

CMC DOUBLINGS OF MINIMAL SURFACES VIA MIN-MAX

LIAM MAZUROWSKI

ABSTRACT. Let $\Sigma^2 \subset M^3$ be a minimal surface of index 0 or 1. Assume that a neighborhood of Σ can be foliated by constant mean curvature (cmc) hypersurfaces. We use min-max theory and the catenoid estimate to construct ε -cmc doublings of Σ for small $\varepsilon > 0$. Such cmc doublings were previously constructed for minimal hypersurfaces $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ with $n + 1 \geq 4$ by Pacard and Sun [21] using gluing methods.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be a Riemannian manifold. A minimal hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$ is a critical point of the area functional on M . A constant mean curvature (cmc) hypersurface is a critical point of the area functional subject to variations that preserve the enclosed volume. A fundamental problem in geometry is to construct minimal and cmc hypersurfaces in a given manifold.

Min-max methods have long proven to be a powerful tool for constructing minimal surfaces. In 1981, Pitts [22], building on work of Almgren [1], used min-max methods to show that every closed manifold M^{n+1} with $3 \leq n+1 \leq 6$ contains a smooth, embedded minimal hypersurface. Schoen and Simon [23] improved this to $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$. In fact, the work of Schoen and Simon shows that every M^{n+1} with $n+1 \geq 3$ contains a minimal hypersurface which is smooth and embedded up to a set of codimension 7.

In 1982, Yau [27] conjectured that every closed manifold contains infinitely many minimal surfaces. Marques and Neves devised a program to prove Yau's conjecture by developing a detailed understanding of the Morse theory of the area functional on a manifold. This program has now been carried out to great success. In [8], Irie, Marques, and Neves showed that Yau's conjecture is true for a generic metric on M^{n+1} with $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$. In fact, they proved more: generically the union of all minimal surfaces in M is dense in M . A crucial ingredient in the proof was the Weyl law for the volume spectrum proven by Liokumovich, Marques, and Neves [14].

Later Marques, Neves, and Song [19] improved the result in [8] by showing that, for a generic metric on M , some sequence of minimal surfaces becomes equidistributed in M . Gaspar and Guaraco [6] showed that the Weyl law and equidistribution results also hold in the Allen-Cahn setting. In the non-generic case, Song [25] has shown that a closed manifold of dimension $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$ with an arbitrary metric contains infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces. Thus Yau's conjecture is fully resolved for these dimensions. In the higher dimensional case, Li [13] has shown that for a generic metric on M^{n+1} with $n+1 \geq 8$ there are infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces of optimal regularity.

Recently, Zhou [28] proved the multiplicity one conjecture of Marques and Neves [17]. Using this, Marques and Neves [17] [18] were able to prove the following: for a generic metric on M^{n+1} with $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$ there is a smooth, embedded, two-sided, index p minimal hypersurface for every $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, the area of these surfaces grows with p according to the Weyl law for the volume spectrum [14].

Min-max methods for constructing constant mean curvature surfaces have only been developed more recently. Fix a number $h > 0$. Define a functional A^h on open sets in M with smooth boundary by setting

$$A^h(\Omega) = \text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - h \text{Vol}(\Omega).$$

It is known that the critical points of A^h are precisely those sets Ω whose boundary has constant mean curvature h with respect to the inward pointing normal vector. In [30], Zhou and Zhu developed a min-max theory for the A^h functional, and used this theory to show that every closed manifold M^{n+1} with $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$ admits a smooth almost-embedded h -cmc hypersurface for every $h > 0$. In [29], Zhou and Zhu extended the theory to construct more general prescribed mean curvature hypersurfaces. Zhou [28] used this to give a proof of the multiplicity one conjecture of Marques and Neves [17]. Earlier work of Chodosh and Mantoulidis [3] had shown that the multiplicity one conjecture was true for dimension $n+1 = 3$ in the Allen-Cahn setting.

Another technique for constructing minimal and constant mean curvature hypersurfaces is the so-called gluing method. Starting from a collection of nearly minimal surfaces, one joins them together in a carefully chosen manner and then shows that the resulting surface can be perturbed to be minimal (or to have constant mean curvature). Kapouleas and Yang [11] used this technique to construct minimal doublings of the Clifford torus in S^3 . Kapouleas has also used it to construct constant mean curvature surfaces of high genus in \mathbb{R}^3 [9], and to construct minimal doublings of the equator in S^3 [10]. In [21], Pacard and Sun used gluing methods to construct constant mean curvature

doublings of minimal hypersurfaces. The following theorem is a special case of their results (see Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.1 in [21]).

Theorem 1 (Pacard and Sun). *Let $n+1 \geq 4$. Let $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ be an embedded minimal hypersurface. Assume that the Jacobi operator J for Σ is invertible, and that the unique solution ϕ to $J\phi = 1$ does not change sign, and that ϕ has a non-degenerate critical point. Then for every sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an embedded ε -cmc hypersurface which is a doubling of Σ .*

It is natural to ask whether surfaces produced by gluing methods can also be produced by variational techniques. In the case of the Clifford torus in S^3 , Ketover, Marques, and Neves [12] proved the catenoid estimate and used it to give a min-max construction of the doublings of Kapouleas and Yang [11]. In this paper we show that, in certain circumstances, cmc doublings like those of Pacard and Sun can be constructed using min-max methods. Our results apply in the case $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$. In the remainder of the introduction, we give a heuristic explanation of the min-max construction of cmc doublings.

1.1. The Stable Case. Fix a dimension $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$. Suppose that $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ is an embedded, two-sided, stable, minimal hypersurface. Assume that a neighborhood of Σ can be foliated by β -cmcs Σ^β whose mean curvature vectors point towards Σ . Every strictly stable minimal surface admits such a neighborhood by the implicit function theorem and the maximum principle. A degenerate stable minimal surface may or may not admit such a neighborhood.

Let Ω^ε be the open set in between Σ^ε and $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$. Then Ω^ε is a critical point of A^ε . Moreover, using the second variation formula for A^ε , one can check that Ω^ε is strictly stable for A^ε . Thus Ω^ε is a strict local minimum for A^ε in the smooth topology. Now, by the isoperimetric inequality, the empty set is also a local minimum for A^ε . Thus one can attempt to do min-max for the A^ε functional over all 1-parameter families of open sets connecting the empty set to Ω^ε .

Theorem 6 and Theorem 7 are the main results of this paper in the stable case. In Theorem 6, we formalize the min-max argument outlined above to construct an ε -cmc doubling of Σ . The key tool in the proof is the min-max theory for the A^ε functional introduced by Zhou and Zhu in [30]. We also borrow ideas from previous mountain pass type arguments for minimal surfaces. See De Lellis and Ramic [4], Marques and Neves [16], and Montezuma [20]. In the case $n = 2$, we are further able to show that the ε -cmc doubling constructed in Theorem 6 consists of two parallel copies of Σ joined by a small

catenoidal neck. This is the content of Theorem 7. The proof of this theorem is based on work of Chodosh, Ketover, and Maximo [2].

1.2. The Index 1 Case. Fix a dimension $3 \leq n + 1 \leq 7$. Let $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ be an embedded, two-sided, index 1, minimal hypersurface. Let L be the Jacobi operator on Σ and assume that L is non-degenerate and that the unique solution ϕ to $L\phi = 1$ is positive. The assumption that L is non-degenerate together with the fact that $\phi > 0$ implies that a neighborhood of Σ is foliated by cmc hypersurfaces. Again let Σ^β denote the β -cmc in this foliation and note that the mean curvature vector of Σ^β points away from Σ . Moreover, the surface Σ^β lies at a height on the order of β over Σ .

Now fix a small number $\varepsilon > 0$ and consider an ε -cmc doubling Λ^ε of Σ . If Λ^ε arises from the construction of Pacard and Sun, there is a decomposition

$$\Lambda^\varepsilon = \Lambda_+ \cup \Lambda_- \cup N$$

where N is a small neck, and Λ_+ and Λ_- are each diffeomorphic to Σ with a small ball removed. The sheet Λ_+ is the graph of a function of small norm over Σ^ε , and the sheet Λ_- is the graph of a function of small norm over $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$. From this structure, we expect that the index of Λ^ε is three, where the three deformations decreasing A^ε correspond to varying the height of Λ_+ , varying the height of Λ_- , and pinching the neck. Thus Λ^ε should be the solution to a three parameter min-max problem.

Based on this, we construct a three parameter family of surfaces Φ parameterized by the cube

$$X = \left\{ (x, y, t) : -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq x \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq y \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, 0 \leq t \leq R \right\},$$

where $R \gg \varepsilon$ is a fixed small number. To define Φ , first let $\Phi(0, 0, 0) = \Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$. Think of this as a top sheet Σ^ε at height ε and a bottom sheet $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ at height $-\varepsilon$. Then extend Φ to the rest of X as follows: changing the x -coordinate varies the height of the top sheet by up to $\pm\varepsilon/2$, changing the y -coordinate varies the height of the bottom sheet by up to $\pm\varepsilon/2$, and increasing the t -coordinate opens up a neck between the two sheets.

This family Φ has two important properties.

- (i) The surface $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ is an index two critical point of A^ε and the bottom face of the cube X is a two parameter family of deformations that decreases A^ε .

(ii) The surface $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ maximizes A^ε over the boundary of X .

To see property (ii), first observe that $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ maximizes A^ε over the bottom face of the cube. Second, note that by opening a neck up to a fixed size $R \gg \varepsilon$, we can ensure that $A^\varepsilon(S) < A^\varepsilon(\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon})$ for every surface S in the top face of the cube. Finally, consider a surface T in the boundary of the bottom face of the cube. Since Σ is unstable, there is a uniform constant c such that

$$A^\varepsilon(T) < A^\varepsilon(\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}) - c\varepsilon^2.$$

On the other hand, by the catenoid estimate of Ketover, Marques, and Neves [12], it is possible to open a neck between the two sheets in T without ever increasing the area by more than $C\varepsilon^2/|\log \varepsilon|$. Therefore, we can ensure that $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ also maximizes A^ε over the side faces of the cube.

Theorem 25 and Theorem 26 are the main results of this paper in the index 1 case. In Theorem 25, we construct ε -cmc surfaces Λ^ε in M by doing min-max for the A^ε functional over all families of surfaces Ψ parameterized by the cube X with $\Psi = \Phi$ on ∂X . These surfaces Λ^ε have the property that $\text{Area}(\Lambda^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In Theorem 26, we show that for a generic metric on M the surfaces Λ^ε of Theorem 25 are doublings of Σ .

1.3. Organization. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews some concepts from geometric measure theory as well as some definitions and theorems from Zhou's min-max theory. Section 3 constructs cmc doublings in the stable case. Section 4 constructs cmc doublings in the index 1 case. Appendix A contains a quantitative minimality theorem that is needed to check that the width of certain homotopy classes is non-trivial. Appendix B proves that a certain class of metrics is generic.

1.4. Acknowledgements. I would like to thank my advisor André Neves for his continual encouragement and for many valuable discussions regarding this work.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let M^{n+1} be a smooth, closed Riemannian manifold. We begin by introducing some tools from geometric measure theory.

- The set $\mathcal{I}_k(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the space of k -dimensional rectifiable flat chains mod 2 in M .

- The flat norm on $\mathcal{I}_k(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is denoted by \mathcal{F} , and the mass norm on $\mathcal{I}_k(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is denoted by \mathbf{M} .
- Given $T \in \mathcal{I}_k(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$, the notation $|T|$ stands for the varifold induced by T .
- The \mathbf{F} metric on $\mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{F}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \mathcal{F}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) + \mathbf{F}(|\partial\Omega_1|, |\partial\Omega_2|)$$

where \mathbf{F} on the right hand side is Pitts' \mathbf{F} -metric on varifolds.

- Following Marques and Neves, an embedded minimal cycle in M is defined to be a varifold V of the form

$$V = a_1\Gamma_1 + \dots + a_\ell\Gamma_\ell$$

where the Γ_i are disjoint, smooth, embedded minimal surfaces in M and the a_i are positive integers.

- Given $\varepsilon > 0$, define $A^\varepsilon: \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $A^\varepsilon(\Omega) = \text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega)$.

The following definitions are due to Zhou in [28]. Let X be a cubical complex and let Z be a subcomplex of X . Fix an \mathbf{F} -continuous map $\Phi: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Definition 2. The (X, Z) -homotopy class of Φ consists of all sequences $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ with the following properties. First, each Ψ_i is an \mathbf{F} -continuous map $X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Second, for each i , there is a flat continuous homotopy $H_i: [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that

$$(i) \quad H_i(0, x) = \Psi_i(x),$$

$$(ii) \quad H_i(1, x) = \Phi(x),$$

$$(iii) \quad \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup_{z \in Z, t \in [0, 1]} \mathbf{F}(\Phi(z), H_i(t, z)) \right] = 0.$$

Definition 3. Let Π be the (X, Z) -homotopy class of Φ . Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$. Given a sequence $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ in Π we let

$$L^\varepsilon(\{\Psi_i\}_i) = \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left[\max_{x \in X} A^\varepsilon(\Psi_i(x)) \right].$$

The width of the homotopy class Π is then defined by

$$L^\varepsilon(\Pi) = \inf_{\{\Psi_i\}_i \in \Pi} L^\varepsilon(\{\Psi_i\}_i).$$

Definition 4. Let Γ be a smooth, immersed, constant mean curvature hypersurface in M . Then Γ is said to be almost-embedded provided for every point $p \in M$ either

- (i) Γ is embedded in a neighborhood of p , or
- (ii) Γ decomposes into the union of two embedded pieces Γ_1 and Γ_2 in a neighborhood of p with Γ_1 on one side of Γ_2 .

The following min-max theorem for the A^ε functional is due to Zhou. See Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 3.1 in [28].

Theorem 5 (Zhou). *Assume that the min-max width Π is non-trivial, i.e., that*

$$L^\varepsilon(\Pi) > \max_{z \in Z} A^\varepsilon(\Phi(z)).$$

Then there is a smooth, almost-embedded ε -cmc hypersurface Λ^ε in M , and there is an open set Θ^ε in M with $\partial\Theta^\varepsilon = \Lambda^\varepsilon$ and $A^\varepsilon(\Theta^\varepsilon) = L^\varepsilon(\Pi)$. Moreover, the index of Λ^ε as a critical point of A^ε is at most the dimension of X .

3. THE STABLE CASE

3.1. Statement of Results. We now formalize the assumptions outlined in the introduction. Fix a dimension $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$. Let (M^{n+1}, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold and let $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ be a closed, connected, two-sided, minimal hypersurface. Also assume the following.

- (S-i) There is a neighborhood U of Σ and a smooth function f on U and a number $\alpha > 0$ such that $-\alpha < f < \alpha$ on U .
- (S-ii) The level set $\Sigma^\beta := f^{-1}(\beta)$ is a closed hypersurface diffeomorphic to Σ with constant mean curvature $|\beta|$ for $|\beta| < \alpha$. Moreover $\Sigma^0 = \Sigma$.
- (S-iii) The mean curvature vector of Σ^β points toward Σ for each $|\beta| < \alpha$.
- (S-iv) The gradient ∇f does not vanish anywhere on $U \setminus \Sigma$.

For future reference, we will refer to this collection of assumptions as (S). Let Ω^ε be the region contained between Σ^ε and $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$.

Our main theorems in the stable case are the following.

Theorem 6. *Fix (M^{n+1}, g) and Σ for which the assumptions (S) hold. Then there is a smooth, almost-embedded ε -cmc Λ^ε contained in Ω^ε . Moreover, there is an open set $\Theta^\varepsilon \subset \Omega^\varepsilon$ with $\Lambda^\varepsilon = \partial\Theta^\varepsilon$, and the index of $\Lambda^\varepsilon = \partial\Theta^\varepsilon$ as a critical point of A^ε is at most 1.*

Theorem 7. *Assume further that $n = 2$. Then the surface Λ^ε from the previous theorem admits a decomposition*

$$\Lambda^\varepsilon = \Lambda_+^\varepsilon \cup \Lambda_-^\varepsilon \cup N$$

where each Λ_\pm^ε is the graph of a function of small norm over Σ minus a ball and N is a catenoidal neck.

3.2. Sweepouts. We would like to use a mountain pass type argument to produce an ε -cmc. We now introduce the maps that will serve as sweepouts. Fix a number $0 < \varepsilon < \alpha$. For each $0 < \beta < \alpha$, let $\Omega^\beta = \{-\beta < f < \beta\}$ denote the open set between $\Sigma^{-\beta}$ and Σ^β . Also fix a small number $\eta > 0$ to be specified later and let $\Omega^* = \Omega^{\varepsilon+\eta}$.

Proposition 8. *There is an \mathbf{F} -continuous map $\Phi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\Phi(0) = \emptyset$ and $\Phi(1) = \Omega^\varepsilon$.*

Proof. The map $\Psi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ given by $\Psi(t) = \Omega^{t\varepsilon}$ is continuous in the flat topology. By Lemma A.1 in Zhou and Zhu [30], it is possible to construct a sequence $\{\phi_i\}_i$ of better and better discrete approximations to Ψ . Applying Zhou's discrete to continuous interpolation theorem (Theorem 1.12 in [28]) produces the required map Φ from the sequence $\{\phi_i\}_i$. \square

Definition 9. Let Φ be the map constructed in the previous proposition. A sweepout is an \mathbf{F} -continuous map $\Psi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\Psi(0) = \emptyset$ and $\Psi(1) = \Omega^\varepsilon$ that is flat homotopic to Φ relative to $\partial[0, 1]$. More precisely, this last statement means that there is a flat continuous map $H: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that

- (i) $H(0, t) = \Phi(t)$,
- (ii) $H(1, t) = \Psi(t)$,
- (iii) $H(s, 0) = \emptyset$,
- (iv) $H(s, 1) = \Omega^\varepsilon$,

for all s and t .

Remark 10. Let $X = [0, 1]$ and $Z = \{0, 1\}$. Note that a sweepout Ψ is essentially an element of the (X, Z) -homotopy class of Φ as defined in Section 2. However, we require that $\Psi(0)$ exactly equals $\Phi(0)$ and that $\Psi(1)$ exactly equals $\Phi(1)$. Moreover, all sets in a sweepout Ψ are required to be contained in the set Ω^* .

Definition 11. The min-max width W^ε is defined by

$$W^\varepsilon = \inf_{\text{sweepouts } \Psi} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} A^\varepsilon(\Psi(t)) \right].$$

Definition 12. A critical sequence is a sequence of sweepouts $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ with the property that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, 1]} A^\varepsilon(\Psi_i(t)) \right] = W^\varepsilon.$$

Definition 13. Let $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ be a critical sequence. The associated critical set $C(\{\Psi_i\}_i)$ is the collection of all varifolds of the form

$$V = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\partial \Psi_i(t_i)|$$

with $t_i \in [0, 1]$ and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A^\varepsilon(\Psi_i(t_i)) = W^\varepsilon$. Note that the critical set is always non-empty and compact.

3.3. Non-trivial Width. Fix (M, g) and Σ satisfying the assumptions (S) and fix a number $0 < \varepsilon < \alpha$. Recall that the notation Ω^β denotes the open set between $\Sigma^{-\beta}$ and Σ^β . Also $\eta > 0$ is a fixed small number and $\Omega^* = \Omega^{\varepsilon+\eta}$. The number W^ε is the min-max width of the collection of all paths in $\mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ joining \emptyset to Ω^ε while staying inside Ω^* .

The goal of this section is to show that $W^\varepsilon > \max\{A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon), 0\}$. The fact that $W^\varepsilon > A^\varepsilon(\emptyset) = 0$ is a consequence of a suitable isoperimetric inequality.

Proposition 14 (See Theorem 2.15 in [30]). *There are constants C and V such that*

$$\text{Area}(\partial \Omega) \geq C \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{n/(n+1)}$$

whenever $\Omega \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ satisfies $\text{Vol}(\Omega) < V$.

Corollary 15. *The width W^ε is positive.*

Proof. Choose a small number $0 < v < \min\{V, \text{Vol}(\Omega^\varepsilon)\}$. Let $\Psi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbf{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ be a sweepout. By continuity, there must be some Ω in the image of Ψ with $\text{Vol}(\Omega) = v$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A^\varepsilon(\Omega) &= \text{Area}(\partial \Omega) - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega) \\ &\geq C \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{n/(n+1)} - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega) = \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{n/(n+1)} (C - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{1/(n+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

The number on the right hand side is positive provided v is taken sufficiently small. \square

It remains to show that $W^\varepsilon > A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon)$. To begin, we first show that Ω^ε is a strictly stable critical point of A^ε .

Proposition 16. *Assume that (M, g) and Σ satisfy the assumptions (S). Then Ω^ε is a strictly stable critical point of A^ε .*

Proof. Let N be the outward pointing normal vector to $\partial\Omega^\varepsilon$. The second variation formula for A^ε says that

$$\delta^2 A^\varepsilon \Big|_{\Omega^\varepsilon} (uN) = - \int_{\Sigma^\varepsilon} u L_\varepsilon u - \int_{\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}} u L_{-\varepsilon} u,$$

where L_β is the Jacobi operator on Σ^β . Hence to prove the claim it suffices to show that the lowest eigenvalue of L_β is positive for $\beta = \pm\varepsilon$.

We will prove this for L_ε , the argument for $L_{-\varepsilon}$ being essentially identical. Let H be the mean curvature operator on Σ^ε (computed with respect to N). It is known that L_ε is the linearization of H . For γ close enough to ε , we can write Σ^γ as a normal graph of a function φ_γ over Σ^ε . Define

$$\psi = \frac{d}{d\gamma} \Big|_{\gamma=\varepsilon} (\varphi_\gamma)$$

and note that $\psi \geq 0$. Differentiating the equation $H(\varphi_\gamma) = -\gamma$ and evaluating at $\gamma = \varepsilon$ shows that $L_\varepsilon \psi = -1$.

The existence of a non-negative solution to this equation implies that the lowest eigenvalue of L_ε is positive. Indeed, let λ be the lowest eigenvalue of L_ε and let $\zeta > 0$ be the associated eigenfunction so that $L_\varepsilon \zeta + \lambda \zeta = 0$. Since

$$\int_{\Sigma^\varepsilon} \zeta = - \int_{\Sigma^\varepsilon} \zeta L_\varepsilon \psi = - \int_{\Sigma^\varepsilon} \psi L_\varepsilon \zeta = \lambda \int_{\Sigma^\varepsilon} \psi \zeta$$

it follows that λ must be positive. \square

The desired inequality for the width now follows from the quantitative minimality results in Appendix A.

Proposition 17. *There are positive constants δ and C such that*

$$A^\varepsilon(\Omega) \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) + C\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Omega^\varepsilon)^2$$

for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Omega^\varepsilon) < \delta$.*

Proof. Proposition 16 says that Ω^ε is strictly stable for A^ε . Hence the desired result follows from Corollary 40 in Appendix A. \square

Corollary 18. *The width satisfies $W^\varepsilon > A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Let δ and C be the constants from Proposition 17. Without loss we can assume that $\delta < \text{Vol}(\Omega^\varepsilon)$. Let

$$\Psi: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

be a sweepout. By continuity there is some Ω in the image of Ψ with $\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Omega^\varepsilon) = \delta/2$. But then Proposition 17 implies that

$$A^\varepsilon(\Omega) \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) + \frac{C\delta^2}{4},$$

and the corollary follows. \square

3.4. A Deformation Lemma. The goal of this section is to prove a deformation lemma that will be used to show that the min-max surface lies in the interior of Ω^* . The proof closely follows an argument of Marques and Neves [17], and relies on the existence of a deformation that pushes currents away from $\partial\Omega^*$ while simultaneously decreasing A^ε .

Proposition 19. *It is possible to find an open set Ω^{**} with*

$$\Omega^\varepsilon \subset\subset \Omega^{**} \subset\subset \Omega^*$$

together with a Lipschitz vector field Z supported on $\Omega^ \setminus \Omega^\varepsilon$ with flow φ_t such that the following properties hold.*

- (i) $\text{supp}((\varphi_1)_\# \Omega) \subset \Omega^{**}$, for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$
- (ii) $A^\varepsilon((\varphi_1)_\# \Omega) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Omega)$, for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$

Proof. Recall that the cmc foliation near Σ is given by the level sets of a function f and that $\nabla f \neq 0$ on a neighborhood W of $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon} \cup \Sigma^\varepsilon$. By taking η small enough, we can assume that $\Omega^* \setminus \Omega^\varepsilon \subset W$. Define a vector field $X = \nabla f / |\nabla f|^2$ on W . Then define

$$Z = \begin{cases} -(f - \varepsilon)X, & \text{on } \Omega^* \setminus \Omega^\varepsilon \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and note that Z is a Lipschitz vector field on Ω^* .

Fix some $\Omega \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(\Omega^*, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and let ν be the outward pointing normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. According to the first variation formula,

$$\delta A^\varepsilon \Big|_\Omega (Z) = \int_{\partial\Omega} \operatorname{div}_\sigma Z - \varepsilon \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle Z, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

To understand the right hand side, we need to compute $\operatorname{div}_\sigma Z$.

Let ϕ_t denote the flow of X and let x denote a point in Σ^ε . Choose a point $y = \psi(x, t)$ and let $\sigma \subset T_y M$ be an n -plane. Let x_i be coordinates on a neighborhood of x in Σ^ε . Then the map $\psi(x, t) = \phi_t(x)$ gives coordinates on a neighborhood of y . Define $e_i = \partial\psi/\partial x_i$ and note that $\partial\psi/\partial t = X$. Let $N = \nabla f/|\nabla f|$ be the unit normal vector to the surfaces Σ^β and let A denote the second fundamental form of the surfaces Σ^β . As in Marques and Neves [17], we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_{e_i} Z, e_j \rangle &= -\langle Z, A(e_i, e_j) \rangle, \\ \langle \nabla_N Z, N \rangle &= \langle \nabla_N(-(f - \varepsilon)X), N \rangle = -1 - (f - \varepsilon)\langle \nabla_N X, N \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_{e_i} Z, N \rangle &= (f - \varepsilon) \left\langle \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x_i}, \nabla_{\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}} N \right\rangle = \frac{f - \varepsilon}{|\nabla f|} \langle e_i, \nabla_N N \rangle, \\ \langle e_i, -\nabla_N Z \rangle &= \left\langle e_i, N \left(\frac{f - \varepsilon}{|\nabla f|} \right) N + \frac{f - \varepsilon}{|\nabla f|} \nabla_N N \right\rangle = \frac{f - \varepsilon}{|\nabla f|} \langle e_i, \nabla_N N \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\langle \nabla_{e_i} Z, N \rangle = -\langle e_i, \nabla_N Z \rangle.$$

Using this one can compute $\operatorname{div}_\sigma Z$ as follows.

Let v_1, \dots, v_n be an orthonormal basis for σ . We can arrange that v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} are tangent to $\Sigma^{\varepsilon+t}$ and that $v_n = (\cos \theta)u + (\sin \theta)N$ for some unit vector u which is tangent to $\Sigma^{\varepsilon+t}$ and orthogonal to v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} . Let H be the mean curvature vector for $\Sigma^{\varepsilon+t}$. Then from the above computations one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_\sigma Z &= \left(\langle \nabla_u Z, u \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle \nabla_{v_i} Z, v_i \rangle \right) + \langle \nabla_{v_n} Z, v_n \rangle - \langle \nabla_u Z, u \rangle \\ &= -\langle Z, H \rangle + (\cos^2 \theta - 1) \langle \nabla_u Z, u \rangle + \sin^2 \theta \langle \nabla_N Z, N \rangle \\ &= -\frac{\varepsilon(f - \varepsilon)}{|\nabla f|} - \sin^2 \theta \left(1 + (f - \varepsilon) \langle \nabla_N X, N \rangle + (f - \varepsilon) \langle X, A(u, u) \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, provided η is small enough, it follows that

$$\operatorname{div}_\sigma Z - \varepsilon \langle Z, \nu \rangle \leq -\frac{\varepsilon(f - \varepsilon)}{|\nabla f|} + \varepsilon|Z| = 0.$$

Hence following the flow of Z decreases A^ε . \square

Corollary 20. *There exists an open set Ω^{**} with $\Omega^\varepsilon \subset\subset \Omega^{**} \subset\subset \Omega^*$ and a critical sequence $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ such that*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\Psi_i(x)) \subset \Omega^{**}$$

for all i and all $x \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Let $\{\Phi_i\}_i$ be a critical sequence. Let φ_t denote the flow of Z . Define $\Psi_i(x) = (\varphi_1)_\# \Phi_i(x)$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. By the previous proposition, $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ is as required. \square

3.5. Constructing the Min-Max Surfaces. We can now perform a min-max argument to construct the doublings. The following min-max theorem essentially follows from Theorem 5. The theorem is not an immediate consequence of Theorem 5 because we require that the surfaces in a sweepout are contained in Ω^* . However, it is straightforward to modify the proof of Theorem 5 to handle our situation.

Theorem 21. *Assume that $W^\varepsilon > \max\{0, A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon)\}$. Then for any critical sequence $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ there is a varifold $V \in C(\{\Psi_i\}_i)$ that is induced by a smooth, almost-embedded ε -cmc hypersurface Λ^ε . There is an open set $\Theta^\varepsilon \subset \Omega^*$ such that $\partial\Theta^\varepsilon = \Lambda^\varepsilon$ and $A^\varepsilon(\Theta^\varepsilon) = W^\varepsilon$. Moreover, there is a bound $\operatorname{ind}(\Lambda^\varepsilon) \leq 1$.*

Proof. We outline the necessary changes to the proof of Theorems 1.7 and 3.1 in [28]. Let $X = [0, 1]$ and $Z = \{0, 1\}$. Let Φ be the map from Proposition 8. Zhou defines the (X, Z) -homotopy class of Φ to consist of all sequences $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ such that each Ψ_i is flatly homotopic to Φ and

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\mathbf{F}(\Psi_i(0), \emptyset), \mathbf{F}(\Psi_i(1), \Omega^\varepsilon)\} = 0.$$

However, because the domain X is one dimensional, the interpolation results of Zhou show that nothing changes if we instead insist that $\Psi_i(0) = \emptyset$ and $\Psi_i(1) = \Omega^\varepsilon$ for all i . This leads to the notion of homotopy in Definition 9.

Now let Ψ be a sweepout. Assume that Ψ' is obtained from Ψ by either the pulltight procedure, the combinatorial argument, or the deformations in the index estimates. Note that we can arrange so that the following property is true: if W is an open set and $\operatorname{supp}(\Psi(t)) \subset W$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ then $\operatorname{supp}(\Psi'(t)) \subset W'$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ where W' is a slightly larger open set

containing W . Therefore, by Corollary 20, we can perform all the arguments of Zhou on a critical sequence $\{\Psi_i\}_i$ while always staying inside Ω^* . \square

We can now prove the first main theorem.

Proof. (Theorem 6) Corollary 15 and Corollary 18 show that

$$W^\varepsilon > \max\{0, A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon)\}.$$

Therefore Theorem 21 applies to produce Λ^ε and Θ^ε satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 6. \square

3.6. Topology of the Min-Max Doubling. The goal of this section is to show that the min-max surfaces constructed above consist of two parallel copies of Σ joined by a small catenoidal neck. For this section only, we require that $n + 1 = 3$.

Choose a sequence $\varepsilon_j \rightarrow 0$. Let $\Lambda_j = \Lambda^{\varepsilon_j}$ be the ε_j -cmc given by Theorem 6. Note that Λ_j converges to Σ in the Hausdorff distance. Hence by the compactness theorem for cmcs with bounded area and index (Zhou [28]), there is a point $p \in \Sigma$ such that (up to a subsequence) Λ_j converges locally smoothly to Σ away from p .

Proposition 22. *The convergence $\Lambda_j \rightarrow \Sigma$ occurs with multiplicity two.*

Proof. First we show that the multiplicity is at most two. To prove this, it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} W^\varepsilon \leq 2 \text{Area}(\Sigma).$$

Fix some $\varepsilon > 0$. Since the map $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ given by $\Phi(t) = \Omega^{t\varepsilon}$ can be interpolated to a sweepout, it follows that

$$W^\varepsilon \leq \max_{\beta \in [0, \varepsilon]} A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\beta) \leq \max_{\beta \in [0, \varepsilon]} \text{Area}(\partial\Omega^\beta).$$

The quantity on the right hand side converges to $2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

It remains to show that the multiplicity is at least 2. To prove this, it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} W^\varepsilon \geq 2 \text{Area}(\Sigma).$$

To see this, recall that

$$W^\varepsilon \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) = \text{Area}(\partial\Omega^\varepsilon) - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega^\varepsilon).$$

Again the quantity on the right hand side converges to $2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Proposition 23. *The surface Λ_j is connected.*

Proof. Otherwise there would be a component Λ'_j of Λ_j which is graphical over Σ . The maximum principle shows that such a surface Λ'_j cannot exist. \square

Corollary 24. *The index of Λ_j is one.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\text{ind}(\Lambda_j) = 0$. By the curvature estimates for stable cmcs (see Zhou [28]), the convergence $\Lambda_j \rightarrow \Sigma$ would consequently occur smoothly everywhere. But, since Σ is two-sided, it is impossible for a connected surface Λ_j to converge smoothly to Σ with multiplicity two. \square

We can now give the proof of Theorem 7.

Proof. (Theorem 7) The proof is based on results of Chodosh, Ketover, and Maximo [2]. Although the results in [2] are stated for minimal hypersurfaces, one can check that they continue to hold in our setting. For the sake of completeness, we sketch the details of the argument.

Let A_j denote the second fundamental form of Λ_j . Recall that stable cmcs have curvature estimates (see Zhou [28]). Therefore we must have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \Lambda_j} |A_j(x)| = \infty$$

since the convergence $\Lambda_j \rightarrow \Sigma$ is not smooth near p . By a point picking argument together with the fact that $\text{ind}(\Lambda_j) = 1$, it is possible to find a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence of points $p_j \in \Lambda_j$ with $|A_j(p_j)| \rightarrow \infty$ and such that

$$|A_j(x)| \text{dist}_M(x, p_j) \leq C$$

for all $x \in \Lambda_j$. Moreover, it is clear that $p_j \rightarrow p$.

Fix a small number $\sigma > 0$. Choose a sequence $\eta_j \rightarrow 0$ for which $\text{dist}_M(p_j, p) < \eta_j$ and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \eta_j |A_j(p_j)| = \infty.$$

We claim that for j sufficiently large there is a bound

$$|A_j(x)| \text{dist}_M(x, p_j) \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

for all $x \in \Lambda_j \cap (B(p, \sigma) \setminus B(p_j, \eta_j))$. Suppose not. Then there would be points $x_j \in \Lambda_j \cap (B(p, \sigma) \setminus B(p_j, \eta_j))$ with

$$|A_j(x_j)| \text{dist}_M(x_j, p_j) > \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let Λ'_j be the surface Λ_j rescaled by a factor $\text{dist}_M(x_j, p_j)^{-1}$ about the point p_j . Let A'_j denote the 2nd fundamental form of Λ'_j , and given a point $x \in \Lambda_j$ let x' denote the corresponding point in Λ'_j .

Notice that

$$|A'_j(x')| = |A_j(x)| \text{dist}_M(x_j, p_j),$$

and hence the surfaces A'_j have uniform curvature bounds on compact sets that do not include the origin. Moreover,

$$|A'_j(0)| \geq |A_j(p_j)| \eta_j \rightarrow \infty$$

as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, (up to a subsequence) the surfaces Λ'_j converge locally smoothly away from the origin to a complete, embedded minimal surface Λ' with multiplicity two. Since the mean curvature vectors of the two sheets of Λ'_j point toward each other, it follows that Λ' must be stable. Hence Λ' is a plane. But this means that $|A'_j(x'_j)| \rightarrow 0$, and this contradicts the way the points x_j were chosen.

Next one combines the preceding curvature estimate with a Morse theory argument (Lemma 3.1 in [2]) to conclude that $\Lambda_j \cap B(p, \sigma)$ and $\Lambda_j \cap B(p_j, \eta_j)$ have the same topology. We are now reduced to showing that $\Lambda_j \cap B(p_j, \eta_j)$ is topologically a catenoid. Let Λ''_j be the surface Λ_j rescaled by a factor η_j^{-1} about the point p_j . It is equivalent to check that $\Lambda''_j \cap B(0, 1)$ is a catenoid.

Let Λ'''_j be the surface Λ''_j rescaled by a factor $|A''_j(0)|$ about the origin. Then Λ'''_j has uniform curvature estimates everywhere. Thus (up to a subsequence) the surfaces Λ'''_j converge locally smoothly to a complete, embedded, two-sided, non-flat minimal hypersurface $\Lambda''' \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Moreover, we have $\text{ind}(\Lambda''') \leq 1$. By the results in [5] and [15], it follows that Λ''' is a catenoid. Fix a radius $R > 0$ so that $|A'''(y)| \text{dist}(y, 0) < 1/4$ for all $y \in \Lambda''' \setminus B(0, R)$.

We claim that for j sufficiently large there is a bound

$$|A''_j(y)| \text{dist}(y, 0) \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

for all $y \in \Lambda''_j \cap (B(0, 2) \setminus B(0, R/|A''_j(0)|))$. Suppose not. Then there would be points $y_j \in \Lambda''_j \cap (B(0, 2) \setminus B(0, R/|A''_j(0)|))$ with

$$|A''_j(y_j)| \text{dist}(y_j, 0) > \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let Λ''''_j be the surface obtained by scaling Λ''_j by a factor $\text{dist}(y_j, 0)^{-1}$ about the origin.

We claim that $|A_j'''(0)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose this were not the case. Then since

$$|A_j'''(0)| = |A_j''(0)| \operatorname{dist}(y_j, 0),$$

it must be that

$$\frac{R}{|A_j''(0)|} \leq \operatorname{dist}(y_j, 0) \leq \frac{B}{|A_j''(0)|}$$

for some constant B . But then (up to a subsequence) Λ_j''' must converge to a surface $\Lambda''' = a\Lambda'''$ where

$$\frac{1}{B} \leq a \leq \frac{1}{R}.$$

Now observe that

$$\frac{1}{4} < |A'''(\operatorname{dist}(y_j, 0)^{-1}y_j)| = a^{-1}|A'''(a^{-1}\operatorname{dist}(y_j, 0)^{-1}y_j)|.$$

This contradicts the choice of R . Therefore it must be that $|A_j'''(0)| \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

The surfaces Λ_j''' have uniform curvature estimates on compact subsets that do not include the origin. Hence arguing as above, it follows that (up to a subsequence) the surfaces Λ_j''' converge locally smoothly to a plane away from the origin. This contradicts the way the points y_j were chosen. Finally one repeats the Morse theory argument with this curvature estimate to deduce that $\Lambda_j'' \cap B(0, 1)$ has the same topology as $\Lambda_j'' \cap B(0, R/|A_j''(0)|)$. Since the surface $\Lambda_j'' \cap B(0, R/|A_j''(0)|)$ has the same topology as $\Lambda_j''' \cap B(0, R)$, it follows that $\Lambda_j'' \cap B(0, R/|A_j''(0)|)$ is topologically a catenoid, as needed. This completes the proof of Theorem 7. \square

4. THE INDEX 1 CASE

4.1. Statement of Results. Now consider the index 1 case. Fix a dimension $3 \leq n+1 \leq 7$. Let (M^{n+1}, g) be a closed Riemannian manifold and let $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ be a closed, connected, two-sided, minimal hypersurface. Also assume the following.

- (U-i) The hypersurface Σ has index 1 and the Jacobi operator L for Σ is non-degenerate. Moreover, the unique solution ϕ to $L\phi = 1$ is positive.

Note that by assumption (U-i) and the implicit function theorem, there is a neighborhood of Σ that is foliated by constant mean curvature hypersurfaces whose mean curvature vectors point away from Σ . More precisely, we have the following.

- (i) There is a neighborhood U of Σ and a smooth function $f: U \rightarrow (-\beta, \beta)$.
- (ii) For each $\varepsilon \in (-\beta, \beta)$, the set $\Sigma^\varepsilon = f^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ is a smooth hypersurface with constant mean curvature $|\varepsilon|$. Moreover, $\Sigma^0 = \Sigma$.
- (iii) For each $\varepsilon \in (-\beta, \beta)$, the mean curvature vector of Σ^ε points away from Σ .

The next theorem is the main result of the paper in the index 1 case.

Theorem 25. *Fix (M, g) and Σ for which the assumption (U-i) holds. Then for each small $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a smooth, almost-embedded hypersurface Λ^ε of constant mean curvature ε in M . The index of Λ^ε is at most 3 and $\text{Area}(\Lambda^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

To ensure that Λ^ε is a doubling of Σ , we have to make an additional assumption. Namely, suppose the following additional property holds.

- (U-ii) The varifold 2Σ is the only embedded minimal cycle in M with area $2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$.

Then we have the following.

Theorem 26. *Fix (M, g) and Σ for which the assumptions (U-i) and (U-ii) hold. Then the surfaces Λ^ε from Theorem 25 converge to 2Σ as varifolds as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.*

Remark 27. It is natural to ask whether hypothesis (U-ii) significantly restricts the applicability of Theorem 26. In Appendix B we show that (U-ii) holds for a generic set of metrics on M .

4.2. Construction of the three parameter family. In this section, we formally construct the three parameter family Φ described in the introduction. Fix (M, g) and Σ satisfying the assumption (U-i) and fix a small number $\varepsilon > 0$. For simplicity, we give the construction in the case where $n + 1 = 3$. The cases $4 \leq n + 1 \leq 7$ are similar but easier since one can use cylindrical necks rather than catenoidal ones.

Before constructing the three parameter family, we need to introduce some notation. Write Σ^β as the normal graph of a function ψ_β over Σ . Recall that ϕ is a positive function on Σ that solves $L\phi = 1$, and observe that $\psi_\beta/\beta \rightarrow \phi$ smoothly as $\beta \rightarrow 0$.

The following notation is taken from [12]. Fix a point $p \in \Sigma$ and for $x \in \Sigma$ let $r(x)$ be the distance from x to p . Fix a number $R > 0$ to be specified later. For each $0 \leq t \leq R$ define a function η_t on Σ by

$$\eta_t(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r(x) \geq t \\ (1/\log(t))(\log t^2 - \log r(x)), & \text{if } t^2 \leq r(x) \leq t \\ 0 & \text{if } r(x) \leq t^2. \end{cases}$$

This function η_t will be used to construct the necks.

Definition 28. Let $X = [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]^2 \times [0, R]$ and define

$$\Phi: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

as follows. First, for each $(x, y, t) \in X$ let $S(x, y, t)$ be the union of the graph of $\eta_t \psi_{\varepsilon+x}$ with the graph of $\eta_t \psi_{-\varepsilon+y}$. This is a piecewise smooth surface. Choose a point $q \in \Sigma$ with $r(q) \gg R$. Then let $\Phi(x, y, t)$ be the open set in M such that $\partial \Phi(x, y, t) = S(x, y, t)$ and $q \notin \Phi(x, y, t)$. The family Φ is continuous in the \mathbf{F} topology.

In the next sequence of propositions, we prove the two key properties of the family Φ outlined in the introduction.

Proposition 29. *The surface $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ is an index two critical point of A^ε . Moreover, there is a constant $c > 0$ that doesn't depend on ε such that*

$$A^\varepsilon(\Phi(x, y, 0)) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Phi(0, 0, 0)) - c(x^2 + y^2)$$

for all $(x, y, 0) \in X$.

Proof. Since Σ is an index one critical point of A^0 , it follows that Σ^ε is an index one critical point of A^ε . Likewise $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ is an index one critical point of A^ε and therefore the union $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ is an index two critical point of A^ε . Next we study how $A^\varepsilon(\Sigma^t)$ depends on t . Let L_t be the Jacobi operator on Σ^t . Since the Jacobi operator on Σ is non-degenerate, L_t is also non-degenerate for all sufficiently small t . Moreover, the unique solution f_t to $L_t f_t = 1$ is uniformly positive for t small enough. Since

$$\frac{d}{dt} A^\varepsilon(\Sigma^t) = \int_{\Sigma^t} (t - \varepsilon) f_t \, dv_{\Sigma^t},$$

it follows that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$A^\varepsilon(\Sigma^t) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Sigma^\varepsilon) - c|t - \varepsilon|^2$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq 2\varepsilon$. The same reasoning applies to $\Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$ and this implies the proposition. \square

Lemma 30. *Let c be the constant from the previous proposition. Then for all ε sufficiently small and all $(x, y, t) \in X$ there is an inequality*

$$\text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, t)) \leq \text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, 0)) + \frac{c\varepsilon^2}{2}.$$

Moreover, $\text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, R)) < \text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, 0))$ for all choices of x and y .

Proof. This essentially follows from the proof of Theorem 2.4 in [12]. We include the details for the sake of clarity. Let $\gamma = \varepsilon + x$ and let $g_{\gamma,t} = \psi_\gamma \eta_t / \gamma$. Note that there is a bound $\|g_{\gamma,t}\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$ where C is a constant that does not depend on γ or t .

For a function f on $B(p, R) \subset \Sigma$, let S_f be the normal graph of f over $B(p, R)$. Proposition 2.5 in [12] gives the existence of an $h_0 > 0$ so that for $h \leq h_0$ there is an expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}(S_{hg_{\gamma,t}}) &\leq \text{Area}(B_t) - \text{Area}(B_{t^2}) \\ &\quad + \frac{h^2}{2} \int_{B_t \setminus B_{t^2}} (|\nabla g_{\gamma,t}|^2 - g_{\gamma,t}^2(|A|^2 + \text{Ric}(N, N))) \\ &\quad + Ch^3 \int_{B_t \setminus B_{t^2}} (1 + |\nabla g_{\gamma,t}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the constants h_0 and C do not depend on ε or t .

In particular, for $\gamma < h_0$ we can set $h = \gamma$ in the above expansion to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}(S_{\psi_\gamma \eta_t}) &\leq \text{Area}(B_t) - \text{Area}(B_{t^2}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \int_{B_t \setminus B_{t^2}} (|\nabla g_{\gamma,t}|^2 - g_{\gamma,t}^2(|A|^2 + \text{Ric}(N, N))) \\ &\quad + C\gamma^3 \int_{B_t \setminus B_{t^2}} (1 + |\nabla g_{\gamma,t}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\psi_\gamma / \gamma \rightarrow \phi$ smoothly as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, taking R small enough and ε small enough, we get that

$$\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \left| \int_{B_t \setminus B_{t^2}} g_{\gamma,t}^2(|A|^2 + \text{Ric}(N, N)) \right| \leq \frac{c\gamma^2}{128}.$$

Shrinking ε further to absorb the γ^3 terms, this implies that

$$\text{Area}(S_{\psi_\gamma \eta_t}) \leq \text{Area}(B_t) + \frac{c\gamma^2}{128} + \gamma^2 \int_{B_t \setminus B_{t^2}} |\nabla g_{\gamma,t}|^2.$$

Finally, using the logarithmic cutoff trick as in [12] together with the fact that $\psi_\gamma/\gamma \rightarrow \phi$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$, it follows that

$$\int_{B_t \setminus B_{t/2}} |\nabla g_{\gamma,t}|^2 \leq \frac{c}{128} + \frac{A}{|\log t|}$$

where A is a constant that does not depend on γ or t . For R small enough, this implies that

$$\text{Area}(S_{\psi_\gamma \eta_t}) \leq \text{Area}(B_R) + \frac{c\gamma^2}{32}$$

for all $t \in [0, R]$.

Therefore, letting $\Omega^+ = \{f > 0\} = \cup_{\beta > 0} \Sigma^\beta$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, t) \cap \Omega^+) - \text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, 0) \cap \Omega^+) \\ &\leq \text{Area}(S_{\psi_\gamma \eta_t}) - \text{Area}(B_R)(1 - C\varepsilon^2) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^2 \text{Area}(B_R) + \frac{c\gamma^2}{32} \\ &\leq \frac{c\varepsilon^2}{4} \end{aligned}$$

provided R is small enough. A similar argument shows that the above inequality is also true with Ω^+ replaced by $\Omega^- = \{f < 0\} = \cup_{\beta < 0} \Sigma^\beta$. This proves the lemma. \square

Proposition 31. *For every $(x, y, t) \in \partial X$ it holds that*

$$A^\varepsilon(\Phi(x, y, t)) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Phi(0, 0, 0))$$

with equality if and only if $(x, y, t) = (0, 0, 0)$.

Proof. Fix a point $(x, y, t) \in \partial X$. The proposition is clearly true if $t = 0$, and the proposition is true if $t = R$ by the previous lemma. So assume that $0 < t < R$. The previous lemma implies that

$$\text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, t)) \leq \text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, 0)) + \frac{c\varepsilon^2}{2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A^\varepsilon(\Phi(x, y, t)) &= \text{Area}(\partial\Phi(x, y, t)) - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Phi(x, y, t)) \\ &\leq A^\varepsilon(\Phi(x, y, 0)) + \frac{c\varepsilon^2}{2} \\ &\leq A^\varepsilon(\Phi(0, 0, 0)) - \frac{c\varepsilon^2}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the proposition. \square

4.3. Non-trivial Width. Again fix (M^{n+1}, g) and Σ satisfying assumption (U-i) and fix a small number $\varepsilon > 0$. Let Π be the $(X, \partial X)$ -homotopy class of the map Φ constructed in the previous section. Let $\Omega^\varepsilon = \Phi(0, 0, 0)$ so that $\partial\Omega^\varepsilon = \Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon}$. The goal of this section is to prove that the width of Π is non-trivial, i.e., to check that

$$L^\varepsilon(\Pi) > A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) = \max_{(x,y,t) \in \partial X} A^\varepsilon(\Phi(x, y, t)).$$

The proof is based on the quantitative minimality results in Appendix A.

Proposition 32. *There are constants $\gamma > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that the following property holds. If $\Psi: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is an \mathbf{F} -continuous map with*

$$\sup_{(x,y,t) \in \partial X} \mathbf{F}(\Psi(x, y, t), \Phi(x, y, t)) < \eta$$

then there is a point $(x_0, y_0, t_0) \in X$ such that

$$A^\varepsilon(\Psi(x_0, y_0, t_0)) \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) + C\gamma^2.$$

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ be the constants from Theorem 36 applied to $\Sigma^\varepsilon \cup \Sigma^{-\varepsilon} = \partial\Omega^\varepsilon$. Fix some $0 < \gamma < \delta/4$ and then choose a constant $\eta > 0$ to be specified later. Consider a map Ψ as in the statement of the proposition. If η is small enough, it is possible to find a piecewise linear surface $S \subset X$ such that the following properties hold.

- $\gamma < \mathcal{F}(\Psi(p), \Omega^\varepsilon) < 2\gamma$ for all $p \in S$
- ∂S is a connected curve in the bottom face of X that encloses $(0, 0, 0)$. Moreover, $\text{dist}(\partial S, (0, 0, 0)) > d$ for some positive constant d that doesn't depend on Ψ .

This can be done, for example, by taking a suitable simplicial approximation to the function

$$(x, y, t) \in X \mapsto \mathcal{F}(\Psi(x, y, t), \Omega^\varepsilon).$$

Note that $A^\varepsilon(\Phi(p)) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) - d_1$ for all $p \in \partial S$. Here $d_1 > 0$ is a constant that does not depend on Ψ .

Fix a small number $\alpha > 0$. By Theorem 3.8 in [18], if η is small enough there exists an \mathbf{F} -continuous homotopy

$$H: \partial S \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

with the properties that

- $H(p, 0) = \Psi(p)$ for all $p \in \partial S$, and

- $H(p, 1) = \Phi(p)$ for all $p \in \partial S$, and
- $\mathbf{F}(H(p, s), \Phi(p)) < \alpha$ for all $p \in \partial S$ and all $s \in [0, 1]$.

For an appropriate choice of α , this ensures that

$$A^\varepsilon(H(p, s)) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Phi(p)) + \frac{d_1}{2} < A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) \quad (1)$$

for all $p \in \partial S$ and all $s \in [0, 1]$.

Now let $S_1 = S \cup_{\partial S} (\partial S \times [0, 1])$ and define a map $\Psi_1: S_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ by letting $\Psi_1 = \Psi$ on S and letting $\Psi_1 = H$ on $\partial S \times [0, 1]$. Note that part (ii) of Theorem 36 applies to the family Ψ_1 parameterized by S_1 . Therefore, there is some point $q \in S_1$ such that

$$A^\varepsilon(\Psi_1(q)) \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) + C\mathcal{F}(\Psi_1(q), \Omega^\varepsilon)^2.$$

By (1), the point $q = (x_0, y_0, t_0)$ must belong to S . Thus we have exhibited a point $(x_0, y_0, t_0) \in X$ with

$$A^\varepsilon(\Psi(x_0, y_0, t_0)) \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon) + C\gamma^2,$$

and the proposition follows. \square

Corollary 33. *The width of Π satisfies $L^\varepsilon(\Pi) > A^\varepsilon(\Omega^\varepsilon)$.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 32. \square

4.4. Construction of the Doublings. Fix (M^{n+1}, g) and Σ satisfying assumption (U-i). In this section ε will be allowed to vary, and so we write X^ε , Φ^ε , and Π^ε to emphasize the dependence of these objects on ε .

Proof. (Theorem 25) Corollary 33 shows that

$$L^\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon) > \max_{(x,y,t) \in \partial X^\varepsilon} A^\varepsilon(\Phi^\varepsilon(x, y, t)),$$

and therefore Π^ε satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 5. Hence min-max produces an almost embedded ε -cmc hypersurface $\Lambda^\varepsilon = \partial\Theta^\varepsilon$ in M with $A^\varepsilon(\Theta^\varepsilon) = L^\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon)$ and $\text{ind}(\Lambda^\varepsilon) \leq 3$.

Observe that

$$A^\varepsilon(\Phi^\varepsilon(0, 0, 0)) \leq L^\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon) \leq \max_{(x,y,t) \in X^\varepsilon} A^\varepsilon(\Phi^\varepsilon(x, y, t)),$$

and that both bounds for $L^\varepsilon(\Pi^\varepsilon)$ converge to $2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Therefore the area of Λ^ε converges to $2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Proof. (Theorem 26) Assume additionally that (U-ii) holds. By the compactness theorem for cmc surfaces with bounded area and index, there is an embedded minimal cycle V in M with $\|V\|(M) = 2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ such that $\Lambda^\varepsilon \rightarrow V$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (up to a subsequence). Assumption (U-ii) implies that $V = 2\Sigma$. \square

4.5. The Non-foliated Case. We close this section with some remarks on the non-foliated case. Assume that $\Sigma \subset M$ is an index one, non-degenerate minimal hypersurface. Let L be the Jacobi operator on Σ and let ϕ be the solution to $L\phi = 1$. One can show that ϕ has at most two nodal domains. In the case of exactly two nodal domains, ϕ changes sign and thus there is no cmc foliation of a neighborhood of Σ .

Nevertheless, it is still possible to foliate a neighborhood of Σ by surfaces whose mean curvature vectors point away from Σ . Let H be the mean curvature operator on Σ , and let $\zeta > 0$ be the first eigenfunction of L . Then by the implicit function theorem, for every small $\beta > 0$ there is a smooth function ψ_β on Σ with $H(\psi_\beta) = \beta\zeta$. The surfaces $\Sigma^\beta = \text{graph}(\psi_\beta)$ foliate a neighborhood of Σ .

Let x be a system of coordinates on Σ and let (x, t) be Fermi coordinates on a tubular neighborhood of Σ . Let h be a smooth, positive function on M such that $h(x, t) = \zeta(x)$ on a tubular neighborhood of Σ . Fix some $\varepsilon > 0$ and note that Σ^ε is a critical point of the $A^{\varepsilon h}$ functional defined by

$$A^{\varepsilon h}(\Omega) = \text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} h.$$

Using the prescribed mean curvature (pmc) min-max theory of Zhou and Zhu [29] and the same arguments as above, one can show that there are εh -pmc surfaces Λ^ε with $\text{Area}(\Lambda^\varepsilon) \rightarrow 2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$. Generically these are doublings of Σ .

APPENDIX A. QUANTITATIVE MINIMALITY

This appendix contains a quantitative minimality result for the A^ε functional. This result is needed to check that the widths of the min-max families in the paper are non-trivial. The result is based on the following theorem of Inauen and Marchese [7].

Theorem 34. ([7] Theorem 4.3) *Let F be an elliptic parametric functional on M^{n+1} . Let $\Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1}$ be a smooth, closed, hypersurface which is a non-degenerate, index k critical point for F . Then there are constants $r > 0$, $c > 0$, $\delta > 0$, and $C > 0$ and a smooth k -parameter family of surfaces*

$$(\Sigma_v)_{v \in \overline{B}_r^k}$$

such that the following properties hold.

(i) *For every $v \in \overline{B}_r^k$, the surface Σ_v is homologous to Σ and satisfies $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma_v, \Sigma) < \delta$ and $F(\Sigma_v) \leq F(\Sigma) - c|v|^2$.*

(ii) *Let S^k be an abstract k -manifold with $\partial S^k = \partial \overline{B}_r^k$. Then for any continuous family of integral currents*

$$(\tilde{\Sigma}_v)_{v \in S},$$

each homologous to Σ with $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\Sigma}_v, \Sigma) < \delta$ for all $v \in S$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_v = \Sigma_v$ for $v \in \partial S$, it holds that

$$\sup_{v \in S} \left[F(\tilde{\Sigma}_v) - C\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\Sigma}_v, \Sigma)^2 \right] \geq F(\Sigma).$$

Remark 35. Let u_1, \dots, u_k be the eigenfunctions for the second variation of F on Σ with negative eigenvalues. Let

$$(\psi_v)_{v \in \overline{B}_r^k}$$

be a family of smooth functions on Σ for which the map

$$v \in \overline{B}_r^k \mapsto \left(\int_{\Sigma} \psi_v u_1, \dots, \int_{\Sigma} \psi_v u_k \right) \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of 0. Then by inspecting the proof of Theorem 4.3 in [7] along with the proofs of Theorem 4 and Theorem 5 in [26], one sees that it is possible to take $\Sigma_v = \text{graph}(\psi_v)$ in the above theorem.

Unfortunately, Theorem 34 does not apply directly in our setting since the A^ε functional cannot be written globally as an elliptic parametric functional. Nevertheless, we have the following.

Theorem 36. *Let $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ be a smooth, closed, hypersurface in M which is a non-degenerate, index k critical point for A^ε . Then there are constants $r > 0$, $c > 0$, $\delta > 0$, and $C > 0$ and a smooth k -parameter family of open sets*

$$(\Omega_v)_{v \in \overline{B}_r^k}$$

such that the following properties hold.

- (i) For every $v \in \overline{B}_r^k$, the set Ω_v satisfies $\mathcal{F}(\Omega_v, \Omega) < \delta$ and $A^\varepsilon(\Omega_v) \leq A^\varepsilon(\Omega) - c|v|^2$.
- (ii) Let S^k be an abstract k -manifold with $\partial S^k = \partial \overline{B}_r^k$. Then for any \mathbf{F} continuous family

$$(\tilde{\Omega}_v)_{v \in S}$$

in $\mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\Omega}_v, \Omega) < \delta$ for all $v \in S$ and $\tilde{\Omega}_v = \Omega_v$ for $v \in \partial S$, there is a point $v \in S$ such that

$$\sup_{v \in S} \left[A^\varepsilon(\tilde{\Omega}_v) - C\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\Omega}_v, \Omega)^2 \right] \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega).$$

Moreover, the inequality is strict unless $\tilde{\Omega}_v = \Omega$.

Let u_1, \dots, u_k be the eigenfunctions for the Jacobi operator on Σ with negative eigenvalues. Let

$$(\psi_v)_{v \in \overline{B}_r^k}$$

be a family of smooth functions on Σ for which the map

$$v \in \overline{B}_r^k \mapsto \left(\int_\Sigma \psi_v u_1, \dots, \int_\Sigma \psi_v u_k \right) \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of 0. Then it is possible to choose Ω_v above so that $\partial \Omega_v = \text{graph}(\psi_v)$.

To prove Theorem 5.3, one essentially copies the arguments from [7] and observes that they continue to hold with F replaced by A^ε . We include the details for completeness.

Proof. Let u_1, \dots, u_k be the eigenfunctions for the Jacobi operator on Σ with negative eigenvalues. Pick a smooth function $\vec{f}: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$\vec{f}(x) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \vec{f}(x) = (u_1(x), \dots, u_k(x))$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$. Let K be a very large constant and define

$$G(\Theta) = A^\varepsilon(\Theta) + K \left\| \int \vec{f} d\|\partial\Theta\| \right\|^2$$

for $\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. It follows from [26] that the functional G is lower-semicontinuous with respect to flat convergence, and $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ is a strictly stable critical point of G .

Lemma 37. *There is some $\delta > 0$ such that $G(\Omega) < G(\Theta)$ for all $\Theta \neq \Omega$ with $\mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Omega) < \delta$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that this is not the case. Then there are sets $\Omega_i \neq \Omega$ with $\mathcal{F}(\Omega_i, \Omega) \rightarrow 0$ and $G(\Omega_i) \leq G(\Omega)$. Define

$$G_i(\Theta) = G(\Theta) + \lambda |\mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Omega) - \mathcal{F}(\Omega_i, \Omega)|,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant to be specified later. Let Ω'_i be a minimizer of G_i . Passing to a subsequence, $\Omega'_i \rightarrow \Omega'$ in the flat topology. The proof of Lemma 3.3 in [7] applies verbatim to show that Ω' minimizes

$$G_0(\Theta) = G(\Theta) + \lambda |\mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Omega)|$$

over all $\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Next one verifies the analog of Lemma 3.5 in [7].

Lemma 38. *There are constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$G(\Omega) - G(\Theta) \leq C\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Theta)$$

for all $\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\Omega) - G(\Theta) &= [\text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \text{Area}(\Theta)] - \varepsilon[\text{Vol}(\Omega) - \text{Vol}(\Theta)] - K \left\| \int \vec{f} d\|\partial\Theta\| \right\|^2 \\ &\leq [\text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \text{Area}(\Theta)] - \varepsilon[\text{Vol}(\Omega) - \text{Vol}(\Theta)] \\ &\leq [\text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \text{Area}(\Theta)] + \varepsilon\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Theta). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.5 in [7], there is a constant C such that $\text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \text{Area}(\partial\Theta) \leq C\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Theta)$, and the lemma follows. \square

The proof of Lemma 3.6 in [7] now applies verbatim to show that Ω is the only minimizer of G_0 . Thus the minimizers Ω'_i converge to Ω in the flat topology. We claim that in fact $\Omega'_i \rightarrow \Omega$ in the \mathbf{F} -topology. Indeed, since Ω'_i minimizes G_i , there is an inequality

$$G(\Omega'_i) + \lambda |\mathcal{F}(\Omega'_i, \Omega) - \mathcal{F}(\Omega_i, \Omega)| \leq G_i(\Omega_i) = G(\Omega_i) \leq G(\Omega).$$

This implies that

$$\text{Area}(\partial\Omega'_i) - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega'_i) \leq \text{Area}(\partial\Omega) - \varepsilon \text{Vol}(\Omega),$$

and it follows that

$$\limsup \text{Area}(\partial\Omega'_i) \leq \text{Area}(\partial\Omega)$$

since $\text{Vol}(\Omega'_i) \rightarrow \text{Vol}(\Omega)$. This proves the \mathbf{F} -convergence.

Now observe that the varifolds $|\Omega'_i|$ have uniformly bounded first variation. This implies that they satisfy a monotonicity formula with uniform constants. Since $\Omega'_i \rightarrow \Omega$ in the \mathbf{F} -topology, it follows that $\partial\Omega'_i$ is eventually contained in a tubular neighborhood of Σ . According to White [26], this implies that $G(\Omega'_i) > G(\Omega)$, and this is a contradiction. This establishes Lemma 37. \square

Lemma 39. *There are constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$G(\Omega) \leq G(\Theta) + C\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Theta)^2$$

for all $\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\mathcal{F}(\Omega, \Theta) < \delta$.

Proof. Think of $C > 0$ as a fixed constant to be chosen later. Suppose for contradiction that the claim fails. Then there are sets $\Omega_i \neq \Omega$ with $\mathcal{F}(\Omega_i, \Omega) \rightarrow 0$ and

$$G(\Omega_i) + C\mathcal{F}(\Omega_i, \Omega)^2 \leq G(\Omega)$$

Define

$$H_i(\Theta) = G(\Theta) + \lambda[\mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Omega) - \mathcal{F}(\Omega_i, \Omega)]^2$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a constant to be specified later. Let Ω'_i be a minimizer of H_i . Passing to a subsequence, $\Omega'_i \rightarrow \Omega'$ in the flat topology. The proof of Lemma 4.1 in [7] applies verbatim to show that Ω' minimizes

$$H_0(\Theta) = G(\Theta) + \lambda\mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Omega)^2$$

over all $\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

We claim that Ω is the unique minimizer of H_0 provided λ is large enough. Suppose for contradiction that there is some $\Omega_1 \neq \Omega$ with $H_0(\Omega_1) \leq H_0(\Omega)$. Then

$$G(\Omega_1) + \lambda\mathcal{F}(\Omega_1, \Omega)^2 \leq A^\varepsilon(\Omega)$$

which implies that

$$\mathcal{F}(\Omega_1, \Omega)^2 \leq \frac{A^\varepsilon(\Omega) - A^\varepsilon(\Omega_1)}{\lambda} \leq \frac{A^\varepsilon(\Omega) + \varepsilon \text{Vol}(M)}{\lambda}.$$

In particular, if λ is large enough then Claim 37 applies to Ω_1 and so $G(\Omega_1) > G(\Omega)$. This is a contradiction.

Since Ω is the unique minimizer of H_0 , it follows that $\Omega'_i \rightarrow \Omega$ in the flat topology. The same argument as above shows that this convergence is actually in the \mathbf{F} -topology. Again the varifolds $|\Omega'_i|$ satisfy a monotonicity formula with uniform constants and hence are eventually contained in a tubular neighborhood of Σ . This contradicts Theorem 1.1 in [7] since the A^ε functional can locally be written as an elliptic parametric functional. (This is because the

volume form ω on M is exact in a tubular neighborhood of Σ .) This establishes Lemma 39. \square

Finally Theorem 36 follows from Lemma 39 as explained in [26]. \square

Note that Theorem 36 has the following corollary.

Corollary 40. *Let $\Sigma = \partial\Omega$ be a smooth, closed, ε -cmc in M which is strictly stable for A^ε . Then there are constants $\delta > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that every $\tilde{\Omega} \in \mathcal{I}_{n+1}(M, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\Omega}, \Omega) < \delta$ satisfies $A^\varepsilon(\tilde{\Omega}) \geq A^\varepsilon(\Omega) + C\mathcal{F}(\tilde{\Omega}, \Omega)^2$.*

APPENDIX B. GENERIC METRICS

It is natural to ask whether assumption (U-ii) poses a significant restriction to the applicability of Theorem 26. The following proposition addresses this question. It shows that assumption (U-ii) holds for a generic set of metrics g on M .

Proposition 41. *Let M be a closed manifold. There is a (Baire) generic set \mathcal{G} of smooth metrics on M with the following property: if $g \in \mathcal{G}$ then for any closed, connected, embedded minimal hypersurface Σ in (M, g) the varifold 2Σ is the only embedded minimal cycle in (M, g) with area $2 \text{Area}(\Sigma)$.*

Proposition 41 is a corollary of the following result of Marques and Neves [18]. Given a metric g on M and $C > 0$ and $I \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M}_{C,I}(g)$ denote the collection of all closed, connected, embedded minimal hypersurfaces in (M, g) with area at most C and index at most I .

Proposition 42. ([18] Proposition 8.6) *Let g be a bumpy metric on M , and fix $C > 0$ and $I \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist metrics \tilde{g} arbitrarily close to g in the smooth topology such that the following properties hold.*

- (i) *The set $\mathcal{M}_{C,I}(\tilde{g}) = \{\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N\}$ is finite and every surface in $\mathcal{M}_{C,I}(\tilde{g})$ is non-degenerate.*
- (ii) *The areas $\text{Area}_{\tilde{g}}(\Sigma_1), \dots, \text{Area}_{\tilde{g}}(\Sigma_N)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} .*

Remark 43. Note that property (ii) above immediately implies the following weaker property.

- (iii) *Let $A = a_1 \text{Area}_{\tilde{g}}(\Sigma_1) + \dots + a_N \text{Area}_{\tilde{g}}(\Sigma_N)$ for some integers $a_i \geq 0$. If $A = 2 \text{Area}_{\tilde{g}}(\Sigma_i)$ for some i then $a_i = 2$ and all the other a_j 's are zero.*

Proof. (Proposition 41) Given $C > 0$ and $I \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ be the collection of all metrics g on M for which properties (i) and (iii) above hold (with g in place of \tilde{g}). We claim that $\mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ is open and dense in the set of all smooth metrics on M .

First we show that $\mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ is open. Fix some $g \in \mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ and write

$$\mathcal{M}_{C,I}(g) = \{\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N\}.$$

Since every surface in $\mathcal{M}_{C,I}(g)$ is non-degenerate, there is a neighborhood U of g such that for any $\tilde{g} \in U$ and any $i = 1, \dots, N$ there is a unique minimal surface $\Sigma_i(\tilde{g})$ in (M, \tilde{g}) that is smoothly close to Σ_i . Moreover, these surfaces $\Sigma_i(\tilde{g})$ are all non-degenerate. By Sharp's compactness theorem [24], it follows that there is a potentially smaller neighborhood U_1 of g such that

$$\mathcal{M}_{C,I}(\tilde{g}) \subseteq \{\Sigma_1(\tilde{g}), \dots, \Sigma_N(\tilde{g})\}$$

for all $\tilde{g} \in U_1$. Taking an even smaller neighborhood U_2 of g , it is then possible to ensure that condition (iii) holds for all $\tilde{g} \in U_2$.

Next we show that $\mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ is dense. Consider any metric g on M . Since bumpy metrics are dense, there is a bumpy metric g_1 on M arbitrarily close to g . Applying Proposition 3.2 to g_1 then yields $g_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ that is arbitrarily close to g_1 . Thus there is a metric $g_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{C,I}$ arbitrarily close to g in the smooth topology.

To conclude the proof, take sequences $C_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $I_n \rightarrow \infty$ and define

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_n \mathcal{G}_{C_n, I_n}.$$

Then \mathcal{G} is Baire generic, and every metric $g \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 41. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Almgren. The theory of varifolds. Mimeographed notes, 1965.
- [2] O. Chodosh, D. Ketover, and D. Maximo. Minimal hypersurfaces with bounded index. *Invent. Math.*, 209(3):617–664, 2017.
- [3] O. Chodosh and C. Mantoulidis. Minimal surfaces and the allen-cahn equation on 3-manifolds: index, multiplicity, and curvature estimates. *Ann. of Math.*, 191:213–328, 2020.
- [4] C. De Lellis and J. Ramic. Min-max theory for minimal hypersurfaces with boundary. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 68(5):1909–1986, 2018.
- [5] D. Fischer-Colbrie and R. Schoen. The structure of complete stable minimal surfaces in 3-manifolds of nonnegative scalar curvature. *Comm. pure appl. math*, 33(2):199–211, 1980.

- [6] P. Gaspar and M.A.M. Guaraco. The weyl law for the phase transition spectrum and density of limit interfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 29:382–410, 2019.
- [7] D. Inauen and A. Marchese. Quantitative minimality of strictly stable extremal submanifolds in a flat neighborhood. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 275(6):1532–1550, 2018.
- [8] K. Irie, F.C. Marques, and A. Neves. Density of minimal hypersurfaces for generic metrics. *Ann. of Math.*, 187:963–972, 2018.
- [9] N. Kapouleas. Constant mean curvature surfaces constructed by fusing wente tori. *Invent. Math.*, 119(3):443–518, 1995.
- [10] N. Kapouleas. Minimal surfaces in the round three-sphere by doubling the equatorial two-sphere, i. *J. Differential Geom.*, 106(3):393–449, 2017.
- [11] N. Kapouleas and S.-D. Yang. Minimal surfaces in the three-sphere by doubling the clifford torus. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 132(2):257–295, 2010.
- [12] D. Ketover, F.C. Marques, and A. Neves. The catenoid estimate and its geometric applications. *J. Differential Geom.*, 115(1):1–26, 2020.
- [13] Y. Li. Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in higher-dimensional closed manifolds with generic metrics. arXiv:1901.08440, 2019.
- [14] Y. Liokumovich, F.C. Marques, and A. Neves. Weyl law for the volume spectrum. *Ann. of Math.*, 187(3):933–961, 2018.
- [15] F. Lopez and A. Ros. Complete minimal surfaces with index one and stable constant mean curvature surfaces. *Comment. math. helv.*, pages 34–43, 1989.
- [16] F.C. Marques and A. Neves. Rigidity of min-max minimal spheres in three-manifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 161(15):2725–2752, 2012.
- [17] F.C. Marques and A. Neves. Morse index and multiplicity of min-max minimal hypersurfaces. *Cambridge journal of mathematics*, 4(4):463–511, 2016.
- [18] F.C. Marques and A. Neves. Morse index of multiplicity one min-max minimal hypersurfaces. arXiv:1803.04273, 2018.
- [19] F.C. Marques, A. Neves, and A. Song. Equidistribution of minimal hypersurfaces in generic metrics. *Invent. Math.*, 216(2):421–443, 2019.
- [20] R. Montezuma. A mountain pass theorem for minimal hypersurfaces with fixed boundary. arXiv:1802.04757, 2018.
- [21] F. Packard and T. Sun. Doubling construction for cmc hypersurfaces in riemannian manifolds. www.cmls.polytechnique.fr/perso/pacard.frank/Publications/PR-01.pdf.
- [22] J. Pitts. *Existence and regularity of minimal surfaces on Riemannian manifolds*. Princeton University Press, 1981.
- [23] R. Schoen and L. Simon. Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces. *Comm. pure appl. math*, 34:741–797, 1981.
- [24] B. Sharp. Compactness of minimal hypersurfaces with bounded index. *J. Differential Geom.*, 106(2):317–339, 2017.
- [25] A. Song. Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in closed manifolds. arXiv:1806.08816, 2018.
- [26] B. White. A strong minimax property of nondegenerate minimal submanifolds. *J. reine angew. Math.*, pages 203–218, 1994.
- [27] S.-T. Yau. Seminar on differential geometry. In *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, volume 102. Princeton University Press, 1982.
- [28] X. Zhou. On the multiplicity one conjecture in min-max theory. arXiv:1901.01173, 2019.
- [29] X. Zhou and J. Zhu. Existence of hypersurfaces with prescribed mean curvature i - generic min-max. arXiv:1808.03527, 2018.

- [30] X. Zhou and J. Zhu. Min-max theory for constant mean curvature hypersurfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 218(2):441–490, 2019.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHICAGO, IL 60637

Email address: maz@math.uchicago.edu