

MEAN CURVATURE BLOWUP IN MEAN CURVATURE FLOW

ANDREW A. COOPER

ABSTRACT. In this note we establish that finite-time singularities of the mean curvature flow of compact Riemannian submanifolds $M_t^m \hookrightarrow (N^{m+n}, h)$ are characterised by the blow up of the mean curvature.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that the mean curvature flow $\partial_t F = H$ of submanifolds $F_t : M^m \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ has finite-time singularities characterised by the blowup of the second fundamental form Π :

Theorem 1.1 (Huisken [4]). *Suppose $T < \infty$ is the first singular time for a compact mean curvature flow. Then $\max_{M_t} |\Pi| \rightarrow \infty$.*

We will prove that in fact it suffices to consider the mean curvature vector $H = \text{tr } \Pi$:

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose $T < \infty$ is the first singular time for a mean curvature flow of compact submanifolds of a Riemannian manifold (N, h) with bounded geometry. Then $\max_{M_t} |H| \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow T$.*

The blow-up of $|H|$ was previously known for hypersurfaces with $H > 0$, by work of Huisken and Sinestrari [3], [2] which established lower bounds on the principal curvatures in the mean-convex setting.

In [7], Šešum proved the analogous result for the Ricci flow, namely that $|\text{Ric}|$ blows up at a finite first singular time. Our proof is motivated by hers.

2. PRELIMINARIES

First we recall some evolution equations for the flow. We use indices $1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq m, m+1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq m+n$. $h_{ij\alpha}$ denotes the α th component of $\Pi(\partial_i, \partial_j)$. H^α denotes the α th component of H . g_{ij} denotes the induced metric. \overline{R} with four indices denotes the extrinsic Riemannian curvature, and \overline{R} with two indices denotes the extrinsic Ricci curvature. ∇_i denotes the tangential covariant derivative in the direction i . We use the summation convention for upper and lower indices.

Lemma 2.1 (Huisken [4], Smoczyk [6]). *Along a mean curvature flow $M_t \hookrightarrow (N, h)$, we have*

- (1) $\partial_t g_{ij} = -2H^\alpha h_{ij\alpha}$
- (2) $\partial_t \text{dvol} = -|H|^2 \text{dvol}$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C44.

Key words and phrases. Mean curvature flow.

The author was partially supported by an RTG Research Training in Geometry and Topology NSF grant DMS 0353717 and as a graduate student on NSF grant DMS 06-04759.

$$(3) \quad \partial_t h_{ij\alpha} = \Delta h_{ij\alpha} - 2H^\beta h_{jk\beta} h_i^k{}_\alpha + h_{ik\beta} h_l^{k\beta} h_j^l{}_\alpha + \bar{R}_{il} h_j^l{}_\alpha - \nabla_i \bar{R}_{j\alpha} - \nabla_k \bar{R}^k{}_{ij\alpha}$$

By integrating the evolution equation for $|\nabla^s \Pi|$ and using the Hölder and Morrey inequalities, one can obtain

Theorem 2.1 (Huisken [4], Smoczyk [6]). *Along the mean curvature flow,*
 $\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\nabla^s \Pi|$ *is bounded in terms of* $\sup_{M \times [0, T)} |\Pi|$.

We also recall

Lemma 2.2 (Glickenstein [1]). *Suppose a 1-parameter family of complete Riemannian manifolds $(M, g(t))$ is uniformly continuous in t , that is, for any t_0 and any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ so that $(1 - \epsilon)g(t_0) \leq g(t) \leq (1 + \epsilon)g(t_0)$ for $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \delta]$. Then for any $p \in M$, $r > 0$, the metric balls centred at p satisfy:*

$$B_{g(t_0)}(p, \frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}}) \subset B_{g(t)}(p, r)$$

Proof. Let $p, q \in M$. Let $\gamma : [0, S] \rightarrow M$ be a minimising geodesic from p to q for the metric $g(t_0)$. Then the distance $d_{g(t_0)}(p, q)$ in the metric $g(t_0)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} d_{g(t_0)}(p, q) &= \int_0^S |\dot{\gamma}|_{g(t_0)}(s) ds \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}} \int_0^S |\dot{\gamma}|_{g(t)}(s) ds \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}} d_{g(t)}(p, q) \end{aligned}$$

so that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}} d_{g(t)}(p, q) \leq d_{g(t_0)}(p, q)$. This immediately implies

$$B_{g(t_0)}(p, \frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}}) \subset B_{g(t)}(p, r)$$

□

3. THE BLOW UP

We will prove Theorem 1.2 by contradiction. To this end, assume $\max_M |H(t)| \leq C$ for all $t \in [0, T)$, and that the flow has a singularity at $T < \infty$.

By Theorem 1.1, we know that as $t \rightarrow T$, $\max_M |\Pi(t)| \rightarrow \infty$. Let (p_j, t_j) be a sequence in $M \times [0, T)$ with $t_j \rightarrow T$ and $\max_{t \leq t_j} |\Pi| = |\Pi(p_j, t_j)| =: Q_j^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that all $F(p_j, t_j)$ lie in an ambient metric ball $B^N(R)$ about some $p_0 \in N$, and choose p_0 so that $F(p_j, t_j) \rightarrow p_0$. We can assume R has radius less than the injectivity radius of (N, h) .

For any $r > 0$, suppose $F(q, 0) \in B^N(r)$. Since $|\partial_t F| = |H| \leq C$, we have $F(q, t) \in B^N(CTr)$ for any $t \in [0, T)$. So $F_t(F_0^{-1}(B^N(\frac{R}{CT}))) \subset B^N(R)$. By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that all the p_j lie in one component \tilde{M} of $F_0^{-1}(B^N(\frac{R}{CT}))$. The sequel only uses this smaller set $\tilde{M} \subset M$, so we will denote it by M as well.

Consider the flows given by scaling the ambient metric by Q_j and time by Q_j^{-2} :

$$F_j(p, t) = F(p, t_j + \frac{t}{Q_j^2}) : M \hookrightarrow (B^N, Q_j^2 h)$$

Lemma 3.1. *Each F_j is a mean curvature flow on $M \times [-Q_j^2 t_j, 0]$. The second fundamental form of F_j is bounded:*

$$\max_{t \leq 0} |\Pi_j| = |\Pi_j(p_j, 0)| = 1$$

Proof. Clearly $\partial_t F_j = Q_j^{-2} \partial_t F$. We need to show that by scaling the ambient metric, we induce the same scaling in H . By definition

$$\begin{aligned} H_{Q_j^2 h}(F_j) &= \text{tr}_{Q_j^2 h} \Pi_{Q_j^2 h}(F_j) \\ &= (Q_j^2 h)^{pq} (\partial_p \partial_q F_j)^{\perp_{Q_j^2 h}} \end{aligned}$$

where $(Q_j^2 h)^{pq}$ is the inverse matrix of $(Q_j^2 h)(\partial_p F_j, \partial_q F_j)$ and $\perp_{Q_j^2 h}$ is the projection onto the normal bundle induced from $Q_j^2 h$.

$Q_j^2 h$ induces the same splitting into tangent and normal bundles as h , so we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{Q_j^2 h}(F_j) &= Q_j^{-2} [h^{pq} (\partial_p \partial_q F_j)^{\perp_h}] \\ &= Q_j^{-2} \text{tr}_h \Pi_h(F_j) \\ &= Q_j^{-2} H_h(F_j) \end{aligned}$$

So H scales as required.

Similarly scaling the ambient metric by Q_j^2 scales $|\Pi|$ by Q_j^{-2} , so we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \leq 0} |\Pi_j| &= \max_{t \leq t_j} Q_j^{-2} |\Pi| \\ &= Q_j^{-2} |\Pi(p_j, t_j)| = 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

It is clear that the $(B^N, Q_j^2 h, p_0)$ converge in the Cheeger-Gromov sense to $(\mathbb{R}^{m+n}, dx^2, 0)$, where dx^2 is the Euclidean metric. In particular, we have a monotone exhausting sequence of open sets $V_j \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ and embeddings $\psi_j : (V_j, 0) \hookrightarrow (B^N, p_0)$, such that $\psi_{j+1}|_{V_j} = \psi_j$.

Let $s_0 = -Q_1^2 t_1$. Again after passing to a smaller spatial region $\tilde{M} \subset M$, we can assume $F_j(\tilde{M} \times [s_0, 0]) \subset \psi_j(V_j)$. As before, we restrict our argument to this smaller region and write M without confusion.

Define $\tilde{F}_j : M \times [s_0, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ by $\tilde{F}_j = \psi_j^{-1} F_j$. Each \tilde{F}_j is a mean curvature flow with respect to the metric $\psi_j^*(Q_j^2 h)$.

The second fundamental forms $\tilde{\Pi}_j$ of the \tilde{F}_j are uniformly bounded, so Theorem 2.1 gives uniform bounds on the covariant derivatives of the $\tilde{\Pi}_j$. Hence we have uniform bounds on the spatial derivatives of \tilde{F}_j .

Since $\partial_t \tilde{F}_j = \tilde{H}_j$, we get bounds on the time derivative of \tilde{F}_j . In fact the evolution of H gives a bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_t^2 \tilde{F}_j| &= |\partial_t \tilde{H}_j| \leq |\Delta \tilde{H}_j| + C_1 |\nabla \tilde{H}_j| + C_2 |\tilde{H}_j| |\tilde{\Pi}_j|^2 \\ &\leq |\nabla^2 \tilde{\Pi}_j| + C_1 |\nabla \tilde{\Pi}_j| + C_2 |\tilde{\Pi}_j|^3 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, any iterated time derivative $\partial_t^s \tilde{F}_j = \partial_t^{s-1}(\tilde{H}_j)$ is controlled in terms of $|\nabla^r \tilde{\Pi}_j|$ for $r \leq 2(s-1)$. The mixed derivatives $\partial_t^r \nabla^s \tilde{\Pi}_j$ can be similarly controlled by $|\nabla^l \tilde{\Pi}_j|$ for $l \leq 2r+s$.

Thus the derivatives of \tilde{F}_j are uniformly bounded. By the Arzela-Ascoli theorem we have a convergence in any C^k to a limit $F_\infty : M \times [s_0, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$.

Proposition 3.1. *F_∞ is a stationary mean curvature flow.*

Proof. Fix i and consider the sequence $H_{\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)}(\tilde{F}_j)$ of mean curvature vectors of the \tilde{F}_j with respect to the metric $\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)$.

$$H_{\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)}(\tilde{F}_j) = (\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h))^{pq}(\tilde{F}_j)(\partial_p \partial_q \tilde{F}_j)^{\perp_{\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)}}$$

Since the ψ_i agree, every $\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)$ is conformal to $\psi_k^*(Q_k^2 h)$ on V_k for $k \leq i$. Hence splitting into normal and tangent bundles is the same for each $\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)$. Since the $\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h) \rightarrow dx^2$, this splitting is the same as the one from dx^2 . Now letting first $j \rightarrow \infty$ and then $i \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_i \lim_j H_{\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h)}(\tilde{F}_j) &= \lim_i (\partial_p \partial_q (\lim_j \tilde{F}_j))^{\perp_{dx^2}} (\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h))^{pq} (\lim_j \tilde{F}_j) \\ &= (\partial_p \partial_q F_\infty)^{\perp_{dx^2}} \lim_i (\psi_i^*(Q_i^2 h))^{pq} (F_\infty) \\ &= (\partial_p \partial_q F_\infty)^{\perp_{dx^2}} (dx^2)^{pq} (F_\infty) \\ &= H_{dx^2}(F_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\lim_j H_{\psi_j^*(Q_j^2 h)}(\tilde{F}_j) = H_{dx^2}(F_\infty)$. On the other hand, since \tilde{F}_j is a mean curvature flow with respect to $\psi_j^*(Q_j^2 h)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_j H_{\psi_j^*(Q_j^2 h)}(\tilde{F}_j) &= \lim_j \partial_t \tilde{F}_j \\ &= \partial_t \lim_j \tilde{F}_j = \partial_t F_\infty \end{aligned}$$

Thus F_∞ is a mean curvature flow.

The rescaled $\tilde{H}_j = H_{\psi_j^*(Q_j^2 h)}(\tilde{F}_j)$ have $|\tilde{H}_j| \leq \frac{C}{Q_j^2}$, so in the limit $H_{dx^2}(F_\infty)$ vanishes. Hence the flow is stationary. \square

Since the limit flow is stationary, we will abuse notation and write $F_\infty : M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ for $F_\infty(\cdot, 0)$.

Adapting the ideas of [7], we consider the growth of balls in $F_\infty(M)$.

Definition 3.1. We say that the submanifold $F : M^m \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ has euclidean extrinsic volume growth at $p \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ if $\text{vol}(F(M) \cap \bar{B}(p, r)) = r^m \omega_m$ for all $r > 0$, where \bar{B} is the ball in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} with centre p and radius r and ω_m is the volume of the unit Euclidean m -ball.

Proposition 3.2. *$F_\infty : M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ has euclidean extrinsic volume growth at 0.*

Proof. Let us make the following convention for intersections with extrinsic balls. $\bar{B}_\infty(\rho)$ will denote the metric ball in (\mathbb{R}^{m+n}, dx^2) centred at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. $\bar{B}_j(\rho)$ will denote the metric ball in $(N, Q_j^2 h)$ centred at $F_j(p_j, 0)$. $\bar{B}_{t_j}(\rho)$ will denote the metric ball in (N, h) centred at $F(p_j, t_j)$. Note that $\bar{B}_j(\rho) = \bar{B}_{t_j}(\frac{\rho}{Q_j})$.

Let vol_∞ , vol_j , and vol_{t_j} denote the volumes induced from the embeddings F_∞ , $F_j(\cdot, 0)$, and $F(\cdot, t_j)$ respectively. We also use vol_{t_j} to denote the pullback volume $F_{t_j}^* \text{vol}_{t_j}$ on the domain manifold M .

We have, for any $r > 0$,

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}_\infty(r))}{r^m} &= \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_j(F_j(M) \cap \overline{B}_j(r))}{r^m} \\ &= \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(F_{t_j}(M) \cap \overline{B}_{t_j}(\frac{r}{Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\partial_t F| = |H| \leq C$, we have that $|F(\cdot, t) - F(\cdot, t_0)| \leq C|t - t_0|$. Thus F is uniformly continuous in time. In particular, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ so that $F(q, t) \in \overline{B}(F(q, t_0), \epsilon)$ for all $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \delta]$, $q \in M$.

Then we have, for such ϵ, δ, t, t_0 , that

$$F_{t_j}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_j}(\rho)) \subset F_{t_0}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_0}((1 + \epsilon)\rho))$$

which implies

$$\text{vol}_{t_j}(F_{t_j}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_j}(\frac{r}{Q_j}))) \leq \text{vol}_{t_j}(F_{t_0}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_0}((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j})))$$

Since $t_j \rightarrow T$, we can take some j_0 so large that, for our given ϵ , all the t_j with $j \geq j_0$ are δ -close. So we can estimate (1) by:

$$(2) \quad \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(F_{t_j}(M) \cap \overline{B}_{t_j}(\frac{r}{Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} \leq \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(F_{t_{j_0}}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_{j_0}}((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j})))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m}$$

The evolution of the volume form shows that the flow is volume-reducing. So $\text{vol}_{t_j} \leq \text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}$ for $j \geq j_0$. Thus we can estimate (2) by

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(F_{t_{j_0}}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_{j_0}}((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j})))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} &\leq \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}(F_{t_{j_0}}^{-1}(\overline{B}_{t_{j_0}}((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j})))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} \\ &= \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}(F_{t_{j_0}}(M) \cap \overline{B}_{t_{j_0}}((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} \\ &= \lim_j (1 + \epsilon)^m \frac{\text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}(F_{t_{j_0}}(M) \cap \overline{B}_{t_{j_0}}((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j}))}{((1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} \end{aligned}$$

so that the only dependence of the right hand side on j is in the Q_j .

Since $F_{t_{j_0}}(M)$ is a submanifold, we have $\lim_{\rho \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}(F_{t_{j_0}}(M) \cap \overline{B}_{t_{j_0}}(\rho))}{\rho^m} = \omega_m$. Since $Q_j \rightarrow \infty$, we may take $\rho = (1 + \epsilon)\frac{r}{Q_j} \rightarrow 0$. So we have shown

$$\frac{\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}_\infty(r))}{r^m} \leq (1 + \epsilon)^m \omega_m$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary, it follows that $\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}(r)) \leq r^m \omega_m$.

The monotonicity formula for minimal submanifolds [5] asserts that $\frac{\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}_\infty(r))}{r^m}$ is decreasing as $r \rightarrow 0$. Since $F_\infty(M)$ is a submanifold,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}_\infty(r))}{r^m} = \omega_m$$

Hence $\frac{\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}_\infty(r))}{r^m} \searrow \omega_m$ as $r \rightarrow 0$. In particular

$$\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}_\infty(r)) \geq r^m \omega_m$$

Thus we have established that F_∞ has euclidean extrinsic volume growth at 0. \square

Now we consider intrinsic metric balls $B_\infty \subset M$ induced from F_∞ .

Proposition 3.3. *M_∞ has supereuclidean intrinsic volume growth at 0, that is, $\text{vol}_\infty(B_\infty(0, r)) \geq r^m \omega_m$.*

Proof. This claim is proved essentially identically to the corresponding claim in the proof of Theorem 2 from [7].

Consider the flow of rescaled metrics $g_j(t)$ induced from the rescaled $F_j(\cdot, t)$. Their evolution is given by

$$\partial_t g_j = -2H_j \cdot \Pi_j$$

where H_j is the rescaled mean curvature vector and Π_j is the rescaled second fundamental form. By choice of rescaling, $|\Pi_j| \leq 1$ and $|H_j| \leq \frac{C}{Q_j^2}$. In particular, $|\partial_t g_j| \leq 2C$, so the $g_j(t)$ are uniformly continuous in t in the sense of Lemma 2.2, with no dependence on j .

The uniform continuity of each g_j implies the uniform continuity of the original metric $g(t)$. To see this, simply compute the rescaled metrics. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \epsilon)g_j(t_0) &\leq g_j(t) \leq (1 + \epsilon)g_j(t_0) \\ (1 - \epsilon)g(t_j + \frac{t_0}{Q_j^2}) &\leq g(t_j + \frac{t}{Q_j^2}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)g(t_j + \frac{t_0}{Q_j^2}) \end{aligned}$$

where $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \delta]$. This inequality appears to depend on j , but in fact we may choose one j (say $j = 1$) and obtain that g is uniformly continuous in t .

Thus we may apply Lemma 2.2 to estimate the metric balls at any time t_j by the metric ball at time t_{j_0} , so long as $t_j - t_{j_0} \leq \delta$. Since $t_j \rightarrow T$, we can pick a j_0 so that this condition holds for all $j \leq j_0$. Let B_∞ , B_j , and B_{t_j} denote the intrinsic metric balls induced by the embeddings F_∞ , $F_j(\cdot, 0)$, and $F(\cdot, t_j)$ respectively, considered as subsets of the domain M .

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{vol}_\infty(B_\infty(r))}{r^m} &= \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_j(B_j(r))}{r^m} \\ &= \lim_j \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(B_{t_j}(\frac{r}{Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{Q_j})^m} \\ &\geq \lim_j (1 + \epsilon)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(B_{t_{j_0}}(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}Q_j})^m} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Since $|H| \leq C$, we have using the evolution of dvol that

$$\text{dvol}_t \geq e^{-C^2|t-t_0|} \text{dvol}_{t_0}$$

Since the $t_j \rightarrow T$, we can take j_0 large enough that $\text{vol}_{t_j} \geq (1 - \epsilon) \text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}$ for $j > j_0$. Then we may continue (3):

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_j (1 + \epsilon)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \frac{\text{vol}_{t_j}(B_{t_{j_0}}(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}Q_j})^m} &\geq \lim_j (1 - \epsilon)(1 + \epsilon)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \frac{\text{vol}_{t_{j_0}}(B_{t_{j_0}}(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}Q_j}))}{(\frac{r}{\sqrt{1+\epsilon}Q_j})^m} \\ &= \frac{1 - \epsilon}{(1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{m}{2}}} \omega_m \end{aligned}$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$. Thus $\text{vol}_\infty(B_\infty(r)) \geq r^m \omega_m$. \square

We also need an elementary fact about continuous functions.

Lemma 3.2. *Let ϕ, ψ be continuous, nonnegative real functions on a measure space (X, μ) , such that*

- (1) $\mu(U) > 0$ for any nonempty open U .
- (2) $\phi \leq \psi$
- (3) For any $R \in \mathbb{R}$, the sublevel sets $D_\phi(R) = \{x \in X | \phi(x) \leq R\}$ and $D_\psi(R) = \{x \in X | \psi(x) \leq R\}$ have the same finite measure.

Then $\phi \equiv \psi$.

Proof. Since $\phi \leq \psi$, we have for each R that $D_\psi(R) \subset D_\phi(R)$.

Hence $\mu(D_\phi(R) \setminus D_\psi(R)) = \mu(D_\phi(R)) - \mu(D_\psi(R)) = 0$.

Consider $V = \{x \in X | \phi(x) < \psi(x)\}$. For each $x \in V$, we can find a rational R so that $\phi(x) \leq R < \psi(x)$. Then $x \in D_\phi(R) \setminus D_\psi(R)$. Thus we have

$$V \subset \bigcup_{R \in \mathbb{Q}} D_\phi(R) \setminus D_\psi(R)$$

Thus $\mu(V) \leq \sum_{R \in \mathbb{Q}} \mu(D_\phi(R) \setminus D_\psi(R)) = 0$. On the other hand, V is open since ϕ

and ψ are continuous. Then the assumption on μ implies that V must be empty, i.e. $\phi \equiv \psi$. \square

Now we combine these lemmas to finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 give

$$r^m \omega_m \leq \text{vol}_\infty(B_\infty(r)) \leq \text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}(r)) = r^m \omega_m$$

Thus $\text{vol}_\infty(F_\infty(M) \cap \overline{B}(r)) = \text{vol}_\infty(B_\infty(r))$.

Let $d(p)$ denote the intrinsic distance in $F_\infty(M)$ from 0 to p and $\bar{d}(p)$ denote the extrinsic distance. Then $d \geq \bar{d}$. By Lemma 3.2, we have in fact $d \equiv \bar{d}$. So $F_\infty(M)$ -minimising geodesics at 0 are \mathbb{R}^{m+n} -minimising geodesics at 0. That is, $F_\infty(M)$ is totally geodesic at 0.

Hence $\Pi_\infty(0, 0) = 0$.

This is the desired contradiction, for $|\Pi_\infty(0, 0)| = 1$ by construction. \square

Remark. There are two major differences between the argument we give here and that in [7].

First, the blow-up argument in Šešum's work makes use of Perelman's non-collapsing theorem to get an injectivity radius bound, and uses Cheeger-Gromov convergence of the rescaled Ricci flows. We note that our argument could be stated in terms of the Cheeger-Gromov limit of $(M, F_j^*(Q_j^2 h), p_j)$. Uniform bounds on the second fundamental forms $\tilde{\Pi}_j$ immediately imply a uniform injectivity radius bound, so this approach would not require a result analogous to Perelman's.

Second, where Šešum's argument employs the Bishop volume comparison for Ricci-nonnegative Riemannian manifolds, we use the monotonicity theorem for minimal submanifolds.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank his adviser Jon Wolfson for his help and suggestions. He also wishes to thank Xiaodong Wang for suggesting this problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] David Glickenstein. Precompactness of solutions to the ricci flow. *Geometry and Topology*, 7:487–510, 2003.
- [2] Gerhard Huisken and Carlo Sinestrari. Convexity estimates for mean curvature flow and singularities of mean convex surfaces. *Acta Mathematica*, 183:45–70, 1999.
- [3] Gerhard Huisken and Carlo Sinestrari. Mean curvature flow singularities for mean convex surfaces. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 8:1–14, 1999.
- [4] Gerhard Huisken. Flow by mean curvature of convex hypersurfaces into spheres. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 20:237–266, 1984.
- [5] Leon Simon. *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*, volume 3 of *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematics and its Applications*. Centre for Mathematical Analysis, 1983.
- [6] Knut Smoczyk. Angle theorems for the lagrangian mean curvature flow. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 240:849–883, 2002.
- [7] Nataša Šešum. Curvature tensor under the ricci flow. arXiv:math.DG/0311397, 2003.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48824

E-mail address: `andrew.a.cooper@gmail.com`