^2 h_{12} + 2(\lambda^1 \varphi_u + \lambda^2 \varphi_v) \\
&= \lambda^1 (\lambda^1 h_{11} + \lambda^2 h_{12}) + \lambda^2 (\lambda^1 h_{12} + \lambda^2 h_{22}) + 2(\lambda^1 \varphi_u + \lambda^2 \varphi_v) \\
&= -\lambda^1 (\mathbf{N}_u \cdot \mathbf{y}) - \lambda^2 (\mathbf{N}_v \cdot \mathbf{y}) + 2(\lambda^1 \varphi_u + \lambda^2 \varphi_v) \\
&= W^{-1} [(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})(\mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{y}_u) + (\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})(\mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{y}_v)] + (\lambda^1 \varphi_u + \lambda^2 \varphi_v) \\
&= W^{-1} [\varphi(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y}_u) + \varphi(\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y}_v) + (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_u + (\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_v] \\
&\quad - W^{-1} [\mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) + \mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Inserting (3.15) and (3.16) into (3.14), the asserted identity follows from the resulting relation and formula (3.7). \square

Proposition 2. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 1, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} [\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
&= 2W\varphi^2 [\nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N} - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})^2] + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\
&\quad - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) [\varphi(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y}_u) + \varphi(\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y}_v) + (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_u + (\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_v] \\
&\quad + 2[\varphi \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})]_u + 2[\varphi \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})]_v + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\
&\quad + [(D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{x}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{x}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u \\
&\quad + [(D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z})]_v + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v
\end{aligned}$$

on B' .

Proof. Using (2.4) and the general relation

$$[\mathbf{M}\mathbf{a}] \cdot (\mathbf{b} \wedge \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{a} \cdot ([\mathbf{M}\mathbf{b}] \wedge \mathbf{c}) + \mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{b} \wedge [\mathbf{M}\mathbf{c}]) = (\text{tr } \mathbf{M})[\mathbf{a} \cdot (\mathbf{b} \wedge \mathbf{c})] \tag{3.17}$$

for arbitrary vectors $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and matrices $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ with trace $\text{tr } \mathbf{M}$, we first compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} [\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v)] \\
&= [D\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\varepsilon] \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v) + \mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\varepsilon \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v)_u + \mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\varepsilon)_v \\
&= 2\mathcal{H}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\varepsilon \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v) + [\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\varepsilon \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\varepsilon)]_v
\end{aligned}$$

on B^+ . Having (3.4) and (3.5) in mind, a second differentiation yields at $\varepsilon = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} [\mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v)] \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} &= 2[\nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{y}]\mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\
&\quad + 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}_v + \mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\
&\quad + [(D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{x}_v)]_u + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{x}_v)]_u \\
&\quad + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u + [(D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\
&\quad + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{z})]_v + [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Writing again $\mathbf{y} = \lambda^j \mathbf{x}_{uj} + \varphi \mathbf{N}$ on B' with $\lambda^j = W^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{uj} \cdot \mathbf{y}$ and employing (1.1), the assertion follows from (3.18) and the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2[\nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{y}] \mathbf{y} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{x}_v) \\
&= 2W\varphi^2 \nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N} + 2\varphi \lambda^j W \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})_{uj} \\
&= 2W\varphi^2 \nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N} + 2[\varphi \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})]_u + 2[\varphi \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})]_v \\
&\quad - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})[\varphi(\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y}_u) + \varphi(\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y}_v) + (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_u + (\mathbf{x}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})\varphi_v] \\
&\quad - 4W\varphi^2 \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})^2
\end{aligned}$$

on B' . \square

As already announced, the right-hand sides in the results of Propositions 1 and 2 can be extended continuously onto $B^+ \cup I$, according to Lemma 2. Hence we can compute the second variation via the divergence theorem for *any* admissible one-parameter family $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon)$ with direction $\mathbf{y} \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfying (3.1). Nevertheless, we concentrate on directions of the form

$$\mathbf{y}(w) := \frac{\varphi(w)}{1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}(w)) \cdot \mathbf{N}(w)} [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}(w)) + \mathbf{N}(w)], \quad (3.19)$$

with some function $\varphi \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I)$. Note that \mathbf{y} is well-defined according to assumption (2.4), belongs to $C_c^2(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$, and satisfies $\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{N} \equiv \varphi$ as well as (3.1); for the latter, see Remark 1.

Definition 3. For given $\varphi \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I)$ we define $\mathbf{y} \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I, \mathbb{R}^3)$ by (3.19) and consider the admissible perturbation $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon)$ with direction \mathbf{y} . Then we set

$$\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \varphi) := \left. \frac{d^2}{d\varepsilon^2} A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot, \varepsilon)) \right|_{\varepsilon=0}$$

for the second variation of $A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x})$ with dilation φ .

In order to compute $\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \varphi)$, we introduce the curvature of the cylindrical support surface S defined by

$$\kappa(\mathbf{p}) := -(\sigma''(s), 0) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p}) \quad \text{for } \mathbf{p} \in \{\sigma(s)\} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad s \in [0, s_0], \quad (3.20)$$

compare Section 2. Note that, due to the cylindrical structure of S , we have the relation

$$[D\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p})\zeta_1] \cdot \zeta_2 = \kappa(\mathbf{p})[\zeta_1 \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{p})][\zeta_2 \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{p})] \quad \text{for all } \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in T_{\mathbf{p}}S, \quad \mathbf{p} \in S, \quad (3.21)$$

interpreting $D\mathbf{n}$ as the Weingarten map of S .

Lemma 3. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, be a stationary \mathcal{H} -surface w.r.t. $E_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and let $\varphi \in C_c^2(B^+ \cup I)$ be chosen. Setting

$$q(w) := [2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}(w))^2 - K(w) - \nabla \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}(w)) \cdot \mathbf{N}(w)]W(w), \quad w \in B^+ \cup I, \quad (3.22)$$

we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \varphi) &= \iint_{B^+} \left\{ |\nabla \varphi|^2 - 2q\varphi^2 \right\} du dv + \int_I \varphi^2 \frac{\mathbf{N}_v \cdot \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})}{1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N}} du \\
&+ \int_I \varphi^2 \left\{ \frac{[D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N})] \cdot [\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u]}{(1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N})^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{x})[(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})][(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})]^2}{(1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N})^2} \right\} du.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. We add the results of Propositions 1 and 2 obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v| + \mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
&= |\nabla \varphi|^2 - 2q\varphi^2 - [\varphi(\mathbf{N}_u \cdot \mathbf{y})]_u - [\varphi(\mathbf{N}_v \cdot \mathbf{y})]_v \\
&\quad + [(D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{x}_v)]_u + [(D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\
&\quad + [(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N}) \cdot (\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{y}_v)]_u + [(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N}) \cdot (\mathbf{y}_u \wedge \mathbf{y})]_v \\
&\quad + [\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u + \mathbf{x}_v \wedge \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}))]_u + [\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u)]_v.
\end{aligned}$$

Having $\mathbf{y} \parallel (\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N})$ on I in mind, the divergence theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \varphi) &= \iint_{B^+} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} (|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v| + \mathbf{Q}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_u \wedge \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_v) \Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
&= \iint_{B^+} \left\{ |\nabla \varphi|^2 - 2q\varphi^2 \right\} du dv + \int_I \varphi(\mathbf{N}_v \cdot \mathbf{y}) du \\
&\quad - \int_I \left\{ (D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{y}) \cdot (\mathbf{x}_u \wedge \mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \right\} du.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Due to the special choice (3.19) of \mathbf{y} , the first three terms on the right-hand side of (3.24) are identical with those in the announced relation (3.23). In order to identify the fourth terms of (3.23) and (3.24), we recall Lemma 2 (i) and deduce

$$\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) = (\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})) [(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})] \quad \text{on } I. \tag{3.25}$$

Similar to [HS3] p. 431, we compute $\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})$ on I : Since $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon) \in S$ holds for all $w \in I$ and $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$, we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon)) = 0$ and, consequently,

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varepsilon^2} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon)) + \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon) \cdot \left[D\mathbf{n}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon)) \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(w, \varepsilon) \right] = 0$$

for $w \in I$ and $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0)$. For $\varepsilon = 0$ we employ (3.21) and infer

$$\mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) = -\kappa(\mathbf{x}) [\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})]^2 \quad \text{on } I.$$

Together with (3.25), we arrive at

$$\mathbf{z} \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) = -\kappa(\mathbf{x}) [(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})] [\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})]^2 \quad \text{on } I.$$

Putting this relation into (3.24), proves the assertion. \square

Remark 2. By a standard approximation argument, dilations $\varphi \in H_2^1(B^+) \cap C_c^0(B^+ \cup I)$ are admissible in the second variation $\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \varphi)$ due to formula (3.23).

Definition 4. A partially free \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in C_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$ with $\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \varphi) \geq 0$ for any dilation $\varphi \in H_2^1(B^+) \cap C_c^0(\overline{B^+})$ is called stable.

4 Boundary condition for the surface normal and proof of the theorem

In order to deduce the crucial relation $N^3 > 0$ on $\overline{B^+}$ for the third component of the surface normal of our stable \mathcal{H} -surface, we will combine formula (3.23) with the following boundary condition:

Lemma 4. Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be satisfied and let a stationary \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in C_\mu(\Gamma, S; \overline{Z})$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$, be given. Then, the third component N^3 of the surface normal of \mathbf{x} fulfills the boundary condition

$$N_v^3 = \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{N}_v \cdot \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})}{1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N}} + \frac{[D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N})] \cdot [\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u]}{(1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N})^2} + \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{x})[(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x})][(\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}(\mathbf{x})]^2}{(1 + \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{N})^2} \right\} N^3 \quad \text{on } I, \quad (4.1)$$

where \mathbf{t} , \mathbf{n} , and κ were defined in (2.1), (3.20).

Proof.

1. From (1.1) and Lemma 2 (iv) we get the well known relations

$$\mathbf{N}_u = \mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{N}_v - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}_u, \quad \mathbf{N}_v = -\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{N}_u - 2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}_v \quad \text{on } B^+ \cup I. \quad (4.2)$$

Writing $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x})$, $\kappa = \kappa(\mathbf{x})$ etc. and employing (4.2) as well as (2.17), we compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{N}_v \cdot \mathbf{Q})N^3 &= \{[(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{N}_v]\mathbf{N}\} \cdot \mathbf{e}_3 \\ &= -\left\{(\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{N}_v) \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) - [\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})]\mathbf{N}_v\right\} \cdot \mathbf{e}_3 \\ &= -\left\{\mathbf{N}_u \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) + 2\mathcal{H}\mathbf{x}_u \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) - [1 + (\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N})]\mathbf{N}_v\right\} \cdot \mathbf{e}_3 \\ &= (\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) + [1 + (\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N})]N_v^3 \quad \text{on } I. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the asserted relation (4.1) is equivalent to the identity

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) &= -\left\{[D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \kappa[(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}][(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}]^2\right\} \frac{N^3}{1 + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N}} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

on I .

2. Next, we manipulate the left-hand side of (4.3): Having (2.17) in mind, we find

$$(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_3 = (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \wedge (\mathbf{n} \wedge \mathbf{t}) = [(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}] \mathbf{n} \quad \text{on } I.$$

Together with (3.21), we infer

$$\begin{aligned} [(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_3]_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) &= [(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}] \{[(D\mathbf{n})\mathbf{x}_u] \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})\} \\ &= \kappa [(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}]^2 (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{t}) \quad \text{on } I. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

On the other hand, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{t})(1 + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N}) &= (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{t})[\mathbf{N} \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \\ &= [\mathbf{x}_u \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \cdot (\mathbf{t} \wedge \mathbf{N}) - (\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{N})[\mathbf{t} \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \\ &= \{[\mathbf{x}_u \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \cdot \mathbf{n}\}[\mathbf{n} \cdot (\mathbf{t} \wedge \mathbf{N})] \\ &= -[(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}]N^3 \quad \text{on } I \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \mathbf{t} = -\frac{N^3}{1 + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N}} [(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}] \quad \text{on } I. \quad (4.5)$$

From (4.4) and (4.5) we now deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{N} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) &= [(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \wedge \mathbf{e}_3]_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) - (\mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \\ &= -\kappa [(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \cdot \mathbf{n}] [(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \cdot \mathbf{t}]^2 \frac{N^3}{1 + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N}} \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) \quad \text{on } I. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

By inserting (4.6) into (4.3), the claimed relation (4.1) becomes equivalent to

$$(\mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) = [D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \frac{N^3}{1 + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N}} \quad \text{on } I. \quad (4.7)$$

3. In the next step, we observe that (4.7) is equivalent to the identity

$$[(D\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{x}_u] \cdot [\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] + \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \{ \mathbf{e}_3 \wedge [(D\mathbf{Q})(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \} = 0 \quad \text{on } I. \quad (4.8)$$

Indeed, the left hand side of (4.7) can be written as

$$(\mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{e}_3)_u \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) = \{[(D\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{x}_u] \wedge \mathbf{e}_3\} \cdot (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}) = [(D\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{x}_u] \cdot [\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})],$$

whereas, using Lagrange identity and boundary condition (2.13), we compute on the right hand side

$$\begin{aligned} [D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \cdot (\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) N^3 &= [(\mathbf{x}_v + \mathbf{Q} \wedge \mathbf{x}_u) \wedge \mathbf{N}] \cdot \{[D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \wedge \mathbf{e}_3\} \\ &= (1 + \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{N}) \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \{[D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \wedge \mathbf{e}_3\} \quad \text{on } I. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claimed equivalence.

4. It remains to prove (4.8). Applying the relation (3.17) with $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{x}_u$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{e}_3$, $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N}$, and $\mathbf{M} = D\mathbf{Q}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & [(D\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{x}_u] \cdot [\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] + \mathbf{x}_u \cdot \{\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge [(D\mathbf{Q})(\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})]\} \\ &= -\mathbf{x}_u \cdot \{[(D\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{e}_3] \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})\} + (\text{tr } D\mathbf{Q})\{\mathbf{x}_u \cdot [\mathbf{e}_3 \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})]\} \\ &= [(D\mathbf{Q})\mathbf{e}_3] \cdot [\mathbf{x}_u \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})] \quad \text{on } I, \end{aligned}$$

where we also used $\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N} \parallel T_{\mathbf{x}}S$. For the same reason, $\mathbf{x}_u \wedge (\mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{N})$ is normal to S along I and, as a consequence, the right hand side of the above identity vanishes. Indeed, we have

$$[D\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p})\mathbf{e}_3] \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p}) = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial p^3} \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}) \right] \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial p^3} [\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{p})] = 0 \quad \text{on } S,$$

by assumption. This completes the proof of (4.8), and (4.1) is confirmed.
q.e.d.

We are now able to give the

Proof of Theorem 1. 1. According to Lemma 2 (iv), the surface normal $\mathbf{N} = (N^1, N^2, N^3)$ of \mathbf{x} belongs to $C^{2,\alpha}(B^+) \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}) \cap C^0(\overline{B^+})$. In addition, the inclusion $f(\overline{B^+}) \subset \overline{G}$ and the $\frac{1}{R}$ -convexity of G imply $N^3 > 0$ on $J \setminus \{-1, +1\}$ as was shown in [S1] Satz 2. The behaviour of the surface normal near the corner points ± 1 was studied in [M4] Theorem 5.4; the applicability of the cited result follows – after reflecting S and rotating appropriately in \mathbb{R}^3 – from the assumption $|(\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n})(\mathbf{p}_j)| < \cos \alpha_j \leq \cos \gamma_j$ for $j = 1, 2$, where γ_j denote the angles between Γ and S at \mathbf{p}_j ($j = 1, 2$). In particular, $N^3(\pm 1)$ cannot vanish and, by continuity, we infer $N^3(\pm 1) > 0$. Consequently, the dilation $\omega := (N^3)^- = \max\{0, -N^3\} \in C_c^0(B^+ \cup I) \cap H_2^1(B^+)$ is admissible in the second variation of $A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x})$. Writing $\omega^2 = -\omega N^3$ and $|\nabla \omega|^2 = -\nabla \omega \cdot \nabla N^3$, we obtain from Lemmas 3 and 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) &= \iint_{B^+} \{|\nabla \omega|^2 - 2q\omega^2\} du dv - \int_I \omega N_v^3 du \\ &= - \iint_{B^+} \{\text{div}(\omega \nabla N^3) + \omega(\Delta N^3 + 2qN^3)\} du dv - \int_I \omega N_v^3 du \\ &= \iint_{B^+} \omega(\Delta N^3 + 2qN^3) du dv = -2 \iint_{B^+} \omega \mathcal{H}_{p^3}(\mathbf{x}) W du dv \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have applied Gauss' theorem, equation (2.14), and assumption (2.9) in the last line. The stability of \mathbf{x} thus yields $\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = 0$.

2. Now we choose $\xi \in C_c^\infty(B^+)$ arbitrarily. Then also $\omega + \varepsilon \xi$ is admissible in $\delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \cdot)$ for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. The function $\Xi(\varepsilon) := \delta^2 A_{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{x}, \omega + \varepsilon \xi)$ depends

smoothly on $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies $\Xi \geq 0$ as well as $\Xi(0) = 0$. Consequently, we have $\Xi'(0) = 0$, which means

$$\iint_{B^+} \{\nabla \omega \cdot \nabla \xi - 2q\omega\xi\} du dv = 0 \quad \text{for any } \xi \in C_c^\infty(B^+),$$

according to formula (3.23). From $\omega = 0$ near J , we conclude $\omega \equiv 0$ by means of the weak Harnack inequality. Hence, we have $N^3 \geq 0$ in $\overline{B^+}$. Due to assumption (2.9) and equation (2.14), we further have $\Delta N^3 + 2qN^3 \leq 0$ in B^+ . Therefore, Harnack's inequality, in conjunction with $N^3 > 0$ near J , yields $N^3 > 0$ in $B^+ \cup J$. Finally, we have $N^3 > 0$ on I and hence everywhere on the closed half disc $\overline{B^+}$. Indeed, if $N^3(w_0) = 0$ would be true for some point $w_0 \in I$, relation (4.1) would imply $N_v^3(w_0) = 0$. But this is impossible due to Hopf's boundary point lemma.

3. Since we have no branch points on $\partial B^+ \setminus \{-1, +1\}$ according to Lemma 2 (iii), the relation $N^3 > 0$ on ∂B^+ implies $x_u^1 x_v^2 - x_u^2 x_v^1 > 0$ on $\partial B^+ \setminus \{-1, +1\}$. Consequently, the projection $f = \pi(\mathbf{x}) = (x^1, x^2) : \overline{B^+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ maps ∂B^+ topologically and positively oriented onto ∂G . As in [S1] Hilfsatz 7, an index argument now shows that $f : \overline{B^+} \rightarrow \overline{G}$ is a homeomorphism, \mathbf{x} has no branch points in $\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}$, and $J_f > 0$ is satisfied in $\overline{B^+} \setminus \{-1, +1\}$. By the inverse mapping theorem and the regularity of \mathbf{x} , the mapping $f : \overline{G} \rightarrow \overline{B^+}$ belongs to $C^2(\overline{G} \setminus \{p_1, p_2\}) \cap C^0(\overline{G})$, where we abbreviated $p_j = \pi(\mathbf{p}_j)$, $j = 1, 2$.

Now we consider $\zeta := x^3 \circ f^{-1} \in C^2(\overline{G} \setminus \{p_1, p_2\}) \cap C^0(\overline{G})$. Since we have $(x^1, x^2, \zeta(x^1, x^2)) = \mathbf{x} \circ f^{-1}(x^1, x^2)$, ζ is the desired graph representation over \overline{G} satisfying the differential equation (2.11) and the second boundary condition in (2.12). In addition, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{(2.17)}{=} -\mathbf{N} \cdot \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \zeta|^2}} (\zeta_{x^1}, \zeta_{x^2}, -1) \cdot (\nu(\mathbf{x}), 0) \\ &= \frac{\nabla \zeta \cdot \nu(\mathbf{x})}{\sqrt{1 + |\nabla \zeta|^2}}, \quad \mathbf{x} = (x^1, x^2, \zeta(x^1, x^2)), \quad (x^1, x^2) \in \Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, ζ is a solution of the boundary value problem (2.11), (2.12), and standard elliptic theory yields $\zeta \in C^{3,\alpha}(G) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{G} \setminus \{p_1, p_2\})$ according to the regularity assumptions on \mathbf{Q} , \mathcal{H} , S , and Γ . This completes the proof. \square

We finally give an example of how to apply Theorem 1 to the existence question for the mixed boundary value problem (2.11), (2.12).

Corollary 2. *Let $G \subset B_R := \{(x^1, x^2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |(x^1, x^2)| < R\}$ be a $\frac{1}{R}$ -convex domain with boundary $\partial G = \underline{\Gamma} \cup \Sigma$, where $\underline{\Gamma}, \Sigma \in C^3$ are closed Jordan arcs, which satisfy $\underline{\Gamma} \cap \Sigma = \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$ and which meet with interior angles $\alpha_j \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ w.r.t. G at the distinct points π_j ($j = 1, 2$). In addition, assume that Σ can be written as a graph*

$$\Sigma = \{(x^1, x^2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 = g(x^1), a \leq x^1 \leq b\}, \quad -R < a < b < R,$$

with some function $g \in C^3([-R, R])$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{H} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{B_R})$, $\psi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\Sigma)$ and $\gamma \in C^3(\mathbb{T})$ be given functions and abbreviate $h_0 := \sup_{B_R} |H|$, $\psi_0 := \sup_{\Sigma} |\psi|$, $g_0 := \sup_{[-R,R]} |g'|$. Finally, suppose the conditions

$$4Rh_0 + \psi_0 \sqrt{1 + g_0^2} < 1, \quad |\psi(\pi_j)| < \cos \alpha_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (4.9)$$

to be satisfied. Then, the boundary value problem (2.11), (2.12) has a unique solution $\zeta \in C^{3,\alpha}(G) \cap C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{G} \setminus \{\pi_1, \pi_2\}) \cap C^0(\overline{G})$.

Remark 3. Note that the prescribed mean curvature function \mathcal{H} in Corollary 2 does not depend on the height p^3 . If one wants to allow such a dependence, one has to use estimates for the length of the free trace as given in [M2]; see [M3] sec. 6 for a description of the required arguments.

Proof of Corollary 2. We assume w.l.o.g. that the exterior normal ν w.r.t. G is given by $\nu = (1 + (g')^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(g', -1)$ along Σ and set

$$Q_2(p^1, p^2) := 2 \int_{g(p^1)}^{p^2} H(p^1, \eta) d\eta - \psi(p^1, g(p^1)) \sqrt{1 + g'(p^1)}, \quad (p^1, p^2) \in \overline{B_R}.$$

We use the notations $Z = B_R \times \mathbb{R}$, $\Gamma = \text{graph } \varphi$, $S = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{n} = (\nu, 0), \dots$ from above and set $\mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{p}) := (0, Q_2(p^1, p^2), 0)$ for $\mathbf{p} = (p^1, p^2, p^3) \in \overline{Z}$. Then, \mathbf{Q} belongs to $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{Z}, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and satisfies

$$\text{div } \mathbf{Q} = Q_{2,p^2} = 2\mathcal{H} \quad \text{in } \overline{Z}, \quad \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \psi \quad \text{on } \Sigma.$$

In addition, \mathbf{Q} fulfills relations (2.10) and $\sup_Z |Q| < 1$, according to our assumptions (4.9). Consequently, the preconditions of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 are satisfied. The graph representation of the existing (and unique) stable \mathcal{H} -surface $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_\mu(\Gamma, S, \overline{Z})$ yields the desired solution of (2.11), (2.12). \square

References

- [DHT] U. Dierkes, S. Hildebrandt, A. J. Tromba: *Regularity of minimal surfaces*. Grundlehren math. Wiss. **340**. Springer, Heidelberg, 2010.
- [He] E. Heinz: *Über das Randverhalten quasilinearer elliptischer Systeme mit isothermen Parametern*. Math. Z. **113**, 99–105 (1970).
- [Hi] S. Hildebrandt: *Einige Bemerkungen über Flächen beschränkter mittlerer Krümmung*. Math. Z. **115**, 169–178 (1970).
- [HJ] S. Hildebrandt, W. Jäger: *On the regularity of surfaces with prescribed mean curvature at a free boundary*. Math. Z. **118**, 289–308 (1970).
- [HS1] S. Hildebrandt, F. Sauvigny: *Embeddedness and uniqueness of minimal surfaces solving a partially free boundary value problem*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **422**, 69–89 (1991).
- [HS2] S. Hildebrandt, F. Sauvigny: *On one-to-one harmonic maps and minimal surfaces*. Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Gött., II. Math.-Phys. Kl., 73–93 (1992).

- [HS3] S. Hildebrandt, F. Sauvigny: *Uniqueness of stable minimal surfaces with partially free boundaries*. J. Math. Soc. Japan **47**, 423–440 (1995).
- [M1] F. Müller: *On the analytic continuation of H -surfaces across the free boundary*. Analysis **22**, 201–218 (2002).
- [M2] F. Müller: *A priori bounds for surfaces with prescribed mean curvature and partially free boundaries*. Analysis **26**, 471–489 (2006).
- [M3] F. Müller: *On stable surfaces of prescribed mean curvature with partially free boundaries*. Calc. Var. **24**, 289–308 (2005).
- [M4] F. Müller: *The asymptotic behaviour of surfaces with prescribed mean curvature near meeting points of fixed and free boundaries*. Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, Cl. Sci. (5) **6**, 529–559 (2007).
- [M5] F. Müller: *On the regularity of H -surfaces with free boundaries on a smooth support manifold*. Analysis **28**, 401–419 (2008).
- [M6] F. Müller: *On $C^{1, \frac{1}{2}}$ -regularity of \mathcal{H} -surfaces with a free boundary*. Preprint, Universität Duisburg-Essen, arXiv:2008.12581 (2020).
- [MW] F. Müller, S. Winklmann: *Projectability and uniqueness of F -stable immersions with partially free boundaries*. Pac. J. Math. **230**, 409–426 (2007).
- [S1] F. Sauvigny: *Flächen vorgeschriebener mittlerer Krümmung mit eindeutiger Projektion auf eine Ebene*. Math. Z. **180**, 41–67 (1982).
- [S2] F. Sauvigny: *Partial Differential Equations 1 - Foundations and Integral Representations*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.