

# RIGIDITY OF 3D SPHERICAL CAPS VIA $\mu$ -BUBBLES

YUHAO HU, PENG LIU, AND YUGUANG SHI

ABSTRACT. By using Gromov's  $\mu$ -bubble technique, we show that the 3-dimensional spherical caps are rigid under perturbations that do not reduce the metric, the scalar curvature, and the mean curvature along its boundary. Several generalizations of this result will be discussed.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, a lot of progress has been made toward understanding the scalar curvature of a Riemannian manifold (see [Gro21] and its references). A particular medium for gaining such understanding is to answer whether one can perturb the metric of a 'model space' in certain ways without reducing its scalar curvature. This viewpoint was famously represented by the positive mass theorem and its various generalizations and analogues. One analogue, which motivated the current work, is the following conjecture proposed by Min-Oo around 1995 (cf. [MO98, Theorem 4]).

**Conjecture 1.1.** (Min-Oo) *Suppose that  $g$  is a smooth Riemannian metric on the (topological) hemisphere  $\mathbf{S}_+^n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) with the properties:*

- (1) *the scalar curvature  $R_g$  satisfies  $R_g \geq n(n-1)$  on  $\mathbf{S}_+^n$ ;*
- (2) *the boundary  $\partial\mathbf{S}_+^n$  is totally geodesic with respect to  $g$ ;*
- (3) *the induced metric on  $\partial\mathbf{S}_+^n$  agrees with the standard metric on  $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ .*

*Then  $g$  is isometric to the standard metric on  $\mathbf{S}_+^n$ .*

Unlike its counterparts<sup>1</sup> modeled on  $\mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{H}^n$ , Min-Oo's conjecture turned out to admit counterexamples (see [BMN11]). Yet, its statement remains interesting, especially when it is compared with the following theorem of Llarull (see [Lla98, Theorem A]).

**Theorem 1.2.** (Llarull) *Let  $(\mathbf{S}^n, \hat{g})$  be the standard  $n$ -sphere ( $n \geq 3$ ). Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{S}^n$  satisfying  $g \geq \hat{g}$  and  $R_g \geq R_{\hat{g}}$ . Then  $g = \hat{g}$ .*

A side-by-side view of Min-Oo's conjecture and Llarull's theorem suggests the following.

**Conjecture 1.3.** *Let  $(\mathbf{S}_+^n, \hat{g})$  be the standard  $n$ -dimensional hemisphere. Then Conjecture 1.1 holds under the additional assumption:  $g \geq \hat{g}$ .*

Our first result in this article is that Conjecture 1.3 holds when  $n = 3$ ; here is a more precise statement (cf. Corollary 3.12 below):

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $(\mathbf{S}_+^3, \hat{g})$  be the standard 3-dimensional hemisphere. Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{S}_+^3$  with the properties:*

- (1)  *$g \geq \hat{g}$  and  $R_g \geq R_{\hat{g}}$  on  $\mathbf{S}_+^3$ ;*

<sup>1</sup>See [SY79, Corollary 2], [GL83, Theorem A], [MO89] and [ACG08].

- (2) the mean curvature<sup>2</sup>  $H_g$  on  $\partial\mathbf{S}_+^3$  satisfies  $H_g \geq 0$ ;  
(3) the induced metrics on  $\partial\mathbf{S}_+^3$  satisfy  $g_{\partial\mathbf{S}_+^3} = \hat{g}_{\partial\mathbf{S}_+^3}$ .

Then  $g = \hat{g}$ .

As we will see below, Theorem 1.4 admits a somewhat direct proof. With more technical work, we can generalize it in the following aspects: (i) the assumption (3) in Theorem 1.4 will be removed; and (ii) the model space will not need to be the standard hemisphere—it can be a ‘spherical cap’ or, more generally, a geodesic ball inside a space form. To make these points explicit, we now state our main result (cf. Theorem 5.3 below).

**Theorem 1.5.** *For any suitable constants  $\kappa, \mu$ , let  $(\mathbf{B}_{\kappa, \mu}, \hat{g}_\kappa)$  be a geodesic ball in the 3-dimensional space form with sectional curvature  $\kappa$  such that  $\partial\mathbf{B}_{\kappa, \mu}$  has mean curvature  $\mu$ . Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_{\kappa, \mu}$  satisfying*

$$g \geq \hat{g}_\kappa, \quad R_g \geq 6\kappa \text{ on } \mathbf{B}_{\kappa, \mu} \quad \text{and} \quad H_g \geq \mu \text{ on } \partial\mathbf{B}_{\kappa, \mu}.$$

Then  $g = \hat{g}_\kappa$ .

In Gromov’s first preprint of [Gro19], a (more general) version of Theorem 1.5 was stated as a ‘non-existence’ result (see [Gro18a, Theorem 1]); an outline of proof was sketched, which relied on a ‘generalized Llarull’s theorem’. Following Gromov’s main idea, we present a detailed and purely variational proof of Theorem 1.5; this theorem also confirms, in the case of  $n = 3$ , a rigidity statement mentioned in [Gro18a, Remark (d)] without proof.

A simple modification of the proof of Theorem 1.5 yields the following (cf. Theorem 5.1).

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let  $(\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}, \hat{g})$  be the standard 3-sphere with a pair of antipodal points removed, and let  $h \geq 1$  be a smooth function on  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$ . Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$  satisfying*

$$g \geq h^4 \hat{g} \quad \text{and} \quad R_g \geq h^{-2} R_{\hat{g}}.$$

Then  $h \equiv 1$ , and  $g = \hat{g}$ .

When  $h \equiv 1$ , Theorem 1.6 is a special case of Gromov’s theorem of ‘extremality of doubly punctured spheres’ (cf. [Gro21, Sections 5.5 and 5.7]), and it implies Theorem 1.2 in the case of  $n = 3$ . We also remark that Theorem 1.6 would fail without the assumption  $h \geq 1$  (see Remark 5.2 below). We tend to believe that the conclusion of Theorem 1.6 still holds when the condition  $g \geq h^4 \hat{g}$  is replaced by  $g \geq h^2 \hat{g}$ ; a condition such as  $\inf h > 0$  would still be needed, otherwise, the metric in Remark 5.2 would serve as a counterexample.

Before sketching our technical ingredients, let us remind the reader that since the early 1980s, two different approaches—variational and spinorial—have been developed for studying the scalar curvature. Yet, for more than two decades, extensions of Llarull’s rigidity theorem, like Llarull’s original proof, had been mainly carried out from the spinorial approach.<sup>3</sup> It is relatively recent that variational methods have also become available for proving results of Llarull type.<sup>4</sup> A key in this new development, which is also a main tool for the current paper, is Gromov’s  $\mu$ -bubble technique [Gro21, Section 5].

<sup>2</sup>Given a domain  $\Omega$  in a Riemannian manifold, unless we specify otherwise, we shall adopt the (sign) convention for the mean curvature of  $\partial\Omega$  to be  $H = \text{tr}(\nabla\nu)$ , where  $\nu$  is the *outward* unit normal along  $\partial\Omega$ . Under this convention, the mean curvature of the boundary of the unit ball in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  is  $n - 1$ .

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, [GS02], [Her05], [Lis10], [CZ21] (especially Theorem 1.15, Corollary 1.17) and [Lot21].

<sup>4</sup>To our best knowledge, a purely variational proof of Llarull’s original theorem remains to be found.

Roughly speaking, given a function  $\mu$  on a Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$ , a  $\mu$ -bubble is a minimizer (and a critical point) of the functional

$$(1.1) \quad \Omega \mapsto \text{vol}_{n-1}(\partial\Omega) - \int_{\Omega} \mu$$

defined for suitable subsets  $\Omega \subset M$ ; given a  $\mu$ -bubble, useful geometric information can be extracted from its first and second variation formulae. In order to guarantee that a non-degenerate  $\mu$ -bubble exists,  $(M, g)$  is often assumed to be a *Riemannian band*<sup>5</sup>, and  $\mu$  is often required to satisfy a *barrier condition* (see (2.2) below), which prevents minimizing sequences from collapsing either to a point or into  $\partial M$ .

In some cases, even without the assumption of either a Riemannian band or a barrier condition, a  $\mu$ -bubble may still be found by direct observation of the functional (1.1). This is the case with our proof of Theorem 1.4—In fact, if we modify (1.1) by considering the new functional

$$(1.2) \quad \Omega \mapsto \text{vol}_{n-1}(\partial\Omega) + \int_{\mathbf{S}_+^3 \setminus \Omega} \mu,$$

the variational properties remain unchanged; in our situation, the new functionals associated to  $g$  and  $\hat{g}$  admit an inequality, which becomes an equality when  $\Omega = \mathbf{S}_+^3$ , and then direct comparison shows that  $\mathbf{S}_+^3$  is a  $\mu$ -bubble (see the proof of Corollary 3.12). We note that this argument crucially relies on the assumption (3) in Theorem 1.4.

Now let us continue to take Theorem 1.4 as an example to explain how to obtain rigidity results from having an ‘initial’  $\mu$ -bubble  $\Omega$ . Although  $\Omega$  need not be  $\mathbf{S}_+^3$ , we do, for a technical reason, require that  $\partial\Omega$  has a connected component  $\Sigma_0$  whose projection onto  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has *nonzero degree* (see (3.6))—for simplicity, let us call such a  $\Sigma_0$  a ‘good component’. By using the second variation and the Gauss–Bonnet formulae, we show that, under certain extra assumptions,  $\Sigma_0$  must be a 2-sphere parallel (w.r.t.  $\hat{g}$ ) to the equator  $\partial\mathbf{S}_+^3$ ; furthermore, along  $\Sigma_0$  the ambient metric  $g$  must agree with  $\hat{g}$  (Proposition 3.4). This obtained, a standard foliation lemma (Lemma 3.8) and minimality of  $\Omega$  imply that  $g$  must agree with  $\hat{g}$  in a *neighborhood* of  $\Sigma_0$  (Lemma 3.10). Finally, with an ‘open-closed’ argument and standard facts in geometric measure theory, we show that such a neighborhood can be extended to the whole manifold, thus completing the proof (Proposition 3.11).

In the more general setting of Theorem 1.5, the existence of an ‘initial’  $\mu$ -bubble becomes less direct to prove. For simplicity, let us still assume that the model space is the standard hemisphere. Although  $(\mathbf{S}_+^3, g)$  is *not* a Riemannian band, we may consider creating one from it by removing a small geodesic ball centered at the north pole  $O \in (\mathbf{S}_+^3, \hat{g})$ , but an immediate problem arises: the natural choice  $\mu = \hat{H}$  (see (3.3)), which corresponds to the mean curvature of the geodesic spheres centered at  $O$  with respect to  $\hat{g}$ , may not satisfy the barrier condition.

To address this problem, we construct a sequence of perturbations  $\mu_\epsilon$  (see (4.3); also cf. [Zhu21, Section 3]) of  $\hat{H}$  that *do* satisfy the barrier conditions on a corresponding sequence of Riemannian bands  $M_\epsilon \subset \mathbf{S}_+^3$ . In particular, in each  $M_\epsilon$  there exists a  $\mu_\epsilon$ -bubble  $\Omega_\epsilon$  (Lemma 4.1). By construction,  $\mu_\epsilon$  tends to  $\hat{H}$ , and  $M_\epsilon$  tends to  $\mathbf{S}_+^3$ , as  $\epsilon$  approaches 0. However, two new questions arise:

- (a) *As  $\epsilon$  tends to 0, do the  $\Omega_\epsilon$  subconverge to an  $\hat{H}$ -bubble  $\Omega$  in  $(\mathbf{S}_+^3, g)$ ?*
- (b) *If so, does  $\partial\Omega$  possess a component whose projection to  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has nonzero degree?*

<sup>5</sup>See Section 2.1 below for definition, and see [Gro18b] and [Räd21] for related discussion.

To put these in a slightly different way, regarding (a), we worry that  $\Omega_\epsilon$  may become degenerate in the limit; regarding (b), we worry that the ‘good components’ of  $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$  may either approach the north pole  $O$  and thus lose the ‘degree’ property, or ‘meet and cancel’ each other so that none of them is actually preserved in the limit.

In Sections 4.3 and 4.4, we answer both questions (a) and (b) in the affirmative. A key step is to argue that each  $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$  not only possesses a ‘good component’  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , but such a component must be disjoint from a fixed neighborhood of  $O \in \mathbf{S}_+^3$  provided that  $\epsilon$  is small (Proposition 4.7), which is, again, enforced by the Gauss–Bonnet theorem. This step allows us to obtain a universal upper bound for the norm of the second fundamental form on  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , which is then used to prove the existence of a limiting hypersurface  $\Sigma_0$  that is indeed a component of  $\partial\Omega$  (Lemma 4.11).

Once having an ‘initial’  $\mu$ -bubble, one may complete the proof of Theorem 1.5 by the foliation argument described above.

Regarding Theorem 1.6, we may consider Riemannian bands in  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$  bounded by small geodesic spheres in  $(\mathbf{S}^3, \hat{g})$  centered at  $O$  and  $O'$ , but because of the lack of mean curvature information with respect to  $g$  along those boundaries, perturbations of the form (4.3) are no longer adequate for meeting the barrier condition. To address this issue, we construct new functions  $\mu_\alpha$  by composing the function  $\hat{H}$  with dilations of  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$  in the ‘longitude’ direction, and then  $\mu_\alpha$  will satisfy the desired barrier conditions—see Section 5 for more detail. The rest of the proof is similar to the other cases.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Prof. Weiping Zhang for his interest in this work and Dr. Jintian Zhu for helpful conversations. Y. Shi and P. Liu are grateful for the support of the National Key R&D Program of China Grant 2020YFA0712800, and Y. Hu is grateful for the support of the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation Grant 2021TQ0014.

#### 2. ELEMENTS OF GROMOV’S $\mu$ -BUBBLE TECHNIQUE

In this section we recall some elements of Gromov’s  $\mu$ -bubble technique. Our discussion follows Section 5 of [Gro21], Section 2 of [Zhu21] and Section 3 of [ZZ20].

##### 2.1. $\mu$ -bubbles in a Riemannian band.

Let  $(M^n, g)$  be a compact Riemannian manifold whose boundary  $\partial M$  is expressed as a disjoint union  $\partial M = \partial_- \sqcup \partial_+$  where both  $\partial_-$  and  $\partial_+$  are closed hypersurfaces. Such a quadruple  $(M, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$  is called a *Riemannian band*. Given a Riemannian band, let  $\Omega_0 \subset M$  be a fixed smooth Caccioppoli set<sup>6</sup> that contains a neighborhood of  $\partial_-$  and is disjoint from a neighborhood of  $\partial_+$ ; we call such an  $\Omega_0$  a *reference set*. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}$  denote the collection of Caccioppoli sets  $\Omega \subset M$  satisfying  $\Omega \Delta \Omega_0 \Subset \overset{\circ}{M}$  (“ $\Subset$ ” reads “is compactly contained in”); here  $\Omega \Delta \Omega_0$  denotes the symmetric difference between  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega_0$ , and  $\overset{\circ}{M}$  stands for the interior of  $M$ .

Let  $\mu$  be either a smooth function on  $M$ , or a smooth function defined on  $\overset{\circ}{M}$  satisfying  $\mu \rightarrow \pm\infty$  on  $\partial_\mp$ . For  $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}$  consider the *brane action*

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega) := \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega) - \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_0) - \int_M (\chi_\Omega - \chi_{\Omega_0})\mu \, d\mathcal{H}^n$$

where  $\mathcal{H}^k$  is the  $k$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure induced by  $g$  and  $\chi_\Omega$  denotes the characteristic function associated to  $\Omega$ . A minimizer  $\Omega$  of (2.1) is called a  $\mu$ -bubble.

<sup>6</sup>Also known as ‘sets of locally finite perimeter’; see [Giu84] for details.

**Remark 2.1.** (1) For  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in \mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}$ , we have  $\mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega_2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_1}^\mu(\Omega_2) = \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega_1)$ ; thus, in a sense, minimizers are independent of the choice of a reference set. (2) The brane action (2.1) may be defined on manifolds that are not necessarily Riemannian bands; in those cases, one may replace  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega)$  by  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial(\Omega \cap K))$  and similarly for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial\Omega_0)$ , where  $K$  is a compact set such that  $\Omega \Delta \Omega_0 \subset K$ .

## 2.2. Existence and regularity.

**Definition 2.2.** Given a Riemannian band  $(M, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$ , a function  $\mu$  is said to satisfy the barrier condition if either  $\mu \in C^\infty(\overset{\circ}{M})$  with  $\mu \rightarrow \pm\infty$  on  $\partial_\mp$ , or  $\mu \in C^\infty(M)$  with

$$(2.2) \quad \mu|_{\partial_-} > H_{\partial_-}, \quad \mu|_{\partial_+} < H_{\partial_+}$$

where  $H_{\partial_-}$  is the mean curvature of  $\partial_-$  with respect to the inward normal and  $H_{\partial_+}$  is the mean curvature of  $\partial_+$  with respect to the outward normal.

**Lemma 2.3.** (Cf. [Zhu21, Proposition 2.1]) Let  $(M^n, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$  be a Riemannian band with  $n \leq 7$ , and let  $\Omega_0$  be a reference set. If  $\mu$  satisfies the barrier condition, then there exists an  $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}$  with smooth boundary such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega) = \inf_{\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}} \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega').$$

**Remark 2.4.** In Lemma 2.3 the smooth hypersurface  $\Sigma := \partial\Omega \setminus \partial_-$  is homologous to  $\partial_+$ .

## 2.3. Variational properties.

Let  $\Omega$  be a smooth  $\mu$ -bubble in a Riemannian band  $(M^n, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$ , and let  $\Sigma = \partial\Omega \setminus \partial_-$ . One may derive variation formulae for  $\mathcal{A}^\mu$  at  $\Omega$ —see Equation (2.3) in [Zhu21] and the unnumbered equation above it. Specifically, the first variation implies that the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  (with its outward normal  $\nu$ ) is equal to  $\mu|_\Sigma$ ; the second variation implies that the Jacobi operator

$$(2.3) \quad J_\Sigma := -\Delta_\Sigma + \frac{1}{2}(R_\Sigma - R_g - \mu^2 - |\text{II}|^2) - \nu(\mu)$$

is non-negative, where  $\Delta_\Sigma$  and  $R_\Sigma$  are respectively the  $g$ -induced Laplacian and scalar curvature of  $\Sigma$ ;  $R_g$  is the scalar curvature of  $(M, g)$ ; and  $\text{II}$  is the second fundamental form of  $\Sigma$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\mu$  be a smooth function on a Riemannian manifold  $(M^n, g)$ . A smooth two-sided hypersurface  $\mathcal{S} \subset M$  with unit normal  $\nu$  is said to be a  $\mu$ -hypersurface if its mean curvature taken with respect to  $\nu$  is equal to  $\mu|_\mathcal{S}$ .

Clearly, (2.3) also makes sense when  $\Sigma$  is replaced by a  $\mu$ -hypersurface; this motivates the following notion of stability.

**Definition 2.6.** A  $\mu$ -hypersurface  $\mathcal{S} \subset M$  with unit normal  $\nu$  is said to be stable if  $J_\mathcal{S}$  is non-negative on  $C_0^\infty(\mathcal{S})$ .

**Remark 2.7.** If  $\mu$  satisfies the barrier condition, then for any  $\mu$ -bubble  $\Omega$  each connected component of  $\partial\Omega \setminus \partial_-$  with its outward unit normal is a stable  $\mu$ -hypersurface.

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a  $\mu$ -hypersurface. Following [Gro21, Section 5.1] we consider the operator

$$(2.4) \quad L_\mathcal{S} := -\Delta_\mathcal{S} + \frac{1}{2}(R_\mathcal{S} - R_+^\mu)$$

where

$$(2.5) \quad R_+^\mu := R_g + \frac{n}{n-1}\mu^2 - 2|\text{d}\mu|_g.$$

In fact,  $L_{\mathcal{S}}$  is obtained from applying the obvious inequalities

$$(2.6) \quad -\partial_{\nu}\mu \leq |\mathrm{d}\mu|_g, \quad |\mathrm{II}|^2 \geq \frac{1}{n-1}\mu^2$$

to  $J_{\mathcal{S}}$ . One can easily verify that the following holds when  $\mathcal{S}$  is stable:

$$(2.7) \quad L_{\mathcal{S}} \geq J_{\mathcal{S}} \geq 0.$$

**Example 2.8.** Consider  $\mathbf{S}^2 \times [t_1, t_2]$  ( $0 < t_1 < t_2 < \pi$ ) equipped with the metric  $g = (\sin^2 t)g_{\mathbf{S}^2} + dt^2$  where  $g_{\mathbf{S}^2}$  is the standard metric on  $\mathbf{S}^2$ . This represents an annular region in the standard  $\mathbf{S}^3$ . Take  $\mu(t) = 2 \cot t$ . It is easy to see that each  $t$ -level set  $S_t$ , with the unit normal  $\nu = \hat{\partial}_t$ , is a  $\mu$ -hypersurface. Moreover, on  $S_t$  we have

$$R_g = 6, \quad R_{S_t} = \frac{2}{\sin^2 t}, \quad |\mathrm{II}|^2 = 2 \cot^2 t, \quad \nu(\mu) = \mu'(t) = -\frac{2}{\sin^2 t}.$$

In this case, both  $J_{S_t}$  and  $L_{S_t}$  reduce to  $-\Delta_{S_t}$ .

The following lemma is part of Theorem 3.6 in [ZZ20].

**Lemma 2.9.** Let  $(M^n, g)$  be a closed Riemannian manifold with  $2 \leq n \leq 6$ , and let  $\mu \in C^\infty(M)$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be an immersed stable  $\mu$ -hypersurface contained in an open subset  $V \subset M$  and satisfying  $\partial\mathcal{S} \cap V = \emptyset$ . If  $\mathrm{area}(\mathcal{S}) \leq C$  for some constant  $C$ , then there exists a constant  $C_1 = C_1(M, n, \|\mu\|_{C^3(M)}, C)$  such that

$$(2.8) \quad |\mathrm{II}|^2(x) \leq \frac{C_1}{\mathrm{dist}_g^2(x, \partial V)} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{S}.$$

#### 2.4. Comparison with a warped-product metric.

Given a Riemannian manifold  $(N^{n-1}, g_N)$ , an interval  $I$  (with coordinate  $t$ ) and a function  $\varphi : I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ , consider the warped product metric defined on  $\hat{N} := N \times I$

$$(2.9) \quad \hat{g} := \varphi(t)^2 g_N + dt^2.$$

A standard calculation shows that the mean curvature on each slice  $N \times \{t\}$  with respect to the  $\partial_t$ -direction is

$$(2.10) \quad \hat{H}(t) = (n-1) \frac{\varphi'(t)}{\varphi(t)};$$

moreover, one may verify that the scalar curvature  $R_{\hat{g}}$  of  $\hat{g}$  satisfies

$$(2.11) \quad 0 = -R_{\hat{g}} + \frac{1}{\varphi^2} R_N - \frac{n}{n-1} \hat{H}^2 - 2 \frac{d\hat{H}}{dt},$$

where  $R_N$  is the scalar curvature of  $(N, g_N)$ .

Now suppose that  $f : M \rightarrow \hat{N}$  is a smooth map from a Riemannian band  $(M, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$  to  $\hat{N}$ . By pulling back all functions in (2.11) via  $f$  and adding the resulting equation with (2.5), we obtain

$$(2.12) \quad R_+^\mu = \frac{1}{\varphi^2} R_N + (R_g - R_{\hat{g}}) + \frac{n}{n-1} (\mu^2 - \hat{H}^2) - 2 \left( \partial_t \hat{H} + |\mathrm{d}\mu|_g \right),$$

where pull-back symbols are omitted for clarity. The expression (2.12) will be useful in our analysis of  $\mu$ -bubbles.

## 3. RIGIDITY OF 3D SPHERICAL CAPS

A spherical cap of radius  $T \in (0, \pi)$  in the standard  $\mathbf{S}^3$  may be represented by the closed ball  $\mathbf{B}_T := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^3 : |\mathbf{x}| \leq T\}$  equipped with the metric

$$(3.1) \quad \hat{g} = \varphi(t)^2 g_{\mathbf{S}^2} + dt^2 \quad \text{with } \varphi(t) = \sin t,$$

where  $t \in [0, T]$  serves as the radial coordinate on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  and  $g_{\mathbf{S}^2}$  is the standard metric on  $\mathbf{S}^2$ . For  $t \in (0, T]$ , let  $S_t := \partial \mathbf{B}_t$ . For  $0 < t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ , let  $\mathbf{B}_{[t_1, t_2]} := \mathbf{B}_{t_2} \setminus \overset{\circ}{\mathbf{B}}_{t_1}$ ; similarly, let  $\mathbf{B}_{(t_1, t_2]} := \mathbf{B}_{t_2} \setminus \mathbf{B}_{t_1}$ . Given a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{B}_T$  with smooth boundary  $\Sigma$ , the outward normal along  $\Sigma$  with respect to the metric  $\hat{g}$  will be denoted by  $\hat{\nu}$ .

The objective of this section and the next is to prove the following rigidity theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}_T, \hat{g})$  be the 3-dimensional spherical cap of radius  $T \in (0, \pi)$ . Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying*

$$(3.2) \quad g \geq \hat{g}, \quad R_g \geq R_{\hat{g}} \text{ on } \mathbf{B}_T, \quad \text{and } H_g \geq H_{\hat{g}} = 2 \cot T \text{ on } \partial \mathbf{B}_T.$$

Then  $g = \hat{g}$ .

Our proof begins by establishing a key ingredient: certain stable  $\mu$ -hypersurfaces are necessarily  $t$ -level sets in  $\mathbf{B}_T$  (Proposition 3.4), the justification of which hinges on an integral inequality (see (3.14)) involving an application of the Gauss–Bonnet formula. This result is followed by a classical foliation lemma (Lemma 3.8). Under a suitable ‘minimality’ assumption (Assumption 3.9), each leaf in that foliation turns out to be stable, which implies local rigidity of the metric (Lemma 3.10). Section 3 culminates at Proposition 3.11, which justifies Theorem 3.1 assuming the existence of an ‘initial’ minimizer (Assumption 3.9); this assumption will be verified in Section 4 via a perturbation argument (see Proposition 4.12).

3.1. Stable  $\mu$ -hypersurfaces and  $t$ -level sets.

The metric (3.1) is of the form (2.9); thus, (2.10) applies to give

$$(3.3) \quad \hat{H}(t) = 2 \cot t.$$

It will be useful to define, for  $\mu = \mu(t)$ , the function (cf. the last two terms in (2.12))

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_\mu(t) &:= \frac{3}{2}(\mu(t)^2 - \hat{H}(t)^2) - 2(\hat{H}'(t) - \mu'(t)) \\ &= \frac{3}{2}\mu(t)^2 + 2\mu'(t) - 6 \cot^2 t + \frac{4}{\sin^2 t}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice, in particular, that  $Z_{\hat{H}}(t) \equiv 0$ . As  $t$  is a coordinate on  $\mathbf{B}_T$ , we may regard  $\mu$  and  $Z_\mu$  as functions defined on  $\mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\mu(t)$  be a smooth, decreasing function defined on  $(0, T]$ , and let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying (3.2). At a point  $q \in \mathbf{B}_T$ , if  $Z_\mu \geq 0$ , then  $R_+^\mu \geq 2/\varphi^2 > 0$ .*

*Proof.* On the RHS of (2.12), the second term is non-negative by assumption. Moreover,  $g \geq \hat{g}$  implies

$$(3.5) \quad |d\mu|_g \leq |d\mu|_{\hat{g}} = |\partial_t \mu| = -\mu'(t).$$

Substituting this in the last term of (2.12) and noticing that  $R_{\mathbf{S}^2} = 2$ , we obtain the desired inequality.  $\square$

Now let  $\Sigma_0$  be a hypersurface in  $\mathbf{B}_{(0,T]}$ , and let  $\Phi$  denote the projection map from  $\Sigma_0$  to  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , namely,

$$(3.6) \quad \Phi : \Sigma_0 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_{(0,T]} \cong (0, T] \times \mathbf{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^2.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $d\sigma_{\hat{g}}$  be the area form on  $\Sigma_0$  induced by  $\hat{g}$ . We have*

$$(3.7) \quad d\sigma_{\hat{g}} \geq \varphi^2 |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}|$$

where the absolute-value sign is put to eliminate the ambiguity of orientation.

*Proof.* Let  $(\theta_\alpha)$  ( $\alpha = 1, 2$ ) be local coordinates on  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , and write  $g_{\mathbf{S}^2} = h_{\alpha\beta} d\theta_\alpha d\theta_\beta$ . We get

$$(3.8) \quad \Phi^*(g_{\mathbf{S}^2}) = h_{\alpha\beta} d\theta_\alpha d\theta_\beta \leq \frac{1}{\varphi^2} (dt^2 + \varphi^2 h_{\alpha\beta} d\theta_\alpha d\theta_\beta) = \frac{1}{\varphi^2} \hat{g}_{\Sigma_0},$$

where the functions and forms are restricted to  $\Sigma_0$ . The conclusion follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\mu(t)$  be a smooth, decreasing function defined on  $(0, T]$ . Suppose that  $\Sigma_0 \hookrightarrow (\mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{0\}, g)$  is a stable, closed  $\mu$ -hypersurface with unit normal  $\nu$ , where  $g$  satisfies  $g \geq \hat{g}$  and  $R_g \geq \hat{R}_{\hat{g}}$ . Moreover, suppose that  $Z_\mu \geq 0$  on  $\Sigma_0$  and that the projection  $\Phi$  from  $\Sigma_0$  to  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has nonzero degree. Then*

- (a)  $\Sigma_0 = S_\tau$  for some  $\tau \in (0, T]$ ;
- (b)  $J_{\Sigma_0} = L_{\Sigma_0} = -\Delta_{\Sigma_0}$  (see (2.3), (2.4));
- (c)  $\Sigma_0 \subset (\mathbf{B}_T, g)$  is umbilic with constant mean curvature  $\mu(\tau)$ ;
- (d)  $g(p) = \hat{g}(p)$  at all points  $p \in \Sigma_0$ ; in particular,  $g_{\Sigma_0} = \hat{g}_{\Sigma_0} = (\sin^2)\tau g_{\mathbf{S}^2}$ ;
- (e) on  $\Sigma_0$ ,  $\nu = \partial_t$ ;
- (f) on  $\Sigma_0$ ,  $R_+^\mu = 2/\varphi^2$  and  $Z_\mu = 0$ .

We prepare our proof of this proposition with the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.4,  $\Sigma_0$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{S}^2$ .*

*Proof.* By stability, the operator  $L_{\Sigma_0}$  defined by (2.4) is non-negative. Let  $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma_0)$  be a principal eigenfunction of  $L_{\Sigma_0}$ , and let  $\lambda_1 \geq 0$  be the corresponding eigenvalue. By the maximum principle, we can always choose  $u$  to be strictly positive. Thus,

$$(3.9) \quad -u^{-1} \Delta_{\Sigma_0} u + \frac{1}{2} (R_{\Sigma_0} - R_+^\mu) = \lambda_1 \geq 0.$$

Expanding

$$(3.10) \quad \operatorname{div}(u^{-1} \nabla_{\Sigma_0} u) = -u^{-2} |\nabla_{\Sigma_0} u|^2 + u^{-1} \Delta_{\Sigma_0} u,$$

applying it in the previous equation and integrating over  $\Sigma_0$ , we obtain

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma_0} (R_{\Sigma_0} - R_+^\mu) d\sigma_g = \int_{\Sigma_0} (\lambda_1 + u^{-2} |\nabla_{\Sigma_0} u|^2) d\sigma_g \geq 0.$$

From (3.11), the Gauss–Bonnet formula, and Lemma 3.2, we deduce

$$(3.12) \quad 4\pi\chi(\Sigma_0) = \int_{\Sigma_0} R_{\Sigma_0} d\sigma_g \geq \int_{\Sigma_0} R_+^\mu d\sigma_g > 0;$$

since  $\Sigma_0$  is a connected oriented surface, it is homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{S}^2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** *Lemma 3.5 remains true if we assume  $R_+^\mu > 0$  instead of  $Z_\mu \geq 0$  on  $\Sigma_0$ .*

**Lemma 3.7.** *Under the assumption of Proposition 3.4, if  $J_{\Sigma_0} = L_{\Sigma_0} = -\Delta_{\Sigma_0}$ , then*



- (i)  $\Sigma_0 \subset (\mathbf{B}_T, g)$  is umbilic;
- (ii)  $\Sigma_0 = S_\tau$  for some  $\tau \in (0, T]$ ;
- (iii)  $\mu|_{\Sigma_0} = \mu(\tau)$ .

*Proof.* By assumption, (2.6) must be equalities. In particular, the traceless part of  $\Pi_{\Sigma_0}$  must vanish, and thus  $\Sigma_0 \subset (\mathbf{B}_T, g)$  is umbilic, justifying (i). Moreover,  $-\nu(\mu) = |\mathrm{d}\mu|_g$ , and so  $\nu$  must be parallel to  $\nabla_g \mu$ . Thus, for any tangent vector  $X \in T\Sigma_0$ , we have that  $\mathrm{d}\mu(X) = g(\nabla_g \mu, X)$  is proportional to  $g(\nu, X) = 0$ ; this implies that  $\mu$  is constant along  $\Sigma_0$ . Combining with the fact that  $\Sigma_0 \cong \mathbf{S}^2$  (Lemma 3.5), we conclude that  $\Sigma_0$  is a level set  $S_\tau$ , justifying (ii), and (iii) immediately follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.4.* The assumption  $g \geq \hat{g}$  implies the relation between area forms on  $\Sigma_0$ :

$$(3.13) \quad d\sigma_g \geq d\sigma_{\hat{g}}.$$

We deduce

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_0} R_+^\mu d\sigma_g &\geq \int_{\Sigma_0} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} d\sigma_{\hat{g}} \geq 2 \int_{\Sigma_0} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \\ &\geq 2 \left| \int_{\Sigma_0} \Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2} \right| = 2k \int_{\mathbf{S}^2} d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2} = 8k\pi, \end{aligned}$$

where  $k := |\deg(\Phi)| \geq 1$  by assumption. In (3.14), the first inequality is due to (3.13) and Lemma 3.2; the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.3; the remaining (in)equalities are obvious.

On combining (3.12) with (3.14), we obtain

$$(3.15) \quad 8\pi = \int_{\Sigma_0} R_{\Sigma_0} d\sigma_g \geq \int_{\Sigma_0} R_+^\mu d\sigma_g \geq 8k\pi, \quad (k \geq 1).$$

This enforces the two inequalities in (3.15) to become equalities. Saturation of the first inequality, which we deduced from (3.11), implies that  $\lambda_1 = 0$  and that  $u$  is a constant; hence, by (3.9),  $R_{\Sigma_0} = R_+^\mu$ ; then, by (2.4),  $L_{\Sigma_0} = -\Delta_{\Sigma_0}$ . With this established, the relation (2.7) would enforce that  $J_{\Sigma_0} = L_{\Sigma_0} = -\Delta_{\Sigma_0}$ , justifying (b). By Lemma 3.7, (a) and (c) follow.

Next consider saturation of the second inequality in (3.15), or rather (3.14). Because we have already deduced that  $\Sigma_0$  is a  $t$ -level set, the second and third inequalities in (3.14) automatically become equalities. Saturation of the first inequality in (3.14), on the other hand, has two implications:

$$d\sigma_g = d\sigma_{\hat{g}} \quad \text{and} \quad R_+^\mu = \frac{2}{\varphi(\tau)^2}.$$

The former, along with  $g \geq \hat{g}$ , implies that

$$(3.16) \quad g_{\Sigma_0} = \hat{g}_{\Sigma_0} = \varphi(\tau)^2 g_{\mathbf{S}^2};$$

the latter, along with the proof of Lemma 3.2, implies that  $Z_\mu(\tau) = 0$  and  $|\mathrm{d}\mu|_g = |\mathrm{d}\mu|_{\hat{g}}$ , which is just  $-\nu(\mu) = |\partial_t \mu|$  (see the proof of Lemma 3.7). Hence,  $\nu = \partial_t + X$  for some vector field  $X$  on  $\Sigma_0 = S_\tau$ . Note that

$$(3.17) \quad 1 = |\nu|_g \geq |\nu|_{\hat{g}} = |\partial_t|_{\hat{g}} + |X|_{\hat{g}} = 1 + |X|_{\hat{g}};$$

we have  $X = 0$  and  $\nu = \partial_t$ . Combining this with (3.16), we get  $g(p) = \hat{g}(p)$  for all  $p \in \Sigma_0$ . This justifies (d), (e) and (f), completing the proof.  $\square$

### 3.2. Foliation, minimality and rigidity.

The following ‘foliation’ lemma is standard (cf. [Ye91], [ACG08], [Nun13] and [Zhu21]).

**Lemma 3.8.** *Suppose that  $\Sigma_0 \subset (\mathbf{B}_T, g)$  is a  $\mu$ -hypersurface (with unit normal  $\nu$ ) on which the stability operator  $J$  (see (2.3)) reduces to  $-\Delta_{\Sigma_0}$ . Then there exists an interval<sup>7</sup>  $I$  and a map  $\phi : \Sigma_0 \times I \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_T$  such that*

- (1)  $\phi$  is a diffeomorphism onto a neighborhood of  $\Sigma_0 \subset \mathbf{B}_T$ ;
- (2) the family  $\Sigma_s = \phi(\Sigma_0, s)$  is a normal variation of  $\Sigma_0$  with  $\partial_s \phi = \nu$  along  $\Sigma_0$ ; and
- (3) on each  $\Sigma_s$ , the difference  $H_{\Sigma_s} - \mu$  is a constant  $k_s$ .

*Proof.* The proof is the same as that of Lemma 3.4 in [Zhu21], except for the extra step: once having obtained a foliation, we re-express it as a normal variation by using a vector field normal to all its leaves (cf. [ACG08, p.6, 2nd paragraph]).  $\square$

Before proceeding further, let us state a recurring assumption.

**Assumption 3.9.** *Let  $g$  be a metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying (3.2), and let  $\Omega \subset (\mathbf{B}_T, g)$  be a Caccioppoli set such that  $\partial\Omega \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is smooth and embedded. Define the class  $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$  of Caccioppoli sets by*

$$(3.18) \quad \mathcal{C}_\Omega := \{ \Omega' \subset \mathbf{B}_T \text{ Caccioppoli set} : \Omega' \Delta \Omega \Subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\} \}.$$

*Suppose that  $\Omega$  is a minimizer in the sense that for any  $\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}_\Omega$ , we have  $\mathcal{A}_\Omega^{\hat{H}}(\Omega') \geq 0$ ; and assume that there is a connected component  $\Sigma_0 \subset \partial\Omega$  that is a stable  $\hat{H}$ -hypersurface,<sup>8</sup> disjoint from  $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{B}_T$  and with nonzero-degree projection onto  $\mathbf{S}^2$ . Assume that  $\text{dist}_g(\Sigma_0, \partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0) > 0$ .*

**Lemma 3.10.** (Cf. [Gro21, Section 5.7]) *If Assumption 3.9 holds, then*

- (1) there exists a constant  $\tau \in (0, T]$  such that  $\Sigma_0 = S_\tau$  with outward normal  $\partial_t$ ; and
- (2) there exists an open neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\Sigma_0 = S_\tau$ , disjoint from  $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0$ , on which  $g = \hat{g}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\Sigma_0$  is assumed to be a stable, closed  $\hat{H}$ -hypersurface, and since  $Z_{\hat{H}} \equiv 0$  (see (3.4)), Proposition 3.4 applies and yields (1).

To prove (2), first note that Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 3.8 together imply that a neighborhood  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\Sigma_0$  is foliated by a normal variation  $\{\Sigma_s\}$  ( $s \in I$ ) of  $\Sigma_0$ ; moreover, on each leaf  $\Sigma_s$  the difference  $H_{\Sigma_s} - \hat{H}$  is a constant  $k_s$ . Since  $\mathbf{0} \notin \Sigma_0$  and  $\text{dist}_g(\Sigma_0, \partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0) > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{U}$  can be chosen to be disjoint from both  $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0$  and  $\mathbf{0}$ .

For  $s_1, s_2 \in I$  with  $s_1 < s_2$  define  $\Sigma_{[s_1, s_2]} \subset \mathbf{B}_T$  to be the (compact) subset with boundary  $\Sigma_{s_1} \cup \Sigma_{s_2}$ ; then consider  $\Omega_s$  defined by

$$(3.19) \quad \Omega_s := \begin{cases} \Omega \cup \Sigma_{[0, s]}, & \text{if } s \geq 0, \\ \Omega \setminus \Sigma_{[-s, 0]}, & \text{if } s < 0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, these  $\Omega_s$  belong to the class  $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$ . Let us denote  $\mathcal{A}_\Omega^{\hat{H}}(\Omega_s)$  by  $\mathcal{A}(s)$  for brevity, and write  $u_s = \langle \partial_s \phi, \nu_s \rangle > 0$  where  $\nu_s$  is the (suitably oriented) unit normal along  $\Sigma_s$ . By Lemma 3.8 and the first variation formula,

$$(3.20) \quad \mathcal{A}'(s) = \int_{\Sigma_s} k_s u_s.$$

Since  $\mathcal{A}(0)$  attains the minimum, it is necessary that

<sup>7</sup>If  $0 < \tau < T$ ,  $I$  can be taken to be an open interval containing 0; if  $\tau = T$ ,  $I$  is of the form  $(a, 0]$ ; and if  $\tau = \delta$ ,  $I$  is of the form  $[0, b)$ .

<sup>8</sup>We allow  $\Sigma_0$  to overlap with  $\partial\mathbf{B}_T$ .

- (i) either  $\mathcal{A}(s) \equiv 0$  for all  $s \geq 0$ , or  $\mathcal{A}'(s) > 0$  (equivalently,  $k_s > 0$ ) for some  $s > 0$ ;
- (ii) either  $\mathcal{A}(s) \equiv 0$  for all  $s \leq 0$ , or  $\mathcal{A}'(s) < 0$  (equivalently,  $k_s < 0$ ) for some  $s < 0$ .

To complete the proof, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{A}(s) \equiv 0$  for all  $s \in I$ . If this does not hold, first suppose that  $k_s > 0$  for some  $s > 0$ . Then on the Riemannian band  $\Sigma_{[0,s]}$  with  $\partial_- = \Sigma_0$  and  $\partial_+ = \Sigma_s$  define the function

$$(3.21) \quad \tilde{\mu}(t) = \hat{H}(t) + \frac{\epsilon}{\sin^3 t},$$

which is smooth and decreasing in  $t$ . By choosing sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ , we can arrange that  $\tilde{\mu} > H_{\Sigma_0}$  on  $\Sigma_0$  and that  $\tilde{\mu} < H_{\Sigma_s}$  on  $\Sigma_s$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.3, there exists a  $\tilde{\mu}$ -bubble  $\tilde{\Omega}$  in  $\Sigma_{[0,s]}$ ; in particular,  $\tilde{\Sigma} = \partial\tilde{\Omega} \setminus \Sigma_0$  has a component  $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$  whose projection to  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has nonzero degree. However, by a direct calculation using (3.4), we get

$$(3.22) \quad Z_{\tilde{\mu}}(t) = \frac{3\epsilon^2}{2\sin^6 t} > 0,$$

contradicting Proposition 3.4(f).

The case when  $k_s < 0$  for some  $s < 0$  may be similarly and independently ruled out; it suffices to consider  $\Sigma_{[s,0]}$  with  $\partial_- = \Sigma_s$  and  $\partial_+ = \Sigma_0$  and the following analogue of (3.21):  $\tilde{\mu}(t) = \hat{H}(t) - \epsilon \sin^{-3} t$ .

Finally, since we have proved that all  $\Omega_s$  are  $\mathcal{A}^{\hat{H}}$ -minimizing in the class  $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$ , each  $\Sigma_s$  must be a  $t$ -level set. By Proposition 3.4(d),  $g = \hat{g}$  on  $\mathcal{U}$ , and this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.11.** *If Assumption 3.9 holds, then  $g = \hat{g}$  on  $\mathbf{B}_T$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.10,  $\Sigma_0 = S_\tau$  for some  $\tau \in (0, T]$ , and its outward normal is  $\partial_t$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $\tau \in (0, T)$ . Let  $I = (t_1, t_2)$  be the maximum open interval containing  $\tau$  such that  $\mathbf{B}_{(t_1, t_2)}$  is disjoint from  $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0$  and that  $g = \hat{g}$  on  $\mathbf{B}_{(t_1, t_2)}$ . For  $t \in I$ , let  $\Omega_t$  denote  $\Omega \setminus \mathbf{B}_{(t, \tau]}$  if  $t < \tau$  and  $\Omega \cup \mathbf{B}_{[\tau, t]}$  if  $t \geq \tau$ . In particular,  $\partial\Omega_t = (\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0) \cup S_t$ .

It suffices to show that  $t_1 = 0$  and  $t_2 = T$ , and we argue by contradiction. First suppose that  $t_1 > 0$ . Then  $\Omega_{t_1}$  is in the class  $\mathcal{C}_\Omega$ , and it satisfies  $\mathcal{A}_\Omega^{\hat{H}}(\Omega_{t_1}) = 0$ . If  $S_{t_1}$  were disjoint from  $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0$ , then, by Lemma 3.10, the interval  $I$  can be extended further, violating its maximality. On the other hand, if  $S_{t_1}$  were to intersect a connected component  $\Sigma' \subset \partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0$ , then by smoothness and embeddedness  $\partial\Omega_{t_1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  (cf. [ZZ20, Theorem 2.2]),  $\Sigma'$  must be equal to  $\Sigma_{t_1}$  but with the opposite outward normal, violating Proposition 3.4(e). Thus, we conclude that  $t_1 = 0$ . The proof of  $t_2 = T$  is similar.  $\square$

With Proposition 3.11, it becomes clear that Theorem 3.1 would follow if one can verify Assumption 3.9. To illustrate this point, we now discuss a special case of Theorem 3.1 which admits a more direct proof. (The general situation is more subtle and will be addressed in the next section.)

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let  $(\mathbf{B}_T, \hat{g})$  be the 3-dimensional spherical cap of radius  $T \in (0, \pi/2]$ . Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying  $g \geq \hat{g}$  and  $R_g \geq R_{\hat{g}}$  on  $\mathbf{B}_T$ ; in addition, suppose that  $H_g \geq H_{\hat{g}} = 2 \cot T$  and  $g\partial\mathbf{B}_T = \hat{g}\partial\mathbf{B}_T$  on  $\partial\mathbf{B}_T$ . Then  $g = \hat{g}$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $\mu = \hat{H}$ , which is in  $L^1(\mathbf{B}_T)$ . Since adding a constant to a functional does not affect its variational properties, we may consider, instead of (2.1),

$$(3.23) \quad \mathcal{B}^\mu(\Omega) := \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega) + \int_{\mathbf{B}_T \setminus \Omega} \mu d\mathcal{H}^3,$$

for all smooth Caccioppoli sets  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{B}_T$  with  $\Omega \Delta \mathbf{B}_T \Subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , and underlying metrics will be specified in subscripts. Since  $\hat{H} = \operatorname{div}(\partial_t)$  on  $\mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , we have

$$(3.24) \quad \mathcal{B}_g^\mu(\Omega) = \mathcal{H}_g^2(\partial\Omega) - \int_{\partial\Omega} \langle \partial_t, \hat{\nu} \rangle_{\hat{g}} d\mathcal{H}_g^2 + \mathcal{H}_g^2(S_T) \geq \mathcal{H}_g^2(S_T) = \mathcal{B}_g^\mu(\mathbf{B}_T),$$

where the first equality is an application of the divergence formula, and the inequality is derived from the relation  $\langle \partial_t, \hat{\nu} \rangle_{\hat{g}} \leq 1$ . Now, since  $g \geq \hat{g}$  and  $\mu \geq 0$  on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  ( $T \leq \pi/2$ ), we have  $\mathcal{B}_g^\mu(\Omega) \geq \mathcal{B}_{\hat{g}}^\mu(\Omega)$ ; moreover, by  $g_{\partial\mathbf{B}_T} = \hat{g}_{\partial\mathbf{B}_T}$ , we have  $\mathcal{B}_g^\mu(\mathbf{B}_T) = \mathcal{B}_{\hat{g}}^\mu(\mathbf{B}_T)$ . Combining these with (3.24) gives  $\mathcal{B}_g^\mu(\Omega) \geq \mathcal{B}_g^\mu(\mathbf{B}_T)$ ; and using  $H_g \geq 2 \cot T = \hat{H}|_{\partial\mathbf{B}_T}$ , we deduce that  $H_g = 2 \cot T$  and that  $S_T$  is a stable  $\hat{H}$ -hypersurface. Now it is easy to see that the pair  $(\mathbf{B}_T, S_T)$  satisfies Assumption 3.9. The conclusion then follows from Proposition 3.11.  $\square$

#### 4. EXISTENCE OF AN INITIAL MINIMIZER

Throughout this section, let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying (3.2). Our goal is to obtain an ‘initial’ minimizer  $\Omega$  and a connected component  $\Sigma_0 \subset \partial\Omega$  which satisfy Assumption 3.9. To achieve this, we consider perturbations  $\mu_\epsilon$  of  $\hat{H} = 2 \cot t$  (see (4.3)). For each  $\epsilon$ , we find a Riemannian band  $M_\epsilon \subset \mathbf{B}_T$  on which  $\mu_\epsilon$  satisfies the barrier condition; thus, a  $\mu_\epsilon$ -bubble  $\Omega_\epsilon$  exists, and  $\partial\Omega_\epsilon \cap M_\epsilon$  has a component  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  which projects onto  $\mathbf{S}^2$  with nonzero degree. One may wonder whether this ‘degree’ property is preserved in the limit as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ; this led us to find that each  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  must be disjoint from a fixed open neighborhood of  $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{B}_T$ , provided  $\epsilon$  is small (Proposition 4.7). Then we verify Assumption 3.9 by analyzing the limits of  $\Omega_\epsilon$  and  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  (Proposition 4.12).

##### 4.1. A choice of $\mu_\epsilon$ .

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be a small constant, and define

$$(4.1) \quad t_c := \min \left\{ \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{T}{2} \right\}.$$

Moreover, we shall fix a function  $\beta \in C^\infty((0, T])$  which is strictly decreasing and satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad \beta(t) = \cot t \text{ on } (0, t_c] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(T) = -1;$$

such a  $\beta$  clearly exists. Now consider the function defined on  $(0, T]$ :

$$(4.3) \quad \mu_\epsilon(t) \equiv \hat{H}(t) + \epsilon\beta(t) = 2 \cot t + \epsilon\beta(t).$$

Writing  $Z^\epsilon$  for  $Z_{\mu_\epsilon}$ , we have (cf. (3.4))

$$(4.4) \quad Z^\epsilon(t) = \frac{3}{2}[\epsilon\beta(t)]^2 + 2\epsilon\beta'(t) + 6\epsilon(\cot t)\beta(t),$$

and, in particular,

$$(4.5) \quad Z^\epsilon(t) = \frac{\epsilon}{2 \sin^2 t} [(3\epsilon + 12) \cos^2 t - 4] > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, t_c].$$

Moreover, by (4.4), it is clear that there exists a constant  $b_0 > 0$ , depending only on  $\beta$ , such that

$$(4.6) \quad Z^\epsilon(t) \geq -\epsilon b_0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T].$$

#### 4.2. Existence of a $\mu_\epsilon$ -bubble.

Let  $S(r, g)$  (resp.,  $B(r, g)$ ) denote the geodesic sphere (resp., open geodesic ball) of radius  $r$ , taken with respect to the metric  $g$  and centered at  $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbf{B}_T$ . An asymptotic expansion of the mean curvature function (see Lemma 3.4 of [FST09]) gives: for small  $r > 0$  and all  $q \in S(r, g)$ ,

$$(4.7) \quad H_{S(r,g)}(q) = \frac{2}{r} + O(r), \quad \hat{H}(q) = \frac{2}{t(q)} + O(t(q)).$$

Since  $g \geq \hat{g}$ , we have  $r \geq t(q)$ ; then by (4.3) and (4.2), as long as  $r < t_c$ , we have

$$(4.8) \quad \mu_\epsilon(t(q)) = \frac{2 + \epsilon}{t(q)} + O(t(q)) \geq \frac{2 + \epsilon}{r} + O(t(q)), \quad q \in S(r, g).$$

It is now clear that there exists an  $r_\epsilon < \epsilon$  such that  $\mu_\epsilon > H_{S(r_\epsilon, g)}$  on  $S(r_\epsilon, g)$ . On the other hand, we have  $H_g \geq 2 \cot T > \mu_\epsilon(T)$  on  $S_T$ , where the first inequality is part of (3.2), and the second inequality is due to the choice of  $\mu_\epsilon$  and  $\beta$ . Therefore,  $\mu_\epsilon$  satisfies the barrier condition (see Definition 2.2) applied to the Riemannian band  $(M_\epsilon, g)$ , where  $M_\epsilon = \mathbf{B}_T \setminus B(r_\epsilon, g)$ , with the distinguished boundaries:  $\partial_- = S(r_\epsilon, g)$  and  $\partial_+ = S_T$ . The lemma below follows directly from Lemma 2.3.

**Lemma 4.1.** *In the Riemannian band  $(M_\epsilon, g; S(r_\epsilon, g), S_T)$  there exists a minimal  $\mu_\epsilon$ -bubble  $\Omega_\epsilon$ ; moreover,  $\partial\Omega_\epsilon \setminus S(r_\epsilon, g)$  is disjoint from  $S_T$ , and it has a connected component  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  whose projection onto  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has nonzero degree.*

**Lemma 4.2.**  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{[t_c, T]}$  is nonempty.

*Proof.* Otherwise,  $Z^\epsilon > 0$  on  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , which contradicts Proposition 3.4(f).  $\square$

#### 4.3. A ‘no-crossing’ property of $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ .

From now on, let  $t_* \in (0, t_c)$  be fixed. We will begin by assuming that  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{t_*}$  were nonempty; consequences of this hypothesis will be developed progressively with three lemmas (Lemmas 4.3, 4.5 and 4.6). Based on these lemmas, we prove that  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  must be disjoint from  $\mathbf{B}_{t_*}$  for small enough  $\epsilon$  (Proposition 4.7).

In the following, let  $\hat{\nu}$  denote the outward-pointing unit normal on  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  with respect to  $\hat{g}$ , and let  $\Phi$  denote the projection map from  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  to  $\mathbf{S}^2$  (cf. (3.6)).

**Lemma 4.3.** *If  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{t_*}$  were nonempty, then there would exist a point  $q \in \Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{[t_*, T]}$  such that the angle  $\angle_{\hat{g}}(\hat{\nu}, \partial_t) \in [\alpha, \pi - \alpha]$  at  $q$ , where*

$$(4.9) \quad \alpha = \min \left\{ \arctan \left( \frac{t_c - t_*}{2\pi} \right), \frac{\pi}{4} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction, and this proceeds in two steps. In step one we prove: if the lemma does not hold, then there would exist a smooth path  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Sigma_0^\epsilon$  satisfying  $\gamma(0) \in S_{t_c}$ ,  $\gamma(1) \in S_{t_*}$ ,  $d\Phi(\gamma') \neq 0$  and

$$(4.10) \quad \text{length}_{g_{\mathbf{S}^2}}(\Phi(\gamma)) \leq \pi.$$

In step two, we show that existence of such a path would lead to a contradiction.

*Step 1.* Since  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  is a closed surface,  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{(t_*, T]} \subset \Sigma_0^\epsilon$  is open. By Lemma 4.2,  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  intersects  $\mathbf{B}_{t_c}$ ; hence, by connectedness of  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , there exists a connected component  $\mathcal{E} \subset \Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{(t_*, T]}$  such that the closure  $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$  intersects both  $S_{t_*}$  and  $S_{t_c}$ .

Now assume that the lemma does not hold; then the projection map  $\Phi|_{\mathcal{E}} : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{S}^2$  would be a local diffeomorphism. In particular,  $\Phi|_{\mathcal{E}}$  cannot be surjective; otherwise, it would be a covering

map, implying that  $\mathcal{E}$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{S}^2$ , which contradicts the fact that  $\mathcal{E}$  is not closed. With these, we deduce that  $\Phi(\mathcal{E}) \subset \mathbf{S}^2$  has nonempty boundary which is necessarily contained in  $\Phi(\bar{\mathcal{E}} \cap S_{t_*})$ .

Choose any  $x \in \mathcal{E} \cap S_{t_c} \subset \mathcal{E}$ , and then select a shortest path  $\Gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \Phi(\bar{\mathcal{E}})$  with  $\Gamma(0) = \Phi(x)$  and  $\Gamma(1) \in \partial(\Phi(\mathcal{E}))$ ; clearly,  $\text{length}_{g_{\mathbf{S}^2}}(\Gamma) \leq \pi$ . Now it suffices to take  $\gamma$  to be the lifting, via  $\Phi$ , of  $\Gamma$  through  $x$ . By the last sentence in the previous paragraph,  $\gamma(1) \in S_{t_*}$ .

*Step 2.* Given a path  $\gamma$  as described in Step 1, let us write its tangent vectors  $\gamma'$  as the sum of  $\gamma'_N$  (parallel to  $\partial_t$ ) and  $\gamma'_T$  (tangent to  $t$ -level sets). By  $\hat{g} \leq g_{\mathbf{S}^2} + dt^2$  and the hypothesis  $\angle_{\hat{g}}(\hat{\nu}, \partial_t) \in [0, \alpha) \cup (\pi - \alpha, \pi]$ , we obtain the estimate

$$(4.11) \quad |\gamma'_N|_{\hat{g}} \leq (\tan \alpha) |\gamma'_T|_{\hat{g}} \leq (\tan \alpha) |d\Phi(\gamma')|_{g_{\mathbf{S}^2}}.$$

Hence,

$$(4.12) \quad t_c - t_* \leq \int_{\gamma} |\gamma'_N|_{\hat{g}} \leq (\tan \alpha) \cdot \text{length}_{g_{\mathbf{S}^2}}(\Phi(\gamma)) \leq \pi \tan \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}(t_c - t_*),$$

where the first inequality holds because  $\gamma$  connects the level sets  $S_{t_*}$  and  $S_{t_c}$ ; the second and third inequalities are due to (4.11) and (4.10), respectively; the last inequality holds by the choice of  $\alpha$ . We get a contradiction.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.4.** *In Lemma 4.3 we can choose  $q$  such that:  $\angle_{\hat{g}}(\hat{\nu}, \partial_t) = \alpha$  or  $\pi - \alpha$  at  $q$ .*

*Proof.* In  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  there exists a point at which  $t$  attains global maximum. At that point  $\hat{\nu} = \pm \partial_t$ . Thus, by continuity of angle, there exists a point  $q \in \Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{t_*}$  at which the angle between  $\hat{\nu}$  and  $\partial_t$  is equal to either  $\alpha$  or  $\pi - \alpha$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\alpha$  be defined by (4.9). If  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{t_*}$  were nonempty, then there would exist a constant  $S = S(g, \hat{g}, \beta, t_*) > 0$ , independent of  $\epsilon$ , and an open subset  $U_\epsilon \subset \Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{[t_*/2, T]}$  such that*

- (1) *at each point  $q \in U_\epsilon$ ,  $\angle_{\hat{g}}(\hat{\nu}, \partial_t) \in (\alpha/2, 2\alpha) \cup (\pi - 2\alpha, \pi - \alpha/2)$ ;*
- (2)  $\int_{U_\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \geq S$ .

*Proof.* To begin with, let  $q$  be as in Corollary 4.4. For any unit tangent vector  $X$  (with respect to  $\hat{g}$ ) of  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , we have

$$(4.13) \quad |X \langle \hat{\nu}, \partial_t \rangle_{\hat{g}}| = |\langle \hat{\nabla}_X \hat{\nu}, \partial_t \rangle_{\hat{g}} + \langle \hat{\nu}, \hat{\nabla}_X \partial_t \rangle_{\hat{g}}| \leq |\hat{\Pi}|_{\hat{g}} + |\hat{\nabla} \partial_t|_{\hat{g}},$$

where  $\hat{\nabla}$  is the connection of  $\hat{g}$ . It is clear that there exists a constant  $C = C(\hat{g}, t_*)$  such that  $|\hat{\nabla} \partial_t|_{\hat{g}} \leq C$  on  $\mathbf{B}_{[t_*/2, T]}$ . Moreover, by applying Lemma 2.9 and by comparing between  $|\mathbb{II}|_g$  and  $|\hat{\Pi}|_{\hat{g}}$ , it is not difficult to see that there exists a constant  $C' = C'(g, \hat{g}, \beta, t_*)$  such that  $|\hat{\Pi}|_{\hat{g}} \leq C'$  on  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{[t_*/2, T]}$  for all sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ . Thus, there exists a constant  $\rho = \rho(g, \hat{g}, \beta, t_*) > 0$  such that on the geodesic ball

$$U_\epsilon := \left\{ x \in \Sigma_0^\epsilon : \text{dist}_{\hat{g}_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon}}(x, q) \leq \rho \right\}$$

we have

$$(4.14) \quad \angle_{\hat{g}}(\hat{\nu}, \partial_t) \in \left( \frac{\alpha}{2}, 2\alpha \right) \cup \left( \pi - 2\alpha, \pi - \frac{\alpha}{2} \right).$$

It is easy to see that  $\Phi(U_\epsilon)$  contains a ball  $\mathcal{B}$  of radius  $\cos(2\alpha)\rho$  in  $\mathbf{S}^2$ . The proof is complete by taking  $S := \text{area}_{g_{\mathbf{S}^2}}(\mathcal{B})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *If  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{t_*}$  were nonempty, then we would have*

$$(4.15) \quad \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} d\sigma_{\hat{g}} - 2 \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \geq A_0$$

for some positive constant  $A_0$  that is independent of  $\epsilon$ .

*Proof.* Up to sign, the area form  $d\sigma_{\hat{g}}$  induced by  $\hat{g}$  on each tangent space of  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\cos(\angle_{\hat{g}}(\hat{\nu}, \partial_t))} \varphi^2 \Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}$$

provided that  $\hat{\nu}$  is not orthogonal to  $\partial_t$ . Thus, by Lemma 4.5, we have

$$(4.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{U_\epsilon} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} d\sigma_{\hat{g}} &\geq \int_{U_\epsilon} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} \frac{1}{\cos(\alpha/2)} \varphi^2 |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \\ &\geq 2S \left( \frac{1}{\cos(\alpha/2)} - 1 \right) + 2 \int_{U_\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}|. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.3,

$$(4.17) \quad \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon \setminus U_\epsilon} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} d\sigma_{\hat{g}} \geq 2 \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon \setminus U_\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}|.$$

Adding (4.16) with (4.17) and rearranging terms, we get

$$(4.18) \quad \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} d\sigma_{\hat{g}} - 2 \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \geq 2S \left( \frac{1}{\cos(\alpha/2)} - 1 \right).$$

The proof is complete by taking  $A_0$  to be the RHS of (4.18).  $\square$

**Proposition 4.7.** *For sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ ,  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  must be disjoint from the set  $\mathbf{B}_{t_*} \subset \mathbf{B}_T$ .*

*Proof.* By (4.6) and the proof of Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$(4.19) \quad R_+^{\mu_\epsilon} \geq \frac{2}{\varphi^2} - 2b_0\epsilon \quad \text{on } \Sigma_0^\epsilon.$$

For small  $\epsilon$ , Remark 3.6 and Lemma 3.5 imply that  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{S}^2$ . Moreover, since  $\Omega_\epsilon$  is a  $\mu_\epsilon$ -bubble, the area of  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  with respect to  $g$  has an upper bound  $C_0 > 0$ , which can be chosen to depend only on the metric  $g$  and not on  $\epsilon$ .

Now suppose that  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{t_*} \neq \emptyset$ . Then from (4.19), (3.13) and (4.15), we obtain:

$$(4.20) \quad \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} R_+^{\mu_\epsilon} d\sigma_g \geq \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} \frac{2}{\varphi^2} d\sigma_{\hat{g}} - 2\epsilon b_0 C_0 \geq (A_0 - 2\epsilon b_0 C_0) + 2 \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}|.$$

For small enough  $\epsilon$ ,  $A_0 > 2\epsilon b_0 C_0$ ; by stability of  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , the analogue of (3.12) reads

$$(4.21) \quad 4\pi\chi(\mathbf{S}^2) = \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} R_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} d\sigma_g \geq \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} R_+^{\mu_\epsilon} d\sigma_g > 2 \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \geq 8\pi;$$

a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** *There is another way to get (4.21), which does not rely on the assumption of an upper bound  $C_0$  of  $\text{area}_g(\Sigma_0^\epsilon)$  but does rely on the fact that  $\varphi \leq 1$ . In fact, (4.19) implies that  $R_+^{\mu_\epsilon} \geq 2\varphi^{-2}(1 - b_0\epsilon)$ , and again by (3.13), (4.15) and the degree assumption we have*

$$\int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} R_+^{\mu_\epsilon} d\sigma_g \geq (1 - b_0\epsilon) \left( A_0 + 2 \int_{\Sigma_0^\epsilon} |\Phi^* d\sigma_{\mathbf{S}^2}| \right) \geq (1 - b_0\epsilon)(A_0 + 8\pi) > 8\pi$$

for small enough  $\epsilon$ .

#### 4.4. Existence of a minimizer.

Let  $M_\epsilon$ ,  $\Omega_\epsilon$  and  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  be as in Lemma 4.1. We now study how  $\Omega_\epsilon$  and  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  behave as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

Recall from (4.1) the definition of  $t_c$ , and let  $t_* \in (0, t_c)$  be fixed. By considering small enough  $\epsilon$ , we can assume  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  to be homeomorphic to  $\mathbf{S}^2$  and disjoint from  $\mathbf{B}_{t_*}$ .

For a fixed  $\epsilon$ , since  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  is disjoint from  $S_T$ , the Jordan–Brouwer separation theorem applies. As a result,  $\mathbf{B}_T \setminus \Sigma_0^\epsilon$  has exactly two connected components, say  $\mathcal{U}_-^\epsilon$  and  $\mathcal{U}_+^\epsilon$ . Without loss of generality, let us assume that  $\nu$  points away from  $\mathcal{U}_-^\epsilon$  along  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ . Given any constant  $\delta > 0$ , let us define

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} W_{-\delta}^\epsilon &:= \{x \in \mathcal{U}_-^\epsilon : \text{dist}_g(x, \Sigma_0^\epsilon) \leq \delta\}, \\ W_{+\delta}^\epsilon &:= \{x \in \mathcal{U}_+^\epsilon : \text{dist}_g(x, \Sigma_0^\epsilon) \leq \delta\}, \end{aligned}$$

where distance is taken in  $(\mathbf{B}_T, g)$ .

**Lemma 4.9.** *There exists a constant  $\delta > 0$ , independent of  $\epsilon$ , such that for all small enough  $\epsilon$  we have  $W_{-\delta}^\epsilon \subset \overset{\circ}{\Omega}_\epsilon$  and  $W_{+\delta}^\epsilon \cap \Omega_\epsilon = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Since in  $\mathbf{B}_{[t_*/2, T]}$  all derivatives of  $\mu_\epsilon$  are uniformly bounded, it follows from Lemma 2.9 that the norm of the second fundamental form of  $\partial\Omega_\epsilon \cap \mathbf{B}_{[t_*/2, T]}$  is also uniformly bounded. If some other component  $\Sigma'$  in  $\partial\Omega_\epsilon$  were to get arbitrarily close to  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$ , then a suitable surgery (i.e., a connected sum of  $\Sigma_0^\epsilon$  and  $\Sigma'$  performed within  $M_\epsilon$ ) would yield a Caccioppoli set that has strictly less brane action, contradicting the minimality of  $\Omega_\epsilon$ .  $\square$

Now we fix a sequence  $\{\epsilon_i\} \rightarrow 0$  and corresponding sequences of  $\Omega_{\epsilon_i}$  and  $\Sigma_0^{\epsilon_i}$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *The sequence  $\{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}\}$  subconverges to a Caccioppoli set  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{B}_T$  where convergence is interpreted via the characteristic functions with respect to the  $L_{\text{loc}}^1$ -norm. Moreover,*

- (1)  $\partial\Omega \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is smooth and embedded, and
- (2)  $\Omega$  is a minimizer in the sense that  $\mathcal{A}_\Omega^{\hat{H}}(\Omega') \geq 0$  for any Caccioppoli set  $\Omega'$  with  $\Omega' \Delta \Omega \Subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ .

*Proof.* The existence of a convergent subsequence and that of  $\Omega$  follow from standard theory of BV functions (cf. [Giu84, Theorem 1.20]), and let us replace  $\{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}\}$  by that subsequence.

Now let  $K \subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  be any compact domain. For sufficiently large  $i$ , the second fundamental form of  $\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \cap K$  has a uniform upper bound, and thus  $\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \cap K$  subconverges to a smooth hypersurface  $\mathcal{S} \subset K$  in the graph sense. By using Lemma 4.9, it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{S}$  is embedded and  $\mathcal{S} = \partial\Omega \cap K$ . Since  $K$  is arbitrary, we conclude (1).

To show that  $\Omega$  is a minimizer, we argue by contradiction. Suppose that there exists a Caccioppoli set  $\Omega'$  and a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $\Omega' \Delta \Omega \Subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\Omega^{\hat{H}}(\Omega') \leq -c < 0$ . Let us choose a compact domain  $K \subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  with smooth boundary such that  $\Omega' \Delta \Omega \Subset \overset{\circ}{K}$ . Consider a thin tubular neighborhood  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\partial\Omega \cap K$  that is generated by the unit normal field



along  $\partial\Omega \cap K$ ; as  $\mathcal{T}$  is diffeomorphic to  $(\partial\Omega \cap K) \times I$  for some interval  $I$ , we may modify  $K$  such that the image of  $(\partial\Omega \cap \partial K) \times I$  is equal to  $\partial\mathcal{T} \cap \partial K$  (in particular,  $\partial\Omega$  is transversal to  $\partial K$ ). Note that for large  $i$ ,  $S(r_{\epsilon_i}, g)$  would be disjoint from  $K$ , and  $\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \cap K$  would be completely contained in  $\mathcal{T}$ .




FIGURE 1. The shaded regions represent  $\Omega'_{\epsilon_i}$  (left figure) and  $\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}$  (right figure).

Now consider the following Caccioppoli sets (see Figure 1)

$$(4.23) \quad \Omega'_{\epsilon_i} := (\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \setminus K) \cup (\Omega' \cap K), \quad \Omega^*_{\epsilon_i} := (\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \setminus K) \cup (\Omega \cap K).$$

We claim that, for sufficiently large  $i$ ,

$$(4.24) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}}^{\mu_{\epsilon_i}}(\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}) \leq \frac{c}{4}.$$

To see this, note that  $\chi_{\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}} - \chi_{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}}$  is just  $\chi_{\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \cap K} - \chi_{\Omega \cap K}$ ; since  $\mu_{\epsilon_i}|_K$  is uniformly bounded and  $\chi_{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}} \rightarrow \chi_{\Omega}$  in  $L^1$ , we have

$$(4.25) \quad \int_{\mathbf{B}_T} (\chi_{\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}} - \chi_{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}}) \mu_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow 0 \quad (i \rightarrow \infty).$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$(4.26) \quad \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}) - \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i}) \leq [\mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega \cap K) - \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \cap K)] + \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\mathcal{T} \cap \partial K).$$

Thus, by graph convergence of  $\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i} \cap K$ , we can choose  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $i$  such that

$$(4.27) \quad \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}) - \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\Omega_{\epsilon_i}) \leq \frac{c}{8}.$$

On combining (4.25) and (4.27), we obtain (4.24) for large  $i$ .

Now, since  $\mu_{\epsilon_i} \rightarrow \mu$  in  $L^1(K)$  and  $\Omega'_{\epsilon_i} \Delta \Omega^*_{\epsilon_i} = \Omega \Delta \Omega' \Subset \overset{\circ}{K}$ , we have, for sufficiently large  $i$ ,

$$(4.28) \quad \mathcal{A}_{\Omega^*_{\epsilon_i}}^{\mu_{\epsilon_i}}(\Omega'_{\epsilon_i}) \leq -\frac{c}{2}.$$

On comparing (4.24) and (4.28), we get  $\mathcal{A}_{\Omega_{\epsilon_i}}^{\mu_{\epsilon_i}}(\Omega'_{\epsilon_i}) \leq -c/4 < 0$ , contradicting the minimality of  $\Omega_{\epsilon_i}$ . This proves (2).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $\Omega$  be as in Lemma 4.10. The sequence  $\{\Sigma_0^{\epsilon_i}\}$  subconverges to a smooth, closed stable  $\hat{H}$ -hypersurface  $\Sigma_0 \subset \mathbf{B}_{[t_*, T]}$ , which is a  $t$ -level set in  $\mathbf{B}_T$ ; moreover,  $\Sigma_0 \subset \partial\Omega$  and  $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0 \Subset \mathbf{B}_T \setminus \Sigma_0$ .*

*Proof.* By our choice of  $\{\epsilon_i\}$ , all  $\Sigma_0^{\epsilon_i}$  are contained in the compact set  $\mathbf{B}_{[t_*, T]}$  and have a uniform upper bound on their second fundamental form. Thus, by standard minimal surface theory (cf. [CM11, Proposition 7.14]),  $\{\Sigma_0^{\epsilon_i}\}$  subconverges to a smooth closed hypersurface  $\Sigma_0$  whose projection onto  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has nonzero degree. Now recall that each  $\Sigma_0^{\epsilon_i}$  is a stable  $\mu_{\epsilon_i}$ -hypersurface.

Since all derivatives of  $\mu_{\epsilon_i}$  respectively and uniformly converge to those  $\hat{H}$ ,  $\Sigma_0$  is a stable  $\hat{H}$ -hypersurface; hence,  $\Sigma_0$  is a  $t$ -level set, by Proposition 3.4.

To see that  $\Sigma_0 \subset \partial\Omega$ , first suppose that  $\Sigma_0 \neq S_T$ ; in this case, it suffices to show that each open neighborhood of any  $x \in \Sigma_0$  must intersect both  $\hat{\Omega}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_T \setminus \Omega$ , and this can be easily deduced from Lemma 4.9. The case of  $\Sigma_0 = S_T$  is similar. Also by Lemma 4.9,  $\Sigma_0$  has a tubular neighborhood that is disjoint from all other components of  $\partial\Omega$ , hence  $\text{dist}_g(\Sigma_0, \partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma_0) > 0$ .  $\square$

On combining Lemmas 4.10 and 4.11, we immediately get the following.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying (3.2). Then there exists a Caccioppoli set  $\Omega \subset \mathbf{B}_T$  and a connected component  $\Sigma_0 \subset \partial\Omega$  that satisfy Assumption 3.9.*

Theorem 3.1 follows directly from Propositions 3.11 and 4.12.

## 5. GENERALIZATIONS

In this section we discuss a few variants of Theorem 3.1.

To begin with, we consider a version of Gromov's rigidity theorem for the doubly punctured sphere (see [Gro21, Sections 5.5 and 5.7]), restricted to the 3-dimensional case.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $(\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}, \hat{g})$  be the standard 3-sphere with a pair of antipodal points removed, and let  $h \geq 1$  be a smooth function on  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$ . Suppose that  $g$  is another Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$  satisfying*

$$(5.1) \quad g \geq h^4 \hat{g} \quad \text{and} \quad R_g \geq h^{-2} R_{\hat{g}}.$$

Then  $h \equiv 1$ , and  $g = \hat{g}$ .

*Proof.* For convenience, let us use slightly different notations than those introduced at the beginning of Section 3 by representing  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\}$  as  $\mathbb{B}_{(-\pi/2, \pi/2)} \cong \mathbf{S}^2 \times (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$  with  $t$  being the coordinate on  $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ . Under this representation we have  $\varphi(t) = \cos t$  and

$$(5.2) \quad \hat{H}(t) = -2 \tan t$$

instead of (3.3). Now for  $\alpha \in (0, \pi/2)$  sufficiently close to  $\pi/2$ , consider the Riemannian band  $\mathcal{B}_\alpha := (\mathbb{B}_{[-\alpha, \alpha]}, g; S_{-\alpha}, S_\alpha)$  and the functions

$$(5.3) \quad t_\alpha = \frac{t}{\alpha} \cdot \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_\alpha = -2 \tan t_\alpha \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{B}_{(-\alpha, \alpha)},$$

and consider the problem of finding  $\mu_\alpha$ -bubbles in  $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ . Since  $\mu_\alpha \rightarrow \pm\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \mp\alpha$ ,  $\mu_\alpha$  satisfies the barrier condition; thus, there exists a  $\mu_\alpha$ -bubble  $\Omega_\alpha \subset \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ , which satisfies analogous properties as described in Lemma 4.1. Let  $\Sigma_0^\alpha$  be a connected component of  $\partial\Omega_\alpha \setminus S_{-\alpha}$  whose projection to  $\mathbf{S}^2$  has nonzero degree;  $\Sigma_0^\alpha$  is a stable  $\mu_\alpha$ -hypersurface, on which

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} R_+^{\mu_\alpha} &= R_g + \frac{3}{2}(\mu_\alpha)^2 - 2|\text{d}\mu_\alpha|_g \\ &\geq \frac{1}{h^2} \left( \frac{R_{\mathbf{S}^2}}{\varphi^2} - \frac{3}{2}\hat{H}^2 + 2|\text{d}\hat{H}|_{\hat{g}} \right) + \frac{3}{2}(\mu_\alpha)^2 - \frac{2}{h^2}|\text{d}\mu_\alpha|_{\hat{g}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{h^2} \left( \frac{R_{\mathbf{S}^2}}{\varphi^2} + Z_{\mu_\alpha} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the assumption  $h \geq 1$  and the definition

$$Z_{\mu_\alpha} := \frac{3}{2}(\mu_\alpha^2 - \hat{H}^2) + 2(\partial_t \mu_\alpha - \partial_t \hat{H}).$$

By a careful estimate of  $Z_{\mu_\alpha}$  using the mean value theorem, it is not difficult to show that there exists a constant  $t_c > 0$  such that

$$(5.5) \quad Z_{\mu_\alpha} > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (-\alpha, -t_c) \cup (t_c, \alpha), \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^2 Z_{\mu_\alpha} \geq C(\alpha) \quad \text{for } t \in (-\alpha, \alpha).$$

where  $C(\alpha) < 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\alpha$  and satisfies  $C(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \pi/2$ . Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.7, here (5.5) implies that  $\Sigma_0^\alpha$  is contained in a fixed compact domain in  $\mathbb{B}_{(-\pi/2, \pi/2)}$  that is independent of the choice of  $\alpha$ . Thus, as  $\alpha \rightarrow \pi/2$ , such  $\Sigma_0^\alpha$ 's subconverge to a stable  $\hat{H}$ -hypersurface, and an analogue of Proposition 4.12 can be obtained. An analogue of Proposition 3.4 and a foliation argument yield that  $h \equiv 1$  and  $g = \hat{g}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.2.** *The assumption  $h \geq 1$  is important for Theorem 5.1 to hold. Without this assumption, one may let  $g = \cos^2 t(dt^2 + g_{\mathbb{S}^2}) \neq \hat{g}$  on  $\mathbf{S}^3 \setminus \{O, O'\} \cong \mathbf{S}^2 \times (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$  and take  $h = (\cos t)^{1/2}$ , and it is easy to check that (5.1) is satisfied—in particular,  $R_g = (2 + 4 \cos^2 t)(\cos t)^{-4}$  and  $h^{-2}R_{\hat{g}} = 6(\cos t)^{-1}$ , so  $R_g \geq h^{-2}R_{\hat{g}}$ .*

Theorem 3.1 has Euclidean and hyperbolic analogues. Putting together, let us take

$$(5.6) \quad \hat{g}_\kappa = \varphi_\kappa(t)^2 g_{\mathbb{S}^2} + dt^2 \quad \text{on } \mathbf{B}_T$$

where

$$\varphi_\kappa(t) = \begin{cases} \sin \sqrt{\kappa} t, & \kappa > 0, \\ t, & \kappa = 0, \\ \sinh \sqrt{-\kappa} t, & \kappa < 0, \end{cases}$$

and  $T \in (0, \pi/\sqrt{\kappa})$  if  $\kappa > 0$ ;  $T > 0$  if  $\kappa \leq 0$ . In particular,  $\sec(\hat{g}_\kappa) = \kappa$ , and  $\hat{H}_\kappa(t) = 2\varphi'_\kappa(t)/\varphi_\kappa(t)$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{B}_T, \hat{g}_\kappa$  be as above. Let  $g$  be a Riemannian metric on  $\mathbf{B}_T$  satisfying*

$$g \geq h^4 \hat{g}_\kappa, \quad R_g \geq h^{-2} R_{\hat{g}_\kappa}, \quad H_{\partial \mathbf{B}_T} \geq \hat{H}_\kappa(T),$$

*for some smooth function  $h \geq 1$  defined on  $\mathbf{B}_T$ . Then  $h \equiv 1$ , and  $g = \hat{g}_\kappa$ .*

As pointed out by Gromov in [Gro21, Section 5.5], a key fact that allows the different cases (corresponding to different choices of  $\kappa$ ) in Theorem 5.3 to be treated similarly is that the function  $\varphi_\kappa(t)$  is “log-concave”—in other words,  $\hat{H}_\kappa(t)$  is strictly decreasing in  $t$  (cf. Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.4). Having this in mind, the proof proceeds as that of either Theorem 3.1 or Theorem 5.1, and we leave the details to the interested reader.

**Remark 5.4.** *When  $\kappa \leq 0$  and  $T = +\infty$ , whether Theorem 5.3 holds remains unknown to us.*

## REFERENCES

- [ACG08] Lars Andersson, Mingliang Cai, and Gregory J Galloway. Rigidity and positivity of mass for asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds. In *Annales Henri Poincaré*, volume 9, pages 1–33. Springer, 2008.
- [BMN11] Simon Brendle, Fernando C Marques, and Andre Neves. Deformations of the hemisphere that increase scalar curvature. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 185(1):175–197, 2011.
- [CM11] Tobias H. Colding and William P. Minicozzi, II. *A course in minimal surfaces*, volume 121 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
- [CZ21] S. Cecchini and R. Zeidler. Scalar and mean curvature comparison via the dirac operator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.06833v3*, 2021.
- [FST09] Xu-Qian Fan, Yuguang Shi, and Luen-Fai Tam. Large-sphere and small-sphere limits of the Brown-York mass. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 17(1):37–72, 2009.
- [Giu84] Enrico Giusti. *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, volume 80. Springer, 1984.

- [GL83] Mikhael Gromov and H Blaine Lawson. Positive scalar curvature and the dirac operator on complete riemannian manifolds. *Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS*, 58:83–196, 1983.
- [Gro18a] M. Gromov. Mean curvature in the light of scalar curvature. 2018.
- [Gro18b] Misha Gromov. Metric inequalities with scalar curvature. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 28(3):645–726, 2018.
- [Gro19] Misha Gromov. Mean curvature in the light of scalar curvature. In *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, volume 69, pages 3169–3194, 2019.
- [Gro21] Misha Gromov. Four lectures on scalar curvature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10612v6*, 2021.
- [GS02] Sebastian Goette and Uwe Semmelmann. Scalar curvature estimates for compact symmetric spaces. *Differential Geometry and its Applications*, 16(1):65–78, 2002.
- [Her05] Marc Herzlich. Extremality for the vafa–witten bound on the sphere. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 15(6):1153–1161, 2005.
- [Lis10] Mario Listing. Scalar curvature on compact symmetric spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1007.1832*, 2010.
- [Lla98] M. Llarull. Sharp estimates and the dirac operator. *Mathematische Annalen*, 310(1):55–71, 1998.
- [Lot21] John Lott. Index theory for scalar curvature on manifolds with boundary. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 149(10):4451–4459, 2021.
- [MO89] Maung Min-Oo. Scalar curvature rigidity of asymptotically hyperbolic spin manifolds. *Mathematische Annalen*, 285(4):527–539, 1989.
- [MO98] Maung Min-Oo. Scalar curvature rigidity of certain symmetric spaces. In *Geometry, topology, and dynamics (Montreal, PQ, 1995)*, volume 15 of *CRM Proc. Lecture Notes*, pages 127–136. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.
- [Nun13] Ivaldo Nunes. Rigidity of area-minimizing hyperbolic surfaces in three-manifolds. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 23(3):1290–1302, 2013.
- [Räd21] Daniel Råde. Scalar and mean curvature comparison via  $\mu$ -bubbles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10120*, 2021.
- [SY79] R Schoen and ST Yau. On the structure of manifolds with positive scalar curvature. *Manuscripta mathematica*, 28:159–184, 1979.
- [Ye91] Rugang Ye. Foliation by constant mean curvature spheres. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 147(2):381–396, 1991.
- [Zhu21] Jintian Zhu. Width estimate and doubly warped product. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 374(2):1497–1511, 2021.
- [ZZ20] Xin Zhou and Jonathan Zhu. Existence of hypersurfaces with prescribed mean curvature I—generic min-max. *Camb. J. Math.*, 8(2):311–362, 2020.

KEY LABORATORY OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, P. R. CHINA  
*Email address:* yuhao.hu@math.pku.edu.cn

KEY LABORATORY OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, P. R. CHINA  
*Email address:* 1801110011@pku.edu.cn

KEY LABORATORY OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, P. R. CHINA  
*Email address:* ygshi@math.pku.edu.cn