

PROOF OF THE MICHAEL-SIMON-SOBOLEV INEQUALITY USING OPTIMAL TRANSPORT

SIMON BRENDLE AND MICHAEL EICHMAIR

ABSTRACT. We give a new proof of the Michael-Simon-Sobolev inequality using techniques from optimal transport. The inequality is sharp for submanifolds of codimension 2.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we use techniques from optimal transport to prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *Let $n, m \geq 1$ be integers. Let ρ be a continuous positive function on the interval $[0, \infty)$, normalized so that $\int_{\bar{B}^{n+m}} \rho(|\xi|^2) d\xi = 1$, and let*

$$(1) \quad \alpha = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : |z|^2 + |y|^2 < 1\}} \rho(|z|^2 + |y|^2) dy.$$

Let Σ be a compact n -dimensional submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} , possibly with boundary $\partial\Sigma$. Then

$$(2) \quad |\partial\Sigma| + \int_{\Sigma} |H| \geq n \alpha^{-\frac{1}{n}} |\Sigma|^{\frac{n-1}{n}},$$

where H denotes the mean curvature vector of Σ .

In Theorem 1, we are free to choose the density ρ . If $m \geq 2$, it is convenient to choose the density ρ so that nearly all of the mass of the measure $\rho(|\xi|^2) d\xi$ is concentrated near the boundary of \bar{B}^{n+m} . Hence, if $m \geq 2$, then the inequality (2) holds with

$$\alpha = \frac{m |B^m|}{(n+m) |B^{n+m}|}.$$

In view of this, Theorem 1 recovers the main result from [2]. In particular, this gives a new proof of the sharp version of the Michael-Simon-Sobolev inequality in the codimension 2 setting.

Earlier proofs of the non-sharp version of the inequality were obtained by Allard [1], Michael and Simon [6], and Castillon [3].

The first-named author was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-2103573 and by the Simons Foundation. The second-named author was supported by the START-Project Y963 of the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).

Finally, we refer to the work of Cordero-Erausquin, McCann, and Schmuckenschläger [4], [5] for other applications of optimal transport to geometric inequalities.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let Σ be a compact n -dimensional submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} , possibly with boundary $\partial\Sigma$. Let μ denote the Riemannian measure on Σ . For each point $x \in \Sigma$, we denote by $II : T_x\Sigma \times T_x\Sigma \rightarrow T_x^\perp\Sigma$ the second fundamental form of Σ . As usual, the mean curvature vector $H \in T_x^\perp\Sigma$ is defined as the trace of the second fundamental form.

We first consider the special case when $|\Sigma| = 1$. We define a measure ν on the unit ball \bar{B}^{n+m} by

$$\nu(G) = \int_G \rho(|\xi|^2) d\xi$$

for every Borel set $G \subset \bar{B}^{n+m}$. With this understood, μ is a probability measure on Σ and ν is a probability measure on \bar{B}^{n+m} . Let \mathcal{J} denote the set of all pairs (u, h) such that u is an integrable function on Σ , h is an integrable function on \bar{B}^{n+m} , and

$$u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$ and all $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$. By Theorem 5.10 (iii) in [8], we can find a pair $(u, h) \in \mathcal{J}$ which maximizes the functional

$$\int_{\bar{B}^{n+m}} h d\nu - \int_{\Sigma} u d\mu.$$

The maximizer (u, h) can be chosen in such a way that h is Lipschitz continuous and

$$(3) \quad u(x) = \sup_{\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m}} (h(\xi) + \langle x, \xi \rangle)$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$.

Note that our notation differs from the one in [8]. In our setting, the space X is the unit ball \bar{B}^{n+m} equipped with the measure ν ; the space Y is the submanifold Σ equipped with the Riemannian measure μ ; the cost function is given by $-\langle x, \xi \rangle$ for $x \in \Sigma$ and $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$; the function ψ in [8] corresponds to the function $-h$; and the function ϕ in [8] corresponds to the function $-u$ in this paper. The fact that ψ can be chosen to be a c -convex function implies that h is Lipschitz continuous (see [8], Definition 5.2). The fact that ϕ can be taken as the c -transform of ψ corresponds to the statement (3) above (see [8], Definition 5.2).

We now continue with the proof of Theorem 1. Clearly, u is the restriction to Σ of a convex function on \mathbb{R}^{n+m} which is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant at most 1. In particular, u is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant at most 1. Moreover, u is semiconvex with a quadratic modulus of semiconvexity (see [8], Definition 10.10 and Example 10.11).

Lemma 2. *Let E be a compact subset of Σ . Moreover, suppose that G is a compact subset of \bar{B}^{n+m} such that $u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle > 0$ for all $x \in E$ and all $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} \setminus G$. Then $\mu(E) \leq \nu(G)$.*

Proof. For each j , we define a compact set $G_j \subset \bar{B}^{n+m}$ by

$$G_j = \{\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} : \exists x \in E \text{ with } u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle \leq j^{-1}\}.$$

We define an integrable function u_j on Σ by $u_j = u - j^{-1} \cdot 1_E$. Moreover, we define an integrable function h_j on \bar{B}^{n+m} by $h_j = h - j^{-1} \cdot 1_{G_j}$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$u_j(x) - h_j(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$ and all $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$. Therefore, $(u_j, h_j) \in \mathcal{J}$ for each j . Using the maximality of (u, h) , we obtain

$$\int_{\bar{B}^{n+m}} h_j d\nu - \int_{\Sigma} u_j d\mu \leq \int_{\bar{B}^{n+m}} h d\nu - \int_{\Sigma} u d\mu$$

for each j . This implies $\mu(E) \leq \nu(G_j)$ for each j . Finally, we pass to the limit as $j \rightarrow \infty$. By assumption,

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} G_j \subset \{\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} : \exists x \in E \text{ with } u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle \leq 0\} \subset G,$$

so that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \nu(G_j) \leq \nu(G)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.

Let us fix a large positive constant K such that $|\langle x - \bar{x}, y \rangle| \leq K d(x, \bar{x})^2$ for all points $x, \bar{x} \in \Sigma$ and all $y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma$ with $|y| \leq 1$. For each point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma$, we denote by

$$\partial u(\bar{x}) = \{z \in T_{\bar{x}} \Sigma : u(x) - u(\bar{x}) - \langle x - \bar{x}, z \rangle \geq -K d(x, \bar{x})^2 \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma\}$$

the subdifferential of u at the point \bar{x} .

Lemma 3. *Fix a point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma$ and let $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$. Let ξ^{\tan} denote the orthogonal projection of ξ to the tangent space $T_{\bar{x}} \Sigma$. If $u(\bar{x}) - h(\xi) - \langle \bar{x}, \xi \rangle = 0$, then $\xi^{\tan} \in \partial u(\bar{x})$.*

Proof. By assumption,

$$u(\bar{x}) - h(\xi) - \langle \bar{x}, \xi \rangle = 0.$$

Since

$$u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$, it follows that

$$u(x) - u(\bar{x}) - \langle x - \bar{x}, \xi \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$. On the other hand,

$$\langle x - \bar{x}, \xi - \xi^{\tan} \rangle \geq -K d(x, \bar{x})^2$$

by our choice of K . Putting these facts together, we conclude that

$$u(x) - u(\bar{x}) - \langle x - \bar{x}, \xi^{\tan} \rangle \geq -K d(x, \bar{x})^2.$$

Therefore, $\xi^{\tan} \in \partial u(\bar{x})$. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.

By Rademacher's theorem, u is differentiable almost everywhere, and the norm of the gradient is bounded by 1. By Alexandrov's theorem (see Theorem 14.1 and Theorem 14.25 in [8]), u admits a Hessian in the sense of Alexandrov at almost every point.

Lemma 4. *Fix a point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$ with the property that u admits a Hessian in the sense of Alexandrov at \bar{x} . Let \hat{u} be a smooth function on Σ such that $|u(x) - \hat{u}(x)| \leq o(d(x, \bar{x})^2)$ as $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Then we can find a positive function $\omega(r)$ with $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\omega(r)}{r} = 0$ and with the following property. If x is a point in Σ satisfying $d(x, \bar{x}) \leq \sqrt{n}r$ and $z \in \partial u(x)$, then $|z - \nabla^\Sigma \hat{u}(x)| \leq \omega(r)$.*

Proof. This is one of the properties of the Alexandrov Hessian; see [8], Theorem 14.25 (i').

Lemma 5. *Fix a point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$ with the property that u admits a Hessian in the sense of Alexandrov at \bar{x} . Let \hat{u} be a smooth function on Σ such that $|u(x) - \hat{u}(x)| \leq o(d(x, \bar{x})^2)$ as $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Then we can find a positive function $\delta(r)$ with $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \delta(r) = 0$ and with the following property. If $x \in \Sigma$ and $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$ satisfy $d(x, \bar{x}) \leq \sqrt{n}r$ and $u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle = 0$, then $D_\Sigma^2 \hat{u}(x) - \langle II(x), \xi \rangle \geq -\delta(r)g$.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. If the assertion is false, we can find a real number $\delta_0 > 0$, a sequence of points $x_j \in \Sigma$, and a sequence $\xi_j \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$ with the following properties:

- $x_j \rightarrow \bar{x}$.
- $u(x_j) - h(\xi_j) - \langle x_j, \xi_j \rangle = 0$ for each j .
- For each j , the first eigenvalue of $D_\Sigma^2 \hat{u}(x_j) - \langle II(x_j), \xi_j \rangle$ is less than $-\delta_0$.

After passing to a subsequence, we may assume that the sequence ξ_j converges to $\bar{\xi} \in \bar{B}^{n+m}$. Clearly, the first eigenvalue of $D_\Sigma^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle II(\bar{x}), \bar{\xi} \rangle$ is strictly negative. Moreover,

$$u(\bar{x}) - h(\bar{\xi}) - \langle \bar{x}, \bar{\xi} \rangle = 0.$$

Since

$$u(x) - h(\bar{\xi}) - \langle x, \bar{\xi} \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$, it follows that

$$u(x) - u(\bar{x}) - \langle x - \bar{x}, \bar{\xi} \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $x \in \Sigma$. Therefore,

$$\hat{u}(x) - \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle x - \bar{x}, \bar{\xi} \rangle \geq -o(d(x, \bar{x}))^2$$

as $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. This implies $D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle II(\bar{x}), \bar{\xi} \rangle \geq 0$. This is a contradiction. This completes the proof of Lemma 5.

Lemma 6. *Fix a point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$ with the property that u admits a Hessian in the sense of Alexandrov at \bar{x} . Let \hat{u} be a smooth function on Σ such that $|u(x) - \hat{u}(x)| \leq o(d(x, \bar{x})^2)$ as $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Then*

$$1 \leq \int_{\{y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma : |\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2 \leq 1, D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle II(\bar{x}), y \rangle \geq 0\}} |\det(D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle II(\bar{x}), y \rangle)| \cdot \rho(|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2) dy.$$

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $T_{\bar{x}} \Sigma$. For $r > 0$ small, we consider the cube

$$Q_r = \{z \in T_{\bar{x}} \Sigma : \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\langle z, e_i \rangle| \leq r\}.$$

We denote by

$$E_r = \exp_{\bar{x}}(Q_r)$$

the image of the cube Q_r under the exponential map. We further define

$$A_r = \{(x, y) : x \in E_r, y \in T_x^{\perp} \Sigma, |\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(x)|^2 + |y|^2 \leq (1 + \omega(r))^2, D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(x) - \langle II(x), y \rangle \geq -\delta(r)g\},$$

where $\omega(r)$ is the function from Lemma 4, $\delta(r)$ is the function from Lemma 5, and g denotes the Riemannian metric on Σ . Clearly, $E_r \subset \{x \in \Sigma : d(x, \bar{x}) \leq \sqrt{n}r\}$ is a compact subset of Σ and A_r is a compact subset of the normal bundle of Σ .

We define a smooth map $\Phi : T^{\perp} \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ by

$$\Phi(x, y) = \nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(x) + y$$

for $x \in \Sigma$ and $y \in T_x^{\perp} \Sigma$. Moreover, we denote by

$$G_r = \{\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} : \exists (x, y) \in A_r \text{ with } |\xi - \Phi(x, y)| \leq \omega(r)\}$$

the intersection of \bar{B}^{n+m} with the tubular neighborhood of $\Phi(A_r)$ of radius $\omega(r)$. Clearly, G_r is a compact subset of \bar{B}^{n+m} .

We claim that $u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle > 0$ for all $x \in E_r$ and all $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} \setminus G_r$. To prove this, we argue by contradiction. Suppose that there is a point $x \in E_r$ and a point $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} \setminus G_r$ such that $u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle = 0$. Let ξ^{tan} denote the orthogonal projection of ξ to the tangent space $T_x \Sigma$. By Lemma 3, $\xi^{\text{tan}} \in \partial u(x)$. Consequently,

$$|\xi^{\text{tan}} - \nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(x)| \leq \omega(r)$$

by Lemma 4. Moreover,

$$D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(x) - \langle II(x), \xi \rangle \geq -\delta(r)g$$

by Lemma 5. Hence, if we put $y = \xi - \xi^{\text{tan}} \in T_x^{\perp} \Sigma$, then

$$|\xi - \Phi(x, y)| = |\xi^{\text{tan}} - \nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(x)| \leq \omega(r)$$

and

$$D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(x) - \langle H(x), y \rangle \geq -\delta(r) g.$$

Using the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\sqrt{|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(x)|^2 + |y|^2} = |\Phi(x, y)| \leq |\xi| + \omega(r) \leq 1 + \omega(r).$$

Therefore, $(x, y) \in A_r$. Thus, we conclude that $\xi \in G_r$, contrary to our assumption. To summarize, we have shown that $u(x) - h(\xi) - \langle x, \xi \rangle > 0$ for all $x \in E_r$ and all $\xi \in \bar{B}^{n+m} \setminus G_r$.

Using Lemma 2, we obtain $\nu(G_r) \geq \mu(E_r)$ if $r > 0$ is sufficiently small. This implies

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} (2r)^{-n} \nu(G_r) \geq \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} (2r)^{-n} \mu(E_r) = 1.$$

Next, we estimate $\nu(G_r)$ from above. To that end, we argue as in the proof of the classical change-of-variables formula (see [7], pp. 150–156). The Jacobian of Φ at a point (x, y) is given by $|\det(D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(x) - \langle H(x), y \rangle)|$. Since $\frac{\omega(r)}{r} \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} (2r)^{-n} \nu(G_r) \\ &= \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} (2r)^{-n} \int_{G_r} \rho(|\xi|^2) d\xi \\ &\leq \int_{\{y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma : |\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2 \leq 1 + \varepsilon_0, D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle \geq -\delta_0 g\}} |\det(D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle)| \\ &\quad \cdot \rho(|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2) dy \end{aligned}$$

for every fixed $\delta_0 > 0$ and every fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. To justify the last inequality, we decompose the normal space $T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma$ into m -dimensional cubes of size $2r$. This gives rise to a decomposition of the product $Q_r \times T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma \subset T_{\bar{x}} \Sigma \times T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma$ into $(n + m)$ -dimensional cubes of size $2r$. We then consider the image of each such cube under the smooth map

$$Q_r \times T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m}, (z, y) \mapsto \Phi(\exp_{\bar{x}}(z), P_z y),$$

where $P_z : T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma \rightarrow T_{\exp_{\bar{x}}(z)}^{\perp} \Sigma$ denotes the parallel transport along the geodesic $t \mapsto \exp_{\bar{x}}(tz)$.

Putting these facts together, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq & \int_{\{y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma : |\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2 \leq 1 + \varepsilon_0, D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle \geq -\delta_0 g\}} |\det(D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle)| \\ & \cdot \rho(|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2) dy \end{aligned}$$

for every fixed $\delta_0 > 0$ and every fixed $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Sending $\delta_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 \rightarrow 0$, the assertion follows. This completes the proof of Lemma 6.

Lemma 7. *Fix a point $\bar{x} \in \Sigma \setminus \partial\Sigma$ with the property that u admits a Hessian in the sense of Alexandrov at \bar{x} . Let \hat{u} be a smooth function on Σ such that $|u(x) - \hat{u}(x)| \leq o(d(x, \bar{x})^2)$ as $x \rightarrow \bar{x}$. Then*

$$n \alpha^{-\frac{1}{n}} \leq \Delta_{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x}) + |H(\bar{x})|,$$

where α is defined by (1).

Proof. We argue by contradiction. If the assertion is false, then there exists a real number $\hat{\alpha} > \alpha$ such that

$$\Delta_{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x}) + |H(\bar{x})| \leq n \hat{\alpha}^{-\frac{1}{n}}.$$

If $y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma$ satisfies $|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2 \leq 1$ and $D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle \geq 0$, then

$$|\det(D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle)| \leq \left(\frac{\Delta_{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle}{n} \right)^n \leq \hat{\alpha}^{-1}$$

by the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality. Using Lemma 6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \int_{\{y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma : |\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2 \leq 1, D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle \geq 0\}} |\det(D_{\Sigma}^2 \hat{u}(\bar{x}) - \langle H(\bar{x}), y \rangle)| \\ &\quad \cdot \rho(|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2) dy \\ &\leq \hat{\alpha}^{-1} \int_{\{y \in T_{\bar{x}}^{\perp} \Sigma : |\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2 \leq 1\}} \rho(|\nabla^{\Sigma} \hat{u}(\bar{x})|^2 + |y|^2) dy \\ &\leq \hat{\alpha}^{-1} \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we have used the definition of α . Thus, $\hat{\alpha} \leq \alpha$, contrary to our assumption. This completes the proof of Lemma 7.

After these preparations, we may now complete the proof of Theorem 1. Lemma 7 implies that

$$n \alpha^{-\frac{1}{n}} \leq \Delta_{\Sigma} u + |H|$$

almost everywhere, where $\Delta_{\Sigma} u$ denotes the trace of the Alexandrov Hessian of u . The distributional Laplacian of u may be decomposed into its singular and absolutely continuous part. By Alexandrov's theorem (see Theorem 14.1 in [8]), the density of the absolutely continuous part is given by the trace of the Alexandrov Hessian of u . The singular part of the distributional Laplacian of u is nonnegative since u is semiconvex. This implies

$$\int_{\Sigma} \eta \Delta_{\Sigma} u \leq - \int_{\Sigma} \langle \nabla^{\Sigma} \eta, \nabla^{\Sigma} u \rangle$$

for every nonnegative smooth function $\eta : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that vanishes in a neighborhood of $\partial\Sigma$. Putting these facts together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n \alpha^{-\frac{1}{n}} \int_{\Sigma} \eta &\leq \int_{\Sigma} \eta \Delta_{\Sigma} u + \int_{\Sigma} \eta |H| \\ &\leq - \int_{\Sigma} \langle \nabla^{\Sigma} \eta, \nabla^{\Sigma} u \rangle + \int_{\Sigma} \eta |H| \\ &\leq \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla^{\Sigma} \eta| + \int_{\Sigma} \eta |H| \end{aligned}$$

for every nonnegative smooth function $\eta : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that vanishes in a neighborhood of $\partial\Sigma$. This easily implies

$$n \alpha^{-\frac{1}{n}} |\Sigma| \leq |\partial\Sigma| + \int_{\Sigma} |H|.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1 in the special case when $|\Sigma| = 1$. The general case follows by scaling.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Allard, *On the first variation of a varifold*, Ann. of Math. 95, 417–491 (1972)
- [2] S. Brendle, *The isoperimetric inequality for a minimal submanifold in Euclidean space*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 34, 595–603 (2021)
- [3] P. Castillon, *Submanifolds, isoperimetric inequalities and optimal transportation*, J. Funct. Anal. 259, 79–103 (2010)
- [4] D. Cordero-Erausquin, R.J. McCann, and M. Schmuckenschläger, *A Riemannian interpolation inequality à la Borell, Brascamp and Lieb*, Invent. Math. 146, 219–257 (2001)
- [5] R.J. McCann, *Polar factorization of maps on Riemannian manifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal. 11, 589–608 (2001)
- [6] J.H. Michael and L.M. Simon, *Sobolev and mean value inequalities on generalized submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n* , Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 26, 361–379 (1973)
- [7] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, Third edition, McGraw Hill, 1987
- [8] C. Villani, *Optimal Transport, Old and New*, Springer-Verlag, 2009

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 2990 BROADWAY, NEW YORK NY 10027, USA

UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, OSKAR-MORGENSTERN-PLATZ 1, 1090 VIENNA, AUSTRIA, ORCID: 0000-0001-7993-9536