

DOMAINS WITHOUT PARABOLIC MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS AND WEAKLY HYPERBOLIC DOMAINS

FRANC FORSTNERIČ

ABSTRACT. We show that if Ω is an m -convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n for some $2 \leq m < n$ whose boundary $b\Omega$ has a tubular neighbourhood of positive radius and is not m -flat near infinity, then Ω does not contain any immersed parabolic minimal submanifold of dimension $\geq m$. In particular, if M is a properly embedded nonflat minimal hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n with a tubular neighbourhood of positive radius then every immersed parabolic hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n intersects M . In dimension $n = 3$ this holds if M has bounded Gaussian curvature. We also introduce the class of weakly hyperbolic domains Ω in \mathbb{R}^n characterised by the property that every conformal harmonic map $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Omega$ is constant, and we elucidate their relationship with hyperbolic domains and domains without parabolic minimal surfaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is motivated by two closely related lines of developments in the theory of minimal surfaces. The first one is the circle of results known as halfspace theorems. The second one is the recently introduced hyperbolicity theory for minimal surfaces.

Concerning the first topic, Xavier [41] proved in 1984 that the convex hull of a complete nonflat minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 with bounded Gaussian curvature equals \mathbb{R}^3 , so such a surface cannot be contained in a halfspace. The *Strong Halfspace Theorem* of Hoffman and Meeks [23, Theorem 2] (1990) says that any two proper minimal surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 intersect, unless they are parallel planes. In 2001, it was shown by Pacelli Bessa, Jorge, and Oliveira-Filho [8] and Rosenberg [39] that a pair of complete immersed minimal surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 with bounded curvature intersect, unless they are parallel planes. Note that such surfaces need not be proper (Andrade [6]), unless they are embedded (Meeks and Rosenberg [37, Theorem 2.1]). Closer to the subject of this paper, Pacelli Bessa, Jorge, and Pessoa proved in 2021 that an immersed parabolic minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 intersects every complete immersed nonflat minimal surface with bounded Gaussian curvature [9, Theorem 1.1]. A related line of developments concerns the barrier principle and the maximum principle at infinity. For more information, we refer to the surveys by Meeks and Pérez [31, 33] and the recent paper by Gama et al. [17].

In the present paper we identify geometric conditions on the boundary of a domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n which imply that Ω does not contain any immersed (not necessarily proper or complete) parabolic minimal submanifolds of a given dimension m , where $2 \leq m < n$; see Theorem 2.1. In particular, we obtain a halfspace theorem for a pair of minimal hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 3$, one of which is parabolic and the other one is properly embedded, nonflat, and has

Date: 4 July 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 53A10. Secondary 32Q45.

Key words and phrases. minimal surface, minimal plurisubharmonic function, hyperbolic domain.

Supported by grants P1-0291, J1-9104, J1-3005, and N1-0237 from ARRS, Republic of Slovenia.

a tubular neighbourhood of positive radius; see Corollary 2.2. When $n = 3$, this coincides with a special case of the aforementioned result of Pacelli Bessa et al. [9, Theorem 1.1]; see Corollary 2.3. The proof (see Section 3) is obtained by a suitable convexification of the signed distance function to the boundary of the domain Ω , following the idea from [15] but using uniform estimates provided by a tubular neighbourhood of positive radius of $b\Omega$.

The absence of parabolic minimal submanifolds in a given domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ indicates that Ω is in a certain sense small or tight for minimal submanifolds. Another measure of smallness of a domain with respect to minimal surfaces is hyperbolicity, a notion which was introduced by Forstnerič and Kalaj [16] (2021) and developed by Drinovec Drnovšek and Forstnerič [12]. This is an analogue of Kobayashi hyperbolicity in complex analysis. In Section 4 we introduce the class of weakly hyperbolic domains: these are domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which do not admit any nonconstant conformal harmonic maps $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Omega$. Weak hyperbolicity is an analogue of Brody hyperbolicity which excludes nonconstant holomorphic maps from \mathbb{C} to a given complex manifold. A hyperbolic domain is also weakly hyperbolic; the converse holds on convex domains (see Proposition 4.4) but it fails in general. In fact, we show that the class of weakly hyperbolic domains properly contains the other two mentioned classes, and there is a nonhyperbolic domain in \mathbb{R}^3 without any parabolic minimal surfaces (see Proposition 4.2). On the other hand, it remains an open problem whether there exists a hyperbolic domain containing a parabolic minimal surface which is Kobayashi hyperbolic, such as $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

2. EXCLUDING PARABOLIC MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS

Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer. A connected m -dimensional Riemannian manifold (R, g) is said to be *parabolic* if every negative subharmonic function on R is constant. A connected manifold immersed into a Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n is said to be parabolic if it is parabolic in the metric induced from the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^n by the immersion. On a surface R , parabolicity only depends on the conformal class of the metric. Every compact conformal surface punctured at finitely many points is parabolic; an example is $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus \{\infty\}$. We refer to Grigor'yan [19] for more information. The following result is proved in Section 3.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $2 \leq m < n$ be integers. Assume that Ω is a domain in \mathbb{R}^n with \mathcal{C}^2 boundary $M = b\Omega$ whose principal curvatures $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_{n-1}$ satisfy $\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \dots + \nu_m \geq 0$ at every point, the set of m -flat points $\{p \in M : \nu_j(p) = 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m\}$ has bounded interior in M , and there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that every point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of M has a unique nearest point in M . Then, Ω does not contain any parabolic immersed minimal submanifolds of dimension $\geq m$. In particular, if these conditions hold for $m = 2$ then every conformal harmonic map $R \rightarrow \Omega$ from a parabolic conformal surface R is constant.*

We emphasise that the parabolic minimal submanifolds in the theorem are not assumed to be complete or proper. The hypothesis on the set of m -flat points cannot be omitted; a counterexample is a halfspace if $m = n - 1$, and a product of \mathbb{R}^m with any strictly convex domain in \mathbb{R}^{n-m} if $m \leq n - 2$. A conformal harmonic map $R \rightarrow \Omega$ in the statement for the case $m = 2$ may have branch points. (See Sect. 3 for a more precise explanation.) The result is essentially optimal with respect to the conformal type of R , since many open conformal surfaces of hyperbolic type admit nonconstant bounded conformal harmonic maps to \mathbb{R}^3 . This holds in particular for any bordered conformal surface.

A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with \mathcal{C}^2 boundary whose principal curvatures $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_{n-1}$ from the inner side satisfy $\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \dots + \nu_m \geq 0$ at every point of $b\Omega$ is said to be *m-convex*, and if $m = 2$ it is also called *minimally convex*; see [4, Definition 8.1.9] or Definition 3.1. If $\Omega = \{\rho < 0\}$ where ρ is a function of class \mathcal{C}^2 on a neighbourhood of $\overline{\Omega}$ such that $d\rho \neq 0$ on $b\Omega = \{\rho = 0\}$ and ρ is *m-plurisubharmonic* on $\overline{\Omega}$ (i.e., condition (3.3) holds for every point $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and *m-plane* $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$; see [4, Chap. 8] for background), then Ω is *m-convex*. Conversely, a bounded *m-convex* domain admits an *m-plurisubharmonic* defining function [15]. Although the converse is less clear for unbounded domains, we show that if Ω is *m-convex* and $b\Omega$ admits an ϵ -neighbourhood with the unique nearest point property as in Theorem 2.1, then Ω admits a defining function which is *m-plurisubharmonic* on $\overline{\Omega}$, obtained by convexifying the signed distance function to $b\Omega$; see Proposition 3.2. This is the key fact of independent interest used in the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Note that *m-convex* domains play a major role in the theory of minimal surfaces; see [4, Chapter 8]. In particular, every bounded minimally convex domain contains many properly immersed minimal surfaces parameterized by an arbitrary bordered conformal surface; see [4, Theorems 8.3.1 and 8.3.4] for the orientable case and [3, Theorem 6.9] for the nonorientable one. Such domains also form barriers for minimal submanifolds of appropriate dimension; see Jorge and Tomi [25] and Gama et al. [17], and the references therein. In the latter paper the authors proved the maximum principle at infinity in a very general context including parabolic minimal *m-varifolds* in *m-convex* domains. Nevertheless, I was unable to deduce Theorem 2.1 from [17, Theorem 1.1] which holds under weaker hypotheses on $b\Omega$ but seemingly stronger hypotheses on the minimal submanifold. In some sense, there is a tradeoff between the assumptions on $b\Omega$ and on the minimal submanifolds in Ω .

The case of particular interest is when the boundary $M = b\Omega$ satisfies $\nu_1 + \dots + \nu_{n-1} = 0$, so it is a minimal hypersurface. If M is not a hyperplane then the set of its $(n - 1)$ -flat points has empty interior, and we obtain the following corollary to Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.2. *Assume that M is a properly embedded minimal hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 3$ such that for some $\epsilon > 0$ every point in the ϵ -neighbourhood of M has a unique nearest point in M . Then every immersed parabolic minimal hypersurface $R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ intersects M , unless M is a hyperplane and the image of R is contained in a hyperplane parallel to M .*

The condition that the \mathcal{C}^2 hypersurface $M = b\Omega$ in Theorem 2.1 admit a tubular neighbourhood of positive radius $\epsilon > 0$ is nontrivial when M is unbounded. If this holds, one says that M has *positive reach*, a terminology due to Federer [14, Sect. 4]. The *reach* of M , denoted $\text{reach}(M)$, is the supremum of numbers $\epsilon > 0$ having this property. It is well known and easily seen (cf. the proof of Proposition 3.2) that a hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of class \mathcal{C}^2 with positive reach has uniformly bounded principal curvatures. The converse holds in several cases of interest. A basic result of Federer [14, Lemma 4.11] is that a graph in \mathbb{R}^n over a domain with sufficiently nice boundary in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} such that the gradient of the graphing function is Lipschitz has positive reach. Every compact piece of an embedded hypersurface of class \mathcal{C}^2 has positive reach, so the problem lies in the ends.

If M is a complete embedded minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 of finite total Gaussian curvature, then every end of M can be represented as a graph over the complement of a disc in \mathbb{R}^2 whose graphing function has bounded second order partial derivatives, and the ends are well

separated (see Jorge and Meeks [26]). Hence, every such surface has positive reach. More generally, it was shown by Meeks and Rosenberg [37, Theorem 5.3] (see also [33, Corollary 2.6.6]) that a complete embedded minimal surface with bounded Gaussian curvature in \mathbb{R}^3 has positive reach. This gives the following corollary to Theorem 2.1, which is originally due to Pacelli Bessa, Jorge, and Pessoa [9, Theorem 1.1] (preprint, 2021).

Corollary 2.3. *The image of a nonconstant conformal harmonic map $R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ (possibly with branch points) from a parabolic conformal surface intersects every properly embedded nonflat minimal surface M in \mathbb{R}^3 with bounded Gaussian curvature.*

Remark 2.4. In [9, Theorem 1.1] the statement of Corollary 2.3 is proved in the more general case when M is a complete nonflat immersed minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 . Unlike in the case when M is embedded, such a surface need not be proper in \mathbb{R}^3 as shown by Andrade [6]. Their proof for the immersed case is considerably more involved. I wish to thank Pacelli Bessa and Pessoa for having pointed out their work after an earlier version of this preprint was posted on the arXiv, and for helpful discussions. However, I am mainly interested in boundary properties of a domain which exclude parabolic minimal surfaces, and the boundary of a domain is always proper in the ambient space. If one imposes stronger conditions on a minimal submanifold R of Ω , then the same conclusion may be obtained under weaker conditions on $b\Omega$. For example, if $\Omega \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a smoothly bounded proper minimally convex domain in \mathbb{R}^3 and $R \subset \Omega$ is a complete immersed minimal surface of finite total curvature, then R is a plane and Ω is a slab or a halfspace (see [1, Theorem 1.16]).

Corollary 2.3 applies to every complete embedded nonflat minimal surface M in \mathbb{R}^3 of finite total Gaussian curvature, as well as to many minimal surfaces of infinite total curvature such as the standard helicoid, the helicoids of positive genera constructed by Hoffman, Traizet, and White [24], and Riemann's minimal surfaces [34]. It was shown by Meeks, Pérez, and Ros [35, Theorem 1] that every properly embedded minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 of finite genus has bounded curvature, so Corollary 2.3 holds for such surfaces. Furthermore, every periodic properly embedded minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 whose fundamental domain is of finite topological type satisfies Corollary 2.3 by results of Meeks and Rosenberg [36]; examples include Scherk's surfaces. We refer to Meeks and Pérez [33] for more information on this topic.

Corollary 2.3 gives a partial negative answer to the following problem which was posed in [13, Problem 1.16]. The case of unbounded curvature remains open.

Problem 2.5. Let M be a nonflat properly embedded minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 . Is there a nonconstant conformal harmonic map $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ whose image does not intersect M ?

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1

We begin with preliminaries.

Recall that a map $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n) : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ from an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ is conformal if it preserves angles at every immersion point; equivalently, if $z = x + iy$ is a complex coordinate on U then the partial derivatives of f satisfy $f_x \cdot f_y = 0$ and $|f_x| = |f_y|$. Here, the dot denotes the Euclidean inner product and $|\cdot|$ the Euclidean length. The analogous definition applies to maps from any conformal surface in local isothermal coordinates. The image of a nonconstant conformal harmonic map from an open conformal surface is a minimal surface with isolated

branch points, and every minimal surface with isolated branch points is of this form. For background see, e.g., the monographs [4, 11, 38] and the surveys [2, 32, 33].

Given a subset M of \mathbb{R}^n , we denote by dist_M the Euclidean distance function to M :

$$d_M(x) = \inf\{|x - p| : p \in M\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

For $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we let $\mathbb{B}(p, \epsilon) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - p| < \epsilon\}$. By

$$(3.1) \quad V_\epsilon(M) = \bigcup_{p \in M} \mathbb{B}(p, \epsilon) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d_M(x) < \epsilon\}$$

we denote the open ϵ -neighbourhood of M .

Let M be a properly embedded connected hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n . Such M is orientable, and its complement $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus M = M^+ \cup M^-$ consists of a pair of connected domains. The *signed distance function* to M is defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \delta_M(x) = \begin{cases} d_M(x), & \text{if } x \in M_+ \cup M; \\ -d_M(x), & \text{if } x \in M_-. \end{cases}$$

If $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open neighbourhood of M such that every point $x \in V$ has a unique nearest point $p = \xi(x) \in M$, and if M is of class \mathcal{C}^r for some $r \in \{2, 3, \dots, \infty, \omega\}$, then δ_M is also of class \mathcal{C}^r on V (see Gilbarg and Trudinger [18, Lemma 14.16] or Krantz and Park [29]). If this holds on the ϵ -neighbourhood $V_\epsilon(M)$ of M for some $\epsilon > 0$, we say that M has *positive reach*, and the *reach* of M is the supremum of such numbers $\epsilon > 0$ [14, Sect. 4].

Given a \mathcal{C}^2 function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\text{Hess}_\rho(x)$ the Hessian of ρ at the point $x \in \Omega$, i.e., the quadratic form on the tangent space $T_x \mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^n$ represented by the matrix $(\frac{\partial^2 \rho}{\partial x_i \partial x_j})(x)$ of second order partial derivatives of ρ at x .

Let $2 \leq m < n$ be integers. We recall the notion of an m -plurisubharmonic function on a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (see [4, Sect. 8.1] or [22] for the details). Let $G_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the Grassman manifold of m -planes in \mathbb{R}^n . Given $\Lambda \in G_m(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we denote by $\text{tr}_\Lambda \text{Hess}_\rho(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ the trace of the restriction of the Hessian $\text{Hess}_\rho(x)$ to Λ . A \mathcal{C}^2 function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *m -plurisubharmonic* on Ω if

$$(3.3) \quad \text{tr}_\Lambda \text{Hess}_\rho(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and } \Lambda \in G_m(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

If $\lambda_1(x) \leq \lambda_2(x) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n(x)$ are the eigenvalues of $\text{Hess}_\rho(x)$ then (3.3) is equivalent to

$$\lambda_1(x) + \dots + \lambda_m(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in \Omega.$$

In fact, we have that

$$\lambda_1(x) + \dots + \lambda_m(x) = \inf_{\Lambda} \text{tr}_\Lambda \text{Hess}_\rho(x).$$

A function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is m -plurisubharmonic if and only if its restriction to every m -dimensional minimal submanifold in Ω is a subharmonic function on the submanifold (see [4, Proposition 8.1.2]). A 2-plurisubharmonic function ρ is also called *minimal plurisubharmonic*; this holds if and only if for every conformal harmonic map $f : R \rightarrow \Omega$ from a conformal surface R the composition $\rho \circ f$ is a subharmonic function on R . The notion of an m -plurisubharmonic function easily extends to upper semicontinuous functions.

Definition 3.1. An oriented embedded hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be m -convex for some $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ if its principal curvatures $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_{n-1}$ satisfy

$$(3.4) \quad \nu_1(p) + \nu_2(p) + \dots + \nu_m(p) \geq 0 \text{ for all } p \in M.$$

The hypersurface M is *strongly m -convex* at $p \in M$ if strong inequality holds in (3.4). A point $p \in M$ is *m -flat* if $\nu_j(p) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. We say that M is *not m -flat at infinity* if the set $\{p \in M : \nu_j(p) = 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, m\}$ has bounded relative interior in M .

Note that an m -convex domain is also k -convex for any $m < k \leq n-1$, and a k -flat point is also m -flat.

Theorem 2.1 is a consequence of the following proposition of independent interest.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a domain as in Theorem 2.1. There is a continuous m -plurisubharmonic function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow [-1, 0]$ which is of class \mathcal{C}^2 on $\rho^{-1}(-1, 0]$, it vanishes on $M = b\Omega$, $d\rho \neq 0$ on $\rho^{-1}(-1, 0]$, such that for every $t \in (-1, 0)$ the level set $M_t = \{\rho = t\}$ coincides with a level set of the signed distance function δ_M (3.2), M_t is m -convex, it is strongly m -convex at every m -nonflat point, and is not m -flat near infinity.*

Proof. The conditions imply that the signed distance function $\delta = \delta_M$ (see (3.2)) is of class \mathcal{C}^2 on the ϵ -neighbourhood $V_\epsilon(M)$ of M , and we choose the sign so that $\delta < 0$ on the collar

$$(3.5) \quad C_\epsilon := \Omega \cap V_\epsilon(M) = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, M) < \epsilon\}.$$

We recall some further properties of δ , referring to Bellettini [7, Theorem 1.18, p. 14] and Gilbarg and Trudinger [18, Section 14.6]. There is a \mathcal{C}^1 projection $\xi : V_\epsilon(M) \rightarrow M$ such that for every $x \in V_\epsilon(M)$ the point $p = \xi(x) \in M$ is the unique nearest point to x in M . The gradient $\nabla\delta$ has constant norm $|\nabla\delta| = 1$ on $V_\epsilon(M)$, and it has constant value on the intersection of $V_\epsilon(M)$ with the normal line $N_p = p + \mathbb{R} \cdot \nabla\delta(p)$ at $p \in b\Omega = M$. There is an orthonormal basis $(v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n = \nabla\delta(p))$ of \mathbb{R}^n such that v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} span T_pM and these vectors diagonalize the matrix $A(p)$ of $\text{Hess}_\delta(p)$:

$$(3.6) \quad A(p)v_j = \nu_j v_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1; \quad A(p)v_n = 0.$$

Here, $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2 \leq \dots \leq \nu_{n-1}$ are the principal normal curvatures of M at p from the interior side. For any point $x \in N_p \cap V_\epsilon(M)$ the same basis (v_1, \dots, v_n) then diagonalizes $\text{Hess}_\delta(x)$, with the corresponding eigenvalues

$$(3.7) \quad \nu_j(x) = \frac{\nu_j}{1 + \delta(x)\nu_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1; \quad A(p)v_n = 0.$$

If $\nu_j > 0$ for some j then the above shows that $1 + \delta(x)\nu_j > 0$ for all $x \in C_\epsilon$. Since $\delta(x)$ assumes all values in $(-\epsilon, 0)$ on the set C_ϵ (3.5), this implies $1 - \epsilon\nu_j \geq 0$ and hence $\nu_j \leq 1/\epsilon$ for all such j . From this and the hypothesis $\nu_1 + \nu_2 + \dots + \nu_m \geq 0$ (i.e., M is m -convex) it also follows that $\nu_j \geq -(m-1)/\epsilon$ for every j . Summarising, we have that

$$(3.8) \quad -(m-1)/\epsilon \leq \nu_j(p) \leq 1/\epsilon \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ and } p \in M.$$

That is, the hypersurface $M = b\Omega$ has uniformly bounded principal curvatures. The worst case estimate in the first inequality in (3.8) occurs only when $\nu_1 = -(m-1)/\epsilon$ and $\nu_j = 1/\epsilon$

for $j = 2, \dots, m$, and we also conclude that

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{\nu_j(p) \leq 0} \nu_j(p) \geq -\frac{m-1}{\epsilon} \text{ for all } p \in M.$$

Consider the family of domains

$$\Omega_t = \{x \in C_\epsilon : \delta(x) < t\} \cup (\Omega \setminus C_\epsilon) \quad \text{for } t \in (-\epsilon, 0].$$

As t increases towards 0, the domains Ω_t increase to $\Omega_0 = \Omega$. The tangent space to the hypersurface $\Sigma_t = b\Omega_t = \{\delta = t\}$ at the point $x = p + t\nabla\delta(p)$ is spanned by the same vectors v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} as $T_p M$ (see (3.6)), and the numbers $\nu_j(x)$ in (3.7) for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ are the principal curvatures of Σ_t at x . As $\delta(x)$ decreases (we move away from M), each of the curvatures $\nu_j(x)$ strictly increases unless $\nu_j(p) = 0$, and it does not change the sign. The above analysis implies that for every $x = p + t\nabla\delta(p) \in \Sigma_t$ with $t \in (-\epsilon, 0)$ we have

$$(3.10) \quad \nu_1(x) \leq \nu_2(x) \leq \dots \leq \nu_{n-1}(x), \quad \nu_j(x) \geq \nu_j(p) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n-1, \text{ and}$$

$$(3.11) \quad H(x) := \nu_1(x) + \nu_2(x) + \dots + \nu_m(x) \geq \nu_1(p) + \nu_2(p) + \dots + \nu_m(p) \geq 0,$$

where the first inequality in (3.11) is equality if and only if the point $p \in M$ is m -flat (see Definition 3.1). Indeed, the function H increases as we move away from $M = b\Omega$ into Ω , and it vanishes on $N_p \cap C_\epsilon$ if and only if the point $p \in M$ is m -flat. We conclude that for $t \in (-\epsilon, 0)$ the hypersurface $\Sigma_t = b\Omega_t$ is m -convex, and it is strongly m -convex at $x = p + t\nabla\delta(p) \in C_\epsilon$ if and only if the point $p \in M$ is not m -flat (see Definition 3.1). In particular, since M is not m -flat near infinity, Σ_t is not m -flat near infinity for any $t \in (-\epsilon, 0)$.

From (3.7)–(3.10) it follows that for every $x \in C_{\epsilon/2}$ (see (3.5)) we have that

$$(3.12) \quad -\frac{m-1}{\epsilon} \leq \nu_j(x) \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n-1, \text{ and}$$

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{\nu_j \leq 0} \nu_j(x) \geq -\frac{m-1}{\epsilon}.$$

Despite the estimate (3.11), the function δ need not be m -plurisubharmonic on C_ϵ due the zero eigenvalue of $\text{Hess } \delta$ in the direction of $\nabla\delta$. However, we now show that a suitable convexification of δ on a collar $C_{\epsilon_0} \subset \Omega$ in (3.5) for some $0 < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon/2$ extends to a bounded m -plurisubharmonic function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow [-c, 0)$ such that every level set

$$M_t = \{\rho = t\} \text{ for } t \in (-\epsilon_0, 0]$$

coincides with a level set $\Sigma_\tau = \{\delta = \tau\}$ for some $\tau = \tau(t) \in (-\epsilon, 0]$. The argument is similar to [15, proof of Theorem 1.1], but we are now dealing with an unbounded domain Ω .

Choose a number $\alpha > (m-1)/\epsilon$. Let $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth, convex, increasing function with $h(0) = 0$, $\dot{h}(0) = 1$, and $\ddot{h}(0) = \alpha$. Then,

$$(3.14) \quad h(t) < 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq \dot{h}(t) < 1 \text{ for } -\infty < t < 0.$$

Choose a number ϵ_0 with $0 < \epsilon_0 < \epsilon/2$ such that

$$(3.15) \quad \ddot{h}(t) > \frac{m-1}{\epsilon} \text{ for } -\epsilon_0 \leq t \leq 0.$$

Consider the function $h \circ \delta : C_\epsilon \rightarrow (-\infty, 0)$. We have that

$$\text{Hess}_{h \circ \delta} = (\dot{h} \circ \delta) \text{Hess}_\delta + (\ddot{h} \circ \delta) \nabla\delta \cdot (\nabla\delta)^T.$$

Here, $(\nabla\delta)^T$ is the transpose of $\nabla\delta$ and $\nabla\delta \cdot (\nabla\delta)^T$ is an $n \times n$ matrix. Assume that for $p \in M$ the orthonormal vectors $v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n = \nabla\delta(p)$ diagonalize $\text{Hess}_\delta(p)$, where $T_p M = \text{span}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$. Note that $T_p M$ lies in the kernel of the matrix $\nabla\delta \cdot (\nabla\delta)^T$ while v_n is an eigenvector with eigenvalue 1. The same basis then diagonalizes $\text{Hess}_{h \circ \delta}(x)$ at every point $x = p + \delta(x)v_n \in N_p \cap C_\epsilon$, the eigenvalues corresponding to v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} get multiplied by $\dot{h}(\delta(x)) \geq 0$, and the eigenvalue in the normal direction v_n equals $\ddot{h}(\delta(x))$. Summarising, the eigenvalues of $\text{Hess}_{h \circ \delta}(x)$ at any point $x \in C_\epsilon$ equal

$$(3.16) \quad \dot{h}(\delta(x))\nu_1(x), \dots, \dot{h}(\delta(x))\nu_{n-1}(x), \quad \ddot{h}(\delta(x)).$$

If $x \in C_{\epsilon_0}$ then $-\epsilon_0 < \delta(x) < 0$, and hence by (3.13), (3.14) and (3.15) we have that

$$\sum_{\nu_j(x) \leq 0} \dot{h}(\delta(x))\nu_j(x) + \ddot{h}(\delta(x)) > 0.$$

Together with (3.10) and (3.11) it follows that the sum of any m numbers in the list (3.16) is nonnegative at every point $x \in C_{\epsilon_0}$. In other words, the function $h \circ \delta$ is m -plurisubharmonic on C_{ϵ_0} . Hence, the continuous function $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow [h(-\epsilon_0), 0)$ given by

$$(3.17) \quad \rho(x) = \begin{cases} h(\delta(x)), & \text{if } x \in C_{\epsilon_0}; \\ h(-\epsilon_0), & \text{if } x \in \Omega \setminus C_{\epsilon_0} \end{cases}$$

is m -plurisubharmonic. Near bC_{ϵ_0} we have $\rho = \max\{h \circ \delta, h(-\epsilon_0)\}$, and the maximum of two m -plurisubharmonic functions is m -plurisubharmonic [21, Sect. 6]. Clearly, ρ satisfies the conclusion of the proposition with $c = -h(-\epsilon_0)$, and for every $t \in (-c, 0)$ we have that

$$(3.18) \quad M_t = \{\delta_M = \tau\} \text{ for } \tau = h^{-1}(t) \in (-\epsilon_0, 0).$$

Replacing ρ by ρ/c we may assume that $c = 1$. □

Remark 3.3. By smoothing, one can obtain an m -plurisubharmonic function of class \mathcal{C}^2 on Ω having the properties in Proposition 3.2 in a smaller collar $C_{\epsilon_1} \subset C_\epsilon$. This can be done by a convolution with radially symmetric approximate identity with small support. However, smoothness of ρ away from $b\Omega$ is inessential in the proof of Theorem 2.1. If $b\Omega$ is of class \mathcal{C}^r for some $r \geq 2$ then the same proof gives a function ρ of class \mathcal{C}^r with the stated properties.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Since an m -convex domain is also k -convex for any $m < k \leq n - 1$ and every k -flat point is also m -flat, it suffices to show that Ω does not contain any parabolic minimal surfaces of dimension m .

Let $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow [-1, 0)$ the m -plurisubharmonic function given by Proposition 3.2; see (3.17). If $R \subset \Omega$ is an immersed connected parabolic minimal surface of dimension m then $\rho|_R$ is a bounded subharmonic function on R , hence constant. This means that either $R \subset M_t = \{\rho = t\}$ for some $t \in (-1, 0)$ or $R \subset \Omega \setminus C_{\epsilon_0}$.

Assume that the first possibility holds. The minimal m -dimensional submanifold R is contained in the set of points where the hypersurface M_t is not strongly m -convex. By Proposition 3.2, $M_t = \{\delta_M = \tau\}$ (see (3.18)) is m -flat at every point where it fails to be strongly m -convex, and the set of its m -flat points has bounded interior. Since R is parabolic, it cannot be contained in a bounded set, so this case is impossible.

Therefore, $R \subset \Omega \setminus C_{\epsilon_0}$, so the distance between R and $M = b\Omega$ is at least $\epsilon_0 > 0$. If we translate Ω for the distance $\epsilon_0/2$ in any direction, the same argument (with the same

constants) applies to the translated domain Ω' and its boundary $M' = b\Omega'$. Since $R \subset \Omega'$, we infer that $\text{dist}(R, M') \geq \epsilon_0$. Since this holds for every translate of Ω for $\epsilon_0/2$, we concluded that $\text{dist}(R, M) \geq 3\epsilon_0/2$. Repeating this argument shows that the distance from R to M must be infinite, a contradiction.

If $m = 2$, the same argument shows that there are no nonconstant conformal harmonic maps $f : R \rightarrow \Omega$ (possibly with branch points) from any parabolic conformal surface R . \square

Remark 3.4 (Concerning the paper [15]). By [15, Theorem 1.1], every bounded domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 3$) whose boundary is of class $\mathcal{C}^{r,\alpha}$ for some $r \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and is m -convex for some $m \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ admits an m -plurisubharmonic defining function of class $\mathcal{C}^{r,\alpha}$. The proof uses the result of Li and Nirenberg [30] that the signed distance function to a hypersurface of class $\mathcal{C}^{r,\alpha}$ for such (r, α) is of the same class $\mathcal{C}^{r,\alpha}$ near the hypersurface. By using the result of Gilbarg and Trudinger [18, Lemma 14.16] and Krantz and Parks [29], we see that [15, Theorem 1.1] also holds in smoothness classes \mathcal{C}^r for $r = 2, 3, \dots, \infty, \omega$.

The second remark is that the last statement in [15, Theorem 1.1] is one of the many special cases of a result by Harvey and Lawson [20, Theorem 5.12]. I wish to thank R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson for this communication.

4. WEAKLY HYPERBOLIC DOMAINS

As mentioned in the introduction, the second motivation for this paper comes from the recently introduced hyperbolicity theory for minimal surfaces. We recall the background.

In 2021, Forstnerič and Kalaj [16] defined on any domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 3$ a Finsler pseudometric $g_\Omega : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty)$, the *minimal pseudometric*, and the associated pseudodistance $\text{dist}_\Omega : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ obtained by integrating g_Ω , by using conformal harmonic discs $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\} \rightarrow \Omega$ in the same way as the Kobayashi–Royden pseudometric and pseudodistance are defined on complex manifolds by using holomorphic discs; see [27, 28, 40]. Let $\text{CH}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega)$ denote the space of conformal harmonic discs $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$, possibly with branch points. Denote by $z = x + iy$ the complex coordinate on \mathbb{D} and by f_x the partial derivative on x . The minimal pseudometric at $p \in \Omega$ on a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$g_\Omega(p, v) = \inf \{1/r > 0 : \exists f \in \text{CH}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega), f(0) = p, f_x(0) = rv\} \geq 0.$$

It follows from definitions that dist_Ω is the biggest pseudometric on Ω such that every conformal harmonic map $R \rightarrow \Omega$ from a conformal surface R is distance decreasing with respect to the Poincaré pseudometric on R . Thus, dist_Ω describes the fastest possible rate of growth of hyperbolic minimal surfaces in Ω . A domain Ω is said to be (complete) *hyperbolic* if dist_Ω is a (complete) distance function. Every bounded domain is hyperbolic but not necessarily complete hyperbolic. On the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^n the minimal metric coincides with the Beltrami–Cayley–Klein metric, one of the classical models of hyperbolic geometry, see [16]. In [12], the authors developed basic hyperbolicity theory for domains in Euclidean spaces.

We now introduce the following weaker notion of hyperbolicity, which is of interest on unbounded domains where hyperbolicity remains poorly understood.

Definition 4.1. A domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 3$, is *weakly hyperbolic* (for minimal surfaces) if every conformal harmonic map $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Omega$ is constant.

Weak hyperbolicity is an analogue of Brody hyperbolicity in complex analysis: a complex manifold X is said to be *Brody hyperbolic* if every holomorphic map $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ is constant. Every Kobayashi hyperbolic manifold is also Brody hyperbolic; the converse holds on compact complex manifolds (see Brody [10]) but it fails in general [10, p. 219].

Likewise, every hyperbolic domain in \mathbb{R}^n is weakly hyperbolic but the converse fails in general. Indeed, assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is not weakly hyperbolic. Pick a nonconstant conformal harmonic map $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Omega$ and a point $a \in \mathbb{C}$ where $df_a \neq 0$. The conformal harmonic discs $f_r : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \Omega$ given by $f_r(z) = f(a + rz)$ for $r > 0$ satisfy $f_r(0) = f(a)$ and $d(f_r)_0 = r df_a$. Letting $r \rightarrow +\infty$ we get $g_\Omega(f(a), v) = 0$ for all $v \in df_a(\mathbb{C})$, so Ω is not hyperbolic.

The failure of the converse implication is given by part (b) of the following proposition. Part (c) shows that a weakly hyperbolic domain may contain parabolic minimal surfaces whose universal conformal covering is the disc.

- Proposition 4.2.** (a) *There is a nonhyperbolic domain in \mathbb{R}^3 which does not contain any parabolic minimal surfaces.*
(b) *In particular, there is a weakly hyperbolic domain in \mathbb{R}^3 which is not hyperbolic.*
(c) *For every parabolic domain $D \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ which omits at least two points of \mathbb{C} there is a weakly hyperbolic but nonhyperbolic domain $\Omega_D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ containing $D \times \{0\}$ as a proper minimal surface.*

Proof. Given a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we define the domain $\Omega_D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ by

$$\Omega_D = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |z| < 1, z^2(x^2 + y^2) < 1, (x, y) \in D \text{ if } z = 0\}.$$

We claim that the following assertions hold.

- (i) The minimal distance in Ω_D between any pair of points $p, q \in D \times \{0\}$ vanishes, so Ω_D is not hyperbolic.
- (ii) The image of every nonconstant conformal harmonic map $R \rightarrow \Omega_D$ from a parabolic conformal surface R is contained in $D \times \{0\}$.

To prove the first claim (i), assume that $p = (a, b, 0)$ and $q = (c, d, 0)$. Set $p_k = (a, b, 1/k)$ and $q_k = (c, d, 1/k)$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots$. It is obvious that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\Omega_D}(p, p_k) = 0$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\Omega_D}(q, q_k) = 0$. The sequence of linear discs $\{(x, y, 1/k) : x^2 + y^2 < k^2\} \subset \Omega_D$ shows that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}_{\Omega_D}(p_k, q_k) = 0$. Hence, $\text{dist}_{\Omega_D}(p, q) = 0$.

To prove the second claim (ii), assume that $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3) : R \rightarrow \Omega_D$ is a nonconstant conformal harmonic map from a parabolic conformal surface. We have $|f_3| < 1$, so $f_3 = c$ is constant. If $c \neq 0$ then $f_1^2 + f_2^2 < 1/c^2 < +\infty$, so f_1 and f_2 are constant as well, a contradiction. Thus, $c = 0$ and hence $f(R) \subset D \times \{0\}$.

If we take D to be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^2 then property (ii) implies that Ω_D does not contain any parabolic minimal surface. Since Ω_D is nonhyperbolic by property (i), such a domain satisfies condition (a) in the proposition. Part (b) is an immediate consequence.

Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a parabolic domain which omits at least two points of \mathbb{C} . By (ii) the image of every nonconstant conformal harmonic map $\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \Omega_D$ is contained in $D \times \{0\}$, which contradicts Picard's theorem. Thus, Ω_D is weakly hyperbolic but it contains the parabolic minimal surface $D \times \{0\}$. This proves part (c) of the proposition. \square

Problem 4.3. Is there a hyperbolic domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ containing a parabolic minimal surface? In particular, if $D \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{C}$ is a parabolic domain which omits at least two points of \mathbb{C} , is the domain $D \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ hyperbolic for some (or all) $\epsilon > 0$?

This problem has a simple answer in complex analysis: the domain $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}) \times \mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, where \mathbb{D} is the disc, is foliated by the parabolic surface $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ but is Kobayashi hyperbolic. The difference between the two cases is that the projection of a complex curve onto the first factor is holomorphic, while the projection of a conformal harmonic map is harmonic but not conformal in general. It is easily seen that $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ contains many harmonic images of \mathbb{C} which are conformal at some point, but not everywhere.

The situation is much simpler for convex domains as shown by the following proposition.

Proposition 4.4. *For a convex domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 3$, the following conditions are pairwise equivalent.*

- (a) Ω is complete hyperbolic.
- (b) Ω is hyperbolic.
- (c) Ω is weakly hyperbolic.
- (d) Ω does not contain any affine 2-plane.
- (e) Ω does not contain any parabolic minimal surface.

Proof. The implications $(a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (d)$ and $(e) \Rightarrow (d)$ are trivial. The implication $(d) \Rightarrow (a)$ was proved in [12, Theorem 5.1], thereby establishing the equivalence of properties (a)–(d). It remains to prove $(d) \Rightarrow (e)$. It was shown in [12, proof of Theorem 5.1] that a convex domain Ω in \mathbb{R}^n satisfying condition (d) is contained in the intersection of $n - 1$ halfspaces $H_j = \{\ell_j < c_j\}$ ($j = 1, \dots, n - 1$), where $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{n-1} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are linearly independent linear functionals and c_j are constants. If $f : R \rightarrow \Omega$ is a conformal harmonic map from a connected parabolic conformal surface R then $\ell_j \circ f : R \rightarrow (-\infty, c_j)$ is a bounded from above harmonic function for every $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, hence constant. Thus, $f(R)$ lies in a real line and hence f is constant. \square

A property directly opposite to weak or strong hyperbolicity is *flexibility* for minimal surfaces, which was introduced in [13, Definition 1.1]. A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 3$ is said to be flexible if, given an open conformal surface M , a compact set $K \subset M$ whose complement has no relatively compact connected components, and a conformal harmonic immersion $U \rightarrow \Omega$ from an open neighbourhood $U \subset M$ of K , we can approximate f uniformly on K and interpolate it at finitely many given points of K by conformal harmonic immersions $M \rightarrow \Omega$. A flexible domain admits many conformal harmonic images of \mathbb{C} , so it is not weakly hyperbolic. Conversely, a weakly hyperbolic domain is not flexible. In particular, the domains in Theorem 2.1 are not flexible. A halfspace in \mathbb{R}^n is neither (weakly) hyperbolic nor flexible.

The situation regarding Corollary 2.3 is quite different in \mathbb{R}^4 . As shown in [13, Example 1.9], a domain in \mathbb{R}^4 with coordinates (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) , given by

$$\Omega = \{x_4 > -a|x_2| + b|x_3| \text{ for some } a > 0 \text{ and } b \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

is flexible. Taking $b > 0$, the complementary domain $\Omega' = \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ is of the same type with the reversed roles of x_2 and x_3 , so it is also flexible. It was shown by Alarcón and López

[5] that each of these domains contains a properly immersed conformal minimal surface parameterised by an arbitrary open Riemann surface. (In fact, their result holds for any concave wedge in \mathbb{R}^3 obtained by intersecting Ω with the hyperplane $x_3 = 0$.) This gives many pairs of disjoint properly immersed minimal surfaces in \mathbb{R}^4 of any given conformal type. There also exist pairs of disjoint catenoids in \mathbb{R}^4 whose ends are asymptotic to a pair of orthogonal 2-planes in \mathbb{R}^4 , so their closures in \mathbb{RP}^4 are disjoint as well. On the other hand, a pair of complex curves in \mathbb{C}^2 intersect, or their closures in \mathbb{CP}^2 intersect at infinity. (Note that every complex curve is also a minimal surface.)

Acknowledgements. I thank Antonio Alarcón and Joaquín Pérez who provided essential information on properly embedded minimal surfaces with bounded curvature in \mathbb{R}^3 , and for general advice. I also thank G. Pacelli Bessa and Leandro F. Pessoa for communication regarding their paper [9].

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Alarcón, B. Drinovec Drnovšek, F. Forstnerič, and F. J. López. Minimal surfaces in minimally convex domains. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 371(3):1735–1770, 2019.
- [2] A. Alarcón and F. Forstnerič. New complex analytic methods in the theory of minimal surfaces: a survey. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 106(3):287–341, 2019.
- [3] A. Alarcón, F. Forstnerič, and F. López. New Complex Analytic Methods in the Study of Non-Orientable Minimal Surfaces in \mathbb{R}^n . *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 264(1283), 2020.
- [4] A. Alarcón, F. Forstnerič, and F. J. López. *Minimal surfaces from a complex analytic viewpoint*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2021.
- [5] A. Alarcón and F. J. López. Minimal surfaces in \mathbb{R}^3 properly projecting into \mathbb{R}^2 . *J. Differential Geom.*, 90(3):351–381, 2012.
- [6] P. Andrade. A wild minimal plane in \mathbb{R}^3 . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 128(5):1451–1457, 2000.
- [7] G. Bellettini. *Lecture notes on mean curvature flow, barriers and singular perturbations*, volume 12 of *Appunti. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Nuova Serie) [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)]*. Edizioni della Normale, Pisa, 2013.
- [8] G. P. Bessa, L. P. Jorge, and G. Oliveira-Filho. Half-space theorems for minimal surfaces with bounded curvature. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 57(3):493–508, 2001.
- [9] G. P. Bessa, L. P. Jorge, and L. Pessoa. Stochastic half-space theorems for minimal surfaces and h -surfaces of \mathbb{R}^3 . 2021.
- [10] R. Brody. Compact manifolds and hyperbolicity. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 235:213–219, 1978.
- [11] T. H. Colding and W. P. Minicozzi, II. *Minimal surfaces*, volume 4 of *Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. New York University, Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York, 1999.
- [12] B. Drinovec Drnovšek and F. Forstnerič. Hyperbolic domains in real Euclidean spaces. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, to appear. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.06943>.
- [13] B. Drinovec Drnovšek and F. Forstnerič. Flexible domains for minimal surfaces in Euclidean spaces. *arXiv eprints*, May 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.14254>.
- [14] H. Federer. Curvature measures. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 93:418–491, 1959.
- [15] F. Forstnerič. Every smoothly bounded p -convex domain in \mathbb{R}^n admits a p -plurisubharmonic defining function. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 175:10, 2022. Id/No 103100.
- [16] F. Forstneric and D. Kalaj. Hyperbolicity theory for minimal surfaces in Euclidean spaces. *arXiv e-prints*, March 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.12403>.
- [17] E. S. Gama, J. H. S. de Lira, L. Mari, and A. A. de Medeiros. A barrier principle at infinity for varifolds with bounded mean curvature. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms.12514>.

- [18] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1983.
- [19] A. Grigor'yan. Analytic and geometric background of recurrence and non-explosion of the Brownian motion on Riemannian manifolds. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 36(2):135–249, 1999.
- [20] F. R. Harvey and H. B. j. Lawson. Dirichlet duality and the nonlinear Dirichlet problem. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(3):396–443, 2009.
- [21] F. R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson, Jr. Plurisubharmonicity in a general geometric context. In *Geometry and analysis. No. 1*, volume 17 of *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, pages 363–402. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2011.
- [22] F. R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson, Jr. p -convexity, p -plurisubharmonicity and the Levi problem. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 62(1):149–169, 2013.
- [23] D. Hoffman and W. H. Meeks, III. The strong halfspace theorem for minimal surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 101(2):373–377, 1990.
- [24] D. Hoffman, M. Traizet, and B. White. Helicoidal minimal surfaces of prescribed genus. *Acta Math.*, 216(2):217–323, 2016.
- [25] L. P. Jorge and F. Tomi. The barrier principle for minimal submanifolds of arbitrary codimension. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, 24(3):261–267, 2003.
- [26] L. P. d. M. Jorge and W. H. Meeks, III. The topology of complete minimal surfaces of finite total Gaussian curvature. *Topology*, 22(2):203–221, 1983.
- [27] S. Kobayashi. Invariant distances on complex manifolds and holomorphic mappings. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 19:460–480, 1967.
- [28] S. Kobayashi. *Hyperbolic manifolds and holomorphic mappings. An introduction*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, second edition, 2005.
- [29] S. G. Krantz and H. R. Parks. Distance to C^k hypersurfaces. *J. Differ. Equations*, 40:116–120, 1981.
- [30] Y. Li and L. Nirenberg. Regularity of the distance function to the boundary. *Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat. Appl. (5)*, 29:257–264, 2005.
- [31] W. H. Meeks, III and J. Pérez. Conformal properties in classical minimal surface theory. In *Surveys in differential geometry. Vol. IX*, *Surv. Differ. Geom.*, IX, pages 275–335. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2004.
- [32] W. H. Meeks, III and J. Pérez. The classical theory of minimal surfaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 48(3):325–407, 2011.
- [33] W. H. Meeks, III and J. Pérez. *A survey on classical minimal surface theory*, volume 60 of *University Lecture Series*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [34] W. H. Meeks, III and J. Pérez. The Riemann minimal examples. In *The legacy of Bernhard Riemann after one hundred and fifty years. Vol. II*, volume 35 of *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, pages 417–457. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2016.
- [35] W. H. Meeks, III, J. Pérez, and A. Ros. The geometry of minimal surfaces of finite genus. II: Nonexistence of one limit end examples. *Invent. Math.*, 158(2):323–341, 2004.
- [36] W. H. Meeks, III and H. Rosenberg. The geometry of periodic minimal surfaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 68(4):538–578, 1993.
- [37] W. H. Meeks, III and H. Rosenberg. Maximum principles at infinity. *J. Differential Geom.*, 79(1):141–165, 2008.
- [38] R. Osserman. *A survey of minimal surfaces*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, second edition, 1986.
- [39] H. Rosenberg. Intersection of minimal surfaces of bounded curvature. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 125(2):161–168, 2001.
- [40] H. L. Royden. Remarks on the Kobayashi metric. In *Several complex variables, II (Proc. Internat. Conf., Univ. Maryland, College Park, Md., 1970)*, pages 125–137. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 185, 1971.
- [41] F. Xavier. Convex hulls of complete minimal surfaces. *Math. Ann.*, 269:179–182, 1984.

FRANC FORSTNERIČ, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA, AND INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, PHYSICS, AND MECHANICS, JADRANSKA 19, 1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA
Email address: franc.forstneric@fmf.uni-lj.si