

# A MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR CODIMENSION-1 STATIONARY VARIFOLDS UNDER FIXED CONTACT ANGLE CONDITION

XUWEN ZHANG

**ABSTRACT.** In this note, we establish a boundary maximum principle for codimension-1 stationary varifolds, satisfying a fixed contact angle condition in any Riemannian manifold with smooth boundary.

**MSC 2020:** 53C42, 49Q15.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Minimal surfaces—critical points of the area functional with respect to local deformations—are fundamental objects in Riemannian geometry, and has attracted well attention of many mathematicians. In this note, we establish a boundary maximum principle for the generalized minimal hypersurfaces in any Riemannian manifolds, having constant contact angle  $\theta_0$  with the boundary.

In all follows, let  $(N^*, g)$  be a smooth  $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold with smooth, nonempty boundary  $\partial N^*$ . We use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  and  $\nabla$  to denote the metric and the Levi-Civita connection on  $N^*$  respectively, let  $\nu_{N^*}$  denote its unit normal along  $\partial N^*$ , pointing into  $N^*$ . For any smooth, compact, properly embedded hypersurface  $S \subset N^*$ , let  $\Omega$  be the enclosed region of  $S$  with  $\partial N^*$ , set  $T = \partial\Omega \cap \partial N^*$ . Let  $\nu_S$  denote its unit normal, pointing into  $\Omega$ , let  $A^S$  denote the shape operator of  $S$  in  $N^*$  with respect to  $\nu_S$ , i.e.,  $A^S(u) = -\nabla_u \nu_S$  for any  $u \in \Gamma(TS)$ . We say that  $S$  is strongly mean convex at a point  $p \in S$ , if

$$\kappa_1 + \dots + \kappa_n > 0,$$

where  $\kappa_1 \leq \dots \leq \kappa_n$  are the principal curvatures of  $A^S$  at  $p$ .

Our main result is the following boundary maximum principle, established in the context of varifolds under a fixed contact angle condition, we refer to [Section 2](#) for the precise definition and statement.

### 1.1. Main result.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $S$  be a smooth, compact, properly embedded hypersurface, meeting  $\partial N^*$  with a constant angle  $\theta_0$ ; that is,  $\langle \nu_s, \nu_{N^*} \rangle = -\cos \theta_0$  along  $\partial N^*$ . Suppose  $S$  is strongly mean convex at a point  $p \in \partial S$ .*

*Then, for any stationary pair  $(V, W) \in \mathcal{V}_n(N^*) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\partial N^*)$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_0}$ ,  $p$  is not contained in the support of  $\|V\|$ , if one of the following cases happens:*

- i.  $\theta_0 = \pi/2$ ,  $\|V\|$  is supported in  $\Omega$ ;*
- ii.  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi) \setminus \{\pi/2\}$ ,  $\|V\|$  is supported in  $\Omega$ ,  $\|W\|$  is supported in  $T$ , and away from  $p$ ;*
- iii.  $\theta_0 \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ ,  $\|V\|$  is supported in  $\Omega$ ,  $\|W\|$  is supported in  $T$  and  $p \in \text{spt}\|W\|$ .*

The maximum principle for minimal submanifolds has been proved in various context. The interior maximum principle for  $C^2$ -hypersurfaces is a direct consequence of the well-known Hopf's boundary point lemma [[GT01](#), Lemma 3.4]. It is then generalized to arbitrary codimension by




FIGURE 1. Hypersurface  $S$  having constant contact angle  $\theta_0$  with the boundary  $\partial N^*$ .

Jorge-Tomi [JT03]. In the non-smooth case, B. White [Whi10] established the interior maximum principle in the context of minimal varieties, in any codimension. Recently, M. M. Li and X. Zhou generalized the main result of [Whi10] to the free boundary setting, they established a boundary maximum principle for minimal varieties (stationary varifolds) with free boundary, in arbitrary codimension ([LZ21b, Theorem 1.2]).

As argued in [LZ21b], in the smooth, codimension-1 case, the boundary maximum principle for free boundary hypersurface amounts to be a simple application of Hopf's lemma. Meanwhile, one can also derive a boundary maximum principle for a generic contact angle  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$  by virtue of Hopf's lemma, see e.g., [LZZ21, Lemma 1.13]. Therefore, our main theorem serves as a generalization of this classical result.




FIGURE 2. Local orthogonal foliations and orthonormal frame

Our strategy of proof follows largely from [LZ21b]. In the free boundary case, Li-Zhou managed to prove their main result by a contradiction argument. Precisely, they constructed a test vector field  $X$ , which strictly decreases the first variation of the free boundary, stationary varifold. To construct such  $X$ , they first constructed local orthogonal foliations near  $p$  ([LZ21b, Lemma 2.1]), by virtue of such foliations, they found a local orthonormal frame  $e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}$  of  $N^*$  near  $p$ , see [LZ21b, Figure 2] also Figure 2 for illustration. The key point is that, locally near the free boundary, for any  $q \in \partial N^*$ , there holds  $e_{n+1}(q) \in T_q \partial N^*$ , which motivates their choice of test vector field  $X$ . In our case, we aim at obtaining an admissible vector field  $X$ , which is tangential along  $\partial N^*$ . Thanks to the constant contact angle condition, our choice of  $X$  is thus clear; we want the direction of  $X$  to agree with  $\sin \theta_0 e_{n+1} - \cos \theta_0 e_1$  along  $\partial N^*$ , to have a chance to test the first variation formula (2.10). Then, the strictly mean convexity of  $S$  at  $p$  forces  $X$  to decrease the first variation, which violates the stationarity of  $V$ . Unfortunately, in case **iii.** of Theorem 1.1, our approach seems to work only for half of the angles, precisely,  $\theta_0 \in [\pi/2, \pi)$ .

**1.2. Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we introduce the contact angle condition for varifolds; In Section 3, we prove our main result Theorem 1.1.

**1.3. Acknowledgements.** The author would like to express his deep gratitude to his advisor Chao Xia for many helpful discussions, constant support, and long-term encouragement.

## 2. CONTACT ANGLE CONDITION FOR VARIFOLDS AND STATIONARY PAIRS

Let us begin by recalling some basic concepts of varifolds, we refer to [All72; Pit81; Sim83, Chapter 8] for detailed accounts.

**2.1. Varifolds.** Suppose that  $N^*$  is isometrically embedded into  $\mathbf{R}^L$  by Nash embedding theorem. In what follows, we adopt  $G(L, n)$  to denote the Grassmannian of the unoriented  $n$ -planes of  $\mathbf{R}^L$ . We also use the following notations:  $G_n(N^*) = N^* \times G(L, n) \cap \{(x, S) : S \subset T_x N^*\}$ ,  $G_n(\partial N^*) = \partial N^* \times G(L, n) \cap \{(x, S) : S \subset T_x(\partial N^*)\}$ .

We adopt the following definitions in [Pit81], which are slightly different from the classical ones in [All72]. We denote by  $\mathcal{V}_n(N^*)$  the set of  $n$ -varifolds on  $N^*$ , which is the closure, in the weak topology, of the space of  $n$ -dimensional rectifiable varifolds in  $\mathbf{R}^L$  with support in  $N^*$  ([Pit81, 2.1(18)(g)]).  $\mathcal{V}_n(\partial N^*)$  is understood in a similar way. For a given  $V \in \mathcal{V}_n(N^*)$ , the *weight measure*  $\|V\|$  of  $V$  is the positive Radon measure defined by

$$\|V\|(N^*) = V(G_n(N^*)). \quad (2.1)$$

In particular, for any  $\varphi \in C_c(N^*)$ , we have

$$\|V\|(\varphi) = \int_{G_n(N^*)} \varphi(x) dV(x, S). \quad (2.2)$$

The *support* of  $V$ ,  $\text{spt}\|V\|$ , is the smallest closed subset  $B \subset \mathbf{R}^L$  such that  $V_\perp(\mathbf{R}^L \setminus B) = 0$ . In this note, we mainly work with the following spaces of vector fields,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{R}^L) &:= \text{the space of smooth vector fields on } \mathbf{R}^L, \\ \mathfrak{X}(N^*) &:= \{X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{R}^L) : X(p) \in T_p N^* \text{ for all } p \in N^*\}, \\ \mathfrak{X}_t(N^*) &:= \{X \in \mathfrak{X}(N^*) : X(p) \in T_p(\partial N^*) \text{ for all } p \in \partial N^*\}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $V \in \mathcal{V}_n(N^*)$  and  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_t(N^*)$ , the first variation of  $V$  with respect to  $X$  is denoted by  $\delta V[X]$ , defined by

$$\delta V[X] = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} (|\!(\psi_t)_\# V|\!(N^*)),$$

where  $\psi_t$  is the flow of  $X$  at the time  $t$ . Correspondingly, we have the following well-known first variation formula

$$\delta V[X] = \int_{G_n(N^*)} \operatorname{div}_S X(x) dV(x, S). \quad (2.3)$$

Now we introduce the contact angle condition for varifolds, which, to the author's knowledge, was first brought up in [KT17] formally, and then extended to a weaker form in [MP21]. As commented in [KT17], it is rather important to give a proper definition of the boundary condition, for broader applicability of the notion. We refer the readers to compare the following contact angle condition with the free boundary one.

## 2.2. Contact angle condition for varifolds.

**Definition 2.1** (Capillarity functional for pairs of varifolds, [MP21, Definition 2.5]). If  $(V, W) \in \mathcal{V}_n(N^*) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\partial N^*)$  and given  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ , the  $\theta_0$ -capillarity functional  $F_{\theta_0}$  applied to  $(V, W)$  is defined as

$$F_{\theta_0}(V, W) = \|V\|(N^*) - \cos \theta_0 \|W\|(\partial N^*). \quad (2.4)$$

If  $E \subset N^*$  is an open set of finite perimeter, we denote by  $\partial_i E$  and  $\partial_e E$  the internal and external part of the reduced boundary  $\partial^* E$ ; namely,

$$\partial_i E = \partial^* E \cap \operatorname{Int}(N^*), \quad \partial_e E = \partial^* E \cap \partial N^*,$$

where  $\operatorname{Int}(N^*)$  denotes the topological interior of  $N^*$ . Then, by considering the corresponding rectifiable  $n$ -varifolds  $|\partial_i E|$  and  $|\partial_e E|$  on  $N^*$  and  $\partial N^*$ , respectively, defined by assigning the density function  $\theta \equiv 1$  on the  $n$ -rectifiable sets  $\partial_i E$  and  $\partial_e E$ , we observe that  $F_{\theta_0}(|\partial_i E|, |\partial_e E|)$  agrees with the classical free energy, see [Mag12, (19.1)].

**Remark 2.1.** As a special case, our assumption **iii.** in [Theorem 1.1](#) of  $W$  will be realized if  $W$  is the corresponding  $n$ -rectifiable varifold of a rectifiable pair  $\underline{v}(M, \theta)^1$  on  $\partial N^*$ , where the rectifiable set  $M \subset T$  contains  $p$ . On the other hand, as considered in [KT17, Section 3.1], for a set of finite perimeter  $B^+ \subset \partial N^*$ , if we consider the corresponding  $n$ -varifold of it, say  $W$ , then **iii.** in [Theorem 1.1](#) is equivalent to require that  $B^+ \subset T$  and  $p$  is contained in the reduced boundary of  $B^+$ , due to the De Giorgi's structure theorem (see e.g., [Mag12, Theorem 15.9]).

**Definition 2.2** (Contact angle condition, [MP21, Definition 3.1]). Given  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ , we say that the pair  $(V, W) \in \mathcal{V}_n(N^*) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\partial N^*)$  satisfies the contact angle condition  $\theta_0$ , if there exists a  $\|V\|$ -measurable vector field  $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{L}^1(N^*, \|V\|)$ , such that, for every  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_t(N^*)$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{F_{\theta_0}}(V, W)[X] &= \int_{G_n(N^*)} \operatorname{div}_S X(x) dV(x, S) - \cos \theta_0 \int_{G_n(\partial N^*)} \operatorname{div}_{\partial N^*} X(x) dW(x, T_x \partial N^*) \\ &= - \int_{N^*} \langle X(x), \mathbf{H}(x) \rangle d\|V\|(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>We refer to [Sim83, Chapter 4] for definitions and notations of rectifiable varifold; We note that the multiplicity function  $\theta$  does not have to be identically 1 here, which means that the definitions in [Section 2.2](#) and also [Theorem 1.1](#) work finely for the multi-sheeted case.

In particular, the first variation formula of  $V$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta V[X] &= \int_{G_n(N^*)} \operatorname{div}_S X(x) dV(x, S) \\ &= - \int_{N^*} \langle X(x), \mathbf{H}(x) \rangle d\|V\|(x) + \cos \theta_0 \int_{G_n(\partial N^*)} \operatorname{div}_{\partial N^*} X(x) dW(x, T_x \partial N^*). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

We note that if  $V$  is a  $C^2$ -hypersurface in  $N^*$ , then the first variation of  $V$  with respect to the direction  $X$  is just

$$\delta V(X) := \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \operatorname{Area}(\psi_t(V)) = \int_V \operatorname{div}_V X = - \int_V \langle X, H \rangle - \int_{\partial V} \langle X, \mu \rangle, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\psi_t$  is the flow of  $X$  at the time  $t$ ,  $H$  is the inwards pointing mean curvature vector of  $X$  and  $\mu$  is the inwards pointing unit conormal of  $\partial V$  in  $V$ . If  $V$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with constant contact angle  $\theta_0$ , notice that  $X(x) \in T_x \partial N^*$ , we thus have

$$\int_{\partial V} \langle X, \mu \rangle = \cos \theta_0 \int_{\partial V} \langle X, \bar{\mu} \rangle = - \cos \theta_0 \int_T \operatorname{div}_T X, \quad (2.8)$$

where we denote by  $\Omega$  the enclosed region of  $V$  and  $\partial N^*$ ,  $T := \partial \Omega \cap \partial N^*$  is the wetting hypersurface with respect to  $V$  and  $\bar{\mu}$  is the inwards pointing unit conormal of  $\partial T$  in  $T$ ; we used the contact angle condition to derive the first equality and the divergence theorem for the second equality. It is clear that (2.7) together with (2.8), motivates [Definition 2.2](#).

**Definition 2.3** (Stationary pairs, [[MP21](#), Definition 3.2]). Given  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ , we say that the pair  $(V, W) \in \mathcal{V}_n(N^*) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\partial N^*)$  is stationary for  $F_{\theta_0}$  if it satisfies the contact angle condition (2.5) with  $\mathbf{H} = 0$  for  $\|V\|$ -a.e. In this situation, the first variation formula of  $V$  reads

$$\delta V[X] = \int_{G_n(N^*)} \operatorname{div}_S X(x) dV(x, S) = \cos \theta_0 \int_{G_n(\partial N^*)} \operatorname{div}_{\partial N^*} X(x) dW(x, T_x \partial N^*). \quad (2.9)$$

In view of (2.2), the definition of  $G_n(\partial N^*)$ , and the definition of  $\mathcal{V}_n(\partial N^*)$ , we thus obtain

$$\delta V[X] = \cos \theta_0 \int_{\operatorname{spt}\|W\|} \operatorname{div}_{\partial N^*} X(x) d\|W\|(x). \quad (2.10)$$

### 3. PROOF OF [THEOREM 1.1](#)

As illustrated in [Section 1](#), we need the following foliations, see [[LZ21b](#), Lemma 2.1] for the free boundary case. To prove the following lemma, we will exploit the Fermi coordinate system at  $p$ , for discussions on Fermi coordinate, see for example [[GLZ20](#), Section 6] and [[LZ21a](#), Appendix A].

**Lemma 3.1.** *For any properly embedded hypersurface  $S$ , having constant contact angle  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$  with  $\partial N^*$ , there exists a constant  $\delta > 0$ ; a neighborhood  $U \subset N^*$  containing  $p$ ; and foliations  $\{S_s\}$ ,  $\{T_t\}$ , with  $s \in (-\delta, \delta)$ ,  $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$ , of  $U$ ; such that  $S_0 = S \cap U$ , and  $S_s$  intersects  $T_t$  orthogonally for every  $s$  and  $t$ . In particular, each hypersurface  $S_s$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with constant contact angle  $\theta_0$ .*

*Proof.* We first extend  $S$  locally near  $p$  to a foliation  $\{S_s\}$  such that each  $S_s$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with constant contact angle  $\theta_0$ . This can be done by a simple modification of [[LZ21b](#), Lemma 2.1].

Let  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$  be a local Fermi coordinate system of  $N^*$  centered at  $p$ , such that  $x_1 = \operatorname{dist}_{N^*}(\cdot, \partial N^*)$ . Furthermore, we assume that  $(x_2, \dots, x_{n+1})$  is a local Fermi coordinate system of  $\partial N^*$ , relative to the hypersurface  $S \cap \partial N^*$ ; that is,  $x_{n+1}$  is the signed distance in  $\partial N^*$  from  $S \cap \partial N^*$ . In the rest of this paper, we denote by  $B_{r_0}^+ = \{x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2 < r_0^2 \mid x_1 \geq 0, x_{n+1} = 0\}$

the  $n$ -dimensional half ball in the Fermi coordinate. Since  $S$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with a constant contact angle  $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$ , we can express  $S$  in such local coordinates as the graph  $x_{n+1} = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of a function  $f$  defined on a half ball  $B_{r_0}^+$ , such that  $f = 0$  along  $B_{r_0}^+ \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ . Moreover, due to the contact angle condition, we can carry out the following computation, see also [CM11, Section 7.1] for a detailed computation of minimal graphs on manifolds.

First we fix some notations. Let  $g_{ij}$  denote the metric on  $N^*$  in the local Fermi coordinate  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$ . Set  $\bar{e}_i$  to be the vector field  $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$  so that  $\langle \bar{e}_i, \bar{e}_j \rangle = g_{ij}$ . For simplicity, we set a smooth function  $W$  by

$$W^2 = 1 + \sum_{i,j=1}^n g^{ij} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}.$$

Now, since  $-\nu$  is the upwards pointing unit normal of  $S$ , computing as [CM11, (7.11)], we obtain

$$\langle \nu, \bar{e}_i \rangle = \frac{1}{W} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}. \quad (3.1)$$

In particular, since  $S$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with contact angle  $\theta_0$ , we have  $\langle \nu, \bar{e}_1 \rangle = \cos \theta_0$  along  $B_{r_0}^+ \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$ , and hence (3.1) yields

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \cos \theta_0 W(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \quad \text{along } B_{r_0}^+ \cap \{x_1 = 0\}. \quad (3.2)$$

In view of this, the translated graphs  $x_{n+1} = f(x_1, \dots, x_n) + s := f_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  then gives a local foliation  $\{S_s\}$  near  $p$  such that each leaf  $S_s$  is a hypersurface in  $N^*$  which meets  $\partial N^*$  with constant contact angle  $\theta_0$  along its boundary  $\partial S_s = S_s \cap \partial N^*$ . Indeed, for any point  $q \in \partial S \cap \partial N^*$  near  $p$ , we can represent it as  $q = (0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q, f(0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q))$ . By definition,  $q_s := (0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q, f_s(0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q)) \in S_s \cap \partial N^*$ . Using (3.2), we obtain

$$\frac{\partial f_s}{\partial x_1}(0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q) = \cos \theta_0 W(0, x_2^q, \dots, x_n^q). \quad (3.3)$$

Let  $-\nu_s$  denote the upwards pointing unit normal of  $S_s$ , from (3.1) and (3.3), we then see that  $\langle \nu_s(q_s), \bar{e}_1(q_s) \rangle = \cos \theta_0$ ; that is to say,  $S_s$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with contact angle  $\theta_0$ . To conclude the construction of  $\{S_s\}$ , we note that  $\partial S_s$  gives a local foliation of  $\partial N^*$  near  $p$  obtained from the equidistant hypersurfaces of  $\partial S \subset \partial N^*$ .

Next, the construction of  $\{T_t\}$  which is orthogonal to every leaf of  $\{S_s\}$  follows from [LZ21b, Lemma 2.1], and hence omitted. Here we note that in the original proof, Li-Zhou defined  $T_t$  to be the union of all the integral curves of  $\nu$  which passes through  $\Gamma_t$ , where  $\nu(q)$  is defined to be the unit vector normal to the hypersurface  $S_s$  at  $q$  and  $\Gamma_t \subset S$  is the parallel hypersurface in  $S$  which is of distance  $t > 0$  away from  $S \cap \partial N^*$ . In the free boundary case ( $\theta_0 = \pi/2$ ), such choice of  $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  indeed foliates a small neighborhood of  $p$ , since  $T_0$  coincides with  $T$  near  $p$ . However, for a generic angle  $\theta_0$ ,  $\{T_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  apparently does not form a foliation near  $p$ . To overcome this (we consider for example, the case  $\theta_0 \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ ), for  $t \leq 0$ , we set  $T_t$  to be the union of all the integral curves of  $\nu := e_{n+1}$  which passes through  $\Gamma_{-t}$ ; for  $t > 0$ , we set  $T_t$  to be the union of all the integral curves of  $\nu := e_{n+1}$  which passes through  $S_t \cap \partial N^*$ , see Figure 2 for an illustration. Then, up to a zoom in at  $p$ , we obtain a small  $\delta > 0$ , and a small neighborhood  $U$  of  $p$ , which is indeed foliated by  $\{T_t\}_{t \in (-\delta, \delta)}$ . On the other hand,  $\{S_s\}_{s \in (-\delta, \delta)}$  apparently foliates  $U$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

The local orthogonal foliation in Lemma 3.1 yields the following orthonormal frame of  $N^*$  near  $p$ , which is needed in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Lemma 3.2** ([LZ21b, Lemma 2.2]). *Let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$  be a local orthonormal frame of  $N^*$  near  $p$ , such that at each  $q \in S_s \cap T_t$ ,  $e_1(q)$  and  $e_{n+1}(q)$  is normal to  $S_s \cap T_t$  inside  $S_s$  and  $T_t$ , respectively. In particular, we choose  $e_{n+1}$  so that  $e_{n+1} = \nu_S$  on  $S_0$ ;  $-e_1$  points into  $N^*$  along  $\partial N^*$ .*

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Notice that in terms of **i.**, the proof has been carried out in [LZZ21] and hence we prove for the cases **ii.** and **iii.** As mentioned in the introduction, we want to construct a test vector field  $X$ , having its support contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood of  $p$ . This is done in the following manner.

**Step1. Constructing a hypersurface  $S'$  in  $\partial N^*$ , touches  $\Omega$  from outside up to second order at  $p$ .**

For every  $\epsilon > 0$  small, we define

$$\Gamma = \{x \in \partial N^* : \text{dist}_{\partial N^*}(x, \partial S) = \epsilon \text{dist}_{\partial N^*}(x, p)^4\}, \quad (3.4)$$

which is an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional hypersurface in  $\partial N^*$  and is smooth in a neighborhood of  $p$ . It has been proved in [LZ21b, Section 3, Claim 1] that  $\Gamma$  indeed touches  $\partial S$  from outside  $T$  up to second order at  $p$ .

Now we extend  $\Gamma$  to our desired hypersurface  $S'$  in  $N^*$ . The construction is as follows. Let  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$  be a Fermi coordinate system centered at  $p$  as in Lemma 3.1 so that

- (1)  $\{x_1 \geq 0\} \subset N^*$ ,
- (2)  $\{x_{n+1} = f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq 0\} \subset S$ ,
- (3)  $\{x_{n+1} \geq f(x_1, \dots, x_n)\} \subset \Omega$ ,
- (4)  $\{x_1 = x_{n+1} = 0\} \subset \Gamma$ .

Then, we do a slight modification of the Fermi coordinate  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$  by further requiring  $x_{n+1}$  to agree with the signed distance function from  $\Gamma$  in  $\partial N^*$ . The fact that  $\Gamma$  touches  $\partial S$  from outside  $T$  at  $p$  implies:  $f(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) \geq 0$ , with equality holds only at the origin. On the other hand, due to the contact angle condition of  $S$ , as shown in Lemma 3.1, we have  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = \cos \theta_0 W$  along  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ .

In this new Fermi coordinate, we can proceed our construction of  $S'$ . Let  $\vec{0}$  denote the origin of the Fermi coordinate chart centered at  $p$ , we set  $S'$  to be the graph  $x_{n+1} = u(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of the smooth function  $u$ , defined by

$$u|_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)} = x_1 \cos \theta_0 W(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) + \frac{x_1^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2}(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) + \frac{x_1^3}{6} \left( \frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial x_1^3}(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) - \epsilon \right).$$

It is clear that  $u = 0$  and  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1} = \cos \theta_0 W$  along  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ , which implies: 1.  $S'$  is an extension of  $\Gamma$ ; 2.  $S'$  meets  $\partial N^*$  with constant contact angle  $\theta_0$ , due to (3.1). Now we show that  $S'$  touches  $\Omega$  from outside up to second order at  $p$ . First, by direct computation, we observe that all the partial derivatives with respect to  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , of  $u$  and  $f$  at  $\vec{0}$ , agree up to second order. On the other hand, for a fixed small number  $\epsilon$  to be specified later, we see from the Taylor expansion of  $f$  at  $x_1 = 0$

$$f|_{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)} = x_1 \cos \theta_0 W(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) + \frac{x_1^2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2}(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) + \frac{x_1^3}{6} \frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial x_1^3}(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) + o(x_1^3)$$

that,  $f \geq u$  everywhere in a small enough neighborhood of  $p$  in  $B_{r_0}^+$ , with equality holds only at the origin. These facts have showed that  $S'$  touches  $\Omega$  from outside up to second order at  $p$ , thus finish the first step of our proof.

**Step2. Constructing test vector field  $X$ , which decreases the first variation of  $V$  strictly.**

In **Step1**, we constructed a hypersurface  $S'$ , meeting  $\partial N^*$  with constant contact angle  $\theta_0$ , and hence we can use [Lemma 3.1](#) to obtain local foliations  $\{S'_s\}$  and  $\{T'_t\}$ . We define smooth functions  $s, t$  in a neighborhood of  $p$ , so that  $s(q)$  is the unique  $s$  such that  $q \in S'_s$ ,  $t(q)$  is the unique  $t$  such that  $q \in T'_t$ . Recall that  $s \geq 0$  on  $\Omega$ .

**Claim 0.**  $\nabla s = \psi_1 e_{n+1}$  for some smooth function  $\psi_1$  such that  $\psi_1 \geq c$  near  $p$  for some positive constant  $c$ ;  $\nabla t = \psi_2 e_1$  for some smooth function  $\psi_2$  such that: near  $p$ ,  $\psi_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$  as  $\theta > \pi/2$  and  $\psi_2 \leq -\frac{1}{2}$  as  $\theta \leq \pi/2$ . Here  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$  is a local orthonormal frame of  $N^*$  near  $p$ , as in [Lemma 3.2](#).

*Proof of Claim 0.* Since  $s$  is a constant on each leaf  $S'_s$ ,  $t$  is a constant on each leaf  $T'_t$ , we have that  $\nabla s$  is normal to  $S'_s$  and  $\nabla t$  is normal to  $T'_t$ . It follows from the definitions of  $e_1$  and  $e_{n+1}$ , that  $\nabla s = \psi_1 e_{n+1}$  and  $\nabla t = \psi_2 e_1$ , where  $\psi_1, \psi_2$  are smooth function in a neighborhood of  $p$ .

By continuity, we find that  $\psi_1 \geq \psi_1(p) := c$  near  $p$  (without loss of generality, we assume that  $c = \frac{1}{2}$ , otherwise we substitute  $s$  by  $\frac{\psi_1(p)}{2}s$ ). The last assertion then follows from the construction of  $T'_t$  in [Lemma 3.1](#). Precisely, as  $\theta > \pi/2$ , the fact that  $T'_t \cap S' = \Gamma_{-t}$  (for  $t < 0$ ) are parallel hypersurfaces from  $\Gamma_0$  in  $S'$  implies:  $\nabla t = e_1$  along  $S' \cap T'_t$ , by continuity,  $\psi_2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$  near  $p$ ; the case  $\theta_0 \leq \pi/2$  is understood similarly. In particular, near  $p$ , there holds

$$\frac{1}{2} |\cos \theta_0| \leq -\cos \theta_0 \psi_2. \quad (3.5)$$

□

Now we define the test vector field  $X$  on  $N^*$  near  $p$  by

$$X(q) = \phi(s(q)) \phi(t(q)) (\sin \theta_0 e_{n+1}(q) - \cos \theta_0 e_1(q)), \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\phi(s)$  is the cut-off function defined by

$$\phi(s) = \begin{cases} \exp(\frac{1}{s-\epsilon}), & s < \epsilon, \\ 0, & s \geq \epsilon. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

A direction computation then gives, for  $0 \leq s < \epsilon$ , it holds

$$\frac{\phi'(s)}{\phi(s)} = -\frac{1}{(s-\epsilon)^2} \leq \frac{-1}{\epsilon^2},$$

and hence for any  $s \geq 0$ , we have

$$\phi'(s) \leq -\frac{\phi(s)}{\epsilon^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Since  $S'$  touches  $\Omega$  from outside, we have  $s \geq 0$  on  $\Omega$ , and  $\{q \in N^* \cap \Omega : \phi(s(q)) < \epsilon\}$  will be close to  $p$  as long as  $\epsilon$  is small. Thus, if we choose  $\epsilon$  to be small enough, then our test vector field  $X$  will have compact support near  $p$  in  $N^* \cap \Omega$ . Moreover, since  $\sin \theta_0 e_{n+1}(q) - \cos \theta_0 e_1(q) \in T_q \partial N^*$  for all  $q \in \partial N^*$ , we have that  $X \in \mathfrak{X}_t(N^*)$ . This finishes the construction of our test vector field  $X$ .

### Step3. Testing the first variation by $X$ .

At each  $q$  in a neighborhood of  $p$ , we consider the bilinear form on  $T_q N^*$  defined by

$$Q(u, v) = \langle \nabla_u X, v \rangle(q).$$

Let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$  be a local orthonormal frame near  $p$  as in [Lemma 3.2](#). For ease of notation, we denote  $\phi(s(q))\phi(t(q))$  by  $\phi_{s,t}(q)$ , and set  $\bar{\mu}(q) = \sin \theta_0 e_{n+1}(q) - \cos \theta_0 e_1(q)$ . We also abbreviate  $\phi_{s,t}(q)$  by  $\phi_{s,t}$ ,  $\bar{\mu}(q)$  by  $\bar{\mu}$ , respectively. With these conventions,  $X$  is written simply as  $X(q) = \phi_{s,t} \bar{\mu}$ , and clearly  $\phi_{s,t} \geq 0$  on  $N^*$ .



We note that for  $\phi_{s,t}(q)$  as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{e_i}(\phi_{s,t}(q)) &= \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q)) \langle \nabla s(q), e_i \rangle + \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q)) \langle \nabla t(q), e_i \rangle \\ &= \begin{cases} \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q))\psi_2(q) & i = 1, \\ 0 & i = 2, \dots, n, \\ \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q))\psi_1(q) & i = n+1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Using **Claim 0** and (3.9), we can carry out the following computations.

1.  $Q(e_1, e_1)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_1, e_1) &= \langle \nabla_{e_1}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_1 \rangle = \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q))\psi_2(q) \langle \bar{\mu}, e_1 \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_1}\bar{\mu}, e_1 \rangle \\ &= -\cos\theta_0 \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q))\psi_2(q) - \phi_{s,t} \sin\theta_0 \langle A^{S'_s}(e_1), e_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_1}e_1, e_1 \rangle = 0$  since  $e_1$  is unit; and  $\langle \nabla_{e_1}e_{n+1}, e_1 \rangle = -\langle A^{S'_s}(e_1), e_1 \rangle$  by definition of  $A^{S'_s}$ .

2.  $Q(e_i, e_j)$ ,  $i, j \in (2, \dots, n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_i, e_j) &= \langle \nabla_{e_i}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_j \rangle = \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_i}\bar{\mu}, e_j \rangle \\ &= -\phi_{s,t} \sin\theta_0 \langle A^{S'_s}(e_i), e_j \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \cos\theta_0 \langle A^{T'_t}(e_i), e_j \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_i}e_{n+1}, e_j \rangle = -\langle A^{S'_s}(e_i), e_j \rangle$  and  $\langle \nabla_{e_i}e_1, e_j \rangle = -\langle A^{T'_t}(e_i), e_j \rangle$ .

3.  $Q(e_1, e_j)$ ,  $j \in (2, \dots, n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_1, e_j) &= \langle \nabla_{e_1}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_j \rangle = \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q))\psi_2(q) \langle \bar{\mu}, e_j \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_1}\bar{\mu}, e_j \rangle \\ &= -\phi_{s,t} \sin\theta_0 \langle A^{S'_s}(e_1), e_j \rangle - \phi_{s,t} \cos\theta_0 \langle \nabla_{e_1}e_1, e_j \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

where we have used the orthogonality of the frame and  $\langle \nabla_{e_1}e_{n+1}, e_j \rangle = -\langle A^{S'_s}(e_1), e_j \rangle$ .

4.  $Q(e_1, e_{n+1})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_1, e_{n+1}) &= \langle \nabla_{e_1}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_{n+1} \rangle = \sin\theta_0 \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q))\psi_2(q) + \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_1}\bar{\mu}, e_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= \sin\theta_0 \phi'(t(q))\phi(s(q))\psi_2(q) - \phi_{s,t} \cos\theta_0 \langle A^{S'_s}(e_1), e_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_1}e_{n+1}, e_{n+1} \rangle = 0$  since  $e_{n+1}$  is unit; and  $\langle \nabla_{e_1}e_1, e_{n+1} \rangle = \langle A^{S'_s}(e_1), e_1 \rangle$ .

5.  $Q(e_i, e_1)$ ,  $i \in (2, \dots, n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_i, e_1) &= \langle \nabla_{e_i}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_1 \rangle = \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_i}\bar{\mu}, e_1 \rangle \\ &= -\phi_{s,t} \sin\theta_0 \langle A^{S'_s}(e_i), e_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_i}e_1, e_1 \rangle = 0$  since  $e_1$  is unit; and  $\langle \nabla_{e_i}e_{n+1}, e_1 \rangle = -\langle A^{S'_s}(e_i), e_1 \rangle$ .

6.  $Q(e_{n+1}, e_1)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_{n+1}, e_1) &= \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_1 \rangle = \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q))\psi_1(q) \langle \bar{\mu}, e_1 \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}\bar{\mu}, e_1 \rangle \\ &= -\cos\theta_0 \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q))\psi_1(q) + \phi_{s,t} \sin\theta_0 \langle A^{T'_t}(e_{n+1}), e_{n+1} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}e_1, e_1 \rangle = 0$  since  $e_1$  is unit; and  $\langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}e_{n+1}, e_1 \rangle = \langle A^{T'_t}(e_{n+1}), e_{n+1} \rangle$ .

7.  $Q(e_{n+1}, e_j)$ ,  $j \in (2, \dots, n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_{n+1}, e_j) &= \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_j \rangle = \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q))\psi_1(q) \langle \bar{\mu}, e_j \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}\bar{\mu}, e_j \rangle \\ &= \phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}e_{n+1}, e_j \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 \langle A^{T_t}(e_{n+1}), e_j \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where we have used the orthogonality of the frame and  $\langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}e_1, e_j \rangle = -\langle A^{T_t}(e_{n+1}), e_j \rangle$ .

8.  $Q(e_i, e_{n+1})$ ,  $i \in (2, \dots, n)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_i, e_{n+1}) &= \langle \nabla_{e_i}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_{n+1} \rangle = \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_i}\bar{\mu}, e_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= -\phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 \langle A^{S'_s}(e_i), e_1 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_i}e_{n+1}, e_{n+1} \rangle = 0$  since  $e_{n+1}$  is unit; and  $\langle \nabla_{e_i}e_1, e_{n+1} \rangle = \langle A^{S'_s}(e_i), e_1 \rangle$ .

9.  $Q(e_{n+1}, e_{n+1})$ .

$$\begin{aligned} Q(e_{n+1}, e_{n+1}) &= \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}(\phi_{s,t}\bar{\mu}), e_{n+1} \rangle = \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q))\psi_1(q) \langle \bar{\mu}, e_{n+1} \rangle + \phi_{s,t} \langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}\bar{\mu}, e_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= \sin \theta_0 \phi'(s(q))\phi(t(q))\psi_1(q) + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 \langle A^{T_t}(e_{n+1}), e_{n+1} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where we have used  $\langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}e_{n+1}, e_{n+1} \rangle = 0$  since  $e_{n+1}$  is unit; and  $\langle \nabla_{e_{n+1}}e_1, e_{n+1} \rangle = -\langle A^{T_t}(e_{n+1}), e_{n+1} \rangle$ .

Thus, the bilinear form  $Q$  can be written in the local orthonormal frame  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$  as

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\cos \theta_0 \phi'(t)\phi(s)\psi_2 - \phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 A_{11}^{S'_s} & Q(e_1, e_j)_{2 \leq j \leq n} & Q(e_1, e_{n+1}) \\ Q(e_i, e_1)_{2 \leq i \leq n} & -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 A_{ij}^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 A_{ij}^{T'_t} & Q(e_i, e_{n+1})_{2 \leq i \leq n} \\ Q(e_{n+1}, e_1) & Q(e_{n+1}, e_j)_{2 \leq j \leq n} & \sin \theta_0 \phi'(s)\phi(t)\psi_1 + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 A_{n+1, n+1}^{T'_t} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here  $\phi(s)$  stands for  $\phi(s(q))$ , the other conventions are understood in the same way.

Now we want to show that, as  $\epsilon > 0$  is small enough, there holds

$$\text{tr}_P Q < 0, \quad (3.19)$$

for all  $n$ -dimensional subspaces  $P \subset T_q N^*$ .

Since we are working in the codimension-1 case, it suffice to consider the following three cases.

**Case 1.**  $P_1 = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ .

In this case, we note that  $e_{n+1}(q) \perp T_q S'_s$  as in [Lemma 3.2](#), a direct computation then yields

$$\text{tr}_{P_1} Q = \sum_{i=1}^n Q(e_i, e_i) = -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \text{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 \sum_{i=2}^n A_{ii}^{T'_t} - \cos \theta_0 \phi'(t)\phi(s)\psi_2. \quad (3.20)$$

Thanks to [Claim 0](#), by possibly shrinking the neighborhood of  $p$ , we have:  $\frac{1}{2}|\cos \theta_0| \leq -\cos \theta_0 \psi_2$ ,  $|A^{S'_s}| \leq K$ , and  $|A^{T'_t}| \leq K$ , for some constant  $K > 0$  depending on the chosen orthogonal foliation in [Lemma 3.1](#) yet independt of  $\epsilon$ . On the other hand, since  $\text{spt}(X) \cap \Omega$  will be arbitrarily small as long as  $\epsilon$  is chosen small enough, and we know that  $t(p) = 0$ . By continuity, we may assume that on  $\text{spt}(X) \cap \Omega$ ,  $t(q) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}}$ . Computing as in [\(3.8\)](#), we find

$$\phi'(t(q)) \leq -\frac{\phi(t(q))}{\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} < 0, \quad (3.21)$$

and hence we have the following estimate,

$$-\cos \theta_0 \phi'(t) \phi(s) \psi_2 \leq \frac{|\cos \theta_0|}{2} \phi(s) \phi'(t) \leq -\frac{|\cos \theta_0|}{2} \frac{\phi_{s,t}(q)}{\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2}. \quad (3.22)$$

Back to (3.20), we obtain

$$\operatorname{tr}_{P_1} Q \leq -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \operatorname{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \left[ -\frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} |\cos \theta_0| + (n-1)K |\cos \theta_0| \right]. \quad (3.23)$$

**Claim 1.** As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , there holds

$$\max_{\theta \in [0, \pi]} \left[ -\frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} |\cos \theta| + (n-1)K |\cos \theta| \right] \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.24)$$

If the claim holds, we observe that

$$\operatorname{tr}_{P_1} Q \leq \phi_{s,t} \left[ -\sin \theta_0 \operatorname{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s} - \frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} |\cos \theta_0| + (n-1)K |\cos \theta_0| \right], \quad (3.25)$$

where  $-\operatorname{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s}(p) < 0$  strictly due to the strictly mean-convexity of  $S$  at  $p$ , and hence by choosing  $\epsilon$  small enough, we definitely have  $\operatorname{tr}_{P_1} Q < 0$ , which holds strictly in a small neighborhood of  $p$ . This concludes **Case 1**.

*Proof of Claim 1.* We define a function  $F_1 : [0, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by

$$F_1(\theta) = \left\{ -\frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} + (n-1)K \right\} |\cos \theta|. \quad (3.26)$$

Notice that  $F_1(\theta) = F_1(\pi - \theta)$  for all  $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ ,  $F_1(\pi/2) = 0$ , and

$$F_1(0) = -\frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} + (n-1)K \rightarrow -(n-1)K \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.27)$$

in other words,  $F_1(0)$  is negative as long as  $\epsilon$  is small enough. Moreover, observe that on  $(0, \pi/2)$ ,

$$F'_1(\theta) = \left\{ -\frac{1}{2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n-1)K}} + \epsilon\right)^2} + (n-1)K \right\} (-\sin \theta) \rightarrow (n-1)K \sin \theta \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.28)$$

this means  $F_1(\theta)$  is monotone increasing on  $(0, \pi/2)$  as long as  $\epsilon$  is small, which proves the claim.  $\square$

**Case 2.**  $P_k = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, \hat{e}_k, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$  for  $k \in (2, \dots, n)$ .

A direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{P_k} Q &= \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^n Q(e_i, e_i) + Q(e_{n+1}, e_{n+1}) = \text{tr}_{P_1} Q - Q(e_k, e_k) + Q(e_{n+1}, e_{n+1}) \\ &= \text{tr}_{P_1} Q + \phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 A_{kk}^{S'_s} - \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 A_{kk}^{T'_t} + \sin \theta_0 \phi'(s) \phi(t) \psi_1 + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 A_{n+1, n+1}^{T'_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

Arguing as in **Case 1**, and using (3.8) thanks to the fact that  $s \geq 0$  on  $\Omega$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{P_k} Q &\leq \text{tr}_{P_1} Q + \phi_{s,t} \left[ -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \sin \theta_0 + K (\sin \theta_0 + 2|\cos \theta_0|) \right] \\ &\leq \text{tr}_{P_1} Q + \phi_{s,t} \left[ -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \sin \theta_0 + \tilde{K} \sin \theta_0 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

where  $\tilde{K}$  is a positive constant depending only on  $\theta_0$  and  $K$ , independent of  $\epsilon$ .

**Claim 2.** As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , there holds

$$\max_{\theta \in [0, \pi]} \left[ -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \sin \theta + \tilde{K} \sin \theta \right] \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.31)$$

*Proof of Claim 2.* We define a function  $F_2 : [0, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  by

$$F_2(\theta) = \left( -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} + \tilde{K} \right) \sin \theta. \quad (3.32)$$

Notice that  $F_2(\theta) = F_2(\pi - \theta)$  for all  $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$  and that  $F_2(0) = 0$ ,  $F_2(\pi/2) = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} + \tilde{K}$ , which is negative as long as  $\epsilon$  is small enough. Moreover, observe that  $F_2'(\theta) = \left( -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} + \tilde{K} \right) \cos \theta$ , which is negative on  $(0, \pi/2)$ , namely,  $F_2(\theta)$  is monotone decreasing on  $(0, \pi/2)$ , this prove the claim.  $\square$

Arguing as in **Case 1**, we obtain  $\text{tr}_{P_k} Q < 0$ , which holds strictly in a small neighborhood of  $p$ . This concludes **Case 2**.

**Case 3.**  $P_{n+1} = \text{span}\{e_2, \dots, e_{n+1}\}$ .

A direct computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{P_{n+1}} Q &= \sum_{i=2}^n Q(e_i, e_i) + Q(e_{n+1}, e_{n+1}) \\ &= -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \sum_{i=2}^n A_{ii}^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 \sum_{i=2}^n A_{ii}^{T'_t} + \sin \theta_0 \phi'(s) \phi(t) \psi_1 + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 A_{n+1, n+1}^{T'_t} \\ &= -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \text{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 A_{11}^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \cos \theta_0 \sum_{i=2}^{n+1} A_{ii}^{T'_t} + \sin \theta_0 \phi'(s) \phi(t) \psi_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

Arguing as in **Case 1**, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}_{P_{n+1}} Q &\leq -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \text{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \left( -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \sin \theta_0 + K (\sin \theta_0 + n|\cos \theta_0|) \right) \\ &\leq -\phi_{s,t} \sin \theta_0 \text{tr}_{P_1} A^{S'_s} + \phi_{s,t} \left( -\frac{1}{2\epsilon^2} \sin \theta_0 + \tilde{K} \sin \theta_0 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

where  $\tilde{K}$  is a positive constant depending only on  $n, K, \theta_0$ , independent of  $\epsilon$ . It then follows from **Claim 2** that  $\text{tr}_{P_{n+1}} Q < 0$  holds strictly in a small neighborhood of  $p$ . This concludes **Case 3**.

### Conclusion of the proof.

Now we are in the position to conclude the proof, by testing the first variation formula of  $V$  (2.10) to derive a contradiction. Indeed, recall that as we choose  $\epsilon$  small enough, our test vector field  $X$  will have compact support close to  $p$  in  $\Omega$ , and hence we see from **Step3** that

$$\delta V[X] = \int_{G_n(N^*)} \operatorname{div}_S X(x) dV(x, S) < 0, \quad (3.35)$$

since for any  $n$ -dimensional affine subspace  $P \in T_q N^*$ ,  $\operatorname{div}_P X(q) = \operatorname{tr}_P Q(q) < 0$ . **ii.** is thus proved since  $\operatorname{spt} \|W\|$  is away from  $p$ , and hence the RHS of (2.10) vanishes, which contradicts to (3.35).

For **iii.**, since we have showed that  $\operatorname{div}_P X(x) < 0$  locally near  $p$  for any  $n$ -dimensional subspace  $P$ , it is clear that

$$\cos \theta_0 \int_{\partial N^*} \operatorname{div}_{\partial N^*} X(x) d\|W\|(x) \geq 0 \quad (3.36)$$

where we have used the fact that  $\theta_0 \in (\pi/2, \pi)$ . This contradicts to (3.35) and completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.1.** We can see from the proof that in the free boundary case ( $\theta_0 = \pi/2$ ), our assumption on  $W$  in the cases **ii.**, **iii.** of [Theorem 1.1](#) can be removed, which can be illustrated as follows: in the variational point of view, (generalized) minimal surfaces are critical points of the free energy functional (2.4), as  $\theta_0 = \pi/2$ , the free energy functional reduces to the area(perimeter) functional; that is to say, the wetting part does not contribute to the geometry of the resulting minimal surfaces, and hence no further assumption on  $W$  is needed.

### REFERENCES

- [All72] William K. Allard. “On the first variation of a varifold”. English. In: *Ann. Math. (2)* 95 (1972), pp. 417–491. ISSN: 0003-486X. DOI: [10.2307/1970868](#). MR: [307015](#). Zbl: [0252.49028](#).
- [CM11] Tobias Holck Colding and William P. II Minicozzi. *A course in minimal surfaces*. English. Vol. 121. Grad. Stud. Math. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2011. ISBN: 978-0-8218-5323-8. MR: [2780140](#). Zbl: [1242.53007](#).
- [GLZ20] Qiang Guang, Martin Man-chun Li, and Xin Zhou. “Curvature estimates for stable free boundary minimal hypersurfaces”. English. In: *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 759 (2020), pp. 245–264. ISSN: 0075-4102. DOI: [10.1515/crelle-2018-0008](#). MR: [4058180](#). Zbl: [1466.53075](#).
- [GT01] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. English. Reprint of the 1998 ed. Class. Math. Berlin: Springer, 2001. ISBN: 3-540-41160-7. MR: [1814364](#). Zbl: [1042.35002](#).
- [JT03] Luquésio P. Jorge and Friedrich Tomi. “The barrier principle for minimal submanifolds of arbitrary codimension”. English. In: *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* 24.3 (2003), pp. 261–267. ISSN: 0232-704X. DOI: [10.1023/A:1024791501324](#). MR: [1996769](#). Zbl: [1027.53007](#).
- [KT17] Takashi Kagaya and Yoshihiro Tonegawa. “A fixed contact angle condition for varifolds”. English. In: *Hiroshima Math. J.* 47.2 (2017), pp. 139–153. ISSN: 0018-2079. MR: [3679887](#). Zbl: [1405.49033](#).

- [LZ21a] Martin Man-Chun Li and Xin Zhou. “Min-max theory for free boundary minimal hypersurfaces. I: Regularity theory”. English. In: *J. Differ. Geom.* 118.3 (2021), pp. 487–553. ISSN: 0022-040X. DOI: [10.4310/jdg/1625860624](https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1625860624). MR: [4285846](https://mathscinet.org/mr/4285846). Zbl: [1480.53074](https://zbmath.org/zbl/1480.53074).
- [LZ21b] Martin Man-chun Li and Xin Zhou. “A maximum principle for free boundary minimal varieties of arbitrary codimension”. English. In: *Commun. Anal. Geom.* 29.6 (2021), pp. 1509–1521. ISSN: 1019-8385. DOI: [10.4310/CAG.2021.v29.n6.a7](https://doi.org/10.4310/CAG.2021.v29.n6.a7). MR: [4367433](https://mathscinet.org/mr/4367433). Zbl: [7473920](https://zbmath.org/zbl/7473920).
- [LZZ21] Chao Li, Xin Zhou, and Jonathan J. Zhu. *Min-max theory for capillary surfaces*. 2021. arXiv: [2111.09924](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09924).
- [Mag12] Francesco Maggi. *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems. An introduction to geometric measure theory*. English. Vol. 135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. xix + 454. ISBN: 978-1-107-02103-7; 978-1-139-10813-3. DOI: [10.1017/CB09781139108133](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09781139108133). MR: [2976521](https://mathscinet.org/mr/2976521). Zbl: [1255.49074](https://zbmath.org/zbl/1255.49074).
- [MP21] Luigi De Masi and Guido De Philippis. *Min-max construction of minimal surfaces with a fixed angle at the boundary*. 2021. arXiv: [2111.09913](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09913).
- [Pit81] Jon T. Pitts. *Existence and regularity of minimal surfaces on Riemannian manifolds*. English. Vol. 27. Math. Notes (Princeton). Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1981. MR: [626027](https://mathscinet.org/mr/626027). Zbl: [0462.58003](https://zbmath.org/zbl/0462.58003).
- [Sim83] Leon Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*. English. Vol. 3. Proc. Cent. Math. Anal. Aust. Natl. Univ. Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983. MR: [756417](https://mathscinet.org/mr/756417). Zbl: [0546.49019](https://zbmath.org/zbl/0546.49019).
- [Whi10] Brian White. “The maximum principle for minimal varieties of arbitrary codimension”. English. In: *Commun. Anal. Geom.* 18.3 (2010), pp. 421–432. ISSN: 1019-8385. DOI: [10.4310/CAG.2010.v18.n3.a1](https://doi.org/10.4310/CAG.2010.v18.n3.a1). MR: [2747434](https://mathscinet.org/mr/2747434). Zbl: [1226.53061](https://zbmath.org/zbl/1226.53061).

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, XIAMEN UNIVERSITY, 361005, XIAMEN, P.R. CHINA  
Email address: [xuwenzhang@stu.xmu.edu.cn](mailto:xuwenzhang@stu.xmu.edu.cn)