

# ON A LOCALIZED RIEMANNIAN PENROSE INEQUALITY

PENGZI MIAO

ABSTRACT. Let  $\Omega$  be a compact, orientable, three dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary with nonnegative scalar curvature. Suppose its boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is the disjoint union of two pieces:  $\Sigma_H$  and  $\Sigma_O$ , where  $\Sigma_H$  consists of the unique closed minimal surfaces in  $\Omega$  and  $\Sigma_O$  is metrically a round sphere. We obtain an inequality relating the area of  $\Sigma_H$  to the area and the total mean curvature of  $\Sigma_O$ . Such an  $\Omega$  may be thought as a region, surrounding the outermost apparent horizons of black holes, in a time-symmetric slice of a space-time in the context of general relativity. The inequality we establish has close ties with the Riemannian Penrose Inequality, proved by Huisken and Ilmanen [9] and by Bray [5].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $M$  be a complete, asymptotically flat 3-manifold with nonnegative scalar curvature. Suppose its boundary  $\partial M$  consists of the outermost minimal surfaces in  $M$ . The Riemannian Penrose Inequality, first proved by Huisken and Ilmanen [9] for a connected  $\partial M$ , and then by Bray [5] for  $\partial M$  with any number of components, states that

$$(1) \quad m_{ADM}(M) \geq \sqrt{\frac{A}{16\pi}},$$

where  $m_{ADM}(M)$  is the ADM mass [1] of  $M$  and  $A$  is the area of  $\partial M$ . Furthermore, the equality holds if and only if  $M$  is isometric to a spatial Schwarzschild manifold outside its horizon.

Motivated by the quasi-local mass question in general relativity (see [2], [6], [7], etc.), we would like to seek a localized statement of the above inequality (1). To be precise, we are interested in a compact, orientable, 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold  $\Omega$  with boundary. We call  $\Omega$  a *body surrounding horizons* if its boundary  $\partial\Omega$  is the disjoint union of two pieces:  $\Sigma_O$  (the outer boundary) and  $\Sigma_H$  (the horizon boundary), and  $\Omega$  satisfies the following assumptions:

---

This research is supported in part by the Australian Research Council.

- (a)  $\Sigma_O$  is topologically a 2-sphere.
- (b) Each component of  $\Sigma_H$  is a minimal surface in  $\Omega$ .
- (c) There are no other closed minimal surfaces in  $\Omega$ .

Physically,  $\Omega$  is to be thought as a finite region in a time-symmetric slice of a spacetime containing black holes and  $\Sigma_H$  corresponds to the outermost apparent horizon of the black holes. In such a context, if the spacetime satisfies the dominant energy condition and  $m_{QM}(\Sigma_O)$  represents some quantity (to be defined) which could measure the quasi-local mass of  $\Sigma_O$ , then one would expect

$$(2) \quad m_{QM}(\Sigma_O) \geq \sqrt{\frac{A}{16\pi}}.$$

In this paper, we are able to establish an equality of the above form for a special class of *body surrounding horizons*. Our main result is

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a body surrounding horizons whose outer boundary  $\Sigma_O$  is metrically a round sphere. Suppose  $\Omega$  has nonnegative scalar curvature and  $\Sigma_O$  has positive mean curvature. Then*

$$(3) \quad m(\Sigma_O) \geq \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_H|}{16\pi}},$$

where  $m(\Sigma_O)$  is defined by

$$(4) \quad m(\Sigma_O) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_O|}{16\pi}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{16\pi|\Sigma_O|} \left( \oint_{\Sigma_O} H \, d\sigma \right)^2 \right],$$

where  $|\Sigma_H|$ ,  $|\Sigma_O|$  are the area of  $\Sigma_H$ ,  $\Sigma_O$ ,  $H$  is the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_O$  (with respect to the outward normal) in  $\Omega$ , and  $d\sigma$  is the surface measure of the induced metric. When equality holds,  $\Sigma_O$  is a surface with constant mean curvature.

We remark that, assuming (3) in Theorem 1 holds in the first place, one can derive (1) in the Riemannian Penrose Inequality. That is because, by a result of Bray [4], to prove (1), one suffices to prove it for a special asymptotically flat manifold  $M$  which, outside some compact set  $K$ , is isometric to a spatial Schwarzschild manifold near infinity. On such an  $M$ , let  $\Omega$  be a compact region containing  $K$  such that its outer boundary  $\Sigma_O$  is a rotationally symmetric sphere in the Schwarzschild region. Applying Theorem 1 to such an  $\Omega$  and observing that, in this case, the quantity  $m(\Sigma_O)$  coincides with the Hawking quasi-local mass [8] of  $\Sigma_O$ , hence agrees with the ADM mass of  $M$ , we see that (3) implies (1). On the other hand, our proof of Theorem 1 does make critical use of (1). Therefore, (3) and (1) are equivalent.

Besides the Riemannian Penrose Inequality, Theorem 1 is also largely inspired by the following result of Shi and Tam [14]:

**Theorem 2.** (Shi-Tam) *Let  $\tilde{\Omega}$  be a compact, 3-dimensional Riemannian manifold with boundary with nonnegative scalar curvature. Suppose  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$  has finitely many components  $\Sigma_i$  so that each  $\Sigma_i$  has positive Gaussian curvature and positive mean curvature  $H$  (with respect to the outward normal), then*

$$(5) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_i} H \, d\sigma \leq \oint_{\Sigma_i} H_0 \, d\sigma,$$

where  $H_0$  is the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_i$  (with respect to the outward normal) when it is isometrically imbedded in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Furthermore, equality holds if and only if  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$  has only one component and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is isometric to a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

Let  $\tilde{\Omega}$  be given in Theorem 2. Suppose  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$  has a component  $\Sigma$  which is isometric to a round sphere with area  $4\pi R^2$ , then

$$(6) \quad \oint_{\Sigma} H_0 \, d\sigma = 8\pi R,$$

and (5) yields

$$(7) \quad \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint_{\Sigma} H \, d\sigma \leq R.$$

Now suppose there is a closed minimal surfaces  $\Sigma_h$  in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  such that  $\Sigma_h$  and  $\Sigma$  bounds a region  $\Omega$  which contains no other closed minimal surfaces in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  (by minimizing area over surfaces homologous to  $\Sigma$ , such a  $\Sigma_h$  always exists if  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$  has more than one components). Applying Theorem 1 to  $\Omega$ , we have

$$(8) \quad \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_h|}{16\pi}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{16\pi|\Sigma|} \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H \, d\sigma \right)^2 \right],$$

which can be equivalently written as

$$(9) \quad \frac{1}{8\pi} \oint_{\Sigma} H \, d\sigma \leq \sqrt{R(R - R_h)},$$

where  $R = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{4\pi}}$  and  $R_h = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_h|}{4\pi}}$ . Therefore, Theorem 1 may be viewed as a refinement of Theorem 2 in this special case to include the effect on  $\Sigma$  by the closed minimal surface in  $\tilde{\Omega}$  that lies “closest” to  $\Sigma$ .

In general relativity, Theorem 2 is a statement on the positivity of the Brown-York quasi-local mass  $m_{BY}(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$  [6]. Using the technique of weak inverse mean curvature flow developed by Huisken and Ilmanen

[9], Shi and Tam [15] further proved that  $m_{BY}(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$  is bounded from below by the Hawking quasi-local mass  $m_H(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$ . Suggested by the quantity  $m(\Sigma_O)$  in Theorem 1, we find some new geometric quantities associated to  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$ , which are interestingly between  $m_{BY}(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$  and  $m_H(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$  (hence providing another proof of  $m_{BY}(\partial\tilde{\Omega}) \geq m_H(\partial\tilde{\Omega})$ .) We include this discussion at the end of the paper.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the approach of Shi and Tam in [14] since it plays a key role in our derivation of Theorem 1. The detailed proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 3. In Section 3.1, we establish a partially generalized Shi-Tam monotonicity. In Section 3.2, we make use of the Riemannian Penrose Inequality. In Section 4, we give some discussion on quasi-local mass. In particular, we introduce two quantities motivated by Theorem 1 and compare them with the Brown-York quasi-local mass  $m_{BY}(\Sigma)$  and the Hawking quasi-local mass  $m_H(\Sigma)$ .

*Acknowledgement:* The author wants to thank professor Hubert Bray for the helpful discussion leading to Section 4.

## 2. REVIEW OF SHI-TAM'S APPROACH

In [14], Shi and Tam pioneered the idea of using results on asymptotically flat manifolds to study compact manifolds with boundary. We briefly review their approach in this section.

Let  $\tilde{\Omega}$  be given in Theorem 2. For simplicity, we assume  $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$  has only one component  $\Sigma$ . Since  $\Sigma$  has positive Gaussian curvature,  $\Sigma$  can be isometrically imbedded in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  as a strictly convex surface [11]. On the region  $E$  exterior to  $\Sigma$ , the Euclidean metric  $g_0$  can be written as

$$(10) \quad g_0 = d\rho^2 + g_\rho,$$

where  $g_\rho$  is the induced metric on each level set  $\Sigma_\rho$  of the Euclidean distance function  $\rho$  to  $\Sigma$ . Motivated by the quasi-spherical metric construction of Bartnik [3], Shi and Tam showed that there exists a positive function  $u$  defined on  $E$  such that the warped metric

$$(11) \quad g_u = u^2 d\rho^2 + g_\rho$$

has zero scalar curvature, is asymptotically flat and the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  in  $(E, g_u)$  (with respect to the  $\infty$ -pointing normal) agrees with the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  in  $\Omega$ . Furthermore, as a key ingredient to prove their result, they showed that the quantity

$$(12) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_\rho} (H_0 - H_u) d\sigma$$

is monotone non-increasing in  $\rho$ , and

$$(13) \quad \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\Sigma_\rho} (H_0 - H_u) d\sigma = 8\pi m_{ADM}(g_u),$$

where  $H_0, H_u$  are the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_\rho$  with respect to  $g_0, g_u$ , and  $m_{ADM}(g_u)$  is the ADM mass of  $g_u$ . Let  $M$  be the Riemannian manifold obtained by gluing  $(E, g_u^m)$  to  $\tilde{\Omega}$  along  $\Sigma$ . The metric on  $M$  is asymptotically flat, has nonnegative scalar curvature away from  $\Sigma$ , is Lipschitz near  $\Sigma$ , and the mean curvatures of  $\Sigma$  computed in both sides of  $\Sigma$  in  $M$  (with respect to the  $\infty$ -pointing normal) are the same. By generalizing Witten's spinor argument [16], Shi and Tam proved that the positive mass theorem [13] [16] remains valid on  $M$  (see [10] for a non-spinor proof). Therefore,

$$(14) \quad \oint_{\Sigma} (H_0 - H_u) d\sigma \geq \lim_{\rho \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\Sigma_\rho} (H_0 - H_u) d\sigma = 8\pi m_{ADM}(g_u) \geq 0,$$

with  $\oint_{\Sigma} (H_0 - H) d\sigma = 0$  if and only if  $H = H_0$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is isometric to a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1. The basic idea is to deform the exterior region of a rotationally symmetric sphere in a spatial Schwarzschild manifold in a similar way as Shi and Tam did on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , then attach it to a *body surrounding horizons* and apply the Riemannian Penrose Inequality to the gluing manifold. The key ingredient in our proof is the discovery of a new monotone quantity associated to the deformed metric. We divide the proof into two subsections.

**3.1. A monotonicity property for quasi-spherical metrics on a Schwarzschild background.** Consider part of a spatial Schwarzschild manifold

$$(15) \quad (M_{r_0}^m, g^m) = \left( S^2 \times [r_0, \infty), \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2m}{r}} dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2 \right),$$

where  $r_0$  is a constant chosen to satisfy  $\begin{cases} r_0 > 2m, & \text{if } m \geq 0 \\ r_0 > 0, & \text{if } m < 0. \end{cases}$  Here  $m$  is the ADM mass of the Schwarzschild metric  $g^m$ ,  $r$  is the radial coordinate on  $[r_0, \infty)$ , and  $d\sigma^2$  denotes the standard metric on the unit sphere  $S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ .

Let  $N$  be the positive function on  $M_{r_0}^m$  defined by

$$(16) \quad N = \sqrt{1 - \frac{2m}{r}}.$$

In terms of  $N$ ,  $g^m$  takes the form

$$(17) \quad g^m = \frac{1}{N^2} dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2.$$

The next lemma follows directly from the existence theory established in [14] (see also [3]).

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\Sigma_0$  be the boundary of  $(M_{r_0}^m, g^m)$ . Given any positive function  $\phi$  on  $\Sigma_0$ , there exists a positive function  $u$  on  $M_{r_0}^m$  such that*

(i) *The metric*

$$(18) \quad g_u^m = \left(\frac{u}{N}\right)^2 dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2$$

*has zero scalar curvature and is asymptotically flat .*

(ii) *The mean curvature of  $\Sigma_0$  (with respect to the  $\infty$ -pointing normal) in  $(M_{r_0}^m, g_u^m)$  is equal to  $\phi$ .*

(iii) *The quotient  $\frac{u}{N}$  has the asymptotic expansion*

$$(19) \quad \frac{u}{N} = 1 + \frac{m_0}{r} + O\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right) \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty,$$

*where  $m_0$  is the ADM mass of  $g_u^m$ .*

*Proof.* Consider a Euclidean background metric

$$(20) \quad ds^2 = dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2$$

on  $M_{r_0}^m = S^2 \times [r_0, \infty)$ . By Theorem 2.1 in [14], there is a unique positive function  $v$  on  $M_{r_0}^m$  such that

$$(21) \quad g_v = v^2 dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2$$

has zero scalar curvature, is asymptotically flat and the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_0$  in  $(M_{r_0}^m, g_v)$  is given by  $\phi$ . Furthermore,  $v$  has an asymptotic expansion

$$(22) \quad v = 1 + \frac{m_0}{r} + O\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right),$$

where  $m_0$  is the ADM mass of  $g_v$ . Let  $u = Nv$ , Lemma 1 is proved.  $\square$

We note that metrics of the form  $v^2 dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2$  are called (shear free) *quasi-spherical* metrics [3]. By the formula (2.26) in [3] (or (1.10) in [14]), the differential equation satisfied by  $v = uN^{-1}$  in Lemma 1 is

$$(23) \quad \frac{2}{r} \frac{\partial v}{\partial r} = \frac{v^2}{r^2} \Delta_{S^2} v + \frac{(v - v^3)}{r^2},$$

where  $\Delta_{S^2}$  denotes the Laplacian operator of the metric  $d\sigma^2$  on  $S^2$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $u$ ,  $g_u^m$ ,  $m_0$  be given in Lemma 1. Let  $\Sigma_r$  be the radial coordinate sphere in  $M_{r_0}^m$ , i.e.  $\Sigma_r = S^2 \times \{r\}$ . Let  $H_S$ ,  $H_u$  be the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_r$  with respect to the metric  $g^m$ ,  $g_u^m$ . Then*

$$\oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma$$

is monotone non-increasing in  $r$ . Furthermore,

$$(24) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma = 8\pi(m_0 - m).$$

*Proof.* We have  $H_S = \frac{2}{r}N$  and  $H_u = \frac{2}{r}v^{-1}$ , where  $v = uN^{-1}$ . Hence

$$(25) \quad \begin{aligned} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma &= \oint_{\Sigma_r} \left(\frac{2}{r}\right) (N^2 - Nv^{-1}) d\sigma \\ &= \oint_{S^2} 2r(N^2 - Nv^{-1}) d\omega, \end{aligned}$$

where  $d\omega = r^{-2}d\sigma$  is the surface measure of  $d\sigma^2$  on  $S^2$ . As  $N^2 = 1 - \frac{2m}{r}$ , we have

$$(26) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma = \oint_{S^2} (2r - 4m - 2rNv^{-1}) d\omega.$$

Therefore,

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma &= \oint_{S^2} \left[ (2 - 2Nv^{-1}) - 2r \frac{\partial N}{\partial r} v^{-1} \right] d\omega \\ &+ \oint_{S^2} 2rNv^{-2} \frac{\partial v}{\partial r} d\omega. \end{aligned}$$

By (23), we have

$$(28) \quad v^{-2} \frac{\partial v}{\partial r} = \frac{1}{2r} \Delta_{S^2} v + \frac{(v^{-1} - v)}{2r}.$$

Thus the last term in (27) becomes

$$(29) \quad \begin{aligned} \oint_{S^2} 2rNv^{-2} \frac{\partial v}{\partial r} d\omega &= \oint_{S^2} N \Delta_{S^2} v d\omega + \oint_{S^2} N(v^{-1} - v) d\omega \\ &= \oint_{S^2} N(v^{-1} - v) d\omega, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that  $N$  is a constant on each  $\Sigma_r$  and  $\oint_{S^2} \Delta_{S^2} v d\omega = 0$ . Hence the right side of (27) is given by

$$(30) \quad \oint_{S^2} \left[ (2 - 2Nv^{-1}) - 2r \frac{\partial N}{\partial r} v^{-1} + N(v^{-1} - v) \right] d\omega.$$

Replace  $v$  by  $uN^{-1}$ , the integrand of (30) becomes

$$(31) \quad 2 - N^2 u^{-1} - 2r \frac{\partial N}{\partial r} N u^{-1} - u.$$

By (16), we have

$$(32) \quad N^2 + 2rN \frac{\partial N}{\partial r} = 1.$$

Therefore, it follows from (27), (30), (31) and (32) that

$$(33) \quad \frac{d}{dr} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma = - \oint_{S^2} u^{-1}(u-1)^2 d\omega,$$

which proves that  $\oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma$  is monotone non-increasing in  $r$ .

To evaluate  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma$ , we have

$$(34) \quad Nv^{-1} = 1 - \frac{(m_0 + m)}{r} + O\left(\frac{1}{r^2}\right)$$

by (16) and (22). Therefore, by (26) we have

$$(35) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma = \oint_{S^2} 2(m_0 - m) d\omega + O(r^{-1}),$$

which implies

$$(36) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_S - H_u) d\sigma = 8\pi(m_0 - m).$$

Proposition 1 is proved.  $\square$

**3.2. Application of the Riemannian Penrose Inequality.** In this section, we glue a body surrounding horizons, whose outer boundary is metrically a round sphere, to an asymptotically flat manifold  $(M_{r_0}^m, g_u^m)$  constructed in Lemma 1, and apply the Riemannian Penrose Inequality and Proposition 1 to prove Theorem 1.

We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a body surrounding horizons. Suppose its outer boundary  $\Sigma_O$  has positive mean curvature, then its horizon boundary  $\Sigma_H$  strictly minimizes area among all closed surfaces in  $\Omega$  that enclose  $\Sigma_H$ .*

*Proof.* As  $\Omega$  is compact and the mean curvature vector of  $\Sigma_O$  points into  $\Omega$ , it follows from the standard geometric measure theory that there exist surfaces that minimize area among all closed surfaces in  $\Omega$  that enclose  $\Sigma_H$ , furthermore none of the minimizers touches  $\Sigma_O$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be any such a minimizer. By the Regularity Theorem 1.3 in [9],  $\Sigma$  is a  $C^{1,1}$  surface, and is  $C^\infty$  where it does not touch  $\Sigma_H$ ; moreover, the

mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  is 0 on  $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_H$  and equals the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_H$   $\mathcal{H}^2$ -a.e. on  $\Sigma \cap \Sigma_H$ . Suppose  $\Sigma$  is not identically  $\Sigma_H$ . As  $\Sigma_H$  has zero mean curvature, the maximum principle implies that  $\Sigma$  does not touch  $\Sigma_H$ . Hence,  $\Sigma$  is a smooth closed minimal surface in the interior of  $\Omega$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\Omega$  has no other closed minimal surfaces except  $\Sigma_H$ . Therefore,  $\Sigma$  must be identically  $\Sigma_H$ .  $\square$

Let  $\Omega$  be a body surrounding horizons given in Theorem 1. Let  $R$  and  $R_H$  be the area radii of  $\Sigma_O$  and  $\Sigma_H$ , which are defined by

$$(37) \quad 4\pi R^2 = |\Sigma_O| \quad \text{and} \quad 4\pi R_H^2 = |\Sigma_H|.$$

It follows from Lemma 2 that  $R > R_H$ . To proceed, we choose  $(M^m, g^m)$  to be one-half of a spatial Schwarzschild manifold whose horizon has the same area as  $\Sigma_H$ , i.e.

$$(38) \quad (M^m, g^m) = \left( S^2 \times [R_H, \infty), \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2m}{r}} dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2 \right),$$

where  $m$  is chosen to satisfy  $2m = R_H$ . As  $R > R_H$ ,  $\Sigma_O$  can be isometrically imbedded in  $(M^m, g^m)$  as the coordinate sphere

$$(39) \quad \Sigma_R = \{r = R\}.$$

Henceforth, we identify  $\Sigma_O$  with  $\Sigma_R$  through this isometric imbedding. Let  $M_o^m$  denote the exterior of  $\Sigma_O$  in  $M^m$ . By Lemma 1 and Proposition 1, there exists a metric

$$(40) \quad g_u^m = \left( \frac{u}{N} \right)^2 dr^2 + r^2 d\sigma^2$$

on  $M_o^m$  such that  $g_u^m$  has zero scalar curvature, is asymptotically flat, and the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_O$  (with respect to the  $\infty$ -pointing normal) in  $(M_o^m, g_u^m)$  agrees with  $H$ , the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_O$  in  $\Omega$ . Furthermore, the integral

$$(41) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_s - H_u) d\sigma$$

is monotone non-increasing in  $r$  and converges to  $8\pi(m_0 - m)$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $m_0$  is the ADM mass of  $g_u^m$ .

Now we attach this asymptotically flat manifold  $(M_o^m, g_u^m)$  to the compact body  $\Omega$  along  $\Sigma_O$  to get a complete Riemannian manifold  $M$  whose boundary is  $\Sigma_H$ . The resulting metric  $g_M$  on  $M$  satisfies the properties that it is asymptotically flat, has nonnegative scalar curvature away from  $\Sigma_O$ , is Lipschitz near  $\Sigma_O$ , and the mean curvatures of  $\Sigma_O$  computed in both sides of  $\Sigma_O$  in  $M$  (with respect to the  $\infty$ -pointing normal) agree identically.

**Lemma 3.** *The horizon boundary  $\Sigma_H$  is strictly outer minimizing in  $M$ , i.e.  $\Sigma_H$  strictly minimizes area among all closed surfaces in  $M$  that enclose  $\Sigma_H$ .*

*Proof.* By the construction of  $g_u^m$ , we know  $(M_o^m, g_u^m)$  is foliated by  $\{\Sigma_r\}_{r \geq R}$ , where each  $\Sigma_r$  has positive mean curvature. Let  $\Sigma$  be a surface that minimizes area among surfaces in  $M$  that encloses  $\Sigma_H$  (such a minimizer exists as  $M$  is asymptotically flat). We claim that  $\Sigma \setminus \Omega$  must be empty, for otherwise  $\Sigma \setminus \Omega$  would be a smooth, compact minimal surface in  $(M_o^m, g_u^m)$  with boundary lying in  $\Sigma_O$ , and that would contradict the maximum principle. Therefore,  $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ . It then follows from Lemma 2 that  $\Sigma = \Sigma_H$ .  $\square$

The next lemma is an application of the ‘‘corner smoothing’’ technique in [10].

**Lemma 4.** *There exists a sequence of smooth asymptotically flat metrics  $\{h_k\}$  defined on the background manifold of  $M$  such that  $\{h_k\}$  converges uniformly to  $g_M$  in the  $C^0$  topology, each  $h_k$  has nonnegative scalar curvature,  $\Sigma_H$  has zero mean curvature with respect to each  $h_k$  (in fact  $\Sigma_H$  can be made totally geodesic w.r.t  $h_k$ ), and the ADM mass of  $h_k$  converges to the ADM mass of  $g_M$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M'$  be an exact copy of  $M$ . We glue  $M$  and  $M'$  along their common boundary  $\Sigma_H$  to get a Riemannian manifold  $\bar{M}$  with two asymptotic ends. Let  $g_{\bar{M}}$  be the resulting metric on  $\bar{M}$  and let  $\Sigma'_O$  be the copy of  $\Sigma_O$  in  $M'$ . Denote by  $\Sigma$  the union of  $\Sigma_O$ ,  $\Sigma_H$  and  $\Sigma'_O$ , we then know that the mean curvatures of  $\Sigma$  computed in both sides of  $\Sigma$  in  $\bar{M}$  (with respect to normal vectors pointing to the same end of  $\bar{M}$ ) agree. (At  $\Sigma_O$  and  $\Sigma'_O$ , this is guaranteed by the construction of  $g_u^m$ , and at  $\Sigma_H$ , this is provided by the fact that  $\Sigma_H$  has zero mean curvature.)

Apply Proposition 3.1 in [10] to  $\bar{M}$  at  $\Sigma$ , followed by a conformal deformation as described in Section 4.1 in [10], we get a sequence of smooth asymptotically flat metrics  $\{g_k\}$ , defined on the background manifold of  $\bar{M}$ , with nonnegative scalar curvature such that  $\{g_k\}$  converges uniformly to  $g_{\bar{M}}$  in the  $C^0$  topology and the ADM mass of  $g_k$  converges to the ADM mass of  $g_{\bar{M}}$  on both ends of  $\bar{M}$ . Furthermore, as  $\bar{M}$  has a reflection isometry (which maps a point  $x \in M$  to its copy in  $M'$ ), detailed checking of the construction in Section 3 in [10] shows that  $\{g_k\}$  can be produced in such a way that each  $g_k$  also has the same reflection isometry. (Precisely, this can be achieved by choosing the mollifier  $\phi(t)$  in equation (8) in [10] and the cut-off function  $\sigma(t)$  in equation (9) in [10] to be both even functions.) Therefore, if we let

$\bar{M}_k$  be the Riemannian manifold obtained by replacing the metric  $g_{\bar{M}}$  by  $g_k$  on  $\bar{M}$ , then  $\Sigma_H$  remains a surface with zero mean curvature in  $\bar{M}_k$  (in fact  $\Sigma_H$  is totally geodesic). Define  $h_k$  to be the restriction of  $g_k$  to the background manifold of  $M$ , Lemma 4 is proved.  $\square$

We continue with the proof of Theorem 1. Let  $\{h_k\}$  be the metric approximation of  $g_M$  provided in Lemma 4. Let  $M_k$  be the asymptotically flat manifold obtained by replacing the metric  $g_M$  on  $M$  by  $h_k$ . For any surface  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  in  $M$ , let  $|\tilde{\Sigma}|_k$ ,  $|\tilde{\Sigma}|$  be the area of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  w.r.t the induced metric from  $h_k$ ,  $g_M$  respectively. We can not apply the Riemannian Penrose Inequality directly to claim  $m_{ADM}(h_k) \geq \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_H|_k}{16\pi}}$ . That is because we do not know if  $\Sigma_H$  remains to be the outermost minimal surface in  $M_k$ . However, since  $\Sigma_H$  is a minimal surface in  $M_k$ , we know the outermost minimal surface in  $M_k$ , denoted by  $\Sigma_k$ , exists and its area satisfies

$$(42) \quad |\Sigma_k|_k = \inf\{|\tilde{\Sigma}|_k \mid \tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of closed surfaces  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  in  $M$  that enclose  $\Sigma_H$  (see [5], [9]). By the Riemannian Penrose Inequality (Theorem 1 in [5]), we have

$$(43) \quad m_{ADM}(h_k) \geq \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_k|_k}{16\pi}}.$$

Let  $k$  approach infinity, we have

$$(44) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m_{ADM}(h_k) = m_{ADM}(g_M),$$

and

$$(45) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\Sigma_k|_k = \inf\{|\tilde{\Sigma}| \mid \tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

where we have used (42) and the fact that  $\{h_k\}$  converges uniformly to  $g_M$  in the  $C^0$  topology. By Lemma 3, we also have

$$(46) \quad |\Sigma_H| = \inf\{|\tilde{\Sigma}| \mid \tilde{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Therefore, it follows from (43), (44), (45) and (46) that

$$(47) \quad m_{ADM}(g_M) \geq \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_H|}{16\pi}}.$$

To finish the proof of Theorem 1, we make use of the monotonicity of the integral

$$(48) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_s - H_u) d\sigma.$$

By Proposition 1, we have

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \oint_{\Sigma_O} N(H_s - H_u) d\sigma &\geq \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_s - H_u) d\sigma \\ &= 8\pi(m_0 - m). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we know

$$(50) \quad m_0 = m_{ADM}(g_u^m) = m_{ADM}(g_M),$$

and

$$(51) \quad m = \frac{1}{2}R_H = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma_H|}{16\pi}}.$$

Therefore, it follows from (49), (50), (51) and (47) that

$$(52) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_O} N(H_s - H_u) d\sigma \geq 0.$$

Plug in  $H_s = \frac{2}{R}N$ ,  $H_u = H$  and  $N = \sqrt{1 - \frac{R_H}{R}}$ , we then have

$$(53) \quad 8\pi R \sqrt{1 - \frac{R_H}{R}} \geq \oint_{\Sigma_O} H d\sigma.$$

Direct computation shows that (53) is equivalent to (3). Hence, (3) is proved.

Finally, when the equality in (3) holds, we have

$$(54) \quad \oint_{\Sigma_r} N(H_s - H_u) d\sigma = 0, \quad \forall r \geq R.$$

By the derivative formula (33),  $u$  is identically 1 on  $M_o^m$ . Therefore, the metric  $g_u^m$  is indeed the Schwarzschild metric  $g^m$ . Since the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_O$  in  $(M_o^m, g_u^m)$  was arranged to equal  $H$ , the mean curvature of  $\Sigma_O$  in  $\Omega$ , we conclude that  $H = \frac{2}{R} \left(1 - \frac{R_H}{R}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , which is a constant. Theorem 1 is proved.  $\square$

Comparing to the equality case in Theorem 2, one would expect that the equality in (3) holds if and only if  $\Omega$  is isometric to a region, in a spatial Schwarzschild manifold, which is bounded by a rotationally symmetric sphere and the Schwarzschild horizon. We believe that this is true, but are not able to prove it at this stage. A confirmation of this expectation seems to require a good knowledge of the behavior of a sequence of asymptotically flat 3-manifolds with controlled  $C^0$ -geometry, on which the equality of the Riemannian Penrose Inequality is nearly satisfied. We leave this as an open question.

## 4. SOME DISCUSSION

Let  $\Sigma$  be an arbitrary closed 2-surface in a general 3-manifold  $M$  with nonnegative scalar curvature. Consider the quantity

$$(55) \quad m(\Sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{16\pi|\Sigma|} \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H \right)^2 \right]$$

where  $|\Sigma|$  is the area of  $\Sigma$ ,  $H$  is the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  in  $M$  and we omit the surface measure  $d\sigma$  in the integral. Theorem 1 suggests that, if  $\Sigma$  is metrically a round sphere,  $m(\Sigma)$  may potentially agree with a hidden definition of quasi-local mass of  $\Sigma$ . Such a speculation could be further strengthened by the resemblance between  $m(\Sigma)$  and the Hawking quasi-local mass [8]

$$(56) \quad m_H(\Sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{16\pi} \oint_{\Sigma} H^2 \right].$$

By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$(57) \quad m(\Sigma) \geq m_H(\Sigma)$$

for any surface  $\Sigma$ . On the other hand, if  $\Sigma$  is a closed convex surface in the Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , the classic Minkowski inequality [12]

$$(58) \quad \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H d\sigma \right)^2 \geq 16\pi|\Sigma|$$

implies that  $m(\Sigma) \leq 0$  and  $m(\Sigma) = 0$  if and only if  $\Sigma$  is a round sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Therefore, even though bigger than  $m_H(\Sigma)$ ,  $m(\Sigma)$  shares the same character as  $m_H(\Sigma)$  that it is negative on most convex surfaces in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

In order to gain positivity and to maintain the same numerical value on metrically round spheres, we propose to modify  $m(\Sigma)$  in a similar way as the Brown-York mass  $m_{BY}(\Sigma)$  [6] is defined. Recall that, for those  $\Sigma$  with positive Gaussian curvature,  $m_{BY}(\Sigma)$  is defined to be

$$(59) \quad m_{BY}(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{8\pi} \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H_0 d\sigma - \oint_{\Sigma} H d\sigma \right)$$

where  $H_0$  is the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  when it is isometrically embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Now suppose  $\Sigma$  is metrically a round sphere, then

$$(60) \quad \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H_0 \right)^2 = 16\pi|\Sigma|.$$

In this case, we can re-wriite  $m(\Sigma)$  as either

$$(61) \quad m(\Sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\oint_{\Sigma} H}{\oint_{\Sigma} H_0} \right)^2 \right]$$

or

$$(62) \quad m(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H_0 \right) \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\oint_{\Sigma} H}{\oint_{\Sigma} H_0} \right)^2 \right].$$

This motivates us to consider the following two quantities:

**Definition 1.** For any  $\Sigma$  with positive Gaussian curvature, define

$$(63) \quad m_1(\Sigma) = \sqrt{\frac{|\Sigma|}{16\pi}} \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\oint_{\Sigma} H}{\oint_{\Sigma} H_0} \right)^2 \right],$$

and

$$(64) \quad m_2(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left( \oint_{\Sigma} H_0 \right) \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{\oint_{\Sigma} H}{\oint_{\Sigma} H_0} \right)^2 \right],$$

where  $H$  is the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  in  $M$  and  $H_0$  is the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  when it is isometrically embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

The following result compares  $m_H(\Sigma)$ ,  $m_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $m_2(\Sigma)$  and  $m_{BY}(\Sigma)$ .

**Theorem 3.** Suppose  $\Sigma$  is a closed 2-surface with positive Gaussian curvature in a 3-manifold  $M$ . Then

- (i)  $m_1(\Sigma) \geq m_H(\Sigma)$ , and equality holds if and only if  $\Sigma$  is metrically a round sphere and  $\Sigma$  has constant mean curvature.
- (ii)  $m_{BY}(\Sigma) \geq m_2(\Sigma)$ , and equality holds if and only if  $\oint_{\Sigma} H_0 \, d\sigma = \oint_{\Sigma} H \, d\sigma$ .
- (iii) Suppose  $\Sigma$  bounds a domain  $\Omega$  with nonnegative scalar curvature and the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  in  $\Omega$  is positive, then

$$m_2(\Sigma) \geq m_1(\Sigma) \geq 0.$$

Moreover,  $m_1(\Sigma) = 0$  if and only if  $\Omega$  is isometric to a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , and  $m_2(\Sigma) = m_1(\Sigma)$  if and only if either  $\Omega$  is isometric to a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  in which case  $m_2(\Sigma) = m_1(\Sigma) = 0$  or  $\Sigma$  is metrically a round sphere.

*Proof.* (i) Let  $m(\Sigma)$  be defined as in (55). By the Minkowski inequality (58), we have  $m_1(\Sigma) \geq m(\Sigma)$ . By (57), we have  $m(\Sigma) \geq m_H(\Sigma)$ . Therefore,  $m_1(\Sigma) \geq m_H(\Sigma)$  and equality holds if and only if  $\Sigma$  is metrically a round sphere and the mean curvature of  $\Sigma$  in  $M$  is a constant.

(ii) This case is elementary. Let  $a = \oint_{\Sigma} H$  and  $b = \oint_{\Sigma} H_0$ . Then (ii) is equivalent to the inequality  $(1 - \frac{a}{b})^2 \geq 0$ .

(iii) By the result of Shi and Tam [14], i.e. Theorem 2, we have

$$(65) \quad 1 - \left( \frac{\oint_{\Sigma} H}{\oint_{\Sigma} H_0} \right)^2 \geq 0$$

with equality holding if and only if  $\Omega$  is isometric to a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . (iii) now follows directly from (65) and the Minkowski inequality (58).  $\square$

Suppose  $\Omega$  is a compact 3-manifold with boundary with nonnegative scalar curvature and its boundary  $\partial\Omega$  has positive Gaussian curvature and positive mean curvature. Theorem 3 implies that

$$(66) \quad m_{BY}(\partial\Omega) \geq m_2(\partial\Omega) \geq m_1(\partial\Omega) \geq m_H(\partial\Omega)$$

with  $m_1(\partial\Omega) \geq 0$  and  $m_{BY}(\partial\Omega) = m_H(\partial\Omega)$  if and only if  $\Omega$  is isometric to a round ball in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . This provides a slight generalization of a previous result of Shi and Tam (Theorem 3.1 (b) in [15]), which showed  $m_{BY}(\partial\Omega) \geq m_H(\partial\Omega)$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner. Coordinate invariance and energy expressions in general relativity. *Phys. Rev. (2)*, 122:997–1006, 1961.
- [2] Robert Bartnik. New definition of quasilocal mass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 62(20):2346–2348, 1989.
- [3] Robert Bartnik. Quasi-spherical metrics and prescribed scalar curvature. *J. Differential Geom.*, 37(1):31–71, 1993.
- [4] Hubert L. Bray. The Penrose inequality in general relativity and volume comparison theorems involving scalar curvature. *Stanford University Thesis*, 1997.
- [5] Hubert L. Bray. Proof of the Riemannian Penrose inequality using the positive mass theorem. *J. Differential Geom.*, 59(2):177–267, 2001.
- [6] J. David Brown and James W. York, Jr. Quasilocal energy in general relativity. In *Mathematical aspects of classical field theory (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 132 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 129–142. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.
- [7] D. Christodoulou and S.-T. Yau. Some remarks on the quasi-local mass. In *Mathematics and general relativity (Santa Cruz, CA, 1986)*, volume 71 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 9–14. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1988.
- [8] Stephen Hawking. Gravitational radiation in an expanding universe. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 9:598–604, 1968.
- [9] Gerhard Huisken and Tom Ilmanen. The inverse mean curvature flow and the Riemannian Penrose inequality. *J. Differential Geom.*, 59(3):353–437, 2001.
- [10] Pengzi Miao. Positive mass theorem on manifolds admitting corners along a hypersurface. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 6(6):1163–1182 (2003), 2002.
- [11] Louis Nirenberg. The Weyl and Minkowski problems in differential geometry in the large. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 6:337–394, 1953.

- [12] G. Pólya and G. Szegő. *Isoperimetric Inequalities in Mathematical Physics*. Annals of Mathematics Studies, no. 27. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1951.
- [13] 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.
- [14] Yuguang Shi and Luen-Fai Tam. Positive mass theorem and the boundary behaviors of compact manifolds with nonnegative scalar curvature. *J. Differential Geom.*, 62(1):79–125, 2002.
- [15] Yuguang Shi and Luen-Fai Tam. Quasi-local mass and the existence of horizons. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 274(2):277–295, 2007.
- [16] Edward Witten. A new proof of the positive energy theorem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 80(3):381–402, 1981.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, MONASH UNIVERSITY, VICTORIA, 3800, AUSTRALIA.

*E-mail address:* Pengzi.Miao@sci.monash.edu.au