

Constant mean curvature graphs in \mathbb{H}^3 defined in exterior domains

Patricia Klaser ^{*} Adilson Nunes [†]

Abstract

Given $H \in [0, 1)$ and given a C^0 exterior domain Ω in a H -hypersphere of \mathbb{H}^3 , the existence of hyperbolic Killing graphs of CMC H defined in $\bar{\Omega}$ with boundary $\partial\Omega$ included in the H -hypersphere is obtained.

MSC Class: Primary 53A10. Secondary 53C42.

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the exterior Dirichlet problem for the CMC equation with vanishing boundary data in \mathbb{H}^3 . We recall that a Dirichlet problem is called exterior when the domain is such that its complement is compact.

The exterior Dirichlet problem was probably first considered by Nitsche [Ni], who proved that if u is a solution to an exterior Dirichlet problem over a domain in the Euclidean plane, then it has at most linear growth and its graph has a well defined Gauss map at infinity.

This problem has also been investigated, considering different aspects by Collin and Krust [CK], Kuwert [K], Kutev and Tomi [KT], Ripoll and Tomi [RT] and more recently by Aiolfi, Bustos and Ripoll [ABR] all in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n for minimal surfaces.

As a natural development of Riemannian geometry, the exterior Dirichlet problem was studied by Espirito-Santo and Ripoll [ESR] in product manifolds

^{*}patricia.klaser@ufsm.br

[†]adilson.nunes@furg.br

$M^n \times \mathbb{R}$, assuming zero boundary data. They assume either that M is simply connected, $K_M \leq -k^2 < 0$ and the domain Ω satisfies the exterior sphere condition, or that $\text{Ric}_M \geq 0$ and K_M satisfies a decay condition. They prove that for each $s \geq 0$ there is a function $u \in C^0(\Omega) \cap C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, vanishing at $\partial\Omega$ with minimal graph and $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\nabla u(x)| = s$.

Further in [ARS], the exterior Dirichlet problem in manifolds with $K_M \leq -k^2$ is taken into account. In this case, the authors do not require vanishing boundary data, but the oscillation of the boundary data cannot be arbitrarily large. Besides, instead of prescribing the supremum of the gradient at the boundary, they prove existence results prescribing also continuous boundary data at infinity.

In this paper we extend the results in [ESR] to the hyperbolic space \mathbb{H}^3 . We consider the Dirichlet problem for the CMC H equation with $H \in [0, 1)$ and vanishing boundary data for hyperbolic Killing graphs. We recall that a Killing vector field is called hyperbolic if its integral curves are hypercycles orthogonal to a totally geodesic surface. Given an oriented geodesic γ there is a unique hyperbolic Killing vector field X tangent to γ with $X(\gamma(0)) = \gamma'(0)$. Moreover, it is orthogonal to the totally geodesic hypersurfaces of \mathbb{H}^3 which are orthogonal to γ .

Let X be a hyperbolic Killing vector field of \mathbb{H}^3 orthogonal to a totally geodesic surface \mathbb{H}^2 . Given a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^2$, denote by φ_t the one-parameter family of isometries determined by X , $\varphi_0 = Id$, the X -Killing graph $\text{Gr}(u)$ of a function u is $\text{Gr}(u) = \{\varphi_{u(x)}(x) | x \in \Omega\}$. Our first main result concerns the minimal surfaces and reads as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^2$ be a C^0 exterior domain. Then, given $s \geq 0$, there is $u \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, such that:*

- i) *the X -Killing graph of u is a minimal surface,*
- ii) *$u \geq 0$ in Ω and $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$,*
- iii) *$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u| = s$,*

$$\text{iv) } \sup_{\Omega} |u| \leq \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-2t}}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1-e^{-4t}}} dt < \frac{\pi}{4}.$$

The same technique used to prove Theorem 1.1 applies to $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ and using it we can improve Theorem 1 of [ESR] in the particular case of $M = \mathbb{H}^2$: the

exterior domain Ω does not have to satisfy the exterior sphere condition and the bound for the supremum of u can be improved to $\min\{2s, \pi/4\}$, since the rotational surfaces in $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ have height bounded by $\pi/4$ (see Theorem 3.1 below).

All previous results that the authors know about the exterior Dirichlet problem dealt only with minimal surfaces. Nevertheless in \mathbb{H}^3 we obtain also existence results for $H \in (0, 1)$. For a fixed totally geodesic hypersurface \mathbb{H}^2 , the surfaces equidistant to it are hyperspheres E_H , $H \in (-1, 1)$. They are totally umbilical hypersurfaces of CMC H . When a direction of the Killing graph is fixed, we define the sign of H by considering the normal vector to E_H such that $\langle \eta, X \rangle$ is non negative. The definition of Killing graphs can be extended to functions with domain in E_H . For $H \in (0, 1)$ we prove Theorem 3.6 which summarizes as follows

Theorem 1.2. *For $H \in (0, 1)$, let $\Omega \subset E_H$ be a C^0 exterior domain in a hypersphere equidistant to \mathbb{H}^2 . Then, for any $s \geq 0$ there is a CMC H X -graph of a positive bounded function over Ω with vanishing boundary data and $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u| = s$.*

2 Rotational surfaces

Throughout this work we fix the following notation: γ is the geodesic associated to the hyperbolic Killing field X and \mathbb{H}^2 is the totally geodesic surface orthogonal to X , containing $o := \gamma(0)$. Besides for $x \in \mathbb{H}^2$, $r(x)$ denotes the distance to o , $D_\rho(o) = \{x \in \mathbb{H}^2 \mid r(x) < \rho\}$ and $|X(x)| = \cosh(r(x))$ for any $x \in \mathbb{H}^2$. For instance if we consider the half-space model for \mathbb{H}^3 , that is, \mathbb{R}_+^3 with the metric $ds^2 = (\frac{1}{z^2}) dx^2$, where dx is the Euclidean metric, if the geodesic γ is the oriented z axis, $\gamma(t) = (0, 0, e^t)$ then $\varphi_t(x) = e^t x$, $\mathbb{H}^2 = \{x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1, \ z > 0\}$, $X(p) = p$ for any $p \in \mathbb{H}^2$. Furthermore the X -graphs are euclidean radial graphs. We remark that we may assume that X is this hyperbolic Killing field without loss of generality, since \mathbb{H}^3 is a homogeneous space.

From Proposition 2.1 of [DR], a function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has CMC H X -graph oriented with normal vector pointing in the direction of X , if it satisfies

$\mathcal{M}_H(u) = 0$ for

$$\mathcal{M}_H(u) := \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\cosh(r) \operatorname{grad} u}{\sqrt{1 + \cosh^2(r) |\operatorname{grad} u|^2}} \right) + \frac{\langle \operatorname{grad} u, \sinh(r) \operatorname{grad} r \rangle}{\sqrt{1 + \cosh^2(r) |\operatorname{grad} u|^2}} - 2H, \quad (1)$$

where div and grad are the divergent and gradient respectively, in \mathbb{H}^2 .

Proposition 2.1. *Given $\rho > 0$, $s \geq 0$ (including $s = \infty$) and $H \in (-1, 1)$, there exists a function $v_{\rho,s,H} : \mathbb{H}^2 \setminus D_\rho(o) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $v_{\rho,s,H}|_{\partial D_\rho} = 0$ and the X -Killing graph of $v_{\rho,s,H}$ has CMC H . Besides, $|\operatorname{grad} v_{\rho,s,H}|_{\partial D_\rho} = s$.*

Proof. If we use $u = f \circ r$, remind that $\Delta r = \coth(r)$ and $|\operatorname{grad} r| = 1$, and define the auxiliar function

$$g(r) = \frac{\cosh(r) f'(r)}{\sqrt{1 + \cosh^2(r) f'^2(r)}}$$

equation (1) can be written as

$$g'(r) + g(r)(\coth(r) + \tanh(r)) - 2H = 0.$$

So we have to find f satisfying the ODE above, $f'(\rho) = s$ and $f(\rho) = 0$. This is accomplished by

$$f(r) = \int_\rho^r \frac{H \coth(2t) + C(\rho, s, H) \operatorname{cosech}(2t)}{\cosh(t) \sqrt{1 - (H \coth(2t) + C(\rho, s, H) \operatorname{cosech}(2t))^2}} dt. \quad (2)$$

where

$$C(\rho, s, H) := -H \cosh(2\rho) + \frac{\sinh(2\rho) \cosh(\rho) s}{\sqrt{1 + \cosh^2(\rho) s^2}}. \quad (3)$$

So defining $v_{\rho,s,H}(x) = f(r(x))$, the result holds.

We remark that for all $s > 0$ the function f is well defined in $(\rho, +\infty)$. \square

We use the notation $v_{\rho,\infty,H}$ to indicate the case

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \partial D_\rho} |\operatorname{grad} v_{\rho,\infty,H}(x)| = \infty.$$

Besides, when $H = 0$ and $s = \infty$ we use just v_ρ to denote $v_{\rho,\infty,0}$.

The next result is a consequence of the definition of $v_{\rho,\infty,H}$.

Lemma 2.2. *If $H \in [0, 1)$, we have that $v_{\rho, \infty, H} : \mathbb{H}^2 \setminus D_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an increasing function of the distance to ∂D_ρ and $\lim_{r(x) \rightarrow \infty} |\text{grad } v_{\rho, \infty, H}(x)| = 0$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Given $H \in [0, 1)$ we have that $v_{\rho, \infty, H} : \mathbb{H}^2 \setminus D_\rho \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is bounded above by a constant*

$$B(H) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{H + (1 - H)e^{-2t}}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1 - (H + (1 - H)e^{-2t})^2}} dt \quad (4)$$

which is a continuous increasing function of $H \in [0, 1)$ satisfying

$$B(0) < \pi/4 \text{ and } \lim_{H \rightarrow 1^-} B(H) = \infty.$$

Proof. Let us write $v_{\rho, \infty, H}(r(x)) = f(r(x))$ for

$$f(r) = \int_0^r \frac{x_\rho(t)}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1 - x_\rho(t)^2}} dt, \text{ where}$$

$$x_\rho(t) = \frac{H \cosh(2\rho + 2t) + \sinh(2\rho) - H \cosh(2\rho)}{\sinh(2\rho + 2t)}.$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} x_\rho(t) = \frac{2}{\sinh(2\rho + 2t)} [H(\cosh(2t) - 1) + \sinh(2t)] > 0$$

and $x \mapsto \frac{x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}$ is an increasing function, we conclude that

$$v_{\rho, \infty, H}(r) \leq \int_0^r \frac{1}{\cosh(t)} \lim_{\rho \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{x_\rho(t)}{\sqrt{1 - x_\rho(t)^2}} \right) dt. \quad (5)$$

Straightforward computations show that $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} x_\rho(t) = H + (1 - H)e^{-2t}$ and therefore the bound $B(H)$ given in the statement is obtained. Since $B'(H) > 0$ for $H \in [0, 1)$, B is an increasing function. Besides

$$B(0) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-2t}}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1 - e^{-4t}}} dt \leq \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{e^{-2t}}{\sqrt{1 - e^{-4t}}} dt = \pi/4.$$

□

The following result follows from Lemma 6 of [DL].

Lemma 2.4. *Let Ω be a $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounded open subset of \mathbb{H}^2 and $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$ a solution of $\mathcal{M}_H(u) = 0$ in Ω . Assume that u is bounded in Ω and that $|\text{grad } u|$ is bounded on $\partial\Omega$. Then $|\text{grad } u|$ is bounded in Ω by a constant that depends only on $\sup_\Omega |u|$ and $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u|$.*

3 Main results

Our existence result for the minimal surfaces is inspired on its analogous version in $M^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ proved in [ESR].

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We start with the case that Ω is a C^∞ domain. Let $D_0 \subset \mathbb{H}^2$ be the smallest disk centered at o with $\mathbb{H}^2 \setminus \Omega \subset \overline{D_0}$. Let $R_1 > R_0$ be such that

$$|\text{grad } v_{R_0}(x)|_{\partial D_R} < s/2 \text{ for all } R \geq R_1,$$

which exists since $\lim_{r(x) \rightarrow \infty} |\text{grad } v_{R_0}(x)|_{D_r} = 0$ (see Lemma 2.2). We define the sequence $R_m = R_1 + m$, $m \geq 2$ and set $\Omega_m = D_{R_m} \cap \Omega$.

Claim: For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a function $u_m \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m})$ solution of $\mathcal{M}_0(u)$, such that $u_m = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_m| = s$.

Observe that Ω_m is a connected domain and its boundary consists in $\partial\Omega \cup \partial D_{R_m}$. Set $\Gamma_m = \partial D_{R_m}$ and define

$$T_m = \{t \geq 0 \mid \exists u_t \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m}) \text{ with } \mathcal{M}(u_t) = 0, u_t|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \\ u_t|_{\Gamma_m} = t, \sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_t| \leq s\}. \quad (6)$$

We will prove that $h(m) = \sup T_m$ is well defined and belongs to T_m . Then we demonstrate that u_m , the function associated to $h(m)$, satisfies the claim.

Since $0 \in T_m$, $T_m \neq \emptyset$. We prove in the sequel that $\sup T_m \leq \frac{\pi}{4}$. Assume for contradiction that there is $T \in T_m$, $T > \pi/4$. From Lemma 2.3, there is a function $v_R : \mathbb{H}^2 \setminus D_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each $R \leq R_m$, that vanishes on ∂D_R , has a minimal X -graph which is tangent to the X -Killing cylinder that passes through ∂D_R . Besides, all these functions are bounded by $\pi/4$.

Notice that for $R = R_m$ the X -Killing graphs of u_T and v_{R_m} are disjoint since the intersection of the domains of these functions is Γ_m and on Γ_m , $u_T = T > \pi/4 > 0 = v_{R_m}$. Now consider the family $\{v_R\}_{R \in [R_0, R_m]}$ and define \bar{R} the minimum value of

$$\{R \in [R_0, R_m] \mid Gr_X(v_r) \cap Gr_X(u_T) = \emptyset \forall r \geq R\},$$

which is the first contact point of the graph of u_T with a graph of v_R in this family such that the graph of v_R is disjoint from the graph of u . The graph of $v_{\bar{R}}$ touches the graph of u_T at an interior point, leading us to a




Figure 1: Maximum principle

contradiction with the maximum principle (see Figure 1). More precisely, the inequality $T > \pi/4$ implies that the touching point cannot be in the cylinder over Γ_m , and it also cannot be over $\partial\Omega$ because it would contradict $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_T| \leq s$.

In order to find the function $u_m = u_{h(m)}$, we prove next that $h(m) \in T_m$. First, we observe that our choice of R_1 guarantees that, for all m , if $t \in T_m$, $|\text{grad } u_t| \leq s/2$ in Γ_m . This is again a consequence of the maximum principle, which implies that $v_{R_0} - (v_{R_0}(R_m) + t) \leq u_t \leq t$ in Ω_m . Hence, we have upper (constant t) and lower ($v_{R_0} - (v_{R_0}(R_m) + t)$) barriers to estimate the gradient of u_t on Γ_m and therefore for $t \in T_m$, $\sup_{\partial\Omega_m} |\text{grad } u_t| \leq s$.

To see that $h(m) \in T_m$, let (x_n) be a sequence in T_m with $x_n \rightarrow h(m)$. Let $u_n = u_{x_n}$ and observe that from the maximum principle $0 \leq u_n \leq h(m)$ in Ω_m . Besides, $|\text{grad } u_n|$ is bounded by s on $\partial\Omega_m$. Hence, from Lemma 2.4, there is a constant $C = C(h(m), s, \Omega_m)$, such that $|u_n|_{1, \Omega_m} \leq C$. Now standard PDE theory implies that the sequence (u_n) has a convergent subsequence in the C^2 norm on $\overline{\Omega}$ and, for w being the limit of the sequence, it holds that $w = u_{h(m)}$ so that $h(m) \in T_m$.

To prove that $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_{h(m)}| = s$, we follow the same idea of [ESR], which consists in showing that $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_{h(m)}| < s$ would contradict the fact that $h(m)$ is the supremum of T_m . Intuitively, if the strict inequality held, we could raise a little more the boundary data $h(m)$ and still have the gradient bounded by s . To be precise, fix any function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m})$ such that φ vanishes on $\partial\Omega_m$ and $\varphi \equiv h(m)$ on Γ_m and then define an operator $T : [0, 2] \times C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m}) \rightarrow C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m})$ by $T(t, w) = \mathcal{M}_0(w + t\varphi)$. Notice that T is a

C^1 operator, $T(1, u_{h(m)} - \varphi) = 0$ and $\partial_2 T(t, u_{h(m)} - \varphi)$ is an isomorphism. So, the Implicit Function Theorem in Banach spaces states that there is $\delta > 0$ and a continuous function $i : (1 - \delta, 1 + \delta) \rightarrow C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m})$, with $i(1) = u_{h(m)} - \varphi$ and such that $T(t, i(t)) = 0$. So, there must be a $t_0 > 1$, with $|\text{grad } i(t_0)| < s$ on $\partial\Omega$. This contradicts the definition of $h(m)$ since $t_0 h(m)$ would belong to T_m . By taking $u_m = u_{h(m)}$, the claim is demonstrated.

Now consider the sequence of functions $u_m \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m})$. For any $\Omega_k \subset \Omega$ compact, there is a constant $c(k)$, such that $|u_m|_{1, \overline{\Omega_k}} \leq c(k)$ for all $m > k$. Once again, standard PDE theory implies the existence of a subsequence of $\{u_m\}$ converging, in the C^2 norm on $\overline{\Omega_k}$, to a solution $v_k \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_k})$ of $\mathcal{M}_0 = 0$ in Ω_k satisfying $v_k = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } v_k| = s$. To obtain a solution in Ω , we iterate this process of taking subsequences: The first subsequence is taken to converge in Ω_1 , then, for Ω_2 , we take a subsequence from the one we already know that converges in Ω_1 and so on. By the diagonal method, we obtain the existence of a solution $u \geq 0$ of $\mathcal{M}_0 = 0$ in Ω satisfying $u = 0$ on the boundary and $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u| = s$. Since each element of the sequence is bounded by $\pi/4$, so is the limit.

For the general case of Ω being a C^0 domain we approximate it by C^∞ domains (U_j) such that $\Omega \subset U_{j+1} \subset U_j$ and $\Omega = \cap_j U_j$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $u_j \in C^\infty(\overline{U_j})$ be the solution that exists by the case proved above, that is $\mathcal{M}_0(u_j) = 0$, $u_j|_{\partial U_j} = 0$, $\sup_{\partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_j| = s \leq |u_j|_1 \leq C(s)$.

From the Arzela-Ascoli Theorem we obtain that (u_j) converges uniformly, on compact subsets of $\overline{\Omega}$, to a function $u_s \in C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $u_s|_{\partial\overline{\Omega}} = 0$. Besides, regularity theory implies $u_s \in C^\infty(\Omega)$. By the diagonal method, we obtain the existence of a subsequence (u_j) converging to a solution $u_s \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ of the minimal surface equation.

□

Although this result was inspired in its version for $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$, we were not able to construct barriers depending on the distance to the boundary, so we changed the definition of the exhaustion sets Ω_m . For that, we had to construct the rotational barriers from Section 2 and adapt some steps in the proof. Therefore we were able to discard the requirement on the existence of an exterior sphere condition. We remark that the proof of Theorem 1.1 can be applied in any situation where rotational surfaces are known and therefore one can also obtain an improvement of Theorem 1 of [ESR].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}^2$ be a C^0 exterior domain. Then, given $s \geq 0$, there is $u \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$, such that:*

- i) *the vertical graph of u is a minimal surface in $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$,*
- ii) *$u \geq 0$ in Ω and $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$,*
- iii) *$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u| = s$,*
- iv) *$\sup_{\Omega} |u| < \frac{\pi}{2}$.*

This result follows the same steps of \mathbb{H}^3 if one uses the rotational catenoids

$$\tilde{v}_{\rho, \infty, 0}(r) = \int_0^r \frac{\sinh(\rho)}{\sqrt{\sinh^2(t + \rho) - \sinh^2(\rho)}} dt, \quad r > 0 \quad (7)$$

instead of the functions $v_{\rho, \infty, 0}$. The expression (7) can be found in [KST].

3.1 The case $H \in (0, 1)$

We conclude this manuscript by considering graphs over E_H , which are umbilical hypersurfaces of CMC H . Since for $H \in (0, 1)$, E_H is an entire Killing graph over \mathbb{H}^2 , graphs over E_H are also graphs over \mathbb{H}^2 and vice versa. Nevertheless, it is natural to assume that our exterior domains are subsets of E_H . This is the case, since the geometric idea of our proof is to consider the exterior domain Ω as the graph (of the zero function) and lift the boundary data in order to find non trivial solutions.

This section is organized as follows: We present some facts about graphs over E_H in Proposition 3.2 and a way to take the rotational surfaces from Section 2 to have boundary on E_H in Lemma 3.5. With these tools, Theorem 3.6 can be proved following the same steps as Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $E_H \subset \mathbb{H}^3$ be an umbilical hypersurface with CMC H that is equidistant to \mathbb{H}^2 and X a hyperbolic Killing field, that is orthogonal to \mathbb{H}^2 . Consider $w : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function such that $\text{Gr}_X(w) = E_H$. Then, given a function $u : E_H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have that $\tilde{u} : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\tilde{u}(\tilde{x}) = u(\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}\tilde{x}) + w(\tilde{x})$ is such that $\text{Gr}_X(\tilde{u}) = \text{Gr}_X(u)$ and*

$$\text{grad } \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}) = \langle \text{grad } u(x), X(x) \rangle_x \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}) + [D_2 \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x})]^{-1} \pi(\text{grad } u(x)),$$

where $\pi : T_x E_H \rightarrow T_x (\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})} \mathbb{H}^2)$ is the natural projection and $x = \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x})$.




Figure 2: Relating $\text{grad } u$ and $\text{grad } \tilde{u}$

Proof. Observe that X -graphs with domain $\Omega \subset E_H$ are well defined by $Gr_X(u) = \{\varphi_{u(x)}x \mid x \in \Omega\}$.

First, we show that $Gr_X(\tilde{u}) = Gr_X(u)$. Denoting by $x = \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}\tilde{x}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_X(\tilde{u}) &= \{\varphi_{\tilde{u}(\tilde{x})}\tilde{x} \mid \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{H}^2\} = \{\varphi_{u(x)+w(\tilde{x})}\tilde{x} \mid \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{H}^2\} \\ &= \{\varphi_{u(x)} \circ \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}\tilde{x} \mid \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{H}^2\} = \{\varphi_{u(x)}x \mid x \in E_H\} = Gr_X(u). \end{aligned}$$

For the computation of $\text{grad } \tilde{u}(\tilde{x})$, we consider a curve $\tilde{\alpha} : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^2$ such that $\tilde{\alpha}(0) = \tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}'(0) = \tilde{v}$. Thus

$$\tilde{u}(\tilde{\alpha}(t)) = u(\alpha(t)) + w(\tilde{\alpha}(t)) \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha(t) = \varphi_{w(\tilde{\alpha}(t))}\tilde{\alpha}(t)$. Using the chain rule we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'(t) &= (w \circ \tilde{\alpha})'(t) \frac{d}{dt} \varphi_{w(\tilde{\alpha}(t))}\tilde{\alpha}(t) + D_2 \varphi_{w(\tilde{\alpha}(t))}\tilde{\alpha}(t) \cdot \tilde{\alpha}'(t) \\ &= (w \circ \tilde{\alpha})'(t) X(\alpha(t)) + D_2 \varphi_{w(\tilde{\alpha}(t))}\tilde{\alpha}(t) \cdot \tilde{\alpha}'(t) \end{aligned}$$

and for $t = 0$,

$$\alpha'(0) = \langle \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}} X(x) + D_2 \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{v}. \quad (9)$$

Using (8) and (9) we obtain the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{grad } \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}} &= \langle \text{grad } u(x), \alpha'(0) \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}), \tilde{\alpha}'(0) \rangle_{\tilde{x}} \\ &= \langle \text{grad } u(x), \langle \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}} X(x) \rangle_x \\ &+ \langle \text{grad } u(x), D_2 \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{v} \rangle_x + \langle \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_2\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{v} \in \{X(x)\}^\perp = T_x\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}\mathbb{H}^2 \subset T_x\mathbb{H}^3$,

$$\langle \text{grad } u(x), D_2\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{v} \rangle_x = \langle \pi(\text{grad } u(x)), D_2\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{v} \rangle_x$$

for $\pi : T_x\mathbb{H}^3 \rightarrow T_x\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}\mathbb{H}^2$ the projection $\pi(y) = y - \langle y, X(x) \rangle_x \frac{X(x)}{|X(x)|^2}$. Moreover, since X is a Killing vector field, $D_2\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) : T_{\tilde{x}}\mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow T_x\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}\mathbb{H}^2$ is an isometry and

$$\langle \pi(\text{grad } u(x)), D_2\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}) \cdot \tilde{v} \rangle_x = \langle [D_2\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x})]^{-1} \cdot \pi(\text{grad } u(x)), \tilde{v} \rangle_x.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{grad } \tilde{u}(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}} &= \langle \langle \text{grad } u(x), X(x) \rangle_x \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}} \\ &+ \langle D_2^{-1}(\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x}))\pi(\text{grad } u(x)), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}} + \langle \text{grad } w(\tilde{x}), \tilde{v} \rangle_{\tilde{x}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.3. *We may compute w following the steps from Section 2 adapted and obtain*

$$w(\tilde{x}) = - \int_{r(\tilde{x})}^{\infty} \frac{H(\coth(2t) - \text{cosech}(2t))}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1 - H^2(\coth(2t) - \text{cosech}(2t))^2}} dt$$

which is a negative increasing function that goes to zero as $r(\tilde{x})$ goes to infinity.

Besides, $|w(\tilde{o})|$ is an increasing function of H that diverges as $H \rightarrow 1$.

Since w is a bounded C^∞ function, the following holds

Corollary 3.4. *Under the conditions of the above proposition we have:*

- (i) *If $r(\tilde{x}) \rightarrow \infty$, then $|\text{grad } \tilde{u}(\tilde{x})| \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $|\text{grad } u(x)| \rightarrow 0$*
- (ii) *$|\text{grad } \tilde{u}(\tilde{x})| \rightarrow +\infty$ if and only if $|\text{grad } u(x)| \rightarrow +\infty$.*

The next Lemma presents the family of functions f_R whose graphs are X -translations of the graphs of v_R .

Lemma 3.5. *Given $R > 0$, let D_R be the disk of radius R centered at the origin of E_H . Then there is a function $f_R : E_H \setminus D_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying:*

- (i) *f_R vanishes on ∂D_R ;*

- (ii) f_R has cmc H X -graph which is tangent to the X -Killing cylinder that passes through ∂D_R ;
- (iii) f_R is bounded by $B(H)$;
- (iv) The gradient of f_R at x goes to zero, as x goes to infinity.
- (v) f_R depends only on the distance to the origin of E_H .

Proof. Consider \mathbb{H}^2 the totally geodesic hypersurface that has the same asymptotic boundary as E_H and let $w : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function from Remark 3.3 such that E_H is the X -graph of w . (See Figure 2) We actually need the ‘inverse’ of w , i. e., let $\hat{w} : E_H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function such that \mathbb{H}^2 is the X -graph of \hat{w} . It holds that $\hat{w}(x) = -w(\tilde{x})$ for $x = \varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x})$. Since w (\hat{w}) is radial, we may define $w(\tilde{R}) = w(\tilde{x})$ ($\hat{w}(R) = \hat{w}(x)$) for any $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{H}^2$ ($x \in E_H$).

Observe that $u : U \subset E_H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has cmc H X -graph if and only if $\tilde{u} : \tilde{U} = \{\varphi_{\hat{w}(x)}(x) \mid x \in U\} \subset \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\tilde{u}(\tilde{x}) = u(\varphi_{w(\tilde{x})}(\tilde{x})) + w(\tilde{x})$ satisfies $\mathcal{M}_H(\tilde{u}) = 0$ for \mathcal{M}_H defined in (1). Besides, given a disk $D_R(o) \subset E_H$, there is an associated disk $D_{\tilde{R}}(\tilde{o}) \subset \mathbb{H}^2$ which is the intersection of the X -Killing cylinder through $D_R(o)$ with \mathbb{H}^2 .

For any $R > 0$, consider the function $v_{\tilde{R}, \infty, H} : \mathbb{H}^2 \setminus D_{\tilde{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from Proposition 2.1 and define $f_R : E_H \setminus D_R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f_R(x) = v_{\tilde{R}, \infty, H}(\varphi_{\hat{w}(x)}(x)) - [\hat{w}(R) - \hat{w}(x)].$$

The graph of f_R has cmc H because it is the graph of $x \in \mathbb{H}^2 \setminus D_R \mapsto v_{\tilde{R}, \infty, H}(x) + w(\tilde{R})$. Its boundary is $\partial D_R \subset E_H$ and it is tangent to the Killing cylinder $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(D_R)$ because of the second item in Corollary 3.4. Besides, f_R depends only on the distance to $o \in E_H$ since it is the difference between two other radial functions: $v_1 = v_{\tilde{R}, \infty, H}(\varphi_{\hat{w}(\cdot)}(\cdot))$ and $v_2 = \hat{w}(R) - \hat{w}(\cdot)$.

In order to see that $|f_R| \leq B(H)$, it is sufficient to prove that

$$0 \leq v_1 \leq B(H) \text{ and } 0 \leq v_2 \leq B(H).$$

The first inequality is demonstrated in Lemma 2.3. For the second one, notice that $r \mapsto \hat{w}(r)$ is a positive decreasing function. Therefore, $\hat{w}(R) - \hat{w}(r) \leq \hat{w}(o)$ and it remains to show that $\hat{w}(o) \leq B(H)$, which reads as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^\infty \frac{H(\coth(2t) - \operatorname{cosech}(2t))}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1 - H^2(\coth(2t) - \operatorname{cosech}(2t))^2}} dt \\ & \leq \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{H + (1 - H)e^{-2t}}{\cosh(t)\sqrt{1 - (H + (1 - H)e^{-2t})^2}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

We may compare the integrands and see that this inequality holds. For that, since $x \mapsto \frac{x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}}$ is an increasing function, we only prove that

$$H(\coth(2t) - \operatorname{cosech}(2t)) \leq H + (1 - H)e^{-2t} \forall t > 0.$$

The last inequality follows from $H(\coth(2t) - \operatorname{cosech}(2t)) \leq H$ which is equivalent to $\cosh(2t) - \sinh(2t) \leq 1$ that holds for $t \geq 0$.

Item (iv) is a consequence of the first claim in Corollary 3.4. \square

The following theorem has the precise statement for Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $E_H \subset \mathbb{H}^3$ be an umbilical hypersurface with CMC $H \in [0, 1)$. Consider $\Omega \subset E_H$ an exterior domain of class C^0 and γ an oriented geodesic passing orthogonally through E_H , where X is the hyperbolic Killing field tangent to γ satisfying $\langle X, \eta \rangle > 0$, where η is the normal vector to E_H . Then, given a real number $s \geq 0$ there is a nonnegative bounded function $u \in C^\infty(\Omega) \cap C^0(\overline{\Omega})$ such that the $Gr_X(u)$ has constant mean curvature H , $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\operatorname{grad} u(x)| = s$ and $\sup_\Omega u \leq B(H)$.*

Proof. We start fixing $s \geq 0$ and assuming $\Omega \subset E_H$ is a C^∞ exterior domain. Let D_0, \dots, D_m, \dots be a collection of disks in E_H centered at the origin $o = \gamma \cap E_H$, with radius R_m , satisfying the condition that D_0 is the smallest disk such that $E_H \setminus \Omega \subset D_0$, $D_i \subset D_{i+1}$, $E_H = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} D_i$ and R_1 is large enough so that (10) (see below) holds.

As in Theorem 1.1, let $\Omega_m = D_m \cap \Omega$, set $\Gamma_m = \partial D_m$ and consider the set

$$\begin{aligned} T_m = \{t \geq 0 \mid \exists u_t \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_m}), u_t|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, u_t|_{\Gamma_m} = t, \limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\operatorname{grad} u_t(x)| \leq s \\ \text{and } u_t \text{ has cmc } H \text{ } X\text{-graph}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we prove the following items:

- 1) T_m is not empty
- 2) T_m is bounded
- 3) $h(m) = \sup T_m \in T_m$
- 4) $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_{h(m)}| = s$.

Afterwards we will prove that $u_m = u_{h(m)} \in C^\infty(\Omega_m)$ has cmc H X -graph and $\sup |\text{grad } u_m| = s$. In the end, the fact that $\Omega = \cup_m \Omega_m$ will allow us to find the solution u_s .

The first claim follows from taking $u = 0$, since E_H has cmc H . Therefore $t = 0$ belongs to T_m .

For the remaining items we use the functions f_R , which play the same role as the v'_R s did in the proof of Theorem 1.1. They were presented in Lemma 3.5.

For the second item, consider the family of graphs of $\{f_R\}_{R \leq R_m}$. If $j > B(H)$ belonged to T_m , the graph of the associated u_j would have a first interior contact point with a member of this family, leading us to a contradiction. Hence T_m is bounded by $B(H)$.

In order to find the function $u_m = u_{h(m)}$, we prove next that $h(m) \in T_m$. First, we exhibit the condition on R_1 :

$$|\text{grad } f_{R_0}(x)|_{\partial D_R} \leq s/2 \forall R \geq R_1, \quad (10)$$

which is possible since the gradient of f_R at x goes to zero, as x goes to infinity. Observe that our choice of R_1 guarantees that, for all m , if $t \in T_m$, $|\text{grad } u_t| \leq s/2$ in Γ_m . This is again a consequence of the maximum Principle as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The functions constant function t , u_t and $f_{R_0} - (f_{R_0}(R_m) + t)$ satisfy $f_{R_0} - (f_{R_0}(R_m) + t) \leq u_t \leq t$ in Ω_m . Hence

$$|\text{grad } u_t| \leq |\text{grad } f_{R_0}(R_m)| < s/2 \text{ on } \Gamma_m.$$

Therefore for $t \in T_m$, $\sup_{\partial\Omega_m} |\text{grad } u_t| \leq s$.

We conclude that $h(m) \in T_m$ following the same ideas as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. We remark that the boundedness for $\text{grad } u_t$ obtained using Lemma 2.4 also holds here since Proposition 3.2 gives a nice bijection from functions defined in E_H to functions defined in \mathbb{H}^2 .

The fourth property of T_m , $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \partial\Omega} |\text{grad } u_{h(m)}| = s$, also holds by the argument presented in Theorem 1.1.

Finally, we consider the sequence $u_m = u_{h(m)}$ and conclude that, up to a subsequence, it converges to a function u_s satisfying the statement.

The general case of C^0 domains also holds by the same argument as in Theorem 1.1.

□

The authors acknowledge Jaime Ripoll for suggesting the problem and for some helpful discussions.

References

- [ABR] Aiolfi, A., Bustos, D., Ripoll, J.: “*On the existence of foliations of solutions to the exterior Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation*”. To appear in Proceedings of the AMS.
- [ARS] Aiolfi, A., Ripoll, J., Soret, M.: “*The Dirichlet problem for the minimal hypersurface equation on arbitrary domains of a Riemannian manifold*”. Manuscripta math. 149, 71–81 (2016).
- [CK] Collin, P., Krust, R.: “*Le problème de Dirichlet pour l’équation des surfaces minimales sur des domaines non bornés*”. Bull. Soc. Math. de France, 119, p.443–462 (1991).
- [DL] Dajczer, M., Lira, J.: “*Killing graphs with prescribed mean curvature and Riemannian submersions*”. Ann. I. H. Poincaré – AN 26 763–775, (2009).
- [DR] Dajczer, M., Ripoll, J., “*An Extension of a Theorem of Serrin to Graphs in Warped Products*”. The Journal of Geometric Analysis Volume 15, Number 2, (2005).
- [ESR] Espírito-Santo, N., Ripoll, J.: “*Some existence results on the exterior Dirichlet problem for the minimal hypersurface equation*”. Ann. I. H. Poincaré- AN 28 385–393, (2011).
- [K] Kuwert, E.: “*On solutions of the exterior Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation*”. Ann. I. H. Poincaré/An Non Lin 10, 445–451 (1993).

- [KT] Kutev, N., Tomi, F.: “*Existence and Nonexistence in the Exterior Dirichlet Problem for the Minimal Surface Equation in the Plane*”. the Journal of Differential and Integral Equations. 11 , no. 6, 917-928 (1998).
- [KST] Klaser, P., Soares, R., Telichevesky, M. .: “*Constant mean curvature surfaces in $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ with boundary in two parallel planes* ”. arXiv:1512.07637v1.
- [Ni] Nitsche, J.C.C.: “ *Lectures on Minimal Surfaces*”. Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, (1989).
- [RT] Ripoll, J., Tomi.F.: “*On solutions to the exterior Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation with catenoidal ends*”. Adv. Calc. Var., v. 7, p. 205, (2014).