

A BLOW-UP METHOD TO PRESCRIBED MEAN CURVATURE GRAPHS WITH FIXED BOUNDARIES

HENGYU ZHOU

ABSTRACT. In this paper we discuss the existence of prescribed mean curvature (PMC) graphs with fixed graphical boundaries in the product manifold $N \times \mathbb{R}$. We define an Nc-f domain in which closure does not contain certain domains with the mean curvature of its boundary equal to f . We show the existence of corresponding PMC graphs over bounded Nc-f domains with natural boundary conditions via a blow-up method from Schoen-Yau. This existence can be used in the Plateau problem of PMC surfaces in 3-manifolds.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is motivated by the Plateau problem of prescribed mean curvature (written as PMC for short) hypersurfaces stated as follows.

Problem 1.1. *Given a 3-dimensional compact manifold M , a function \mathcal{H} with $H_{\partial M} > |\mathcal{H}|$ and a null-homotopic Jordan curve $\Gamma \subset \partial M$, in M can we find a parametric PMC disk with its mean curvature equal to \mathcal{H} and boundary Γ ?*

Here $H_{\partial M}$ is the mean curvature of ∂M given by the divergence of the outward normal vector of ∂M . In the minimal surface case $\mathcal{H} \equiv 0$, the Douglas solution to the Problem 1.1 was firstly obtained by Radó [37], Douglas [10] in Euclidean spaces independently and by Morrey [36] in the case of Riemannian manifolds. And the embeddedness of the Douglas solution was established by Meeks-Yau [34]. The Problem 1.1 has been studied by Coskunuzer [7] when \mathcal{H} is a non-zero constant requiring $H_2(M) \equiv 0$. By Gulliver-Spruck [20], if there is a C^1 vector field Q in M satisfying $|\langle Q, Q \rangle| \leq 1 - \mu$ for some constant $\mu \in (0, 1)$, there is a parametric disk with PMC $\text{div}(Q)$. Such domain M is called an admissible domain. By Serrin [43], one can choose Q as $\frac{Du}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}}$ where u is the solution to the Dirichlet problem of PMC equations (1.1) below with an appropriate setting. The existence of Q can be transferred into the existence of a PMC graph with fixed graphical boundaries in the product manifold $M \times \mathbb{R}$.

Although there is a huge literature on the Dirichlet problem of PMC equations, for example (but not limited to) [22, 43, 46, 48, 5, 6, 3, 20] etc. and [17, Chapter 14], within our knowledge, there are very few references to study it from the viewpoint of the Plateau problem of PMC surfaces. That is to find a geometric condition on M as weak as possible to guarantee the solution to the Dirichlet problem of PMC equations on M so that one can use Gulliver-Spruck's derivation [20] to obtain the existence of parametric PMC disks.

To seek more weak conditions, we turn to the application of Jang equations (a

Date: August 16, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 49Q20; Secondary 53A10, 35A01, 35J25.

certain PMC equation) in Schoen-Yau's proof of positive mass theorem [41]. They constructed Jang graphs, graphs of a solution to the Jang equation, via a blow-up process so they can reduce the general case of positive mass theorems to the setting of the Riemannian positive mass theorem. In [11] and [12] Eichmair used this blow-up process to establish the Plateau problem of PMC hypersurfaces under the barrier condition. For further related applications we refer to [4], [14] and [35].

By Schoen-Yau in [42, Corollary 1], no existence of apparent horizons (a cylinder-type limit of Jang graphs) implies the global existence of Jang graphs. Inspired by this we describe a domain with the non-existence of PMC hypersurfaces via the following definition.

Definition 1.2 (The Nc-f property). *Fix $n \geq 2$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and N is an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Suppose f is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function in the tangent bundle TN and $\Omega \subset N$ is a $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain with embedded boundary. We say that Ω has the Nc-f property or is an Nc-f domain if there is no Caccioppoli set E in the closure of Ω satisfying*

- (1) *for any $p \in \partial E$, E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer (see Definition 2.5) in a neighborhood of p for some positive constant Λ ;*
- (2) *the regular part $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ (see Definition 2.5) is $C^{2,\alpha}$, embedded and orientable with its mean curvature equal to $f(x, \vec{v}(x))$ for any x in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ ($-f(x, -\vec{v}(x))$ for any x in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$);*

Here \vec{v} is the outward normal vector of x in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ from E , the mean curvature of $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ is defined by $\text{div}(\vec{v})$.

By Theorem 2.9 in the case of $2 \leq n \leq 7$ Ω is an Nc-f domain if there is no $C^{2,\alpha}$ complete embedded domain E with the mean curvature of its boundary equal to f . In some literature [11] the boundary of a Λ -perimeter minimizer is called a C -almost minimal boundary which generalizes the concept of the minimal boundary.

Theorem 5.3 gives some examples of Nc-f domains from the assumption of the Ricci curvature of the domain and the mean curvature of its boundary. And the topology of an Nc-f domain may be nontrivial even in the case of $f \equiv 0$ (see Example 5.4).

Our main result is formulated as follows.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 6.1). *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Suppose N is an $n(\geq 2)$ dimensional Riemannian manifold. Let $F(x, X, \mathbb{R})$ be a $C^{1,\alpha}(TN \times \mathbb{R})$ function satisfying that $F(x, X, 0) = f(x, X)$ for any point (x, X) in TN with $x \in N, X \in T_x N$. Suppose*

- (i) *Ω is a bounded n -dimensional $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain in N and the mean curvature of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ satisfies $H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq \max\{f(x, \gamma), -f(x, -\gamma)\}$ where γ is the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ at x ;*
- (ii) *Ω has the Nc-f property;*
- (iii) *$\phi(x, z, Y, r) : T(N \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth uniformly bounded function with $\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial z} \geq 0$.*

Then the Dirichlet problem (1.1)

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\text{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) - F\left(x, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + \phi\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right)\frac{1}{\omega} = 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ u = \psi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution in $C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ for any $\psi(x) \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Here Du is the gradient of u , $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}$.

A direct application of Theorem 1.3 gives an example of admissible domains in [20, Page 447] if we assume $F = f = \mathcal{H}(x)$, $\phi \equiv 0$, Ω is a 3-dimensional domain satisfying the condition (i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.3. Therefore the existence of the Problem 1.1 is obtained in the setting of Theorem 1.3 by [20, Theorem 4.2]. This will be investigated in a forthcoming paper.

In (1.1) the term $F - \phi \frac{1}{\omega}$ can represent many PMC functions. For example, constant mean curvature c , $tr(k) - k(\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{Du}{\omega})$ (the Jang equation) for a symmetric $(0, 2)$ -tensor k , $\langle Y, \frac{Du}{\omega} \rangle$ for some C^1 vector field Y and $\frac{c}{\omega}$ (see Remark 6.4). For some earlier results on minimal surface equations in Euclidean spaces and hyperbolic spaces we refer to [22, 30, 19]. From the characterization of the Nc-f property in Theorem 5.3, Theorem 1.3 includes most cases of the results by Spruck [46, Theorem 1.4] and Casteras-Heinonen-Holopainen-Lira [5, Theorem 1.1]. But an Nc-f domain is topological and locally it has no restriction on its Ricci curvature. In the case of translating mean curvature equation ($F \equiv 0$, $\phi \equiv c$) the Nc-f property can not be removed by a hemisphere example (see [16, section 6]). Some special cases of the Dirichlet problem (1.1) have been studied in [15] and [54] via the area functional approach. For the Dirichlet problem of more general PMC functions, we refer to Bergner's work in [3] with a strict condition on the domain Ω . The case of the Dirichlet problem of translating mean curvature equations in Euclidean spaces can be found in [50, 51, 31].

Following the idea of Schoen-Yau [42] we split the proof of Theorem 1.3 into three steps. For any $t \in (0, 1)$ consider an auxiliary Dirichlet problem with respect to (1.1) given by

$$(1.2) \quad -div(\frac{Du}{\omega}) - F(x, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}) + (tu + \phi(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}))\frac{1}{\omega} = 0$$

on Ω with $u = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$. The first step is to assume $\phi \equiv 0$ and to blow up the equation in (1.1) (let $t \rightarrow 0$ in (1.2)). The second step is to use the C^2 estimate in Theorem 3.3 and obtain that no existence of certain domains (the Nc-f property) implies the solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.1) when $\phi \equiv 0$. The last step is to use the conclusion in the case of $\phi \equiv 0$ and obtain the uniformly C^0 bound of u_t . Letting $t \rightarrow 0$ yields the general solution with the condition (iii).

We give some remarks in orders. In the first step above, we apply the Perron method of PMC equations from Eichmair [11] (see also Ju-Liu [23]). To blow up the equation in (1.1) we use $\frac{tu}{\omega}$ in (1.2) instead of tu in [42, (4.1)] because the former one is very friendly to the boundary condition (i) in Theorem 1.3 (see Theorem A.3).

In the second step above we essentially apply the curvature estimate in Theorem 3.3 which holds for any $n \geq 2$ and any sequence of C^2 Λ -perimeter minimizers with good controls upon its PMC functions as long as their limit is regular. This generalizes the result of Simon [44, Theorem 1] when $2 \leq n \leq 7$. Another way to obtain a similar curvature estimate is those of stable-like hypersurfaces from Schoen-Simon [40] pointed by Eichmair [12, Appendix A]. Our different approaches to this curvature estimate shall have independent interest.

In the second step and the third step the interior estimate in Theorem A.2 guarantees that the C^0 bound of u_t solving (1.2) gives their the C^1 bound locally. Such interior estimate for various mean curvature equations has been established in various special cases (see [3, 27, 25, 26, 8, 49, 14, 46, 33] etc.) for any C^2

function u satisfying

$$(1.3) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) + f\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) = 0$$

Here $f = f(x, z, X, r)$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function satisfying the monotone condition $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \geq 0$. In Theorem 1.3 this monotone condition is equivalent to its condition (iii). A non-monotone case ($\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial z}$ maybe not positive) in Theorem 1.3 will be considered in a sequel to this paper.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we collect some preliminary facts on Λ -perimeter minimizers. In section 3 we establish the curvature estimates in Theorem 3.3. In section 4 we consider an auxiliary Dirichlet problem in Theorem 4.1 via a Perron method from Eichmair [11]. In section 5 we discuss the Ne-f property and give some examples. In section 6 we show that the limit of the blow-up process gives the solution to (1.1) in Theorem 1.3. In appendix A we collect some results on PMC equations in Riemannian manifolds.

The author would like to thank Xi-Ping Zhu and Xiantao Huang for their interests and valuable discussions. This project is supported by NSFC no. 11801046 and the Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing, China no. cstc2021jcyj-msxmX0430.

2. PRELIMINARY

We collect some facts on Λ -perimeter minimizers. Our main references are the book of Maggi [32], Giusti [18] and Simon [45]. In those references, most of the statements are described in Euclidean spaces. Their Riemannian versions can be easily obtained by the Nash embedding theorem plus basic facts on Functional Analysis and blow-up analysis. In what follows we directly state them in Riemannian manifolds without proof.

Fix $n \geq 2$. Let $N \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold with possible boundary and TN be its tangent bundle. Let $dvol, div, \langle, \rangle$ denote the volume form, the divergence, and the inner product of N respectively. Let $B_r(x) \subset N$ be an embedded ball $B_r(x) \subset N$ centering at x with sufficiently small radius r . Let W be an open set in N . We say a set $G \subset\subset W$ if the closure of G is a compact set in W . Let E be a Borel set in N and λ_E denotes its characteristic function. Let H^l be the l -dimensional Hausdorff measure in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} .

Definition 2.1 (P. 122, [32]). *Fix an open set Ω in N . We say E is a locally finite perimeter set or a Caccioppoli set if for any compact set $K \subset\subset \Omega$*

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{\operatorname{spt}(X) \subset\subset K} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \lambda_E \operatorname{div}(X) dvol : \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1 \right\} < \infty$$

is finite. The perimeter of E in Ω is given by

$$(2.2) \quad P(E, \Omega) = \sup_{\operatorname{spt}(X) \subset\subset \Omega} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \lambda_E \operatorname{div}(X) dvol : \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1 \right\}$$

Remark 2.2. The claim $P(E, \Omega) = 0$ holds if and only if $\operatorname{vol}(E) = 0$ or $\operatorname{vol}(E \setminus \Omega) = 0$. We say that E is equivalent to an empty set or Ω .

If two Caccioppoli sets differ in a Lebesgue measure set their properties are unchanged. Thus we say such two Caccioppoli sets are equivalent. For example, if a Caccioppoli set is not empty, then the volume of such set is positive. In fact we

can always choose a unique representation in the equivalent class of a Caccioppoli set with the property in (2.3).

Proposition 2.3 (Proposition 3.1, [18]). *Suppose E is a Borel set in N , there is a Borel set \tilde{E} (differs with E only a measure zero set) satisfying*

$$(2.3) \quad 0 < \mathbf{H}^n(\tilde{E} \cap B_r(x)) < \mathbf{H}^n(B_r(x))$$

for any x in $\partial\tilde{E}$ and sufficiently small $r > 0$.

Remark 2.4. Throughout this paper $\{x \in N : 0 < \mathbf{H}^n(E \cap B_r(x)) < \mathbf{H}^n(B_r(x))$ for some $r > 0\}$ is called the measure-theoretical boundary of E , written as ∂E .

Definition 2.5. [32, Page 278]. *Fix a nonnegative constant Λ . We say a Caccioppoli set E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in an open set $W \subset N$ if for any Caccioppoli set F satisfying $F \Delta E \subset\subset W$ it holds that*

$$(2.4) \quad P(E, W) \leq P(F, W) + \Lambda \text{vol}(E \Delta F)$$

Define $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ as the set $\{x \in \partial E : \partial E \text{ is a } C^{1,\gamma} \text{ graph in a neighborhood of } x \text{ for some } \gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})\}$ and $\text{sing}(\partial E) := \partial E \setminus \text{reg}(\partial E)$.

Remark 2.6. If we choose W as the embedded ball $B_r(p)$, a Λ -perimeter minimizer E is a (Λ, r) -perimeter minimizer. By [32, Theorem 26.5] the reduced boundary of Λ -perimeter minimizer is just $\text{reg}(\partial E)$. Moreover in [32] all local properties of (Λ, r) -perimeter minimizers hold for Λ -perimeter minimizers.

Theorem 2.7 (Theorem 17.7, [45]). *Fix $\nu > 0$. Suppose K is compact in the open set $W \subset N$ and the injective radius of W , $\text{inj}(W)$, is positive. Then there is a $d_0 = \min\{\text{dist}(\bar{W}, \partial N), \text{inj}(W)\}$ and κ depending only ν, K for any C^2 hypersurface Σ with mean curvature H_Σ satisfying $|H_\Sigma| \leq \nu$ it holds that*

$$(2.5) \quad e^{\kappa\sigma} \frac{\mathbf{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma \cap B_\sigma(p))}{\omega_{n-1}\sigma^{n-1}}$$

is increasing for all $\sigma \in (0, d_0)$ for any p in K .

Usually, it is hard to detect the regular set in the boundary of a Λ -perimeter minimizer. But there is one exception as follows.

Lemma 2.8. *Let E be a Caccioppoli set in a C^2 bounded domain $\Omega \subset N$ such that ∂E is tangent to $\partial\Omega$ at p . If in a neighborhood of p , E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer for some positive constants Λ . Then p is contained in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$.*

Proof. By the Nash embedding theorem, we assume N is an n -dimensional embedded submanifold in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} . Consider an isometry $T_\lambda(x) = \frac{x-p}{\lambda}$. Following [47, Lemma 3.3] there is a sequence $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ with $\lim_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i = 0$ such that $T_{\lambda_i}(E)$ converges locally to a minimal cone C in $T_p N (= \mathbb{R}^n)$. However $E \subset \Omega$, $p \in \partial\Omega$ and Ω is C^2 near p . Then C is contained in a half-space of $T_p N$. By [18, Lemma 15.5], C is a half-space. Thus the Hausdorff density of ∂E at p is 1. By the Allard regularity theorem ([45, Theorem 24.2]), p belongs to ∂E . \square

From Federer's dimension reduction process and Simons' minimizing cone, the following regular property holds for Λ -perimeter minimizers.

Theorem 2.9 (Theorem 28.1, [32]). *Let N be an n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Suppose E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in an open set $W \subset N$. Then*

- (1) if $2 \leq n \leq 7$, $\text{sing}(\partial E)$ is empty;
- (2) if $n = 8$, $\text{sing}(\partial E)$ is a discrete set;
- (3) if $n \geq 9$, $\text{H}^s(\text{sing}(\partial E)) = 0$ for any $s > n - 8$.

Definition 2.10. We say a sequence of Caccioppoli sets $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ locally converges to a Caccioppoli set E in an open set $\Omega \subset N$ if for any Borel set $A \subset\subset \Omega$

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \int_A |\lambda_E - \lambda_{E_i}| d\text{vol} = 0$$

where $d\text{vol}$ is the volume form of N .

There are three good properties for the convergence of Λ -perimeter minimizers.

Lemma 2.11. Suppose $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of Λ -perimeter minimizers in an open set $W \subset N$. Then

- (1) (Proposition 21.13 and Theorem 21.14 in [32]) there is a Λ -perimeter minimizer E such that a subsequence of $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, still denoted by $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$, converges locally to E in W ;
- (2) Fix $B_{r_0}(p)$ as an embedded ball in W . Then there is a dense set I in $(0, r_0)$ for any r in I such that

$$(2.7) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P(E_j, B_r(p)) = P(E, B_r(p))$$

- (3) (Theorem 1 in [47] and Theorem 26.6 in [32]) Suppose v is the outward normal vector of ∂E at some point x in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$, $\{x_j : x_j \in \partial E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ converges to x , then there is a positive integer j_0 such that there is a neighborhood of x , W , such that for any $j \geq j_0$, ∂E_j is regular in W , $\{x_j \in W : x_j \in \partial E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ converges to x and $\{v_j\}_{j \geq j_0}^\infty$ converges to v in the tangent bundle TN . Here v_j is the normal vector of ∂E_j at x_j .

Proof. We only show the conclusion (2). Since λ_{E_j} converges to λ_E a.e., the coarea formula implies that

$$(2.8) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_r(p) \cap (E_j \Delta E)) = 0$$

for any r in a dense set $I \subset (0, r_0)$. The semicontinuity of the perimeter implies that

$$(2.9) \quad P(E, B_r(p)) \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} P(E_j, B_r(p))$$

for any $r \in (0, r_0)$. Set $\tilde{E}_j = E \cap B_r(p) \cup E_j \setminus B_r(p)$, by our definition

$$(2.10) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{E}_j \Delta E_j = \emptyset,$$

Choose any $r' \in (r, r_0)$. By Definition 2.5, we have

$$(2.11) \quad P(E_j, B_{r'}(p)) \leq P(\tilde{E}_j, B_{r'}(p)) + \Lambda \text{vol}(E_j \Delta \tilde{E}_j)$$

On the other hand by the trace formula [18, Proposition 2.8] we have

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\tilde{E}_j, B_{r'}(p)) &= P(E, B_{r'}(p)) \\ &\quad + P(E_j, B_{r'}(p) \setminus \bar{B}_r(p)) + \text{H}^{n-1}((E_j \Delta E) \cap \partial B_r(p)) \end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.11) and (2.12), we obtain

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} P(E_j, B_r(p)) &\leq P(E, B_r(p)) + \Lambda \text{vol}(E_j \Delta \tilde{E}_j) \\ &\quad + \text{H}^{n-1}(E_j \Delta E \cap \partial B_r(p)) \end{aligned}$$

Recall that we always assume $n \geq 2$. For any r in I by (2.8) and letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain

$$(2.14) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \sup P(E_j, B_r(p)) \leq P(E, B_r(p))$$

Putting (2.9) and (2.14) together we obtain the conclusion. \square

Next, we give an example of Λ -perimeter minimizers for later use. For more examples see [32, section 21.1]. For any function f let $gr(f)$ denote the graph of f . Let $N \times \mathbb{R}$ denote the product manifold. We use the idea and concepts of Eichmair in [11, Example A.1] to obtain the following result.

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose Ω is a C^2 bounded domain in N , u is a C^2 function on Ω such that*

$$(2.15) \quad \left| \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{\omega} \right) \right| \leq \mu \text{ on } \Omega,$$

where $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}$, μ is a fixed positive constant. Define its subgraph $U = \{(x, r) : x \in \Omega, r < u(x)\}$.

Then there are two positive constants $\delta := \delta(\Omega)$, $\Lambda := \Lambda(\Omega, \mu)$ such that U is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R} \setminus (\partial gr(u))$. Here $\partial gr(u)$ is the boundary of the graph of u over Ω , $\Omega_\delta := \{x \in N, d(x, \Omega) < \delta\}$ and the metric of $N \times \mathbb{R}$ is the product metric.

Remark 2.13. Notice that the boundary of U is composed of two parts: $gr(u)$ in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and the set $\{(x, t) : x \in \partial\Omega, t < \partial gr(u)\}$, which belongs to the boundary of the C^2 domain $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Our derivation does not work in a neighborhood of $\partial gr(u)$. Here we do not require u to be uniformly bounded on Ω .

Comparing to [11, Example A.1], our Λ -perimeter minimizers can be defined on some neighborhoods of $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \partial gr(u)$.

Proof. Let $d(x, y)$ be the distance between two points x, y in N . Define $d(x)$ as the function $\operatorname{sign}(x)d(x, \partial\Omega)$ in a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ satisfying $\operatorname{sign}(x) = 1$ when $x \in \Omega$ and otherwise $\operatorname{sign}(x) = -1$. Define a set $\Gamma_\delta := \{x \in N : -\delta < d(x) \leq \delta\}$ such that for any $y \in \Gamma_\delta$ there is only one $x \in \partial\Omega$ such that $d(x, y) = d(y, \partial\Omega)$. Since $\partial\Omega$ is C^2 , then so is $d(x)$. Then we extend $d(x)$ into a function in $\Gamma_\delta \times \mathbb{R}$ as $d(q) = d(x)$ where $q = (x, r)$ in $\Gamma_\delta \times \mathbb{R}$. Let div be the divergence of $N \times \mathbb{R}$. Let n be the dimension of N . We define an n -form on $\Gamma_\delta \times \mathbb{R}$

$$(2.16) \quad \sigma_0 = Dd \lrcorner dvol$$

where D and $dvol$ are the gradient and the volume form of $N \times \mathbb{R}$ respectively. It is easy to see that

$$(2.17) \quad d\sigma_0 = \operatorname{div}(Dd)dvol, \quad |\operatorname{div}(Dd)| \leq c(\delta)$$

in $\Gamma_\delta \times \mathbb{R}$.

Let \vec{v} be the upward normal vector of $gr(u)$ in $N \times \mathbb{R}$. We extend it into a unit vector field X in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ via vertical translation. Namely

$$(2.18) \quad X(x, u(x) + t) = \vec{v}(x, u(x))$$

Define

$$(2.19) \quad \sigma_1 = X \lrcorner (dvol)$$

By the definition of the divergence and (2.15), for any point $q = (x, u(x)+r) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$(2.20) \quad d\sigma_1(q) = -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right)d\operatorname{vol}(q)$$

in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.

Suppose F is any Caccioppoli set such that $F\Delta U \subset\subset \Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R} \setminus (\partial \operatorname{gr}(u))$. Since $F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}) \Delta U \subset\subset \Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \partial \operatorname{gr}(u)$, by [16, Theorem 3.9], there is an $(n+1)$ -integral current $[[V]]$ in $\Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\partial[[V]] = \partial[[F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R})]] - \partial[[U]], \quad \operatorname{spt}([[V]]) \subset F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}) \Delta U$$

Here k is an integer and V is a Borel set in $\Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R}$.

Let W be an open bounded set satisfying $F\Delta U \subset\subset W$ disjoint with $\operatorname{gr}(\psi)$. Let $D_0^n(W)$ be the collection of the n -smooth forms X_ε with compact support in W for some $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfying

- (1) $\langle X_\varepsilon, X_\varepsilon \rangle \leq 1$, $V \subset \operatorname{supp}(X)$;
- (2) $X_\varepsilon = \sigma_1$ in the intersection of a neighborhood of V and $\{(x, r) : x \in \Omega, \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \varepsilon\}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ (if not empty);
- (3) $X_\varepsilon = \sigma_0$ in the intersection of a neighborhood of V and $\{(x, r) : \operatorname{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\}$ (if not empty);

Let \mathcal{M} denote the mass of integral currents. By Definition

$$(2.21) \quad P(F \cap \Omega \times \mathbb{R}, W) = \mathcal{M}_W(\partial[[U]] + \partial[[V]]) \geq (\partial[[U]] + \partial[[V]])(X_\varepsilon)$$

for any $X_\varepsilon \in D_0^n(W)$. Notice that ∂U is C^2 in W because W is disjoint with $\partial \operatorname{gr}(u)$, it is easy to find a sequence $\{X_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ in $D_0^n(W)$ such that

$$(2.22) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \partial[[U]](X_\varepsilon) = P(U, W)$$

For the same sequence $\{X_\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$, by (2.20) and (2.15) we have

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \partial[[V]](X_\varepsilon) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} - \int_V d(X_\varepsilon) d\operatorname{vol} \\ &= - \int_V d\sigma_1 \geq -\mu \operatorname{vol}(F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}) \Delta U) \end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.21) with (2.22) and (2.23) we obtain

$$(2.24) \quad P(F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}), W) \geq P(U, W) - \mu \operatorname{vol}((F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R})) \Delta U)$$

If $F\Delta U \subset \bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$, (2.24) directly gives the conclusion in the claim just letting $\Lambda = \mu$. Otherwise $F \cup (\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$ is not equal to $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. In (2.21), (2.22) and (2.23), we replace $F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$ with $F \cup (\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$, U with $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and X_ε with σ_0 respectively. The same derivation gives that

$$(2.25) \quad P(F \cup (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}), W) \geq P((\Omega \times \mathbb{R}), W) - c(\delta) \operatorname{vol}(F \cup (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}) \Delta (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}))$$

Combining (2.24) with (2.25) we obtain

$$(2.26) \quad \begin{aligned} P(U, W) + P(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, W) &\leq P(F \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}), W) + P(F \cup (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}), W) \\ &+ \max\{c(\delta), \mu\} \operatorname{vol}(F\Delta U) \leq P(F, W) + P(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}, W) + \Lambda \operatorname{vol}(F\Delta U) \end{aligned}$$

Here Λ is the constant $\max\{c(\delta), \mu\}$ and in the second line we apply [18, Lemma 15.1].

By the definition of Λ -perimeter minimizers the proof is completed. \square

3. CURVATURE ESTIMATES

In this section, we extend Simon's curvature estimates [44, Theorem 1] on minimal boundaries into the case of the boundary of PMC Λ -perimeter minimizers.

Let N be an $n(\geq 2)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold with a metric g . Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and an set $N_0 \subset N$. By [28, Page 44] the Hölder space $C^{1,\alpha}(N_0)$ is the collection of $C^{1,\alpha}$ functions u in a neighborhood of N_0 , on which $C^{1,\alpha}$ norm

$$(3.1) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(N_0)} = \sup_{x \in N_0} \{|u|(x) + |\nabla u|(x)\} + \sup_{x,y \in N_0, y \neq x} \frac{|\nabla u(x) - \nabla u(y)|}{d^\alpha(x,y)}$$

is finite. Here the second supremum is taken over all $x \neq y$ in N_0 such that y is in a normal coordinate of x and $\nabla u(y)$ is the tensor at x obtained from ∇u at y by parallel transport along the radial geodesic from y to x .

Let M be a $m(\geq 2)$ -dimensional manifold with a metric σ . Let TM be the tangent bundle with the natural Sasaki metric σ_s (see [1, 39]) from σ . Therefore we have a $C^{1,\alpha}$ norm for $C^{1,\alpha}$ functions on TM .

Definition 3.1. Let $W \subset M$ be any open set. Define $T_u M$ be the unit tangent bundle on W , i.e. $\{(x, v) : x \in W, v \in T_x M, \langle v, v \rangle \leq 1\}$. For a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function $f(x, v) : TM \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function, we define $\mathcal{N}_W(f)$ as

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{N}_W(f) = \|f\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(T_u W)}$$

Remark 3.2. In (3.2) the definition of the Sasaki metric of TM in general has a complicated form. But this definition is not hard to understand as follows. First suppose $W \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, then any $C^{1,\alpha}$ function $f(x, v)$ on $T_u W$ can be written as $f(x^1, \dots, x^m, v^1, \dots, v^m)$. Then $\mathcal{N}_W(f)$ is proportional to

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{(x,v) \in T_u W} \left\{ |f| + \sum_{i=1}^m \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right| + \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial v^i} \right| \right\} (x, v) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^m \left\{ \sup_{(x,v),(y,v) \in T_u W} \frac{|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x,v) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(y,v)|}{|x-y|^\alpha} \right. \\ & \left. + \sup_{(x,w^1),(x,w^2) \in T_u W} \frac{|\frac{\partial f}{\partial v^i}(x,w^1) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial v^i}(x,w^2)|}{|w^1 - w^2|^\alpha} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

When W is contained in a normal coordinate, the Sasaki metric on TW still takes the form

$$(3.4) \quad \sigma_s = \sum_{i,j,k,l=1}^m \sigma_{ij} dx^i dx^j + h_{kl} dv^k dv^l + w_{ki} dv^i dx^k$$

It is not hard to verify that for any $f \in C^{1,\alpha}(TM)$, $\mathcal{N}_W(f)$ is still proportional to (3.3) up to a constant depending only on (3.4).

The main result of this section is stated as follows.

Theorem 3.3. Let M be a $m(\geq 2)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Fix any open set $W \subset \subset M$ and $K \subset W$ is a compact set. Fix a nonnegative constant Λ , a positive constant ν and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Define \mathcal{G} as the set of

- (1) when $2 \leq m \leq 7$ all C^2 Λ -perimeter minimizer E in W with the mean curvature of ∂E equal to a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function $f_E(x, \vec{v})$ satisfying $\mathcal{N}_W(f_E) \leq \nu$;

- (2) when $m \geq 8$ a sequence of C^2 Λ -perimeter minimizers $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ in W with the mean curvature of ∂E_i equal to a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function $f_i(x, \vec{\nu})$ where $\mathcal{N}_W(f_i) \leq \nu$ and $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ converges locally to a Caccioppoli set F in W such that $\text{sing}(\partial F)$ is an empty set.

Then there is a positive constant μ such that

$$(3.5) \quad \sup_{E \in \mathcal{G}} \{ \max_{\partial E \cap K} |A|^2 \} \leq \mu$$

Here A is the second fundamental form of ∂E .

Our proof mainly follows from Simon [44, section 1].

Remark 3.4. Letting $\Lambda = 0$, Simon [44] established the above result for $2 \leq m \leq 7$ and $m = 8$ plus the condition that all sets E in \mathcal{G} are subgraphs.

In what follows we view M as an embedded m -dimensional submanifold with possible boundary ∂M in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{m+k} for some k .

3.1. Preliminary. The Allard regularity theorem is one of the fundamental results of integral varifolds. It says if at a point the density of multiplicity one integral varifolds is sufficiently close to 1, such varifold in a neighborhood of this point is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ graph for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. The statement of the original version [2, Theorem 8.19] is too complicated for our applications. We record the C^2 version of [45, Theorem 24.2] without introducing the concept of varifolds. Let $B_\rho^s(a)$ be the ball $\{x : |x - a| < \rho\}$ in the s -dimensional Euclidean space centered at a with radius ρ . Let ω_s be the volume of s -dimensional unit ball in \mathbb{R}^{s+1} .

Theorem 3.5 (Theorem 24.2, [45]). *Fix $p > n > 0$ and k . Suppose $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ is a n -dimensional C^2 embedded submanifold with empty boundary in the embedded Euclidean ball $B_\rho^{n+k}(q)$, $q \in \Sigma$ satisfying that*

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{H^n(B_\rho^{n+k}(q) \cap \Sigma)}{\omega_n \rho^n} \leq 1 + \delta, \quad \left(\int_{B_\rho^{n+k}(q)} |\vec{H}|^p d\Sigma \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \rho^{1-\frac{n}{p}} \leq \delta$$

where $d\Sigma$ is the area form of Σ and \vec{H} is the mean curvature vector of Σ in \mathbb{R}^{n+k} .

Then there are two constants $\delta = \delta(n, k, p)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, k, p) \in (0, 1)$ such that (3.6) implies the existence of the linear isometry $q \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ and $u \in C^{1,1-\frac{n}{p}}(\bar{B}_{\gamma\rho}^n(0), \mathbb{R}^k)$ with $u(0) = 0$, $\Sigma \cap B_{\gamma\rho}^{n+k}(q) = q(\text{gr}(u)) \cap B_{\gamma\rho}^{n+k}(q)$ and

$$(3.7) \quad \rho^{-1} \sup_{B_{\gamma\rho}(0)} |u| + \sup_{B_{\gamma\rho}(0)} |Du| + \rho^{1-\frac{n}{p}} \sup_{x,y \in B_{\gamma\rho}(0), x \neq y} \frac{|Du(x) - D(y)|}{|x - y|^{1-\frac{n}{p}}} \leq c\delta^{\frac{n}{4}}$$

where $c = c(n, k, p)$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let W be an open set in a $m(\geq 2)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold M and $K \subset W$ be a compact set. Fix constants $\Lambda, \nu, \alpha \in (0, 1)$, $r_0 < \text{dist}(W, \partial M)$. Let $\delta = \delta(m, k, p)$ be the constant given in Theorem 3.5. Let \mathcal{G} be the set of C^2 Λ -perimeter minimizers in Theorem 3.3.*

Then there is a $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\Lambda, \nu, r_0, \delta, K)$ such that for any $E \in \mathcal{G}$, any $q \in K \cap \partial E$ (3.6) holds on the embedded ball $B_\rho(q)$ for any $\rho \in (0, \rho_1]$.

We mainly follow the idea of [44, section 1].

Proof. Let $\delta = \delta(m, k, p)$ be the constant given in Theorem 3.5, $K \subset W$ is compact. Using a finite collection of balls covering K , by Definition 2.5, there is a universal constant A such that

$$(3.8) \quad \mathbf{H}^{m-1}(\partial E \cap B_{r_0}(p)) \leq A$$

for any $p \in K$ and any $E \in \mathcal{G}$. Here $\dim M = m (\geq 2)$. Let $n = m - 1$ and $k' = k + 1$. By the definition of \mathcal{G} , for each $E \in \mathcal{G}$, its mean curvature $|H_{\partial E}| \leq \nu$ on W . Therefore there is a $\rho_1 < r_0$ such that

$$(3.9) \quad \left(\int_{B_{\rho}^{m+k}(q)} |\vec{H}|^p d(\partial E) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \rho^{1 - \frac{m-1}{p}} \leq \delta$$

for any $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$, any $q \in K$ and any $E \in \mathcal{G}$. This is the second inequality in (3.6).

We argue the first inequality in (3.6) by contradiction. Suppose no $\rho_0 \in (0, \rho_1]$ as above such that the first inequality in (3.6) holds for some $E \in \mathcal{G}$ and some $\rho \in (0, \rho_0)$. Then there is a triple sequence $\{(p_j, E_j, \rho_j) : p_j \in K, E_j \in \mathcal{G}, \rho_j \in (0, \rho_1)\}$ such that

$$(3.10) \quad \mathbf{H}^{m-1}(\partial E_j \cap B_{\rho_j}(p_j)) \geq \omega_{m-1}(1 + \delta)\rho_j^{m-1},$$

$$(3.11) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} p_j = z, \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \rho_j = 0$$

By Lemma 2.11 $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ converges locally to a Λ -perimeter minimizer E and $z \in \partial E$.

From the monotonicity formula in Theorem 2.7, we have

$$(3.12) \quad e^{\kappa(r-\rho_j)} \frac{\mathbf{H}^{m-1}(\partial E_j \cap B_r(p_j))}{\omega_{m-1}r^{m-1}} \geq (1 + \delta)$$

for all $r \in [\rho_j, \rho_1]$. Here κ is a constant depending on K and ν . By (3.11)

$$(3.13) \quad \frac{\mathbf{H}^{m-1}(\partial E_j \cap B_r(z))}{\omega_{m-1}(r - t_j)^{m-1}} \geq e^{\kappa(\rho_j + t_j - r)}(1 + \delta)$$

for all r in $[\rho_j + t_j, \rho_1 + t_j]$. Notice that $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ also converges to 0. By the conclusion (2) of Lemma 2.11 there is a $r_1 < \rho_1$ and a dense set $I \in (0, r_1)$ such that for any $r \in I$ we have

$$(3.14) \quad \frac{\mathbf{H}^{m-1}(\partial E \cap B_r(z))}{\omega_{m-1}r^{m-1}} \geq e^{-\kappa r}(1 + \delta) \geq 1 + \frac{\delta}{2}$$

When $2 \leq m \leq 7$, $\text{sing}(\partial E)$ is empty in W by Theorem 2.9. When $m \geq 8$, $\text{sing}(\partial E)$ is empty by the definition of \mathcal{G} in Theorem 3.3. No matter which case, ∂E is regular in W . Thus ∂E is embedded and $C^{1,\gamma}$ in W for some $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Therefore

$$(3.15) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{H}^{m-1}(\partial E \cap B_r(z))}{\omega_{m-1}r^{m-1}} = 1$$

This is a contradiction to (3.14). Thus we obtain the desirable conclusion. \square

3.2. The proof of Theorem 3.3. .

Proof. Let W be an open set of $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+k}$ and $K \subset W$ be compact. Let \mathcal{G} be the collection of C^2 Λ -perimeter minimizers E satisfying the condition (1) or (2) in Theorem 3.3.

By Lemma 3.6, there is a $\rho = \rho(\Lambda, \nu, r_0, \delta, K)$ such that for any $E \in \mathcal{G}$, any $p \in K \cap \partial E$, (3.6) holds on $B_\rho(p)$. Therefore there is a constant γ in $(0, 1)$ such that (3.7) holds on $B_{\gamma\rho}(p)$. Namely for any two points $p_1, p_2 \in B_{\gamma\rho}(p) \cap \partial E$,

$$(3.16) \quad |\vec{v}(p_1) - \vec{v}(p_2)| \leq C(n, k, \rho, \gamma) \delta^{\frac{m-1}{4}} \text{dist}(p_1, p_2)$$

where on the left-hand side we use the Euclidean distance in \mathbb{R}^{m+k} , in the right-hand side dist is the intrinsic distance of M . Here δ is the fixed constant in (3.6).

Because $K \subset W$ is compact, the following fact is easily obtained.

Lemma 3.7. *There is a positive radius $\rho_1 < \min\{r_0, \gamma\rho\}$ such that for any $p \in K$ on $B_{\rho_1}(p)$ there is a local coordinate $\{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$ such that $g_{ij} = \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j} \rangle$ satisfying the metric $g_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$, $g_{mm} \equiv 1$, $g_{mi} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ and*

$$(3.17) \quad C^{-1}I \leq (g_{ij})(p) \leq CI \quad \rho_1^{1+\alpha} \|g_{ij}\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(B_{\rho_1}(p))} \leq C,$$

Here $i, j, k = 1, \dots, m$ for any p in $B_{\rho_1}(p)$, C is a constant only depending on K and I is the identity matrix.

We denote X_m^p by the unit vector field $\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial u_m}}{\sqrt{\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial u_m}, \frac{\partial}{\partial u_m} \rangle}}$ in $B_{\rho_1}(p)$. By Lemma 3.7 there is a uniformly positive constant C_1 such that

$$(3.18) \quad |X_m^p(p_1) - X_m^p(p_2)| \leq C_1 \text{dist}(p_1, p_2)$$

for any $p \in K$ and any $p_1, p_2 \in B_{\rho_1}(p)$. Here $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean distance in \mathbb{R}^{m+k} .

For any $E \in \mathcal{G}$ and any $p \in \partial E \cap K$, we take the coordinate $\{u^1, \dots, u^m\}$ in $B_{\rho_1}(p)$ as in Lemma 3.7. With a rotation we can require that $X_m^p(p)$ is the normal vector of ∂E at p . Let \vec{v}_E denote the normal vector of ∂E . Combining (3.16) and (3.18) yields that for any $p_1 \in B_{\rho_1}(p)$, any $E \in \mathcal{G}$ and $p \in \partial E \cap K$

$$(3.19) \quad |\langle \vec{v}_E, X_m^p \rangle(p_1) - \langle \vec{v}_E, X_m^p \rangle(p)| = |\langle \vec{v}_E, X_m^p \rangle(p_1) - 1| \leq 2C_2 \text{dist}(p_1, p)$$

Here $C_2 = \max\{C(n, k, \rho, \gamma) \delta^{\frac{m-1}{4}}, C_1\}$. Since C_2 is a fixed constant independent of E , we choose $\rho_2 < \rho_1$ sufficiently small such for any E in \mathcal{G} , any $p \in K \cap \partial E$, any $q \in B_{\rho_2}(p) \cap \partial E$, we have

$$(3.20) \quad \langle \vec{v}_E, X_m^p \rangle(q) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

As a result $B_{\rho_2}(p) \cap \partial E$ is written as $\{y, v(y)\}$ where $y = (u_1, \dots, u_{m-1})$. Moreover $(0, v(0))$ represents the point p . By Lemma 3.7, X_m^p is orthogonal to $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial u_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{m-1}}\}$. Therefore

$$(3.21) \quad \vec{v}_E = \frac{-g^{ij} v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} + X_m^p}{\sqrt{1 + g^{ij} v_i v_j}}, \quad \langle \vec{v}_E, X_m^p \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + g^{ij} v_i v_j}}$$

where $(g^{ij}) = (g_{ij})^{-1}$ is a $(m-1) \times (m-1)$ matrix. Here v_i, v_{ij} denote the first and second derivatives of v with respect to the coordinate $\{u_1, \dots, u_{m-1}\}$.

By (3.17) and (3.20), there is a constant C_3 such that

$$(3.22) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} v_i^2 \leq C_3$$

where $(u_1, \dots, u_{m-1}, v(u_1, \dots, u_m))$ belongs to $\partial E \cap B_{\rho_2}(p)$. Thus $\partial E \cap B_{\rho_2}(p)$ contains a graph of v over a domain

$$(3.23) \quad U_{C_4} := \{(u^1, \dots, u^{m-1}) : u_1^2 + \dots + u_{m-1}^2 \leq C_4\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$$

where C_4 only depends on C_3 . Applying the coordinate in Lemma 3.7, v satisfies the following mean curvature type equation

$$(3.24) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + g^{ij}v_i v_j}} \left(g^{ij} - \frac{v^i v^j}{1 + g^{ij}v_i v_j} \right) v_{ij} = f(y, v, \frac{-g^{ij}v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j} + X_m^p}{\sqrt{1 + g^{ij}v_i v_j}})$$

over the domain U_{C_4} . Here $v^i = g^{ik}v_k$. By Lemma 3.7 and (3.22) we have

$$(3.25) \quad C^{-1}I \leq g^{ij}(y, v) \leq CI, \quad \rho_1^{1+\alpha} \|g_{ij}(y, v)\|_{C^{1,\alpha}} \leq C \text{ on } U_{C_4}$$

Recall that the mean curvature of ∂E is $f(p, \vec{v})$ satisfying $\mathcal{N}_W(f) \leq \nu$ (see Definition 3.1). By Definition 3.1, Remark 3.2 and Lemma 3.7, on U_{C_4} we have

$$(3.26) \quad \|f\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(T_u W)} \leq \nu$$

for $(x, p) \in T_u W$. Notice that the normal vector $\vec{v} = (p_1, \dots, p_{m-1}, p_m)$, $p_i = -g^{ij}v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + g^{ij}v_i v_j}}$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ and $p_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + g^{ij}v_i v_j}} X_m^p$. By (3.22), (3.24) is uniformly parabolic. Recall that $g_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$. By (3.22), (3.24) is uniformly elliptic over U_{C_4} . Because of $g_{ij} = 0$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ at p , with (3.25), (3.26) the classical Schauder estimate implies that

$$(3.27) \quad |A|^2(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} v_{ii}(0) \leq \mu(C_4, \nu, C)$$

Notice that all constants C_4, ν, C are independent of any $p \in K$ and any $E \in \mathcal{G}$.

Thus we conclude (3.5). The proof is completed. \square

4. AN AUXILIARY DIRICHLET PROBLEM

In this section we use the Perron method to study the following Dirichlet problem

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_H(u) = 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ u = \psi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

where

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_H(u) := -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) + H_1\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + H_2\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right)\frac{1}{\omega}$$

$\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}$, Ω is a domain in an $n(\geq 2)$ dimensional Riemannian manifold N , M is the product manifold $N \times \mathbb{R}$ and $H_i(x, z, X, r)$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function on TM for $i = 1, 2$ with $(x, z) \in M$ and $X + r\partial_r \in T_{(x,z)}M$ with $X \in T_x N$.

The main result of this section is stated as follows.

Theorem 4.1. Fix two constants $\beta > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let Ω be a bounded $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain. Let $H_1(x, z, X, 0) = f(x, z, X)$ for any $x \in N, z \in \mathbb{R}, X$ in TN . Suppose

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\partial H_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial z} \geq \beta > 0$$

and

$$(4.4) \quad H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq \max\{f(x, \psi(x), \gamma(x)), -f(x, \psi(x), -\gamma(x))\} \quad x \in \partial\Omega$$

Here γ is the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. Then there is a unique solution to the Dirichlet problem (4.1) in $C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ for any ψ in $C(\partial\Omega)$.

Remark 4.2. The Dirichlet problem (4.1) with condition (4.3) can be used to blow up Jang equations. See Sakovich [38, section 4] for more references. Notice that our restriction on the boundary condition (4.4) is very weak.

Remark 4.3. Bergner [3] first considered the general form of (4.1) in Euclidean spaces with only requiring that $\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial z}$ is non-negative. His smallness condition upon H_1, H_2 and Ω guarantees the a priori C^0 estimate of the solution to (4.1) is uniformly bounded. In our setting the strict monotone condition (4.3) gives the corresponding a priori estimate. An improvement of the boundary condition in [3] was later given by Marquardt [33].

Theorem 4.4. If Ω is a closed $n(\geq 2)$ -dimensional manifold without boundary and (4.3) holds. Then there is a unique solution to the problem $\mathcal{L}_H(u) = 0$ on Ω in $C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)$.

We did not consider the variational approach in [18] since the graph of the solution to the Dirichlet problem (4.1) may not be written as the critical point of area-type functional. The continuous method in [17, section 11.3] did not work in our case because we can not keep (4.4) unchanged in the continuous process even if the C^0 estimate of the solution to (4.1) is available by the maximum principle. We will apply the Perron theory of mean curvature equations proposed by Eichmair [11].

4.1. The Maximum Principle. We collect two well-known maximum principles about mean curvature equations for later use.

Theorem 4.5. Suppose $G(x, u, Du)$ is a C^1 function on $N \times \mathbb{R} \times TN$ satisfying $\partial_u G(x, u, Du) \geq 0$. Suppose $u_1, u_2 \in C^2(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$. Define the elliptic operator

$$(4.5) \quad Lu := -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}}\right) + G(x, u, Du) \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

If $Lu_1(x) \geq Lu_2(x)$ on Ω and $u_1(x) \geq u_2(x)$ on $\partial\Omega$, $u_1(x) \geq u_2(x)$ on Ω . Moreover $u_1(x_0) = u_2(x_0)$ for some point $x_0 \in \Omega$, $u_1(x) \equiv u_2(x)$.

Recall that for a hypersurface Σ with its normal vector $\vec{\nu}$, its mean curvature H_Σ is defined by $\operatorname{div}(\vec{\nu})$.

Theorem 4.6 (Proposition 4, [13]). Let Ω be a domain with C^2 boundary. Let $G : TN \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a C^1 function. Suppose

- (1) Σ is a C^2 hypersurface in the complement of Ω ;
- (2) Σ is tangent to $\partial\Omega$ at a point p in the interior of Σ and $\partial\Omega$;

- (3) in an embedded ball B containing p , for any $q \in B$, $H_\Sigma(q) \leq G(q, \vec{v}_1(q))$,
 $H_{\partial\Omega}(q) \geq G(q, \vec{v}_2(q))$;

where \vec{v}_1 and \vec{v}_2 denote the normal vector of Σ and $\partial\Omega$ respectively satisfying $\vec{v}_1(p) = \vec{v}_2(p)$ pointing into Ω .

Then Σ coincides with $\partial\Omega$ in a neighborhood of p .

Remark 4.7. The condition $\vec{v}_1(p) = \vec{v}_2(p)$ is essential because two unit spheres in Euclidean spaces can touch each other at a common point p with $\vec{v}_1(p) = -\vec{v}_2(p)$.

4.2. The Perron Theory. We use the following definitions of the Perron method from Eichmair [11, section 3]. In what follows we always assume the operator \mathcal{L}_H is defined by (4.2) satisfying (4.3), $B_r(x)$ denotes the embedded ball centering at x with radius r .

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose Ω is bounded. Fix any $c > 0$. For any x in $\bar{\Omega}$ there is a continuous positive function $r(x)$ such that the Dirichlet problem $\mathcal{L}_H(u) = 0$ in $B_r(x)$ with $u = \psi$ on ∂B_r , $r \in (0, r(x))$ has a unique solution in $C^{3,\alpha}(B_r(x)) \cap C(\bar{B}_r(x))$ for any $\psi \in C(\partial B_r(x))$ satisfying $|\psi| \leq c$.*

Proof. Fix any $x \in \bar{\Omega}$. First we assume that ψ is in $C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{B}_r(x))$. For any $s \in (0, 1)$, let $v_s \in C^{3,\alpha}(B_r(x)) \cap C(\bar{B}_r(x))$ be the solution to the Dirichlet problem

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) + s\left\{G(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega})\right\} = 0 & \text{on } B_r(x) \\ u = s\psi & \text{on } \partial B_r(x) \end{cases}$$

where $G(p, Y)$ be a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function on TM given by $G(p, Y) = H_1(x, u, X, t) + H_2(x, u, X, t)t$ with $p = (x, u)$ and $Y = X + t\partial_r$ for $X \in TN$. Since $|\psi| \leq c$ and $\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial z} \geq \beta$, by applying the maximum principle

$$(4.7) \quad \max_{\bar{B}_r(y)} |v_s| < c_0 := c_0(\mu_0, \beta, c)$$

Here $\mu_0 := \{x \in \Omega, X \in T\Omega, \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1, |t| \leq 1, |u| \leq c, |H_1(x, \psi, X, t)| + |H_2(x, \psi, X, t)|\}$. Thus on $B_r(x)$ it holds that

$$(4.8) \quad s\left|H_1\left(x, v_s, -\frac{Dv_s}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + H_2\left(x, v_s, -\frac{Dv_s}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right)\frac{1}{\omega}\right| \leq c_1 =: c_1(c_0, \mu_0),$$

where $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Dv_s|^2}$ for any $s \in [0, 1]$. Since $\bar{\Omega}$ is compact, there is a continuous function $r(x)$ depending on x such that for each $r \in (0, r(x))$, the mean curvature of $B_r(x)$ satisfies

$$(4.9) \quad H_{\partial B_r(x)} = \frac{n-1}{r} + o(r) > c_1$$

Therefore there is a positive constant $\mu := \mu(c_0, \beta)$ such that for any $s \in (0, 1)$,

$$(4.10) \quad s\mathcal{N}_W(G) \leq \mu$$

where $W := \{(x, u) : x \in \bar{\Omega}, |u| \leq c_0\}$. By (4.9), (4.8) and Theorem A.3, there are two positive constants κ, ν (independent of $s \in [0, 1]$) and $u_{s,\pm} = s\psi \pm \frac{\log(1+\kappa d(x))}{\nu}$ such that

$$(4.11) \quad \pm \mathcal{L}_s(u_{s,\pm}) \geq 0$$

on the domain $\Gamma_{s,\pm} := \{x' \in B_r(x) : \pm u_{s,\pm}(x') < c_0, d(x') < \frac{1}{2\nu}\}$ and $\pm u_{\pm} = c_0$ on $\partial\Gamma_{s,\pm} \setminus \partial B_r(x)$. Applying Theorem 4.5, we obtain

$$(4.12) \quad s\psi(x') - \frac{\log(1 + \kappa d(x'))}{\nu} \leq v_s(x') \leq s\psi(x') + \frac{\log(1 + \kappa d(x'))}{\nu}$$

for any x' in $\Gamma_{s,\pm}$. Here $d(x') = \text{dist}(x', \partial B_r(x))$. Because $v_s = s\psi$ on $\partial B_r(x)$ this implies that

$$(4.13) \quad \max_{\partial B_r(x)} |Dv_s| \leq c_3 =: c_3(\kappa, \nu)$$

for any $s \in [0, 1]$. By (4.3), (4.10) and (4.13), the item (2) of Theorem A.2 implies that

$$(4.14) \quad \max_{\bar{B}_r(y)} |Dv_s| \leq c_4 =: c_4(c_3, \mu)$$

Applying the classical Schauder estimate the $C^{1,\alpha}$ norm of v_s is uniformly bounded. By the continuous method in [17, Theorem 11.4 and Section 11.3] we obtain the existence of the solution $u \in C^{3,\alpha}(B_r(x)) \cap C(\bar{B}_r(x))$ to the Dirichlet problem $\mathcal{L}_H(u) \equiv 0$ on $B_r(x)$ with $u = \psi$ on $\partial B_r(x)$ for any $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{B}_r(x))$ satisfying $|\psi| \leq c$.

Now we consider the case that ψ is in $C(\partial B_r(x))$. Construct two monotone sequences $\{\psi_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ for $i = 1, 2$ in $C^{2,\alpha}(\partial B_r(x))$ which converges to ψ increasingly or decreasingly in the sense of $C(\partial B_r(y))$. Let $\{u_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \in C^{3,\alpha}(B_r(x)) \cap C(\bar{B}_r(x))$ be the solutions to the problem (4.6) for boundary data $\{\psi_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. Since $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial u} \geq 0$, by Theorem 4.5 $\{u_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $i = 1, 2$ are increasing and decreasing sequences respectively. By Theorem A.2 and Theorem 4.5, $\{u_{1,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ locally converges to a function $u(x)$ in $C^{3,\alpha}(B_r(x))$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_H(u) = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$(4.15) \quad u_{1,k} \leq u \leq u_{2,k} \text{ on } B_r(x)$$

Recall that $\{\psi_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ for $i = 1, 2$ in $C^{2,\alpha}(\partial B_r(x))$ converges to ψ increasingly or decreasingly in the sense of $C(\partial B_r(x))$. Therefore u belongs to $C(\bar{B}_r(x))$.

This gives the existence in Lemma 4.8. The uniqueness is from (4.3) and the maximum principle in Theorem 4.5. The proof is completed. \square

Definition 4.9 (\mathcal{L}_H lift of a Perron subsolution). [11, Definition 3.2]. *Let x be a point in Ω and $r(x)$ be the continuous positive function in Lemma 4.8. Let \underline{u} be a Perron subsolution (supersolution) of \mathcal{L}_H on Ω if the following property holds.*

- (P) *Fix any $r \in (0, r(x))$ and $B_r(x)$ be the embedded ball centered at x with radius r in Ω . Let $u \in C(\bar{B}_r(x)) \cap C^2(B_r(x))$ be the unique solution of $\mathcal{L}_H(u) = 0$ on $B_r(x)$ with $u = \underline{u}$ on $\partial B_r(x)$. Then $u \geq \underline{u}$ ($u \leq \underline{u}$).*

Moreover, the function \hat{u} is defined by

$$\hat{u} = \begin{cases} u(x) & \text{on } B_r(x) \\ \underline{u}(x) & \text{on } \Omega \setminus B_r(x) \end{cases}$$

is called as the \mathcal{L}_H lift of \underline{u} with respect to $B_r(x)$.

Definition 4.10 ([11], Definition 3.3). *Let \bar{u} be a Perron supersolution of \mathcal{L}_H on Ω . We denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}} := \{\underline{u} \in C(\Omega) : \underline{u} \text{ is a Perron subsolution of } \mathcal{L}_H \text{ on } \Omega \text{ with } \underline{u} \leq \bar{u}\}$ the class of all Perron subsolution of \mathcal{L}_H lying below \bar{u} .*

By the maximum principle in Theorem 4.5, we have the following properties on Perron subsolutions.

Lemma 4.11 (Lemma 3.1, [11]). *Let \bar{u} and $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$ be given by Definition 4.10. Then the following two basic properties of $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$ hold*

- (1) *If $\underline{u}, \underline{v} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$, then $\max\{\underline{u}, \underline{v}\} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$;*
- (2) *If $\underline{u} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$, $x \in \Omega$, $r \in (0, r(x))$ and \hat{u} is the \mathcal{L}_ϕ lift of \underline{u} with respect to $B_r(x)$, then $\hat{u} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$.*

Definition 4.12 ([11], Definition 3.4). *Let \bar{u} be a Perron supersolution of \mathcal{L}_H such that $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}} \neq \emptyset$. The function $u^P(x) := \sup\{\underline{u}(x) : \underline{u} \in \mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}\}$ is called the Perron solution of \mathcal{L}_H on Ω with respect to \bar{u} .*

By the interior gradient estimate in Theorem A.2 we obtain the interior regularity of the Perron solution as follows.

Lemma 4.13. *Suppose Ω is a domain. Let \bar{u} be a Perron supersolution on Ω such that $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}} \neq \emptyset$. Let $u^P(x)$ be the Perron solution of \mathcal{L}_H on Ω with respect to \bar{u} . Then $u^P \in C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{L}_H u^P = 0$ on Ω .*

Remark 4.14. In this lemma we do not require that Ω is bounded.

Proof. Fix any $x_0 \in \Omega$ and $r < \frac{1}{4}r(x_0)$ such that $B_r(x_0)$ is an embedded ball and for any y in $B_r(x_0)$, $r(y) \geq \frac{1}{2}r(x_0) > 2r$. Here we use the fact that $r(x)$ is a continuous function in Lemma 4.8. By the definition of the Perron solution, there is a sequence $\{v_i(x)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$ such that $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} v_i(x_0) = u^P(x_0)$.

Now let $\{\hat{v}_i(x)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be the \mathcal{L}_H lift of $v_i(x)$ with respect to $B_r(x_0)$. Since $\hat{v}_i(x)$ is uniformly bounded on $B_r(x_0)$, Theorem A.2 implies that $\max_{x \in B_{r'}(x_0)} |D\hat{v}_i|$ is uniformly bounded for any $r' < r$. By the classical Schauder estimate so is the $C^{3,\alpha}$ norm of \hat{v}_i on $B_{r'}(x_0)$. As a result, possible choose a subsequence, $\{\hat{v}_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ converges to $\hat{u}(x)$ in the locally $C^{3,\alpha}$ sense. Moreover $\mathcal{L}_H \hat{u} = 0$ on $B_r(x_0)$. By definition $\hat{u} \leq u^P$ on $B_r(x_0)$ and $\hat{u}(x_0) = u^P(x_0)$.

Suppose there is a point y_0 in $B_r(x_0)$ such that $\hat{u}(y_0) < u^P(y_0)$. Now let $\{v'_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ in $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{u}}$ such that $v'_i \geq v_i$ for each i $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} v'_i(y_0) = u^P(y_0)$. Let \hat{v}'_i be the \mathcal{L}_H lift of v'_i with respect to $B_{r(y_0)}(y_0)$. Since $r(y_0) > r$, x_0 is contained in $B_{r(y_0)}(y_0)$. As the above derivation in the previous paragraph, $\{\hat{v}'_i\}$ converges to a $\hat{u}'(x)$ in the local C^2 sense. Moreover $\mathcal{L}_H \hat{u}' = 0$ on $B_{r(y_0)}(y_0)$. Let B be the set $B_{r(y_0)}(y_0) \cap B_r(x_0)$. Since $\hat{v}'_i \geq \hat{v}_i$ for each i , $\hat{u}' \geq \hat{u}$ on B . On the other hand, $\hat{u}(x_0) = u^P(x_0) \geq \hat{u}'(x_0)$ and $\mathcal{L}_H \hat{u} = \mathcal{L}_H \hat{u}' \equiv 0$ on B . By Lemma 4.8, $\hat{u}' \equiv \hat{u}$ on B . This is a contradiction since $\hat{u}(y_0) < u^P(y_0) = \hat{u}'(y_0)$. As a result $u^P \equiv \hat{u}$ on $B_r(x_0)$. The proof is completed. \square

4.3. Conclusion of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.4.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4.1. Suppose Ω is a bounded $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain. Without loss of generality we can assume $\psi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$. The general case $\psi \in C(\partial\Omega)$ follows from the same proof in the last part of Lemma 4.8 with a monotone approximation process.

Notice that $\beta > 0$. Define a finite positive number α_1 as

$$(4.16) \quad \alpha_1 := \frac{1}{\beta} \max\{|H_1(x, \psi(x), X, r)| + |H_2(x, \psi(x), X, r)| : x \in \bar{\Omega}, X \in T\Omega, \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1, |r| \leq 1\} + \max_{\bar{\Omega}} |\psi| + 1$$

Since $\frac{\partial H_1}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial z} \geq \beta > 0$, $\pm \mathcal{L}_H(\pm \alpha_1) \geq 0$ on Ω . As a result α_1 and $-\alpha_1$ is the Perron supersolution and the Perron subsolution of $\mathcal{L}_H u = 0$ on Ω respectively.

In Theorem A.3 let c_0 be the constant $\alpha_1 + 1$. By Theorem A.3, there are two positive constants κ, ν and $v_{\pm} = \psi \pm \frac{\log(1+\kappa d(x))}{\nu}$ such that

$$(4.17) \quad \pm \mathcal{L}_H(v_{\pm}) \geq 0$$

on the domain $\Gamma_{\pm} := \{x \in \Omega : \pm v_{\pm}(x) < \alpha_1 + 1, d(x) < \frac{1}{2\nu}\}$ and $\pm v_{\pm} = \alpha_1 + 1$ on $\partial\Gamma_{\pm} \setminus \partial\Omega$. Here $d(x)$ denotes the distance function from Ω which is well-defined because Ω is bounded. Define δ as the number

$$(4.18) \quad \delta := \min\{\inf\{d(x, y) : x \in \Gamma_+, v_+(x) \leq \alpha_1, y \in \partial\Gamma_+ \setminus \partial\Omega\}, \\ \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in \Gamma_-, -v_-(x) \leq \alpha_1, y \in \partial\Gamma_- \setminus \partial\Omega\}\}$$

It is obvious that $\delta > 0$. Now we define two functions

$$(4.19) \quad \pm u_{\pm} := \begin{cases} \min\{\pm v_{\pm}, \alpha_1\} & \text{on } \Gamma_{\pm} \\ \alpha_1 & \text{on } \Omega \setminus \Gamma_{\pm} \end{cases}$$

By definition u_+ and u_- are continuous on $\bar{\Omega}$ with $u_{\pm} = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Indeed u_+ and u_- are the Perron subsolution and the Perron supersolution of $\mathcal{L}_H(u)$ respectively. Let $r(x)$ be the positive continuous function in Lemma 4.8. For any $x \in \Omega$, define

$$(4.20) \quad r_0(x) = \frac{1}{2} \min\{r(x), \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega), \delta\}$$

By the definition of δ for any fixed $x \in \Omega$ and fixed $r < r_0(x)$, there are only two cases happen (a): $B_r(x) \subset \Gamma_+$, $u_+ \leq v_+$ or (b): $u_+ \equiv \alpha_1$ on $B_r(x)$. Then on $B_r(x)$ the \mathcal{L}_H lift of u_+ , \hat{u}_+ , is well-defined. If $B_r(x) \subset \Gamma_+$, $\hat{u}_+ \leq v_+$ on $B_r(x)$ because v_+ is a Perron supersolution on $B_r(x)$. Otherwise $u_+ = \alpha_1$ on $B_r(x)$, then $\hat{u}_+ \leq \alpha_1 \equiv u_+$. No matter which case we have $\hat{u}_+ \leq \min\{v_+, \alpha_1\} = u_+$ on Γ_+ . As a result, u_+ is a Perron supersolution on Ω . As above, u_- is a Perron subsolution on Ω .

Since $u_- \in \mathcal{S}_{u_+}$, by Lemma 4.13 the Perron solution $u^P(x) := \sup\{v(x) : x \in \Omega, v \in \mathcal{S}_{u_+}\}$ exists and $u^P \in C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{L}_H u^P = 0$ on Ω . On the other hand, $u_- \leq u^P \leq u_+$ on $\bar{\Omega}$. Because both of u_+ and u_- are continuous on $\bar{\Omega}$ and equal to ψ on $\partial\Omega$. Thus u^P belongs to $C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)$ and is solution to the Dirichlet problem in (4.1). The uniqueness is obvious because of (4.3) and the maximum principle in Theorem 4.5.

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is completed. \square

Proof. The proof of Theorem 4.4. A key fact is that Ω is a closed Riemannian manifold without boundary. Thus in what follows there is no derivation involving any boundary. Define a positive number

$$(4.21) \quad \alpha_2 := \frac{1}{\beta} \max\{|H_1(x, 0, X, r)| + |H_2(x, 0, X, r)| : x \in \bar{\Omega}, \\ X \in T\Omega, \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1, |r| \leq 1\} + 1$$

where β is from (4.3). A direct computation shows that $\pm \mathcal{L}_H(\pm \alpha_2) \geq 0$. Thus $\alpha_2, -\alpha_2$ are the Perron supersolution and the Perron subsolution of $\mathcal{L}_H(u) = 0$ respectively.

The remainder is the same as the last part in the proof of Theorem 4.1. The proof is finished. \square

5. THE NC-F PROPERTY

In this section we first discuss the relationship between the Nc-f property and the Ricci assumptions of a domain. Then we give an example that a Nc-f domain contains a minimal hypersurface when $f \equiv 0$.

Definition 5.1 (Defintion 1.2, the Nc-f property). *Fix $n \geq 2$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and N is a n -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Suppose f is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function in the tangent bundle TN and Ω is a $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain with embedded boundary. We say that Ω has the Nc-f property if there is no Caccioppoli set E in the closure of Ω satisfying*

- (1) *for any $p \in \partial E$, E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer (see Definition 2.5) in a neighborhood of p for some positive constant Λ ;*
- (2) *the regular part $reg(\partial E)$ (see Definition 2.5) is $C^{2,\alpha}$, embedded and orientable with its mean curvature equal to $f(x, \vec{v}(x))$ for any x in $reg(\partial E)$ ($-f(x, -\vec{v}(x))$ for any x in $reg(\partial E)$);*

Here \vec{v} is the outward normal vector of x in $reg(\partial E)$, the mean curvature is defined as $div(\vec{v})$.

Remark 5.2. In this definition we do not require that Ω is bounded. By Theorem 2.9 the dimension of the Hausdorff dimension of $\partial E \setminus reg(\partial E)$ is at most $n - 8$.

In the case $7 \geq n \geq 2$, Ω is a Nc-f domain if and only if in its closure there is no C^2 domain E with the mean curvature of its boundary equal to $f(x, \vec{v}(x))$ for all $x \in \partial E$ or $-f(x, -\vec{v}(x))$ for all $x \in \partial E$.

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose Ω is a $C^{2,\alpha}$ n -dimensional ($n \geq 2$) bounded domain with connected embedded boundary $\partial\Omega$ in N . Let $\gamma(x)$ be the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ at x . Then Ω has the Nc-f property if*

- (1) *f is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function on TN with $\max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, \vec{v} \in T_x N, \langle \vec{v}, \vec{v} \rangle \leq 1} |f(x, \vec{v})| \leq \mu$ for some constant μ such that neither the mean curvature of $\partial\Omega$ is equal to $f(\cdot, \gamma(\cdot))$ on the whole $\partial\Omega$ or ($-f(\cdot, -\gamma(\cdot))$ on the whole $\partial\Omega$).*
- (2) *one of the following holds:*
 - (a) $H_{\partial\Omega} \geq \mu$, $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, e \in T_x N, \langle e, e \rangle \leq 1} Ric(e, e) > -\frac{\mu^2}{n-1}$;
 - (b) $H_{\partial\Omega} > \mu$, $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, e \in T_x N, \langle e, e \rangle \leq 1} Ric(e, e) \geq -\frac{\mu^2}{n-1}$;

Proof. We argue the conclusion by contradiction. Suppose a non-empty set E is a Caccioppoli set in Ω such that (a) for any $p \in \partial E$, E is a Λ_p -perimeter minimizer in a neighborhood of p for some positive constant Λ_p ; (b) $reg(\partial E)$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$ embedded such that $H_{reg(\partial E)}(x) \equiv f(x, \vec{v})$ for any x in $reg(\partial E)$ (or $H_{reg(\partial E)}(x) \equiv -f(x, -\vec{v})$ for any x in $reg(\partial E)$). Here \vec{v} is the normal outward vector of $reg(\partial E)$.

Now define $l = \inf_{x \in E} dist(\partial\Omega, x)$ where $dist$ is the distance function induced by the metric of N . Let l_m be the number $\sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} dist(x, \partial\Omega)$. We have $l_m > l$ because E is not empty and $vol(E) > 0$ and $vol(\Omega \setminus E) > 0$. First we assume $l > 0$.

We use an idea from Kasue [24, Page, 120]. Because $l \in (0, l_m)$, there is a $\varepsilon > 0$ and a geodesic $\beta(s)$ for the arc-length parameter $s \in (-\varepsilon, l + \varepsilon]$ connecting $\beta(0) = y_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $\beta(l) \in \partial E$ such that $dist(\partial\Omega, \beta(t)) = t$ for $t \in (0, l + \varepsilon)$. Let $\xi(y)$ be the inner normal vector of the point y on $\partial\Omega$. Define the map

$$(5.1) \quad \exp : \partial\Omega \times (-\varepsilon, l + \varepsilon) \rightarrow N, \text{ given by } \exp(y, t) = \exp_y(t\xi(y))$$

Here \exp_y denotes the exponential map at y . By the definition of $\beta(t)$, there is no conjugate point on $\{\beta(t) : t \in [0, l + \varepsilon)\}$. Therefore there is a connected open

set $V \subset \partial\Omega$ containing y_0 and $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that \exp is a diffeomorphism from $V \times (-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1, l + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_1)$ into its image.

Let V_t denote the image of $V \times \{t\}$ under the map \exp for each $t \in [0, l]$. Since $\partial\Omega$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$, V_t is $C^{2,\alpha}$ (see [29]). Moreover for all $t \in (0, l)$, V_t is disjoint with ∂E because $\text{dist}(V_t, \partial\Omega) \leq t < l$. Let H_{V_t} denote the mean curvature of V_t at $\exp_y(t\xi(y))$ with respect the outward unit normal vector $-d(\exp)(\partial_t)$. We can view $\{V_t\}_{t>0}$ as a flow with the velocity ∂_t as a function on $V \times [0, l + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}]$. Choose $\vec{v} = -d(\exp)(\partial_t)$ and $f = -1$, $\partial_t V_t = f\vec{v}$ and by [21, Theorem 3.2 (v)] we have

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H_{V_t}}{\partial t} &= |A|^2 + \text{Ric}(-d(\exp)(\partial_t)), -d(\exp)(\partial_t)) \\ &\geq \frac{H_{V_t}^2}{n-1} - \frac{\mu^2}{n-1} \quad \text{by the condition (2)} \end{aligned}$$

where A is the second fundamental form of V_t in N . From the condition (2) and $V_0 \subset \partial\Omega$, we always have $H_{\partial\Omega} \geq \mu$. By the maximum principle of ordinary differential equation we obtain that

$$(5.3) \quad H_{V_t} \geq \mu$$

in a neighborhood of $\beta(l)$. Since in neighborhood of $\beta(l)$ E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer, by Lemma 2.8 $\beta(l)$ belongs to $\text{reg}(\partial E)$. Because $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ is $C^{2,\gamma}$ with $H_{\text{reg}(\partial E)} = \pm f(x, \pm\vec{v})$ near $\beta(l)$ for some $\gamma \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. By Theorem 4.6, (5.3) and (5.2), V_t coincides with $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ near $\beta(l)$ and

$$(5.4) \quad H_{V_t} \equiv \mu, \quad \text{Ric}_{\exp(t\xi(y))}(-d(\exp)(\partial_t), -d(\exp)(\partial_t)) \equiv \frac{\mu^2}{n-1}$$

for any $t \in [0, l]$ and $y \in V$. This is a contradiction to condition (2).

Second we assume $l = 0$. Then ∂E is tangent to $\partial\Omega$ at some point $p \in \partial\Omega$. By Lemma 2.8 in a neighborhood of p ∂E is contained in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$. By the condition (2) and Theorem 4.6 $\partial\Omega$ is contained in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ and its mean curvature is equal to $f(x, \vec{v})$ near p or $-f(x, -\vec{v})$ near p where \vec{v} is the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. Since $\partial\Omega$ is connected, this means curvature conclusion holds on the whole $\partial\Omega$. However, this is a contradiction to condition (1). No matter which case we will obtain the contradiction.

Therefore Ω has the Nc-f property. The proof is completed. \square

The following example shows that the Nc-f domain can have nontrivial topology even when $f \equiv 0$.

Example 5.4. Let N be any $n(\geq 2)$ -dimensional closed Riemannian manifold with a smooth metric σ . Fix $a > 0$. Define a warped product manifold

$$(5.5) \quad \{N \times (-a, a), \quad \phi^2(r)(\sigma + dr^2)\}$$

where $\phi(r) : (-a, a) \times \mathbb{R}$ is a positive smooth function satisfying

$$(5.6) \quad \phi'(0) = 0, \quad \pm\phi'(\pm t) > 0, \quad t \in (0, a)$$

By [53, Lemma 3.1] the mean curvature of the slice $N_t := N \times \{t\}$ with respect to the direction $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ is

$$(5.7) \quad H_{N_t} = \frac{n\phi'(t)}{\phi^2(t)} \quad \text{for any } t \in (-a, a)$$

Therefore by (5.6) $H_{\partial(N \times (-s, s))} > 0$ with respect to the outward normal vector. Notice that N_0 is a minimal hypersurface in $N \times (-s, s)$. Indeed we claim that

Lemma 5.5. *Let $f \equiv 0$. For any $s \in (0, a)$, $N \times (-s, s)$ has the Nc-f property.*

Proof. Suppose $E \subset N \times (-s, s)$ is a Caccioppoli set satisfying (a) for any $p \in \partial E$, E is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in a neighborhood of p for some positive constant Λ_p , (b) $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ is embedded, C^2 and minimal. Since E is not empty, then $\text{vol}(E) > 0$ and $\text{vol}(N \times (-s, s) \setminus E) > 0$. Then there are two constants a and b in $[-s, s]$ such that $E \subset N \times [a, b]$, both $\partial E \cap N_a$ and $\partial E \cap N_b$ are not empty. By Lemma 2.8, both $\partial E \cap N_a$ and $\partial E \cap N_b$ are contained in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$. By (5.6) and (5.7), at least one of the mean curvature of N_a and N_b is strictly positive with respect to the outward normal vector from $N \times (a, b)$. By Theorem 4.6, this positive mean curvature slice is contained in $\text{reg}(\partial E)$ with vanishing mean curvature. This is a contradiction.

Therefore $N \times (-s, s)$ has the Nc-f property when $f \equiv 0$. \square

6. CONCLUSION OF THEOREM 1.3

The main difficulty to show Theorem 1.3 is that there is no C^0 a priori estimate for the solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.1). Our main idea is to use the Nc-f property to prevent the ‘‘real’’ blow-up and obtain the existence of the finite solution. This idea is first applied by Schoen-Yau [42, Corollary 1]. See the work of Eichmair [11, 12] for further applications and references.

6.1. The proof of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 6.1 (Theorem 1.3). *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Suppose N is an $n(\geq 2)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold. Let $F(x, X, \mathbb{R})$ be a $C^{1, \alpha}(TN \times \mathbb{R})$ function satisfying that $F(x, X, 0) = f(x, X)$ for any (x, X) in TN where $x \in N, X \in T_x N$. Suppose*

- (i) Ω is a bounded n -dimensional $C^{2, \alpha}$ domain in N and the mean curvature of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ satisfies

$$(6.1) \quad H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq \max\{\pm f(x, \pm\gamma(x))\}$$

where $\gamma(x)$ is the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$ at x ;

- (ii) Ω has the Nc-f property;
- (iii) $\phi(x, z, Y, r) : T(N \times \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth uniformly bounded function with $\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial z} \geq 0$.

Then the Dirichlet problem (1.1)

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\text{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right)(x) - F\left(x, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + \phi\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right)\frac{1}{\omega} = 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ u = \psi & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

admits a unique solution in $C^{3, \alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ for any $\psi(x) \in C(\partial\Omega)$ where $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}$.

We record the results of Spruck [46] on constant mean curvature equations and Casteras-Heinonen-Holopainen [5] on weighted minimal graphs as follows.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose Ω is a bounded $C^{2, \alpha}$ domain in an n -dimensional manifold and μ is a positive constant satisfying*

$$(6.2) \quad \min_{x \in \Omega, e \in T_x N, \langle e, e \rangle \leq 1} \text{Ric}(e, e) \geq -\frac{\mu^2}{n-1}, \quad H_{\partial\Omega} \geq \mu$$

then the Dirichlet problem (1.1) has a solution in $C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$

- (1) when $F \equiv \mu$, $\phi \equiv 0$ by Spruck [46, Theorem 1.4] ;
- (2) when $F = \langle \frac{Du}{\omega}, Dm(x) \rangle$, $\phi = h'(z)$ with $\sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, z \in \mathbb{R}} \{|F| + |\phi|\} \leq \mu$ by Casteras-Heinonen-Holopainen [5, Theorem 1.2].

Here m, h are C^2 functions on Ω .

For an earlier similar result we refer to Dajczer-Hinojosa-de Lira[9].

Remark 6.3. If the inequality in (6.2) holds strictly, by Theorem 5.3 Ω has the Nc-f property. Therefore in this case Theorem 6.1 recovers the result in Theorem 6.2.

Remark 6.4. The equation (1.1) appears in the following setting. Let M_f be the conformally product manifold

$$(6.3) \quad (N \times (a, b), e^{2f}(\sigma + dr^2))$$

where f is a C^∞ function on $N \times (a, b)$. Let u is a C^3 function over a domain in N . By [53, Lemma 3.1], the graph of u is minimal in M_f if and only if u satisfies

$$(6.4) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) + n\langle Df, -\frac{Du}{\omega} \rangle + n\frac{\partial f}{\partial r} \frac{1}{\omega} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

Here D denotes the gradient of f with respect to x for fixed u .

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 6.1.

Proof. By the condition (iii), there is a positive constant β_1 satisfying $|\phi| \leq \beta_1$. Fix any $\psi \in C(\partial\Omega)$. By the condition (i), (iii) and Theorem 4.1, for any $t \in (0, 1)$, there is a unique solution u_t in $C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ solving

$$(6.5) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) - F\left(x, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + \left(\phi\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + tu\right)\frac{1}{\omega} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

with $u = \psi$ for any $\psi \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Define

$$(6.6) \quad F_t(p, Y) := F(x, X, r) - (\phi(x, z, X, r) + tz)r$$

for $t \in (0, 1)$ where $p = (x, z)$, $Y = X + r\partial_r$. It is obvious that F_t is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function on $T(N \times \mathbb{R})$. The following property is very useful. Define the subgraph of u_t as

$$(6.7) \quad U_t := \{(x, r) : x \in \Omega, r < u_t(x)\}$$

Lemma 6.5. *It holds that*

- (1) for each $t \in (0, 1)$ the mean curvature of ∂U_t in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ is

$$(6.8) \quad H_{\partial U_t}(p) = F_t(p, \vec{v}),$$

Here $p = (x, u_t(x)) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\vec{v} = \frac{-Du_t + \partial_r}{\sqrt{1 + |Du_t|^2}}$ is the upward normal vector at p .

- (2) Define $\beta_2 = \max_{\{x \in \bar{\Omega}, \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1, |r| \leq 1\}} \{|\psi(x)|, |F(x, X, r) + \phi(x, \psi(x), X, r)|\}$. For any $t \in (0, 1)$

$$(6.9) \quad |tu_t| \leq \beta_2, \quad \left|\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du_t}{\omega}\right)\right| \leq 2\beta_2 \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

where $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du_t|^2}$.

Proof. The item (1) follows from (6.5) and (6.6). The item (2) follows from applying the maximum principle in (6.5). \square

General Case: First we assume that Theorem 6.1 holds in the case of $\phi \equiv 0$. Then there are two solutions v_{\pm} in $C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ to the Dirichlet problems given by

$$(6.10) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) - F\left(x, \frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) \mp \frac{\beta_1 + \beta_2}{\omega} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

with $u = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$. Here we use the fact that

$$(6.11) \quad G_{\pm}(x, X, r) = F(x, X, r) \pm (\beta_1 + \beta_2)r, \quad G(x, X, 0) = f(x, X)$$

and for such G_{\pm} the condition (i) and (ii) in Theorem 6.1 still hold for the same f . By Theorem 4.5 we obtain

$$(6.12) \quad v_- \leq u_t \leq v_+ \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

for any $t \in (0, 1)$. Thus

$$(6.13) \quad \sup_{t \in (0,1)} |u_t| \leq \kappa$$

for a positive constant κ independent of t .

Let W be the set $\{(x, z) \in M : x \in \bar{\Omega}, |z| \leq \kappa\}$. By (6.6) it is obvious that

$$(6.14) \quad \mathcal{N}_W(F_t) \leq c$$

where c is a positive constant independent of $t \in (0, 1)$. By the conclusion (1) in Theorem A.2 the uniformly C^0 estimate implies that $|Du_t|$ is locally uniformly bounded in Ω . By the classical Schauder estimate the $C^{3,\alpha}$ norm of $\{u_t\}_{t \in (0,1)}$ is locally uniformly bounded in Ω . Letting $t \rightarrow 0$, a sequence of $\{u_t\}_{t > 0}$ will converge to a $C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)$ function u locally as $t \rightarrow 0$. This means that $u \in C^{3,\alpha}(\Omega)$ solves

$$(6.15) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) - F\left(x, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + \phi\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) \frac{1}{\omega} = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

On the other hand from (6.12) we have

$$(6.16) \quad v_- \leq u \leq v_+ \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

Therefore u belongs to $C(\bar{\Omega})$. Then u is the solution to the Dirichlet problem (1.1) for fixed boundary data $\psi \in C(\partial\Omega)$. The uniqueness follows from the condition (iii) in Theorem 6.1. Thus we obtain Theorem 6.1 for general ϕ just assuming Theorem 6.1 holds for $\phi \equiv 0$.

The special case $\phi \equiv 0$. From now on we assume $\phi \equiv 0$. Our main objective is to establish (6.13) for $\phi \equiv 0$ under the Nc-f property of Ω .

Define the set Ω_a by

$$(6.17) \quad \Omega_a = \{x \in N : d(x, \Omega), d(x, \Omega) < a\}$$

for some positive constant a . Recall that $gr(\psi) := \{(x, \psi(x)) : x \in \partial\Omega\}$. Since $\partial gr(u_t) = gr(\psi)$ in $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, by Lemma 2.12 and (6.9) one sees that

Lemma 6.6. *There are two positive constants $\delta := \delta(\Omega)$ and $\Lambda := \Lambda(\Omega, \mu)$ such that U_t is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_{\delta} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus gr(\psi)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$.*

Notice that δ and Λ are independent of $t \in (0, 1)$. By Lemma 2.11, there is a sequence $\{t_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ converging to 0 such that $\{U_{t_l}\}$ converges locally to U_0 . Moreover U_0 is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_{\delta} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus gr(\psi)$. By Lemma 15.1 in [18] U_0 is the subgraph of a generalized function u_0 over Ω . Here u_0 may take infinity value on Ω . We define two sets

$$(6.18) \quad \Omega_{\pm} = \{x \in \Omega : u_0(x) = \pm\infty\}$$

Lemma 6.7. *Let Λ, δ be the two constants in Lemma 6.6. It holds that*

- (1) Ω_{\pm} are Λ -perimeter minimizers (see Definition 2.5) in Ω_{δ} ;
- (2) $\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_{\pm})$ are embedded, C^2 and orientable with

$$(6.19) \quad H_{\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_{\pm})}(x) = \pm f(x, \pm\gamma(x))$$

Here $x \in \text{reg}(\partial\Omega_{\pm})$ and $\gamma(x)$ is outward normal vector of $x \in \partial\Omega_{\pm}$ with respect to Ω_{\pm} .

Proof. Define $T_s : N \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow N \times \mathbb{R}$ as $T_s(x, z) = (x, z - s)$ for any $(x, z) \in N \times \mathbb{R}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Since T_s is an isometry of $N \times \mathbb{R}$, by Lemma 6.6 $T_s(U_0)$ are Λ -perimeter minimizers in $\Omega_{\delta} \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{gr}(\psi - s)$. By (6.18) and Lemma 2.11 we have

$$(6.20) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} T_s(U_+) = \Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R},$$

Since $\psi \in C(\partial\Omega)$ and Ω is bounded, $\text{gr}(\psi - s)$ converges to $-\infty$ uniformly as $s \rightarrow +\infty$. By Lemma 2.12 and Lemma 2.11 $\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_{\delta} \times \mathbb{R}$.

Without confusion, we use P to denote the perimeter in N and $N \times \mathbb{R}$ in the following derivation. Suppose Ω_+ is not a Λ -perimeter minimizer in Ω_{δ} . Then there is a Caccioppoli set E in Ω_{δ} satisfying $E\Delta\Omega_+ \subset\subset \Omega_{\delta}$ and

$$(6.21) \quad P(E, \Omega_{\delta}) \leq P(\Omega_+, \Omega_{\delta}) - \Lambda \text{vol}(E\Delta\Omega_+) - \varepsilon$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Now we define a Caccioppoli set E_T in $N \times \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(6.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_{E_T}(p) &= \lambda_{E \times [-T, T]}(p), \quad p \in N \times [-T, T] \\ \lambda_{E_T}(p) &= \lambda_{\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}}(p), \quad p \in N \times (-\infty, -T) \cup N \times (T, +\infty) \end{aligned}$$

Here λ_{E_T} is the characteristic function of E_T . It is easy to see that $E_T\Delta(\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}) \subset\subset \Omega_{\delta} \times (-2T, 2T)$. Let W_{2T} be the open set $\Omega_{\delta} \times (-2T, 2T)$. By (6.21) one sees that

$$\begin{aligned} & P(E_T, W_{2T}) + \Lambda \text{vol}(E_T\Delta(\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R})) - P(\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}, W_{2T}) \\ & \leq P(E_T, \Omega_{\delta} \times (-T, T)) - P(\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}, \Omega_{\delta} \times (-T, T)) + 2\text{vol}(\Omega_{\delta}) + 2T\Lambda \text{vol}(\Omega_+ \Delta E) \\ & \leq 2T(P(E, \Omega_{\delta}) - P(\Omega_+, \Omega_{\delta})) + 2\text{vol}(\Omega_{\delta}) + 2T\Lambda \text{vol}(\Omega_+ \Delta E) \\ & \leq -2\varepsilon T + 2\text{vol}(\Omega_{\delta}) \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $T > \frac{\text{vol}(\Omega_{\delta})}{2\varepsilon}$. This is a contradiction that $\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_{\delta} \times \mathbb{R}$. Thus our assumption is false and Ω_+ is also a Λ -perimeter minimizer in Ω_{δ} . We obtain the conclusion (1).

By the conclusion (1) $\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_+) \times \mathbb{R} = \text{reg}(\partial(\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}))$. Thus the conclusion (2) is equivalent that

$$(6.23) \quad H_{\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_+) \times \mathbb{R}}(x, r) = F(x, \gamma(x), 0)$$

Fix any point (x, r) in $\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_{\pm} \times \mathbb{R})$. Since U_t locally converges to U_0 , there is a $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ converging to $+\infty$ and t_j converging to 0 such that

$$(6.24) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T_{s_j}(U_{t_j}) = \Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}$$

in W where W is a bounded neighborhood of (x, r) in $\Omega_{\delta} \times \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, there is a positive number j_0 such that for any $j \geq j_0$ W lies above on the subgraph of $\psi - s_j$ in $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Thus for any $j \geq j_0$ $\partial T_{s_j}(U_{t_j}) \cap W$ is contained in the graph of $u_{t_j} - s_j$ over Ω . By (6.5) the mean curvature of $\partial T_{s_j}(U_{t_j})$ is

$$(6.25) \quad H_{\partial T_{s_j}(U_{t_j})} = F\left(x, -\frac{Du_{t_j}}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) - t_j \frac{(u_{t_j} - s_j)}{\omega}$$

where $(x, u_{t_j} - s_j) \in W$ and $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du_{t_j}|^2}$. Now write $F_j(x, X, r, z) = F(x, X, r) - t_j(z - s_j)r$. It is easy to see that

$$(6.26) \quad \mathcal{N}_W(F_j) \leq \nu$$

independent of $j \geq j_0$. For any compact set K in $W \setminus \text{sing}(\partial\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R})$, By Theorem 3.3 there is a positive constant κ such that

$$(6.27) \quad \max_{\partial T_{s_j}(U_{t_j}) \cap K} |A|_{\partial T_{s_j}(U_{t_j})}^2 \leq \kappa$$

for any $j \geq j_0$. By Lemma 2.11 the upward normal vector of $\{\partial T_{s_j}(U_{t_j})\}$ should converge to the outward normal vector of $\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ written as $\gamma(x)$ for $x \in \text{reg}(\partial\Omega_+)$. Moreover for any point $(x, u_{t_j} - s_j)$ in W , $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_j(u_{t_j} - s_j) = 0$. By (6.27) and (6.25), we conclude (6.23).

As for the case Ω_- , we consider $\tilde{u}_t = -u_t$. Let \tilde{U}_t be the subgraph of \tilde{u}_t over Ω with the mean curvature of $\partial\tilde{U}_t$ in $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$(6.28) \quad H_{\partial\tilde{U}_t}(x, r) = \tilde{F}(x, -\frac{D\tilde{u}_t}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}) - t\frac{\tilde{u}_t}{\omega}$$

By (6.5), $\tilde{F}(x, z, r) = -F(x, -z, r)$. As the case of $\Omega_+ \{\tilde{U}_t\}_{t>0}$ converges locally to \tilde{U}_0 which is a subgraph of $\tilde{u}_0 = -u_0$ over Ω . In this setting

$$(6.29) \quad \bar{\Omega}_+ = \{\tilde{u}_0 = +\infty\} = \Omega_-$$

Arguing exactly as the argument in the case of Ω_+ , Ω_- is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in Ω_δ and the mean curvature of $\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_-)$ is

$$(6.30) \quad H_{\text{reg}(\partial\Omega_-)}(x) = \tilde{F}(x, \gamma(x), 0) = -F(x, -\gamma(x), 0) = -f(x, -\gamma(x))$$

We conclude in the case of Ω_- . The proof of Lemma 6.7 is completed. \square

Theorem 6.8. *By the Nc-f property of Ω the number $\sup_{\bar{\Omega}, t \in (0,1)} |u_t|$ is finite.*

Proof. By the Nc-f property of Ω and the definition of the perimeter in (2.1) $\text{vol}(\Omega_\pm) = 0$. Here vol is the volume of N .

Suppose $\sup_{\bar{\Omega}, t \in (0,1)} \{|u_t|\}$ is $+\infty$. Then there is a sequence $\{t_i\}_{i \rightarrow \infty}$ converging to 0 and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \Omega$ converging to a point $z \in \bar{\Omega}$ such that (a) $u_{t_i}(x_i) > i$ or (b) $u_{t_i}(x_i) < -i$ holds. The proof of both cases is similar. Thus we only give the proof of case (a). Let U_i be the subgraph of $u_{t_i} - i$ over Ω . By Lemma 6.6 U_i is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{gr}(\psi - i)$. Define $p_i = (x_i, 0)$. Then $p_i \in U_i$. Fix $R > 0$. Because $\psi \in C(\partial\Omega)$ is uniformly bounded, there is $i_0 > 0$ such that for all $i \geq i_0$ $\Omega_\delta \times (-R, R)$ is disjoint with the subgraph of $\psi - i$ in $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Thus for any $i \geq i_0$ U_i are Λ -perimeter minimizers in $\Omega_\delta \times (-R, R)$. Notice that $p_i \in U_i$. From [32, Theorem 21.11] we have

$$(6.31) \quad \text{Vol}(U_i \cap B_r(p_i)) \geq C(n)r^{n+1}$$

for sufficiently small $r < R$ independent of $i \geq i_0$. Here $n = \dim N \geq 2$, Vol is the volume of the product manifold $N \times \mathbb{R}$. As $i \rightarrow +\infty$, U_i should converge to the set $\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}$. As a result, one sees that

$$(6.32) \quad \text{Vol}((\Omega_+ \times \mathbb{R}) \cap B_R((z, 0))) \geq C(n)R^{n+1}$$

This is a contradiction to $\text{vol}(\Omega_+) = 0$. With a similar derivation, case (b) will give a contradiction to that $\text{vol}(\Omega_-) = 0$.

Thus $\sup_{\bar{\Omega}, t \in (0,1)} \{|u_t|\}$ is a finite number. We arrive at the conclusion. \square

Since u_t is uniformly bounded on Ω for $t \in (0, 1)$, as the proof of the general case of Theorem 6.1 in page 23 letting $t \rightarrow 0$ the sequence $\{u_t\}_{t \in (0, 1)}$ converges to a $C^{3, \alpha}$ bounded function u_0 on Ω satisfying

$$(6.33) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) - F\left(x, \frac{-Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega, \quad \omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 6.1, it remains to show that the limit of $u_0(x)$ as x approaches any boundary point z in $\partial\Omega$ is $\psi(z)$. Suppose there is a point $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ the previous statement does not hold. Recall that by Lemma 6.6 U_0 is a Λ -perimeter minimizer in $\Omega_\delta \times \mathbb{R} \setminus \operatorname{gr}(\psi)$. There is a point $(x_0, r_0) \in \partial U_0$ with $r_0 \neq \psi(x_0)$. Since ψ is continuous on $\partial\Omega_0$ and $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ is a C^2 domain, by Lemma 2.8 ∂U_0 is regular in W which is a sufficiently small neighborhood of (x_0, r_0) . As in (6.26) and (6.27), in W ∂U_0 is $C^{3, \alpha}$ with its mean curvature equal to $F(x, X, \langle \bar{v}, \partial_r \rangle)$. Here \bar{v} is the outward normal vector of ∂U_0 in $(x, r) \in W$ with $\bar{v} = X + \langle \bar{v}, \partial_r \rangle \partial_r$ for $X \in T_x N$. At (x_0, r_0) there are two cases $\bar{v} = \pm \gamma(x_0)$. However by the condition (i) in Theorem 6.1 we have

$$(6.34) \quad H_{\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}}(x, z) \geq \pm F(x, \pm \gamma(x), 0)$$

No matter which case, applying the maximum principle in Theorem 4.6, we obtain that ∂U_0 coincides with $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ in W . Since we can repeat the above process to obtain that ∂U_0 coincides with $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ far from $\operatorname{gr}(\psi)$. Namely, the boundary of the graph of u_0 is unbounded. This is a contradiction because $\{u_t\}_{t \in (0, 1)}$ is uniformly bounded.

Therefore $u_0 \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and $\lim_{x \in \Omega, x \rightarrow z} u_0(x) = \psi(z)$ for any $z \in \partial\Omega$. With (6.33) u_0 belongs to $C(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{3, \alpha}(\Omega)$ solving the Dirichlet problem (1.1) satisfying $u_0 = \psi$ on $\partial\Omega$. The uniqueness is from the maximum principle. We conclude Theorem 6.1 in the case that $\phi \equiv 0$.

The proof of Theorem 6.1 is completed. \square

APPENDIX A. SOME RESULTS ON MEAN CURVATURE EQUATIONS

In this section we derive the interior and boundary gradient estimates of the solution to a certain class of mean curvature equations.

Throughout this section we suppose Ω is a bounded domain in a Riemannian manifold N with dimension $n \geq 2$.

Let M be the product manifold $N \times \mathbb{R}$. Suppose u is a function in $C^3(\Omega)$ satisfying $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}$ and

$$(A.1) \quad -\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) + f\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) = 0$$

where $f(x, z, X, r)$ is a $C^{1, \alpha}$ function on the tangent bundle of M (written as TM), $p = (x, z) \in M$ for $x \in N, z \in \mathbb{R}, v = X + r\partial_r \in TM$ for $X \in TN$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Here ∂_r is the unit tangent vector field of \mathbb{R} .

Theorem A.1. *Fix two positive numbers c_0 and μ . Suppose (a) $u \in C^3(\Omega)$ satisfies (A.1) and $\sup_\Omega |u| \leq c_0$; (b) Σ is the graph of u over Ω and*

$$(A.2) \quad \mathcal{N}_W(f) \leq \mu$$

where $W = \{(x, z) : x \in \bar{\Omega}, |z| \leq c_0\} \subset M$ and $\mathcal{N}_W(f)$ is from Definition 3.1. Set $\Theta = \frac{1}{c_0}$. For any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there is a nonnegative constant c_1 only depending on

μ , $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} Ric_x$ and β such that

$$(A.3) \quad \Delta\Theta + \beta|A|^2\Theta + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(1 - \Theta^2) - c_1\Theta - \frac{\partial f}{\partial r}\langle \nabla\Theta, \partial_r \rangle \leq 0,$$

where A is the second fundamental form of Σ , Δ and ∇ is the Laplacian and the covariant derivative of Σ .

Proof. By [53, Lemma 2.2] (its conclusion is true for any dimension greater than two) we have

$$(A.4) \quad \Delta\Theta + (|A|^2 + \bar{Ric}(\vec{v}, \vec{v}))\Theta - \langle \nabla H, \partial_r \rangle = 0$$

where \vec{v} is the upward normal vector of Σ , H is the mean curvature of Σ with respect to \vec{v} and \bar{Ric} is the Ricci curvature of M . Notice that $\Theta = \langle \vec{v}, \partial_r \rangle$. Let ∂_r^T be the tangent component of ∂_r in $T\Sigma$. By definition we have

$$(A.5) \quad \partial_r^T = \partial_r - \Theta\vec{v}$$

By (A.1), $H = -f$ with respect to \vec{v} . As a result, we have

$$(A.6) \quad \Delta\Theta + (|A|^2 + \bar{Ric}(\vec{v}, \vec{v}) - \vec{v}(f))\Theta = 0$$

Let $\{\partial_1, \dots, \partial_n\}$ be a local frame in $T\Omega$, $\sigma_{ij} = \langle \partial_i, \partial_j \rangle$, $(\sigma^{ij}) = (\sigma_{ij})^{-1}$. Let u_i and u_{ij} be the corresponding first and second covariant derivatives of u . Set $u^i = \sigma^{ik}u_k$. The gradient of u is represented by $Du = u^k\partial_k$. As a result, $v^k = \frac{u^k}{\omega}$, $\vec{v} = \frac{1}{\omega}\partial_r - v^k\partial_k$. Then $\{X_i = \partial_i + u_i\partial_r, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is a frame on $T\Sigma$. The metric of Σ is $(g_{ij}) = (\langle X_i, X_j \rangle) = (\sigma_{ij} + u^i u^j)$ with its inverse matrix $(g^{ij}) = (\sigma^{ij} - \frac{u^i u^j}{\omega^2})$.

The following two formulas are useful (see [52, section 2]).

$$v_i^k = \frac{1}{\omega}g^{kl}u_{li} \quad |A|^2 = v_i^k v_k^i$$

Let $X = p^1\partial_1 + \dots + p^n\partial_n$. Let $f(x, z, X, r)$ be the function $f(x, z, p^1, \dots, p^n, r)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} -\vec{v}(f)\Theta &= \Theta^2 \langle Df, Du \rangle = \Theta v^k \partial_k f \\ &= \Theta v^k (\partial_k f + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} u_k + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_j} v_k^j + \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} \Theta_k) \\ &= (v^k \partial_k f + \frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} v_k^i v^k) \Theta + \Theta^2 |Du|^2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} \langle \nabla\Theta, \partial_r \rangle \end{aligned}$$

In what follows we apply (A.2) (also see Remark 3.2). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $\frac{\partial f}{\partial p_i} v_k^i v^k \geq -\varepsilon|A|^2 - \frac{\mu}{4\varepsilon}$, $\bar{Ric}(\vec{v}, \vec{v}) \geq Ric(\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{Du}{\omega}) \geq \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} Ric_x$. Notice that $\Theta^2 |Du|^2 = (1 - \Theta^2)$. As a result, we have

$$(\bar{Ric}(\vec{v}, \vec{v}) - \vec{v}(f))\Theta \geq (\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} Ric_x - \mu(1 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon}) - \varepsilon|A|^2)\Theta - \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} \langle \nabla\Theta, \partial_r \rangle + \frac{\partial f}{\partial z}(1 - \Theta^2)$$

Putting this into (A.6) and letting $\varepsilon = 1 - \beta$ and $c_1 = \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} |Ric_x| + \mu(1 + \frac{1}{4\varepsilon})$, we obtain the conclusion. \square

Let $B_r(x)$ denote the embedded ball in N centering at x with radius r . We roughly extend the result of Wang's estimate [49, Theorem 1.1] into Riemannian manifolds as follows.

Theorem A.2. *Take the assumptions in Theorem A.1. Suppose $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \geq 0$.*

- (1) Let $B_\rho(x_0) \subset \Omega$. Then there is a positive constant μ_1 depending on μ, c_0 and the Ricci curvature on $B_\rho(x_0)$ such that

$$(A.7) \quad \max_{x \in B_{\frac{1}{2}\rho}(x_0)} |Du| \leq \mu_1$$

- (2) Furthermore suppose Ω is $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounded and $u \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. Then there is a positive constant μ_2 depending on μ, c_0 and the Ricci curvature on Ω such that

$$(A.8) \quad \max_{\bar{\Omega}} |Du| \leq \mu_2(1 + \max_{\partial\Omega} |Du|)$$

Proof. Recall that $\omega = \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} = \frac{1}{\Theta}$. We just give the sketch of the proof. Since $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \geq 0$, from (A.3) one sees that

$$(A.9) \quad \Delta\Theta - c_1\Theta - \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} \langle \nabla\Theta, \partial_r \rangle \leq 0,$$

In the conclusion (1) set $q(x) = 1 + \frac{u}{2c_0} - \frac{3}{2\rho^2} \text{dist}^2(x_0, x)$, let $\eta = e^{Kq(x)}$ where K is a sufficiently large constant only depending on ρ, c_0 and $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} \text{Ric}_x$. Checking the maximum point of $\eta\omega$ will yield the estimate.

As the conclusion (2), let $q(x) = u(x)$ and $\eta = e^{Ku}$ where K is determined later. If $\eta\omega$ achieves its maximum in Ω to obtain that

$$(A.10) \quad e^{Ku}\omega \leq \max\{C(K), e^{Kc_0} \sqrt{1 + \max_{\partial\Omega} |Du|^2}\}$$

Here K is a sufficiently large constant only depending on μ in (A.2). This gives the conclusion (2). \square

Next, we record two boundary barrier functions used to construct the Perron subsolution and supersolution in section 4.3. Our derivation is from Marquardt [33].

Theorem A.3. Let $L(u)$ be the operator given by

$$L(u) := -\text{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\omega}\right) + H_1\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right) + H_2\left(x, u, -\frac{Du}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}\right)\frac{1}{\omega}$$

where $H_i(x, z, X, r)$ for $i = 1, 2$ are $C^{1,\alpha}$ functions in the tangent bundle of $N \times \mathbb{R}$. Let $d(x) = \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} d(x, y)$. Fix $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ and any positive constant $c_0 > \max_{\bar{\Omega}} |\varphi|$. Suppose

$$(A.11) \quad H_{\partial\Omega}(x) \geq \pm H_1(x, \varphi, \pm\gamma(x), 0)$$

where $\gamma(x)$ is the outward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. Then there are two positive constants $\kappa > 0, \nu$ depending on c_0, H_1, H_2 and the C^2 norm of φ and d such that for $u_\pm(x) = \varphi \pm \frac{\log(1+\kappa d(x))}{\nu}$ it holds that

$$(A.12) \quad \pm L(u_\pm) \geq 0$$

on the domain $\Gamma_\pm := \{x \in \Omega : \pm u_\pm(x) < c_0\}$ with $\pm u_\pm = c_0$ on $\partial\Gamma_\pm \setminus \partial\Omega$.

Remark A.4. To obtain the Perron subsolution and supersolution of $L(u) \equiv 0$ near $\partial\Omega$, we do not require that the strict inequality of (A.11) holds.

Proof. Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be any local orthonormal frame of TN . As a result any vector field p in TN can be rewritten as $p = p_i e_i$. Thus $|p|^2 = p_i^2$. Then we follow the notation in [17, (14.3)]. For any $u \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ we write

$$(A.13) \quad L'(u) := -(1 + |Du|^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} L(u) = a^{ij} u_{ij} + b$$

where the arguments of all functions are $x, u, p = Du, \omega = \sqrt{1 + |p|^2}, \Lambda = 1 + |p|^2$ and

$$(A.14) \quad \begin{aligned} a^{ij}(x, u, p) &= \Lambda a_{\infty}^{ij} + a_0^{ij}, & b(x, u, p) &= |p| \Lambda b_{\infty} + b_0 \\ a_{\infty}^{ij} &= \delta_{ij} - \frac{p_i p_j}{|p|^2}, & a_0^{ij} &= \frac{p_i p_j}{|p|^2}, b_{\infty} = -H_1(x, u, -\frac{p}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}), \\ b_0(x, u, p) &= -\Lambda \left(\frac{1}{\omega + |p|} H_1(x, u, -\frac{p}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}) + H_2(x, u, -\frac{p}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now define $\phi(r) = \frac{\log(1+\kappa r)}{\nu}$. It holds that

$$(A.15) \quad \phi'(r) = \frac{\kappa}{\nu(1+\kappa r)}, \quad \frac{\phi''}{(\phi')^2} = -\nu$$

Let $d(x)$ be the function $\inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} d(x, y)$ for x in Ω . We define $u_{\pm}(x) = \varphi(x) \pm \phi(d(x))$. Define $\Gamma := \{x \in \Omega : d(x) < d_0\}$ where d_0 is a sufficiently small positive constant determined later such that for any x in Γ_{\pm} there is a unique point $y \in \partial\Omega$ such that $d(x, y) = d(x, \partial\Omega)$. Let $\gamma(y)$ be the outward normal vector of y equal to $-Dd(y)$. From now on let $u = u_{\pm}$ and p be Du_{\pm} .

In what follows we use $q(s)$ denote different continuous functions satisfying $q(0) = 0, |\frac{q(r)}{r}| \leq C$ for all $r \in [-d_0, d_0]$ and some positive constant C . Let μ be the constant

$$(A.16) \quad \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}, |z| \leq c_0, \langle X, X \rangle \leq 1, |r| \leq 1} \{|H_1(x, z, X, r)| + |H_2(x, z, X, r)|\}$$

Let Δ be the Laplacian on N . Then on Γ it holds

$$(A.17) \quad \begin{aligned} |b_0(x, u_{\pm}, Du_{\pm})| &\leq \mu \Lambda, & \Delta d(x) &= -H_{\partial\Omega}(y) + q(d(x)) \\ H_1(x, u_{\pm}(x), -\frac{p}{\omega}, \frac{1}{\omega}) &= H_1(y, \varphi(y), \pm\gamma(y), 0) + q(d(x) + |\phi'|^{-2}(d(x))) \\ p &= D\varphi \pm \phi'(d(x)) Dd = \phi'(d(x)) (1 + q(\frac{1}{\phi'(d(x))})) \\ a^{ij}(x, u_{\pm}, p) (\phi')^2 d_i d_j &= \Lambda (1 + q(\frac{1}{\phi'(d(x))})) \end{aligned}$$

As a result

$$(A.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \pm L'(u)(x) &= \Lambda \phi' \Delta d(x) \pm a^{ij} \varphi_{ij} + \phi' (1 + q(\frac{1}{\phi'})) \Lambda \{\mp H_1(y, \varphi(y), \pm\gamma(y), 0) \\ &+ q(d + |\phi'|^{-2})\} + b_0 - \nu \Lambda (1 + q(\frac{1}{\phi'(d)})) \\ &\leq \Lambda \phi' (-H_{\partial\Omega}(y) \mp H_1(y, \varphi(y), \pm\gamma(y), 0)) \\ &+ \Lambda (C \phi' d + q(\frac{1}{\phi'})) - \nu \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu \geq 1$, we have $\phi'd = \frac{1}{\nu} \frac{\kappa d}{1+\kappa d} \leq 1$. Now there are two positive constants $C_2 \geq 1, C_3$ depending $\mu, d(x)$ and φ such that if

$$(A.19) \quad \phi' \geq C_2, \nu \geq \max\{1, C_3\}$$

then for any x in Γ we have

$$(A.20) \quad \pm L'(u)(x) \leq \Lambda \phi'(-H_{\partial\Omega}(y) \mp H_1(y, \varphi(y), \pm\gamma(y), 0)) \leq 0$$

In the last inequality, we use the condition (A.11). Thus $\pm Lu_{\pm} \geq 0$ on Γ .

Now to achieve the goal in (A.20), first fix $\nu \geq \max\{1, C_3\}$. For x in Γ , we require that

$$(A.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi'(d(x)) &= \frac{\kappa}{\nu(1+\kappa d(x))} \geq \frac{\kappa}{\nu(1+\kappa d_0)} \geq C_2; \\ \phi(d_0) &= \frac{\log(1+\kappa d_0)}{\nu} \geq c_0 + \max_{\Omega} |\varphi| := C_4 \end{aligned}$$

The above two inequalities are satisfied by choosing d_0 small such that $d_0 C_2 \nu \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and choosing κ such that

$$(A.22) \quad \kappa = \max\left\{\frac{C_2 \nu}{1 - C_2 \nu d_0}, \frac{1}{d_0}(e^{C_4 \nu} - 1)\right\}$$

With those fixed κ, ν one sees that $\pm L(u_{\pm}) \geq 0$ on $\Gamma = \{x : d(x) < d_0\}$. Now define $\Gamma_{\pm} = \{x \in \Gamma : \pm u_{\pm}(x) < c_0\}$. We obtain the desirable conclusion. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Albuquerque. Notes on the Sasaki metric. *Expo. Math.*, 37(2):207–224, 2019.
- [2] William K. Allard. On the first variation of a varifold. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 95:417–491, 1972.
- [3] Matthias Bergner. The Dirichlet problem for graphs of prescribed anisotropic mean curvature in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . *Analysis (Munich)*, 28(2):149–166, 2008.
- [4] Hubert L. Bray and Marcus A. Khuri. P.D.E.'s which imply the Penrose conjecture. *Asian J. Math.*, 15(4):557–610, 2011.
- [5] Jean-Baptiste Casteras, Esko Heinonen, and Ilkka Holopainen. Dirichlet problem for f -minimal graphs. *J. Anal. Math.*, 138(2):917–950, 2019.
- [6] Chiara Corsato, Colette De Coster, and Pierpaolo Omari. The Dirichlet problem for a prescribed anisotropic mean curvature equation: existence, uniqueness and regularity of solutions. *J. Differential Equations*, 260(5):4572–4618, 2016.
- [7] Baris Coskunuzer. Embeddedness of the solutions to the H -Plateau problem. *Adv. Math.*, 317:553–574, 2017.
- [8] M. Dajczer, J. H. de Lira, and J. Ripoll. An interior gradient estimate for the mean curvature equation of Killing graphs and applications. *J. Anal. Math.*, 129:91–103, 2016.
- [9] Marcos Dajczer, Pedro A. Hinojosa, and Jorge Herbert de Lira. Killing graphs with prescribed mean curvature. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 33(2):231–248, 2008.
- [10] Jesse Douglas. A method of numerical solution of the problem of Plateau. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 29(1-4):180–188, 1927/28.
- [11] Michael Eichmair. The Plateau problem for marginally outer trapped surfaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 83(3):551–583, 2009.
- [12] Michael Eichmair. Existence, regularity, and properties of generalized apparent horizons. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 294(3):745–760, 2010.
- [13] Michael Eichmair, Lan-Hsuan Huang, Dan A. Lee, and Richard Schoen. The spacetime positive mass theorem in dimensions less than eight. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 18(1):83–121, 2016.
- [14] Michael Eichmair and Jan Metzger. Jenkins-Serrin-type results for the Jang equation. *J. Differential Geom.*, 102(2):207–242, 2016.
- [15] Qiang Gao and Hengyu Zhou. The area minimizing problem in conformal cones, II. *Sci. China Math.*, 63(12):2523–2552, 2020.

- [16] Qiang Gao and Hengyu Zhou. The area minimizing problem in conformal cones, I. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 280(3):Paper No. 108827, 39, 2021.
- [17] David Gilbarg and Neil 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.
- [18] Enrico Giusti. *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, volume 80 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984.
- [19] Elias M. Guio and Ricardo Sa Earp. Errata: “Existence and non-existence for a mean curvature equation in hyperbolic space” [Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 4 (2005), no. 3, 549–568; mr2167187]. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.*, 7(2):465, 2008.
- [20] Robert Gulliver and Joel Spruck. Existence theorems for parametric surfaces of prescribed mean curvature. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 22:445–472, 1972/73.
- [21] Gerhard Huisken and Alexander Polden. Geometric evolution equations for hypersurfaces. In *Calculus of variations and geometric evolution problems (Cetraro, 1996)*, volume 1713 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 45–84. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [22] Howard Jenkins and James Serrin. The Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation in higher dimensions. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 229:170–187, 1968.
- [23] Hongjie Ju and Yannan Liu. Dirichlet problem for anisotropic prescribed mean curvature equation on unbounded domains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 439(2):709–724, 2016.
- [24] Atsushi Kasue. Ricci curvature, geodesics and some geometric properties of Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 35(1):117–131, 1983.
- [25] N. Korevaar. An easy proof of the interior gradient bound for solutions to the prescribed mean curvature equation. In *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications, Part 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1983)*, volume 45 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 81–89. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1986.
- [26] Nicholas J. Korevaar. A priori interior gradient bounds for solutions to elliptic Weingarten equations. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 4(5):405–421, 1987.
- [27] Nicholas J. Korevaar and Leon Simon. Continuity estimates for solutions to the prescribed-curvature Dirichlet problem. *Math. Z.*, 197(4):457–464, 1988.
- [28] John M. Lee and Thomas H. Parker. The Yamabe problem. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 17(1):37–91, 1987.
- [29] Yanyan Li and Louis Nirenberg. Regularity of the distance function to the boundary. *Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat. Appl. (5)*, 29:257–264, 2005.
- [30] Fang-Hua Lin. On the Dirichlet problem for minimal graphs in hyperbolic space. *Invent. Math.*, 96(3):593–612, 1989.
- [31] Rafael López. The Dirichlet problem on a strip for the α -translating soliton equation. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 356(11-12):1179–1187, 2018.
- [32] Francesco Maggi. *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems*, volume 135 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. An introduction to geometric measure theory.
- [33] Thomas Marquardt. Remark on the anisotropic prescribed mean curvature equation on arbitrary domains. *Math. Z.*, 264(3):507–511, 2010.
- [34] William H. Meeks, III and Shing Tung Yau. Topology of three-dimensional manifolds and the embedding problems in minimal surface theory. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 112(3):441–484, 1980.
- [35] Jan Metzger. Blowup of Jang’s equation at outermost marginally trapped surfaces. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 294(1):61–72, 2010.
- [36] Charles B. Morrey, Jr. The problem of Plateau on a Riemannian manifold. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 49:807–851, 1948.
- [37] Tibor Radó. On Plateau’s problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 31(3):457–469, 1930.
- [38] Anna Sakovich. The Jang equation and the positive mass theorem in the asymptotically hyperbolic setting. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 386(2):903–973, 2021.
- [39] Shigeo Sasaki. On the differential geometry of tangent bundles of Riemannian manifolds. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 10:338–354, 1958.
- [40] Richard Schoen and Leon Simon. Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 34(6):741–797, 1981.
- [41] Richard Schoen and Shing Tung Yau. On the proof of the positive mass conjecture in general relativity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 65(1):45–76, 1979.

- [42] Richard Schoen and Shing Tung Yau. Proof of the positive mass theorem. II. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 79(2):231–260, 1981.
- [43] J. Serrin. The problem of Dirichlet for quasilinear elliptic differential equations with many independent variables. *Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 264:413–496, 1969.
- [44] Leon Simon. Remarks on curvature estimates for minimal hypersurfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 43(3):545–553, 1976.
- [45] Leon Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, volume 3 of *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University*. Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983.
- [46] Joel Spruck. Interior gradient estimates and existence theorems for constant mean curvature graphs in $M^n \times \mathbf{R}$. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 3(3, Special Issue: In honor of Leon Simon. Part 2):785–800, 2007.
- [47] Italo Tamanini. Boundaries of Caccioppoli sets with Hölder-continuous normal vector. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 334:27–39, 1982.
- [48] Yuki Tsukamoto. The Dirichlet problem for a prescribed mean curvature equation. *Hiroshima Math. J.*, 50(3):325–337, 2020.
- [49] Xu-Jia Wang. Interior gradient estimates for mean curvature equations. *Math. Z.*, 228(1):73–81, 1998.
- [50] Xu-Jia Wang. Convex solutions to the mean curvature flow. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 173(3):1185–1239, 2011.
- [51] Brian White. Subsequent singularities in mean-convex mean curvature flow. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 54(2):1457–1468, 2015.
- [52] Hengyu Zhou. Nonparametric mean curvature type flows of graphs with contact angle conditions. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (19):6026–6069, 2018.
- [53] Hengyu Zhou. The boundary behavior of domains with complete translating, minimal and CMC graphs in $N^2 \times \mathbf{R}$. *Sci. China Math.*, 62(3):585–596, 2019.
- [54] Hengyu Zhou. Generalized solutions to the Dirichlet problem of translating mean curvature equations. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1902.01512, February 2019.

(H. Z) COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CHONGQING UNIVERSITY, HUXI CAMPUS, CHONGQING, 401331, P. R. CHINA

CHONGQING KEY LABORATORY OF ANALYTIC MATHEMATICS AND APPLICATIONS, CHONGQING UNIVERSITY, HUXI CAMPUS, CHONGQING, 401331, P. R. CHINA

Email address: zhouhyu@cqu.edu.cn