

Local Palais-Smale Sequences for the Willmore Functional

Yann Bernard* , Tristan Rivière*

May 3, 2022

Abstract : Using the reformulation in divergence form of the Euler-Lagrange equation for the Willmore functional as it was developed in the second author's paper [Riv2], we study the limit of a local Palais-Smale sequence of weak Willmore immersions with locally square-integrable second fundamental form. We show that the limit immersion is smooth and that it satisfies the *conformal Willmore equation*: it is a critical point of the Willmore functional restricted to infinitesimal conformal variations.

I Introduction

I.1 The Willmore Functional and the Willmore Equation

Consider an oriented surface Σ without boundary immersed in \mathbb{R}^m , for some $m \geq 3$, through the action of a smooth positive immersion $\vec{\Phi}$. We introduce the Gauß map \vec{n} , which to every point x in Σ assigns the unit $(m-2)$ -plane $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$ orthogonal to the oriented tangent space $T_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$. This map acts from Σ into $Gr_{m-2}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, the Grassmannian of oriented $(m-2)$ -planes in \mathbb{R}^m . It thus naturally induces a projection map $\pi_{\vec{n}}$ which to every vector ξ in $T_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\mathbb{R}^m$ associates its orthogonal projection $\pi_{\vec{n}}(\xi)$ onto $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$. Let x be a point on Σ . We denote by \vec{B}_x the second fundamental form of the immersion $\vec{\Phi}$. It is a $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$ -valued symmetric bilinear form on $T_x\Sigma \times T_x\Sigma$, defined by $\vec{B}_x = \pi_{\vec{n}} \circ d^2\vec{\Phi}$. Having chosen an orthonormal basis $\{e_1, e_2\}$ on $T_x\Sigma$, the mean curvature $\vec{H}(x)$ of the immersion $\vec{\Phi}$ is the vector in $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$ given by

$$\vec{H}(x) := \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}(\vec{B}_x) \equiv \frac{1}{2} (\vec{B}_x(e_1, e_1) + \vec{B}_x(e_2, e_2)).$$

The *Willmore functional* is the Lagrangian

$$W(\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)) := \int_{\Sigma} |\vec{H}|^2 d\mu_g, \quad (\text{I.1})$$

*Department of Mathematics, ETH Zentrum, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland.

where $d\mu_g$ is the area form of the metric g induced on $\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$ via the canonical metric on \mathbb{R}^m .

The critical points of (I.1) for perturbations of the form $\vec{\Phi} + t\vec{\xi}$, where $\vec{\xi}$ is an arbitrary compactly supported smooth map on Σ into \mathbb{R}^m are known as *Willmore surfaces*. Examples of Willmore surfaces are legions. Any minimal surface, i.e. one for which $\vec{H} \equiv 0$, realizes an absolute minimum of the Willmore functional. Round spheres are also Willmore surfaces, and, more generally, all Willmore surfaces with genus zero were obtained by Robert Bryant [Bry1], [Bry2]. Another important example was devised by Willmore in 1965. It is the torus of revolution obtained through rotating a circle of radius 1 whose center is located at a distance $\sqrt{2}$ from its axis of rotation (equivalently, it is the stereographic projection into \mathbb{R}^3 of the Clifford torus). Willmore proved that this torus is indeed a Willmore surface, and he conjectured that it minimizes, up to Möbius transforms, the Willmore energy in the class of smooth and immersed tori. Despite partial answers, this assertion (known as *the Willmore conjecture*) remains unsolved. For more details, the reader is referred to [BK], [LY], [Sim], and [Wil2]. Further examples of Willmore surfaces are profuse in the literature, and we content ourselves with citing [Wil2], [PS], and the references therein.

The Euler-Lagrange equation obtained through varying the Willmore functional as aforementioned was first¹ derived in [Wil1] in the three-dimensional case, and subsequently extended by Weiner [Wei] for general $m \geq 3$. We now recall this equation.

Given any vector \vec{w} in $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$, consider the symmetric endomorphism $A_x^{\vec{w}}$ of $T_x\Sigma$ satisfying $g(A_x^{\vec{w}}(\vec{X}), \vec{Y}) = B_x(\vec{X}, \vec{Y}) \cdot \vec{w}$, where \cdot denotes the standard scalar product in \mathbb{R}^m , for every pair of vectors \vec{X} and \vec{Y} in $T_x\Sigma$. The map $A_x : \vec{w} \mapsto A_x^{\vec{w}}$ is a homomorphism from $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$ into the linear space of symmetric endomorphisms on $T_x\Sigma$. We next define $\tilde{A}_x = {}^t A_x \circ A_x$, which is an endomorphism of $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$. If $\{e_1, e_2\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_x\Sigma$, and if \vec{L} is a vector in $N_{\vec{\Phi}(x)}\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$, then it is readily seen that $\tilde{A}(\vec{L}) = \sum_{i,j} \vec{B}_x(e_i, e_j) \vec{B}_x(e_i, e_j) \cdot \vec{L}$. With this notation, as shown in [Wei], $\vec{\Phi}$ is a smooth Willmore immersion if and only if it satisfies Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\Delta_{\perp} \vec{H} - 2|\vec{H}|^2 \vec{H} + \tilde{A}(\vec{H}) = 0, \quad (\text{I.2})$$

where Δ_{\perp} is the negative covariant Laplacian for the connection D in the normal bundle $N\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$ derived from the ambient scalar product in \mathbb{R}^m . Namely, for every section σ of $N\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)$, one has $D_{\vec{X}}\sigma := \pi_{\vec{n}}(\sigma_*\vec{X})$.

The paternity of the Willmore functional is delicate to establish precisely.

¹although it seemingly was known to Thomsen and Blaschke decades sooner.

Although it bears the name of T.J. Willmore whom studied it in 1965 [Wil1] thereby initiating its popularization, the Willmore functional had been previously considered in the works of Sophie Germain [Ger], Gerhard Thomsen [Tho], and Wilhelm Blaschke [Bla]. Its wide range of applications includes various areas of science, where it plays an important rôle. Amongst others, the Willmore functional appears in molecular biophysics as the surface energy for lipid bilayers in the Helfrich model [Hef] (cell membranes tend to position themselves so as to minimize the Willmore energy) ; in solid mechanics as the limit-energy for thin plate theory [FJM] ; in general relativity as the main contributing term to the Hawking quasilocal mass (cf. [Haw], [HI]) ; in string theory as an extrinsic string action à la Polyakov [Pol].

The importance of the Willmore functional is largely due to its invariance under conformal transformations of the metric of the ambient space. This remarkable property was first brought into light by White [Whi] in the three-dimensional case, then generalized by B.Y. Chen [Che]. As the second author of the present paper showed in [Riv1], Euler-Lagrange equations arising from a two-dimensional conformally invariant Lagrangian with quadratic growth can be written in divergence form. These “conservation laws” fostered within variational problems involving conformally invariant Lagrangians offer a significant help. In particular, the general ideas introduced in [Riv1] are led to fruition in [Riv2], where conservation laws relative to the Willmore functional are developed and successfully applied to produce a variety of interesting results. Our present work stems from this alternative formulation of the Willmore equation.

I.2 Weak Willmore Immersions and Conservation Laws

This section is devoted to recalling the formalism introduced in [Riv2] and the results therein established, which compose the foundation of our work.

Owing to the Gauß-Bonnet theorem, we note that the Willmore energy (I.1) may be equivalently expressed as

$$W(\vec{\Phi}(\Sigma)) = \int_{\Sigma} |\vec{B}|^2 d\mu_g + 4\pi \chi(\Sigma),$$

where \vec{B} is the second fundamental form, and $\chi(\Sigma)$ is the Euler characteristic of Σ . Since the latter is a topological invariant, from the variational point of view, we infer that Willmore surfaces are the critical points of the energy

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\vec{B}|^2 d\mu_g.$$

In studying such surfaces, it thus appears natural to restrict our attention on immersions whose second fundamental forms are locally square-integrable.

More precisely, we work within the framework of *weak immersion with locally L^2 -bounded second fundamental form*, which we now define.

Definition I.1 *Let $\vec{\Phi}$ be a $W^{1,2}$ -map from a two-dimensional manifold Σ into \mathbb{R}^m . $\vec{\Phi}$ is called a weak immersion with locally L^2 -bounded second fundamental form whenever there exist locally about every point an open disk D , a positive constant C , and a sequence of smooth embeddings $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ from D into \mathbb{R}^m , such that*

- i) $\mathcal{H}_2(\vec{\Phi}(D)) \neq 0$,
- ii) $\mathcal{H}_2(\vec{\Phi}_k(D)) \leq C < \infty$,
- iii) $\int_D |B_k|^2 d\text{vol}_{g_k} \leq \frac{8\pi}{3}$,
- iv) $\vec{\Phi}_k \rightharpoonup \vec{\Phi}$ weakly in $W^{1,2}$,

where \mathcal{H}_2 is the two-dimensional Hausdorff measure, B_k is the second fundamental form associated to the embedding $\vec{\Phi}_k$, and g_k denotes the metric on $\vec{\Phi}_k(\Sigma)$ obtained via the pull-back by $\vec{\Phi}_k$ of the induced metric.

A useful characterization of weak immersions with square-integrable second fundamental form was originally obtained by Tatiana Toro [To1] and [To2], and by Stefan Müller and Vladimír Šverák in [MS]. In the same spirit, Frédéric Hélein obtained the following statement (whose proof appears as that of Theorem 5.1.1 in [Hel]).

Theorem I.1 *Let $\vec{\Phi}$ be a weak immersion from a two-dimensional manifold Σ into \mathbb{R}^m with locally L^2 -bounded second fundamental form. Then locally about every point on Σ , there exist an open disk D and a homeomorphism Ψ of D such that $\vec{\Phi} \circ \Psi$ is a conformal bilipschitz immersion. In this parametrization, the metric g on D induced by the standard metric of \mathbb{R}^m is continuous. Moreover, the Gauß map \vec{n} of this immersion lies in $W^{1,2}(D, Gr_{m-2}(\mathbb{R}^m))$, relative to the induced metric g .*

We previously observed that weak immersions with square-integrable second fundamental form are particularly suited for the study of Willmore surfaces. More importantly, in [Riv2], the notion of *weak Willmore immersion* is introduced. It is based on the following theorem, established in the same paper. It provides a reformulation of the Willmore equation in divergence form.

Theorem I.2 *The Willmore equation (I.2) is equivalent to*

$$d \left(*_g d\vec{H} - 3 *_g \pi_{\vec{n}}(d\vec{H}) \right) - d \star \left(d\vec{n} \wedge \vec{H} \right) = 0,$$

where $*_g$ is the Hodge operator on Σ associated with the induced metric g , and \star is the usual Hodge operator on forms.

In particular, a conformal immersion $\vec{\Phi}$ from the flat disc \mathbb{D}^2 into \mathbb{R}^m is Willmore if and only if

$$\Delta \vec{H} - 3 \operatorname{div}(\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H})) + \operatorname{div} \star (\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}) = 0, \quad (\text{I.3})$$

where the operators ∇ , ∇^\perp , Δ , and div are understood with respect to the flat metric on \mathbb{D}^2 . Namely, $\nabla = (\partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2})$, $\nabla^\perp = (-\partial_{x_2}, \partial_{x_1})$, $\Delta = \nabla \cdot \nabla$, and $\operatorname{div} = \operatorname{tr} \circ \nabla$.

We are now ready to define the notion of *weak Willmore immersion with L^2 -bounded second fundamental form*.

Definition I.2 A weak immersion $\vec{\Phi}$ from a two-dimensional manifold Σ into \mathbb{R}^m with locally L^2 -bounded second fundamental form is Willmore whenever (I.3) holds in the sense of distributions locally about every point in a conformal parametrization from the two-dimensional disk D , as indicated in Theorem I.1.

Henceforth, we will work with weak Willmore immersions, which we shall assume to be conformal on the unit-disk.

We introduce the local coordinates (x_1, x_2) for the flat metric on the unit-disk $\mathbb{D}^2 = \{(x^1, x^2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 ; x_1^2 + x_2^2 < 1\}$. The operators ∇ , ∇^\perp , div , and Δ will be understood in these coordinates. Let $\vec{\Phi} : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a conformal immersion. We define the conformal factor λ via

$$\partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi} = e^\lambda = \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi}.$$

Thanks to the topology of \mathbb{D}^2 , there exists, for almost every $z \in \mathbb{D}^2$, a positively oriented orthonormal basis $\{\vec{n}_1, \dots, \vec{n}_{m-2}\}$ of $N_{\vec{\Phi}(z)} \vec{\Phi}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, complement of the tangent plane to $\vec{\Phi}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ at $\vec{\Phi}(z)$, such that $\{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \vec{n}_1, \dots, \vec{n}_{m-2}\}$ forms a basis of $T_{\vec{\Phi}(z)} \mathbb{R}^m$. Following the ‘‘Coulomb gauge extraction method’’ exposed in the proof of Lemma 4.1.3 from [Hel], the basis $\{\vec{n}_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^{m-2}$ may be chosen to satisfy

$$\operatorname{div} \langle \nabla \vec{n}_\alpha, \vec{n}_\beta \rangle = 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq m-2.$$

From the Plücker embedding, which realizes $Gr_{m-2}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ as a submanifold of the projective space of the $(m-2)^{\text{th}}$ exterior power $\mathbb{P}(\bigwedge^{m-2} \mathbb{R}^m)$, we can represent the Gauß map as the $(m-2)$ -vector

$$\vec{n} = \bigwedge_{\alpha=1}^{m-2} \vec{n}_\alpha.$$

Via the Hodge operator \star , we may identify vectors and $(m-1)$ -vectors in \mathbb{R}^m . In particular, there holds

$$\star(\vec{n} \wedge \vec{e}_1) = \vec{e}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \star(\vec{n} \wedge \vec{e}_2) = -\vec{e}_1.$$

With this notation, the second fundamental form \vec{B} , which is a symmetric 2-form on $T_{\vec{\Phi}(z)}\vec{\Phi}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ into $N_{\vec{\Phi}(z)}\vec{\Phi}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, may be expressed as

$$\vec{B} = \sum_{\alpha,i,j} e^{-2\lambda} h_{ij}^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha dx^i \otimes dx^j \equiv \sum_{\alpha,i,j} h_{ij}^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha (\vec{e}_i)^* \otimes (\vec{e}_j)^*, \quad (\text{I.4})$$

with

$$h_{ij}^\alpha = -e^{-\lambda} \vec{e}_i \cdot \partial_{x_j} \vec{n}_\alpha.$$

The mean curvature vector \vec{H} is

$$\vec{H} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m-2} H^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m-2} (h_{11}^\alpha + h_{22}^\alpha) \vec{n}_\alpha.$$

The Weingarten operator \vec{H}_0 is

$$\vec{H}_0 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m-2} H_0^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m-2} (h_{11}^\alpha - h_{22}^\alpha + 2i h_{12}^\alpha) \vec{n}_\alpha.$$

In this framework, the Euler-Lagrange equation (I.2) for the Willmore functional is cast in the form

$$\Delta_\perp \vec{H} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta,i,j} h_{ij}^\alpha h_{ij}^\beta H^\beta \vec{n}_\alpha - 2|\vec{H}|^2 \vec{H} = 0, \quad (\text{I.5})$$

with

$$\Delta_\perp \vec{H} = e^{-2\lambda} \pi_{\vec{n}} \operatorname{div}(\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H})).$$

II Main Results

II.1 Local Palais-Smale Sequences

As we stated in the Introduction, T. Willmore conjectured in 1965 that the Willmore torus (defined on page 2) minimizes, up to Möbius transformations, the Willmore energy in the class of smooth immersed tori in \mathbb{R}^3 . To this day, no satisfactory demonstration of this assertion has been found. Amid the works aimed at solving this problem, one fundamental property of the Willmore functional was brought into light by Leon Simon [Sim]. Namely, for each dimension $m \geq 3$, there exists a compact embedded real analytic torus in \mathbb{R}^m which minimizes the Willmore energy in the class of

compact, genus 1, embedded surfaces without boundary². Unfortunately, it remains unknown whether this minimizer is the Willmore torus. Simon’s rather sophisticated proof is constructive in nature: an explicit minimizing sequence for the Willmore functional is devised. This is thus one instance in which studying and understanding minimizing sequences of the Willmore functional are essential. Yet more generally, it is interesting to investigate Palais-Smale sequences for the Willmore functional. Such will be our goal in this section.

We open our considerations with an “empirical” observation which will hopefully convince the reader that the results derived in [Riv2] offer a suitable framework to acquire information on Palais-Smale sequences of Willmore surfaces.

Let us consider a conformal weak Willmore immersion $\vec{\Phi}$ from the flat disk \mathbb{D}^2 into \mathbb{R}^m with bounded square-integrable second fundamental form. Up to an additive constant, it is possible to define a map \vec{L} satisfying³

$$\nabla^\perp \vec{L} := \nabla^\perp \vec{H} - 3\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) + \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}). \quad (\text{II.1})$$

In [Riv2], it is shown that the following system holds:

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{L} = 0 \\ \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{L} = 2(-1)^m \nabla(\star(\vec{n} \lrcorner \vec{H})) \lrcorner \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{II.2})$$

The Hodge operator \star and the contraction operator \lrcorner commute with the partial differentiation operators. Accordingly, the terms appearing in the system (II.2) enjoy a peculiar property: more than mere “products of derivatives”, they can be factored in divergence form. This structural feature has the analytical advantage of being robust under weak limiting process. Hence it is legitimate to hope that a local Palais-Smale sequence of conformal weak Willmore immersions with, say, uniformly bounded square-integrable second fundamental forms, converges to an element $\vec{\Phi}$ satisfying the system (II.2) for some function \vec{L} (which may or may not be related to $\vec{\Phi}$ via (II.1)).

This is essentially the result that we shall establish. Prior to stating precisely, it is necessary to define the notion of local Palais-Smale sequence for the Willmore functional.

Definition II.3 *Let $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ be a sequence of conformal immersions from the unit-disk \mathbb{D}^2 into \mathbb{R}^m such that*

$$\|\vec{\Phi}_k\|_{W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}} \leq C \quad (\text{II.3})$$

²more generally, Simon obtains an analogous statement for each genus $g \in \mathbb{N}$.

³refer to the Introduction or the Appendix for the notation.

holds uniformly for some positive constant C . Denoting respectively by \vec{n}_k and \vec{H}_k the Gauß map and the mean curvature vector associated with the immersion $\vec{\Phi}_k$, we set

$$Q_k := \nabla \vec{H}_k - 3 \pi_{\vec{n}_k}(\nabla \vec{H}_k) + \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n}_k \wedge \vec{H}_k).$$

The sequence $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ is locally Palais-Smale if, in addition to (II.3), it satisfies

$$\operatorname{div} Q_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } (W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty})'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

The following result provides a first description of the limit of a Palais-Smale sequence of the Willmore functional.

Theorem II.1 *Let $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ be a local Palais-Smale sequence of conformal immersions from the unit-disk \mathbb{D}^2 into \mathbb{R}^m . There exist a conformal weak immersion $\vec{\Phi} \in (W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty})(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and an element $\vec{L} \in L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ such that, up to extraction of a subsequence,*

$$\vec{\Phi}_k \longrightarrow \vec{\Phi} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2)$$

and the system

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{L} = 0 \\ \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{L} = -2 \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla \vec{H} \end{cases} \quad (\text{II.4})$$

holds in the sense of distributions, where \vec{H} denotes the mean curvature vector associated with $\vec{\Phi}$.

The apparent difference between the systems (II.2) and (II.4) is fictitious only. Indeed, one verifies⁴ the identity

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla \vec{H} = (-1)^{m-1} \nabla(\star(\vec{n} \llcorner \vec{H})) \llcorner \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}.$$

II.2 The Conformal Willmore Equation

The convergence result stated in Theorem II.1 naturally begs the following question: if an immersion $\vec{\Phi}$ satisfies the system (II.4), for some function \vec{L} , is it true that $\vec{\Phi}$ is Willmore? Unfortunately, and perhaps surprisingly, as far as the authors know, the answer is negative. Nevertheless, the following identification can be verified.

⁴cf. equation (II.49) in the paper [Riv2].

Theorem II.2 *Let $\vec{\Phi}$ be a conformal weak immersion from the unit-disk \mathbb{D}^2 into \mathbb{R}^m which lies in $W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}$ and such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}^2} |\nabla \vec{n}|^2 \leq \varepsilon,$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Then there exists $\vec{L} \in L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ such that $\vec{\Phi}$ satisfies (II.4) if and only if $\vec{\Phi}$ is smooth and there holds

$$\Delta_{\perp} \vec{H} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta,i,j} h_{ij}^{\alpha} h_{ij}^{\beta} H^{\beta} \vec{n}_{\alpha} - 2 |\vec{H}|^2 \vec{H} = e^{-2\lambda} \langle \vec{H}_0, f \rangle_{\mathbb{C}}, \quad (\text{II.5})$$

for some holomorphic function f .

Remark II.1 *An identity equivalent to (II.5) is obtained via setting*

$$\nabla^{\perp} \vec{L}_0 := \nabla^{\perp} \vec{H} - 3 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) + \star(\nabla^{\perp} \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}). \quad (\text{II.6})$$

The statement of Theorem II.2 may then be rephrased through the equation

$$\Delta(\vec{L} - \vec{L}_0) = 2i \vec{H}_0 f. \quad (\text{II.7})$$

The “if” part of the statement of Theorem II.2 is clear. Indeed, choosing $f \equiv 0$ and $\vec{L} = \vec{L}_0$ as in (II.6), the validity of the system (II.4) was settled in [Riv2]. In the proof, we shall thus restrict our attention on the “only if” part of the statement of Theorem II.2.

Although the amount of information on the holomorphic function f is rather limited, we note that the way it appears on the right-hand side of (II.5) makes it play the rôle of a Lagrange multiplier in the Willmore equation (I.5). This observation enables one to give a natural geometric interpretation of f in the context of Teichmüller theory (cf. [BPP]).

The Willmore functional being conformally invariant, the left-hand side of (I.5), and thus of (II.5), remains unchanged under a holomorphic change of coordinates. An easy computation reveals that \vec{H}_0 is the coefficient of $dz \otimes dz$ in the two-form $2\vec{B}$ given in (I.4). Looking at the right-hand side of (II.5), we deduce that f must be the coordinate of a section $f(z) \partial_z \otimes \partial_z$. There is thus a one-to-one correspondence between the vector space to which f belongs and the vector space $H^0(\Sigma)$ of holomorphic quadratic differentials. Let \mathfrak{g} be the genus of the immersed surface Σ . From the Riemann-Roch theorem (cf. Corollary 5.4.2 in [Jo]), the space $H^0(\Sigma)$ satisfies

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^0(\Sigma) = \begin{cases} 0 & , \mathfrak{g} = 0 \\ 1 & , \mathfrak{g} = 1 \\ 3(\mathfrak{g} - 1) & , \mathfrak{g} \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

The equation (II.5) is not a novelty ; it has been studied in various contexts. Immersions which satisfy (II.5) are sometimes known as *constrained Willmore immersions*, such as in [BPP]. There, it is shown that (II.5) is the Euler-Lagrange equation deriving from the Willmore functional (I.1) under smooth compactly supported infinitesimal *conformal* variations. The corresponding critical points are the conformal-constrained Willmore surfaces. This notion clearly generalizes that of a Willmore surface, obtained via all smooth compactly supported infinitesimal variations. Conformal-constrained Willmore surfaces form a Möbius invariant class of surfaces fostering remarkable properties, some of which are studied in [BPP], [BPU], [Bry1], and [Ric]. In the latter, it is in particular established that every constant mean curvature surface in a 3-dimensional space-form is conformal-constrained Willmore. We have chosen to refer to (II.5) as the *conformal Willmore equation*, rather than as the somewhat vaguer term “constrained Willmore equation”. There are many ways to constrain the variations of the Willmore functional (e.g. restrictions on the volume and surface area in the Helfrich model). The adjective “conformal” appears more descriptive in our situation.

III Proofs of the Theorems

III.1 Proof of Theorem II.1

Let us set

$$Q_k := \nabla \vec{H}_k - 3\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}_k) + \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n}_k \wedge \vec{H}_k).$$

We suppose that

$$\operatorname{div} Q_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } (W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty})'(\mathbb{D}^2). \quad (\text{III.1})$$

and

$$\|\vec{\Phi}_k\|_{W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}} \leq C \quad \text{uniformly, for some constant } C > 0. \quad (\text{III.2})$$

We begin our study with an elementary result.

Lemma III.1 *There holds*

$$\vec{\Phi}_k \operatorname{div} Q_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Proof. For notational convenience, we set

$$X := W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}.$$

Let u be an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D} = C_0^\infty(\mathbb{D}^2)$. The Sobolev embedding

theorem guarantees that the elements $\vec{\Phi}_k$ of X are Hölder continuous on $\overline{\mathbb{D}^2}$. Since in addition X is an intersection of Sobolev spaces, it is clear that $\vec{\Phi}_k u$ is an element of X_0 (i.e. an element of X with null trace on the boundary of the unit disk). More precisely, from (III.2),

$$\|\vec{\Phi}_k u\|_{X_0} \lesssim \|\vec{\Phi}_k\|_X \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq C \|u\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (\text{III.3})$$

Setting $T_k := \text{div } Q_k$, we can make sense of $\vec{\Phi}_k T_k$ as a distribution via

$$\langle \vec{\Phi}_k T_k, u \rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} := \langle T_k, \vec{\Phi}_k u \rangle_{X'_0, X_0}.$$

It follows immediately from (III.1) and (III.3) that $\vec{\Phi}_k T_k$ converges to zero in the sense of distributions. ■

By hypothesis, $T_k := \text{div } Q_k$ is a bounded linear functional on X (with X as in the proof of the previous lemma). Using (A.2), we see that T_k belongs to $W^{-2, (2, \infty)}$, which is the dual space of $W_0^{2, (2, 1)}$. Accordingly, Proposition I.1 grants the existence of an element P_k of $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1, (2, \infty)}$ satisfying

$$T_k = \text{div } P_k \quad (\text{III.4})$$

and

$$\|P_k\|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1, (2, \infty)}} \leq \|T_k\|_{W^{-2, (2, \infty)}} + \delta_k, \quad (\text{III.5})$$

for some positive constant δ_k arbitrarily chosen.

We next establish a useful result.

Lemma III.2 *There holds*

$$P_k \vec{\Phi}_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Proof. From (III.5) and the inclusion

$$X := W^{2, 2} \cap W^{1, \infty} \supset W_0^{2, (2, 1)},$$

there holds

$$\|P_k\|_{\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1, (2, \infty)}} \leq \|T_k\|_{X'} + \delta_k.$$

Owing to (III.1), the sequence (P_k) converges strongly to zero in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1, (2, \infty)}$. Moreover, from (III.2) and (A.3), it follows that the sequence $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{1, (2, 1)}$. The desired statement may now be reached by repeating mutatis mutandis the proof of Lemma III.1, and letting δ_k tend to zero. ■

The identity (III.4) yields

$$\operatorname{div} (Q_k - P_k) = 0. \quad (\text{III.6})$$

By definition, the difference $(Q_k - P_k)$ lies in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1,(2,\infty)}$. As proved in Lemma A.1, the equation (III.6) implies the existence of an element \vec{L}_k in $L^{2,\infty}$ satisfying

$$Q_k - P_k = \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_k. \quad (\text{III.7})$$

Since $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}$, it follows that the sequences (\vec{H}_k) , (\vec{n}_k) , and thus (Q_k) are uniformly bounded, respectively in L^2 , $W^{1,2}$, and $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1,(2,\infty)}$. Likewise, we saw that (P_k) is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1,(2,\infty)}$. Hence, the sequence $(\nabla^\perp \vec{L}_k)$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1,(2,\infty)}$.

Lemma III.3 *There holds*

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \vec{\Phi}_k \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_k \longrightarrow 0 \\ \nabla \vec{\Phi}_k \wedge (\nabla^\perp \vec{L}_k + 2 \nabla \vec{H}_k) \longrightarrow 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Proof. Observe that

$$P_k \cdot \nabla \vec{\Phi}_k = \operatorname{div} (P_k \vec{\Phi}_k) - \vec{\Phi}_k \operatorname{div} P_k = \operatorname{div} (P_k \vec{\Phi}_k) - \vec{\Phi}_k \operatorname{div} Q_k.$$

Whence, the results of Lemma III.1 and Lemma III.2 show that

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi}_k \cdot P_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2). \quad (\text{III.8})$$

From (A.10) in the Appendix, we know that

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi}_k \cdot Q_k = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \vec{\Phi}_k \wedge Q_k = -2 \nabla \vec{\Phi}_k \wedge \nabla \vec{H}_k.$$

The desired statement now ensues by combining (III.7) and (III.8). ■

From the characterization provided in Proposition I.1, we can always arrange for the $L^{2,\infty}$ -norm of \vec{L}_k to be as close as we please to the $W^{-1,(2,\infty)}$ -norm of $\nabla^\perp \vec{L}_k$. In particular, the sequence (\vec{L}_k) is uniformly bounded in $L^{2,\infty}$. We may thus extract a weak* convergent subsequence with

$$\begin{cases} \vec{L}_{k'} \xrightarrow{*} \vec{L} & \text{in } L^{2,\infty} \\ \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'} \xrightarrow{*} g & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{-1,(2,\infty)}, \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.9})$$

with $g = \nabla^\perp \vec{L}$ in the sense of distributions.

As the sequence $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}$ by hypothesis, the Banach-Alaoglu theorem implies that there exists a subsequence $(\vec{\Phi}_{k'})$

converging weak* in $W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}$ to some element $\vec{\Phi}$. In turn, the compact embeddings provided by the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem (A.3) enables us to further extract a subsequence, still denoted $(\vec{\Phi}_{k'})$, satisfying the strong convergences

$$\begin{cases} \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \longrightarrow \vec{\Phi} & \text{in } \bigcap_{p<\infty} W^{1,p} \\ \nabla \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \longrightarrow \nabla \vec{\Phi} & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \bigcap_{p<\infty} L^p. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.10})$$

The convergences (III.9) and (III.10) yield

Lemma III.4

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'} \longrightarrow \nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{L} \\ \nabla \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'} \longrightarrow \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{L} \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Proof. We shall only establish the first convergence, the second one being obtained *mutatis mutandis*. Owing to the general identity

$$\text{div}(a \nabla^\perp b) = \nabla a \cdot \nabla^\perp b,$$

it suffices to show that

$$\vec{\Phi}_{k'} \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'} \longrightarrow \vec{\Phi} \nabla^\perp \vec{L} \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

This is what we shall do. For convenience, we set $Y := \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes W^{1,(2,1)}$. Let g be as in (III.9), and u be an arbitrary test-function in $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathcal{D}$. Clearly, $\vec{\Phi} u$ and $\vec{\Phi}_{k'} u$ are elements of Y_0 (i.e. elements of Y with null trace on the boundary of the unit-disk), with an estimate analogous to (III.3). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'} - \vec{\Phi} g, u \right\rangle_{\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{D}} \\ & \equiv \left\langle \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'}, u (\vec{\Phi}_{k'} - \vec{\Phi}) \right\rangle_{Y'_0, Y_0} + \left\langle \nabla^\perp \vec{L}_{k'} - g, u \vec{\Phi} \right\rangle_{Y'_0, Y_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Whence, from the convergences (III.9) and (III.10), the desired result follows. ■

As explained in Theorem 3.3.8 from [Hel], the fact that⁵

$$\Delta \lambda_k = -e^{2\lambda_k} K_k$$

is an element of the Hardy space \mathcal{H}^1 implies that (λ_k) is a sequence of elements in $W^{1,(2,1)}$, uniformly bounded in norm by a constant depending

⁵where K_k denotes the Gaussian curvature associated with the immersion $\vec{\Phi}_k$.

only upon the uniform bound on $(\|\vec{\Phi}_k\|_{W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}})$. Owing to the Rellich-Kondrachov theorem, we may extract a subsequence $(\lambda_{k'})$ satisfying

$$\lambda_{k'} \longrightarrow \lambda \quad \text{in} \quad \bigcap_{p < \infty} L^p, \quad (\text{III.11})$$

for some λ in the suitable space. Recall that for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, there holds

$$e^{2\lambda_k} = |\partial_{x^j} \vec{\Phi}_k|^2 \quad \text{and thus} \quad \partial_{x^i} (e^{2\lambda_k}) = 2 \partial_{x^j} \vec{\Phi}_k \cdot \partial_{x^j x^i} \vec{\Phi}_k.$$

Accordingly, the sequence $(e^{2\lambda_k})$ is uniformly bounded in $W^{1,2} \cap L^\infty$. From this, and the boundedness of λ_k , the same is true about the sequences $(e^{\pm\lambda_k})$. Combining this to the convergences (III.10) and (III.11), we find the following strong convergences

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} e^{\pm\lambda_{k'}} \longrightarrow e^{\pm\lambda_k} \\ (\vec{e}_j)_{k'} := e^{-\lambda_{k'}} \partial_{x^j} \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \longrightarrow e^{-\lambda} \partial_{x^j} \vec{\Phi} =: \vec{e}_j \end{array} \right. \quad \text{in} \quad \bigcap_{p < \infty} L^p. \quad (\text{III.12})$$

By definition, from the uniform boundedness of the sequence $(\vec{\Phi}_k)$ in $W^{2,2} \cap W^{1,\infty}$ and of that of the sequence (\vec{n}_k) in $W^{1,2}$, we see that the sequence (\vec{H}_k) is uniformly bounded in L^2 . Accordingly, we can extract a weakly convergent subsequence:

$$\vec{H}_{k'} \longrightarrow \vec{H} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2. \quad (\text{III.13})$$

Altogether, (III.12) and (III.13) show that

$$(\vec{e}_1)_{k'} \wedge (\vec{e}_2)_{k'} \wedge \vec{H}_{k'} \longrightarrow \vec{e}_1 \wedge \vec{e}_2 \wedge \vec{H} \quad \text{in} \quad \bigcap_{1 \leq p < 2} L^p. \quad (\text{III.14})$$

Equation (II.42) established in [Riv2] states

$$\star(\vec{n}_{k'} \llcorner \vec{H}_{k'}) = (-1)^{m-1} (\vec{e}_1)_{k'} \wedge (\vec{e}_2)_{k'} \wedge \vec{H}_{k'}.$$

Consequently, (III.14) is tantamount to

$$\star(\vec{n}_{k'} \llcorner \vec{H}_{k'}) \longrightarrow \star(\vec{n} \llcorner \vec{H}) \quad \text{in} \quad \bigcap_{1 \leq p < 2} L^p.$$

Combining this to (III.10) shows that

$$\star(\vec{n}_{k'} \llcorner \vec{H}_{k'}) \llcorner \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \longrightarrow \star(\vec{n} \llcorner \vec{H}) \llcorner \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} \quad \text{in} \quad \bigcap_{1 \leq p < 2} L^p. \quad (\text{III.15})$$

It takes little effort to verify that

$$\text{div}(u \llcorner \nabla^\perp v) = \nabla u \llcorner \nabla^\perp v.$$

holds in general for suitable u, v . In particular, (III.15) yields

$$\nabla(\star(\vec{n}_{k'} \llcorner \vec{H}_{k'})) \llcorner \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \longrightarrow \nabla(\star(\vec{n} \llcorner \vec{H})) \llcorner \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2).$$

Using identity (II.49) from [Riv2], the latter is equivalent to

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi}_{k'} \wedge \nabla \vec{H}_{k'} \longrightarrow \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla \vec{H} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{D}^2). \quad (\text{III.16})$$

Finally, bringing altogether Lemma III.3, Lemma III.4, and (III.16), we conclude as desired that, in the sense of distributions,

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{L} &= 0 \\ \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{L} &= -2 \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla \vec{H}. \end{cases}$$

III.2 Proof of Theorem II.2

As done in the work [Riv2], we introduce the functions S and \vec{R} such that

$$\begin{cases} \nabla S &:= \nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \vec{L} \\ \nabla \vec{R} &:= \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \vec{L} + 2 \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} \wedge \vec{H}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.17})$$

Clearly, S and \vec{R} are defined on \mathbb{D}^2 up to an unimportant additive constant. By hypothesis, \vec{L} is an element of $L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, while $\vec{\Phi}$ is Lipschitz. Accordingly, ∇S and $\nabla \vec{R}$ belong to $L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and to $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ respectively. This observation, and the particular structure of the right-hand side of the system (III.17) will enable us to deduce the regularity result we are seeking to obtain.

III.2.1 Regularity

It is shown in [Riv2] that S and \vec{R} satisfy the system

$$\begin{cases} \Delta S &= (\nabla \star \vec{n}) \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{R} \\ \Delta \vec{R} &= (-1)^n \star (\nabla \vec{n} \bullet \nabla^\perp \vec{R}) - (\nabla \star \vec{n}) \nabla^\perp S. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.18})$$

The advantage of these equations lies essentially in their right-hand sides comprising only Jacobians. This peculiar feature will enable us to apply the techniques of integration by compensation, more precisely Wente-type estimates. We recall two results which shall be of use to our proof. They are due in parts to contributions by Wente [Wen], Tartar [Ta2], Coifman *et al.* [CLMS], Bethuel [Be], and Hélein [Hel].

Lemma III.5 *Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 with C^2 -boundary. Suppose that a and b are elements of $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and of $W^{1,(2,\infty)}(\Omega)$, respectively. If u satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u &= \nabla a \cdot \nabla^\perp b & \text{in } \Omega \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

then ∇u belongs to the space $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)$ with the estimate

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)} \lesssim \|\nabla a\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|\nabla b\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)},$$

up to a multiplicative constant depending only on Ω .

The interested reader will find the proof of this result and further variations on the same theme in [Hel] (Theorem 3.4.5).

Another result (Theorem 3.4.1 in [Hel]) which will be useful to us is the following.

Lemma III.6 *Let Ω be an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 with C^1 -boundary. Suppose that a and b are elements of $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. If u satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = \nabla a \cdot \nabla^\perp b & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

then u belongs to the space $W^{1,(2,1)}(\Omega) \subset C^0(\Omega)$ with the estimate

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{2,1}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla a\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)} \|\nabla b\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2)},$$

up to a multiplicative constant depending only on Ω .

Geared with these results, we are prepared to start our proof. Let us define

$$S = S_0 + S_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{R} = \vec{R}_0 + \vec{R}_1, \quad (\text{III.19})$$

where the new variables, in accordance with (III.18), satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \Delta S_0 = 0, & \Delta \vec{R}_0 = \vec{0} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}^2 \\ S_0 = S, & \vec{R}_0 = \vec{R} & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{D}^2, \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.20})$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \Delta S_1 = \Delta S, & \Delta \vec{R}_1 = \Delta \vec{R} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}^2 \\ S_1 = 0, & \vec{R}_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{D}^2. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.21})$$

We saw above that S and \vec{R} are elements of $W^{1,(2,\infty)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, while $\star \vec{n}$ belongs to $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Since the right-hand sides of (III.18), and thus of (III.21), comprise only Jacobians, Lemma III.5 may be called upon so as to produce the estimates

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla S_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} \lesssim \varepsilon \|\nabla \vec{R}\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)} \\ \|\nabla \vec{R}_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} \lesssim \varepsilon \left(\|\nabla S\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)} + \|\nabla \vec{R}\|_{L^{2,\infty}(\mathbb{D}^2)} \right), \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.22})$$

up to unimportant multiplicative constants depending only on \mathbb{D}^2 . Here ε denotes the (adjustable) upper bound on the energy:

$$\|\nabla \vec{n}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{D}^2)} \leq \varepsilon. \quad (\text{III.23})$$

Let us fix once and for all some point $p \in D_{1/2}(0)$, some $0 < k < 1$, and some radius $0 < r < 1/2$. The flat disk $D_{kr}(p)$ of radius kr and centered on the point p is properly contained in the unit-disk \mathbb{D}^2 . Since S_0 and \vec{R}_0 are harmonic and satisfy (III.20), it is clear that ∇S_0 and $\nabla \vec{R}_0$ are square-integrable on $D_{kr}(p)$. From (III.22), it follows that ∇S and $\nabla \vec{R}$ are likewise square-integrable on $D_{kr}(p)$. Because $\star \vec{n}$ is also an element of $W^{1,2}(D_{kr}(p))$, we are now in position to apply Lemma III.6 to the system (III.21), thereby obtaining

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla S_1\|_{L^{2,1}(D_{kr}(p))} \lesssim \varepsilon \|\nabla \vec{R}\|_{L^2(D_{kr}(p))} \\ \|\nabla \vec{R}_1\|_{L^{2,1}(D_{kr}(p))} \lesssim \varepsilon \left(\|\nabla S\|_{L^2(D_{kr}(p))} + \|\nabla \vec{R}\|_{L^2(D_{kr}(p))} \right), \end{cases}$$

up to some unimportant multiplicative constants involving ε (they are independent of r by homogeneity).

In particular, since $L^{2,1} \subset L^2$ and $k < 1$, the latter gives that for some positive constant C_0 , there holds

$$E_{D_{kr}(p)}(S_1, \vec{R}_1) \leq C_0 \varepsilon E_{D_r(p)}(S, \vec{R}), \quad (\text{III.24})$$

where, for notational convenience, we have set

$$E_{D_\rho(p)}(u, \vec{v}) := \|u\|_{L^2(D_\rho(p))} + \|\vec{v}\|_{L^2(D_\rho(p))}.$$

On the other hand, since S_0 and \vec{R}_0 are harmonic, a classical ‘‘monotonicity’’ result (cf. Theorem 3.3.12 in [Hel], and [Gia]) applied to (III.20) yields that

$$E_{D_{kr}(p)}(S_0, \vec{R}_0) \leq k E_{D_r(p)}(S_0, \vec{R}_0) \leq k E_{D_r(p)}(S, \vec{R}). \quad (\text{III.25})$$

Via combining altogether (III.24) and (III.25), we obtain

$$E_{D_{kr}(p)}(S, \vec{R}) \leq (C_0 \varepsilon + k) E_{D_r(p)}(S, \vec{R}). \quad (\text{III.26})$$

We have the freedom to adjust the positive parameter ε as we please. Because $k \in (0, 1)$, we may in particular arrange for the constant $(C_0 \varepsilon + k)$ to be smaller than 1. Then, iterating (III.26), we infer the existence of some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$E_{D_\rho(p)} \leq C \rho^\gamma \quad (\text{III.27})$$

holds for all $0 < \rho < 1/2$, all points $p \in D_{1/2}(0)$, and some constant $C > 0$. With the help of the Poincaré inequality, the estimate (III.27) can be used

to show that S and \vec{R} are locally Hölder continuous (see [Gia]). We are however interested in another corollary of (III.27). We denote the maximal function by

$$M_{2-\gamma}F(x) := \sup_{\rho>0} \rho^{-\gamma} \int_{D_\rho(x)} |F(y)| dy.$$

Going back to (III.18), owing to (III.27), it follows that

$$M_{2-\gamma}\chi_{D_{1/2}(0)}\Delta S(p) \leq \varepsilon \sup_{0<\rho<\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-\gamma} E_{D_\rho(p)} \leq C\varepsilon, \quad \forall p \in D_{1/2}(0).$$

The same estimate clearly holds with \vec{R} in place of S . Accordingly,

$$\begin{cases} \|M_{2-\gamma}\chi_{D_{1/2}(0)}\Delta S\|_{L^\infty(D_{1/2}(0))} < \infty \\ \|M_{2-\gamma}\chi_{D_{1/2}(0)}\Delta\vec{R}\|_{L^\infty(D_{1/2}(0))} < \infty. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, it is clear that ΔS and $\Delta\vec{R}$ belong to $L^1(D_{1/2}(0))$, since S , \vec{R} , and $\star\vec{n}$ are elements of $W^{1,2}(D_{1/2}(0))$. We may thus call upon Proposition 3.2 in [Ad2] to deduce that

$$\frac{1}{|x|} * \chi_{D_{1/2}(0)}\Delta S \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{|x|} * \chi_{D_{1/2}(0)}\Delta\vec{R}$$

belong to $L^{q,\infty}(D_{1/2}(0))$, with $q = \frac{2-\gamma}{1-\gamma}$.

A classical estimate about Riesz kernels states that in general, there holds

$$|\nabla u|(p) \leq C_1 \frac{1}{|x|} * \chi_{D_{1/2}(0)}\Delta u + C_2, \quad \forall p \in D_{1/4}(0),$$

for two constant C_1 and C_2 . Hence, we infer that ∇S and $\nabla\vec{R}$ are elements of $L^{q,\infty}(D_{1/4}(0))$, with q as above. In particular, because $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, it follows that

$$\nabla S \in L^{2+\delta}(D_{1/4}(0), \mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla\vec{R} \in L^{2+\delta}(D_{1/4}(0), \mathbb{R}^2), \quad (\text{III.28})$$

or some $\delta > 0$.

Now that we have this result at our disposal, we are ready to implement our regularity proof. It involves a bootstrapping argument, which will be performed on the following identity, established in Lemma A.4:

$$-\Delta\vec{\Phi} = \nabla\vec{R} \bullet \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi} + \nabla S \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi}. \quad (\text{III.29})$$

By hypothesis, $\vec{\Phi}$ is a Lipschitz function. Combining (III.28) and (III.29) thus shows that

$$\nabla\vec{\Phi} \in W^{1,2+\delta}(D_{1/4}(0), \mathbb{R}^2). \quad (\text{III.30})$$

Recall next that

$$\star \vec{n} = e^{-2\lambda} \partial_{x^1} \vec{\Phi} \wedge \partial_{x^2} \vec{\Phi} \quad \text{with} \quad 2e^{2\lambda} = |\nabla \vec{\Phi}|^2. \quad (\text{III.31})$$

It is known that λ belongs to $W^{1,(2,1)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Indeed, in [MS] the authors show that

$$\Delta \lambda = -e^{2\lambda} K, \quad \text{where } K \text{ is the Gaussian curvature,}$$

is an element of the Hardy space \mathcal{H}^1 , thereby implying that $\nabla \lambda$ lies in the Lorentz space $L^{2,1}$ (cf. Theorem 3.3.8 in [Hel]). Accordingly, $e^{\pm 2\lambda}$ are bounded from above and below.

Suppose now that $\nabla \vec{\Phi}$ belongs to $W^{1,a}$, for some $a > 2$. Since by hypothesis $\vec{\Phi}$ is Lipschitz, the second equation in (III.31) implies that $e^{2\lambda}$ is an element of $W^{1,a} \cap L^\infty$. In turn, because $e^{\pm \lambda}$ are bounded from above and below, the first equation in (III.31) yields that $\nabla \star \vec{n}$ belongs to L^a . In particular, (III.30) shows that

$$\nabla \star \vec{n} \in L^{2+\delta}(D_{1/4}(0), \mathbb{R}^2). \quad (\text{III.32})$$

For the reader's convenience, we recall

$$\begin{cases} \Delta S &= (\nabla \star \vec{n}) \cdot \nabla^\perp \vec{R} \\ \Delta \vec{R} &= (-1)^n \star (\nabla \vec{n} \bullet \nabla^\perp \vec{R}) - (\nabla \star \vec{n}) \nabla^\perp S. \end{cases}$$

Accounting for (III.28) and (III.32) in this system gives

$$\nabla S \in W^{1,1+\delta/2} \subsetneq L^{2+\delta}.$$

Naturally, the same statement holds with \vec{R} in place of S . Comparing the latter to (III.28) reveals that the regularity has been improved. The process may thus be repeated a finite number of times, until we reach that ∇S and $\nabla \vec{R}$ are continuous. The exact same procedure as above will then yield that $\vec{\Phi}$ belongs to C^1 , and eventually that it is smooth, thereby concluding the proof.

III.2.2 Conformal Willmore Equation

We open our derivations by introducing some notation. Let $z = x^1 + ix^2$ and z^* be its complex conjugate. We set

$$\vec{e}_z := e^{-\lambda} \partial_z \vec{\Phi} = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{e}_1 - i \vec{e}_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{e}_{z^*} := e^{-\lambda} \partial_{z^*} \vec{\Phi} = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{e}_1 + i \vec{e}_2).$$

Since $\vec{\Phi}$ is conformal, there holds

$$\partial_{x_j} \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_{x_k} \vec{\Phi} = e^{2\lambda} \delta_{jk} \quad \text{for} \quad (j, k) \in \{1, 2\},$$

and thus

$$\partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_b \vec{\Phi} = \frac{1}{2} e^{2\lambda} \delta_{ab^*} \quad \text{for} \quad (a, b) \in \{z, z^*\}.$$

From this, it follows easily that for any triple $(a, b, c) \in \{z, z^*\}$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_{bc} \vec{\Phi} &\equiv \delta_{ca} (\partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_{ab} \vec{\Phi}) + \delta_{cb} (\partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_{bb} \vec{\Phi}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\delta_{ca} - \delta_{cb}) \partial_b |\partial_a \vec{\Phi}|^2 + \delta_{cb} \partial_b (\partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_b \vec{\Phi}) \\ &= \delta_{cb} \delta_{ab^*} e^{2\lambda} \partial_b \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{e}_a \cdot \partial_b \vec{e}_c &\equiv e^{-2\lambda} (\partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_{bc} \vec{\Phi} - (\partial_b \lambda) \partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \partial_c \vec{\Phi}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (2 \delta_{cb} \delta_{ab^*} - \delta_{ac^*}) \partial_b \lambda. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.33})$$

Observe furthermore that

$$\vec{e}_a \cdot \vec{e}_b = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab^*}. \quad (\text{III.34})$$

Thus, combining (III.33) and (III.34) gives

$$\partial_b \vec{e}_c = \partial_b \lambda \sum_{a \in \{z, z^*\}} (2 \delta_{cb} \delta_{ab} - \delta_{ac}) \vec{e}_a + \pi_{\vec{n}} (\partial_b \vec{e}_c). \quad (\text{III.35})$$

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{e}_z &= -\vec{e}_z \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha = -\frac{1}{4} (\vec{e}_1 - i \vec{e}_2) (\partial_{x_1} + i \partial_{x_2}) \vec{n}_\alpha \\ &= -\frac{e^\lambda}{4} (h_{11}^\alpha + h_{22}^\alpha) = -\frac{e^\lambda}{2} H^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{e}_{z^*} = \frac{e^\lambda}{2} H_0^\alpha.$$

Accordingly, we may now deduce from (III.35) that

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{z^*} \vec{e}_z &= -(\partial_{z^*} \lambda) \vec{e}_z + \frac{e^\lambda}{2} \vec{H} \\ \partial_{z^*} \vec{e}_{z^*} &= (\partial_{z^*} \lambda) \vec{e}_{z^*} + \frac{e^\lambda}{2} \vec{H}_0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.36})$$

Note that we can also easily obtain from the above computations the identity

$$\partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha = -e^\lambda (H_0^\alpha \vec{e}_z + H^\alpha \vec{e}_{z^*}) + \pi_{\vec{n}} (\partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha). \quad (\text{III.37})$$

These expressions shall come helpful in the sequel.

Suppose now that $\vec{\Phi}$ is smooth and satisfies for some \vec{L} the system

$$\begin{cases} \nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla^\perp\vec{L} & = 0 \\ \nabla\vec{\Phi} \wedge (2\nabla\vec{H} + \nabla^\perp\vec{L}) & = 0. \end{cases} \quad (\text{III.38})$$

Since $\vec{e}_j = e^{-\lambda} \partial_{x_j} \vec{\Phi}$, the first equation in the system is equivalent to

$$\vec{e}_1 \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{L} = \vec{e}_2 \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{L}.$$

Whence, we deduce that \vec{L} satisfies

$$\nabla^\perp\vec{L} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \vec{e}_1 \\ \vec{e}_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} p^\alpha \\ q^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \vec{n}_\alpha, \quad (\text{III.39})$$

for some suitable coefficients a, b, c, p^α , and q^α .

Substituting this form in the second equation from (III.38) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \vec{e}_1 \wedge \left[2(\vec{e}_1 \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{H}) \vec{e}_1 + 2(\vec{e}_2 \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{H}) \vec{e}_2 + 2(\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{H}) \vec{n}_\alpha \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. + a \vec{e}_1 + b \vec{e}_2 + p^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha \right] \\ = & -\vec{e}_2 \wedge \left[2(\vec{e}_1 \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{H}) \vec{e}_1 + 2(\vec{e}_2 \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{H}) \vec{e}_2 + 2(\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{H}) \vec{n}_\alpha \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. + c \vec{e}_1 - a \vec{e}_2 + q^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha \right], \end{aligned}$$

thereby yielding

$$c - b = 2(\vec{e}_2 \cdot \partial_{x_1} - \vec{e}_1 \cdot \partial_{x_2}) \vec{H}, \quad p^\alpha = -2\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{H}, \quad q^\alpha = -2\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{H}.$$

However, because $\vec{H} = H^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha$, and the second fundamental form is symmetric, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} c - b &= 2(\vec{e}_2 \cdot \partial_{x_1} - \vec{e}_1 \cdot \partial_{x_2}) \vec{H} = 2H^\alpha (\vec{e}_1 \cdot \partial_{x_2} - \vec{e}_2 \cdot \partial_{x_1}) \vec{n}_\alpha \\ &= 2H^\alpha e^\lambda (h_{21}^\alpha - h_{12}^\alpha) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Whence, (III.39) may be recast in the form

$$\nabla^\perp\vec{L} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & -a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \vec{e}_1 \\ \vec{e}_2 \end{pmatrix} - 2\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla\vec{H}).$$

Equivalently, in the $\{\vec{e}_z, \vec{e}_{z^*}\}$ frame, this expression reads

$$\partial_z \vec{L} = A \vec{e}_{z^*} - 2i\pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}), \quad (\text{III.40})$$

where $A := b + ia$.

Using (III.36) and (III.37), the latter gives

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{z^*z} \vec{L} &= \partial_{z^*}(A \vec{e}_{z^*}) - 2i(\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_z \vec{H}) \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha - 2i\pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_{z^*} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H})) \\ &= \left[e^{-\lambda} \partial_{z^*}(e^\lambda A) + 2ie^\lambda \vec{H} \cdot \partial_z \vec{H} \right] \vec{e}_{z^*} + 2i \left[e^\lambda \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{H} \right] \vec{e}_z \\ &\quad + \pi_{\vec{n}} \partial_{z^*z} \vec{L}. \quad (\text{III.41})\end{aligned}$$

Observe that (III.37) and (III.40) reveal that

$$\begin{aligned}&\pi_{\vec{n}} \partial_{z^*z} \vec{L} \\ &= \left[\partial_{z^*}(\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_z \vec{L}) - \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \partial_z \vec{L} \right] \vec{n}_\alpha \\ &= \left[-2i \partial_{z^*}(\vec{n}_\alpha \cdot \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H})) + 2i\pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha) \cdot \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) - \frac{1}{2} e^\lambda H_0^\alpha A \right] \vec{n}_\alpha \\ &= 2i \left(\pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha) - \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha \right) \cdot \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) \vec{n}_\alpha - 2i\pi_{\vec{n}} \partial_{z^*} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) - \frac{1}{2} e^\lambda \vec{H}_0 A \\ &= -2i\pi_{\vec{n}} \partial_{z^*} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) - \frac{1}{2} e^\lambda \vec{H}_0 A.\end{aligned}$$

Putting this into (III.41) yields now

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_{z^*z} \vec{L} &= \left[e^{-\lambda} \partial_{z^*}(e^\lambda A) + 2ie^\lambda \vec{H} \cdot \partial_z \vec{H} \right] \vec{e}_{z^*} + 2i \left[e^\lambda \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{H} \right] \vec{e}_z \\ &\quad - 2i\pi_{\vec{n}} \partial_{z^*} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) - \frac{1}{2} e^\lambda \vec{H}_0 A. \quad (\text{III.42})\end{aligned}$$

Because $\Im(\partial_{z^*z} \vec{L}) = \vec{0}$, it suffices to “project” the identity (III.42) to discover

$$\partial_{z^*}(e^\lambda A) = -2ie^{2\lambda} (\vec{H} \cdot \partial_z \vec{H} + \vec{H}_0^* \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{H}) \quad (\text{III.43})$$

and

$$-4\Im \left[i\pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_{z^*} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H})) \right] = e^\lambda \Im(A \vec{H}_0). \quad (\text{III.44})$$

Comparing (III.43) to the Codazzi-Mainardi equation (A.16) shows that

$$A = -2ie^\lambda \vec{H}_0^* \cdot \vec{H} + ie^{-\lambda} f, \quad (\text{III.45})$$

for some holomorphic function $f(z)$.

In conformal coordinates, there holds

$$e^{2\lambda} \Delta_\perp \vec{H} = \pi_{\vec{n}} \left(\text{div} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) \right) \equiv -4\Im \left[i\pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_{z^*} \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H})) \right],$$

so that (III.44) becomes

$$e^\lambda \Delta_\perp \vec{H} = \Im(A \vec{H}_0).$$

Introducing (III.45) in the latter gives

$$\Delta_{\perp} \vec{H} + 2 \Re(\vec{H} \cdot \vec{H}_0^* \vec{H}_0) = e^{-2\lambda} \Im(i \vec{H}_0 f). \quad (\text{III.46})$$

To complete our derivation of the conformal Willmore equation, there remains to observe that⁶

$$\begin{aligned} \Re \left[H_0^{\alpha} (H_0^{\beta})^* \right] &= \frac{1}{4} \left[(h_{11}^{\alpha} - h_{22}^{\alpha})(h_{11}^{\beta} - h_{22}^{\beta}) + 4 h_{12}^{\alpha} h_{12}^{\beta} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 h_{ij}^{\alpha} h_{ij}^{\beta} - \frac{1}{4} (h_{11}^{\alpha} + h_{22}^{\alpha})(h_{11}^{\beta} + h_{22}^{\beta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 h_{ij}^{\alpha} h_{ij}^{\beta} - H^{\alpha} H^{\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, (III.46) becomes, after a few simple manipulations,

$$\Delta_{\perp} \vec{H} + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 h_{ij}^{\alpha} h_{ij}^{\beta} H^{\beta} \vec{n}_{\alpha} - 2 |\vec{H}|^2 \vec{H} = e^{-2\lambda} \langle \vec{H}_0, f \rangle_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

This identity is precisely the conformal Willmore equation.

To finish the proof of Theorem II.2, there remains to derive the identity (II.7). Let

$$\nabla^{\perp} \vec{L}_0 := \nabla^{\perp} \vec{H} - 3 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) + \star(\nabla^{\perp} \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}). \quad (\text{III.47})$$

Since $\vec{H} = H^{\alpha} \vec{n}_{\alpha}$, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \vec{H} - 3 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) &= \langle \vec{e}_1, \nabla \vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_1 - \langle \vec{e}_2, \nabla \vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_2 - 2 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) \\ &= H^{\alpha} \left[\langle \vec{e}_1, \nabla \vec{n}_{\alpha} \rangle \vec{e}_1 + \langle \vec{e}_2, \nabla \vec{n}_{\alpha} \rangle \vec{e}_2 \right] - 2 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) \\ &= -H^{\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} h_{11}^{\alpha} & h_{21}^{\alpha} \\ h_{12}^{\alpha} & h_{22}^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \nabla \vec{\Phi} - 2 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}). \quad (\text{III.48}) \end{aligned}$$

It is shown in equation (II.33) from [Riv2] that

$$\star(\nabla^{\perp} \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}) = -H^{\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} h_{22}^{\alpha} & -h_{21}^{\alpha} \\ -h_{12}^{\alpha} & h_{11}^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \nabla \vec{\Phi}.$$

Substituting the latter and (III.48) into (III.47) yields

$$\nabla^{\perp} \vec{L}_0 := -H^{\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} h_{11}^{\alpha} - h_{22}^{\alpha} & 2 h_{21}^{\alpha} \\ 2 h_{12}^{\alpha} & h_{22}^{\alpha} - h_{11}^{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \nabla \vec{\Phi} - 2 \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}).$$

⁶implicit summations over repeated indices are understood wherever appropriate.

Equivalently,

$$\partial_z \vec{L}_0 = -2i e^\lambda \vec{H}_0^* \cdot \vec{H} \vec{e}_{z^*} - 2i \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) .$$

Introducing (III.45), the latter may be recast as

$$\partial_z \vec{L}_0 = A \vec{e}_{z^*} - i e^{-\lambda} f(z) \vec{e}_{z^*} - 2i \pi_{\vec{n}}(\partial_z \vec{H}) .$$

Accordingly, (III.40) shows that

$$\partial_z (\vec{L}_0 - \vec{L}) = -i e^{-\lambda} f(z) \vec{e}_{z^*} .$$

Finally, owing to (III.36) and to the holomorphy of f , we deduce the desired

$$\Delta(\vec{L}_0 - \vec{L}) \equiv 4 \partial_{z^*} \partial_z (\vec{L}_0 - \vec{L}) = -i f(z) \partial_{z^*} (e^{-\lambda} \vec{e}_{z^*}) = -2i \vec{H}_0 f .$$

A Appendix

A.1 Notational Conventions

We append an arrow to all the elements belonging to \mathbb{R}^m . To simplify the notation, by $\vec{\Phi} \in X(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is meant $\vec{\Phi} \in X(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^m)$ whenever X is a functional space. Similarly, we write $\nabla \vec{\Phi} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \otimes X(\mathbb{D}^2)$ for $\nabla \vec{\Phi} \in X(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^{2m})$.

Although this custom may seem odd at first, we allow the differential operators classically acting on scalars to act on elements of \mathbb{R}^m . Thus, for example, $\nabla \vec{\Phi}$ is the element of $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^m$ that can be written $(\partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi}, \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi})$. If S is a scalar and \vec{R} an element of \mathbb{R}^m , then we let

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{R} \cdot \nabla \vec{\Phi} &:= (\vec{R} \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi}, \vec{R} \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi}) , \\ \nabla^\perp S \nabla \vec{\Phi} &:= \partial_{x_1} S \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi} - \partial_{x_2} S \partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi} , \\ \nabla^\perp \vec{R} \cdot \nabla \vec{\Phi} &:= \partial_{x_1} \vec{R} \cdot \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi} - \partial_{x_2} \vec{R} \cdot \partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi} , \\ \nabla^\perp \vec{R} \wedge \nabla \vec{\Phi} &:= \partial_{x_1} \vec{R} \wedge \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi} - \partial_{x_2} \vec{R} \wedge \partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi} . \end{aligned}$$

Similar quantities (with ∇ in place of ∇^\perp) are defined analogously, following the same logic.

Two operations between multivectors are also useful. The interior multiplication \llcorner maps a pair comprising a q -vector γ and a p -vector β to a $(q-p)$ -vector. It is defined via

$$\langle \gamma \llcorner \beta, \alpha \rangle = \langle \gamma, \beta \wedge \alpha \rangle \quad \text{for all } (q-p)\text{-vector } \alpha .$$

Let α be a k -vector. The first-order contraction operation \bullet is defined inductively through

$$\alpha \bullet \beta = \alpha \llcorner \beta \quad \text{when } \beta \text{ is a 1-vector ,}$$

and

$$\alpha \bullet (\beta \wedge \gamma) = (\alpha \bullet \beta) \wedge \gamma + (-1)^{pq} (\alpha \bullet \gamma) \wedge \beta ,$$

when β and γ are respectively a p -vector and a q -vector.

A.2 Lorentz and Sobolev-Lorentz Spaces

For the reader's convenience, we recall in this section the fundamentals of Lorentz spaces. More detailed accounts may be found in [BL], [Hun], and [Ta1].

For a real-valued measurable function f on an open subset of $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, its belonging to a Lorentz space is determined by a condition involving the non-decreasing rearrangement of $|f|$ on the interval $(0, |U|)$, where $|U|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of U . The non-increasing rearrangement f^* of $|f|$ is the unique function from $(0, |U|)$ into \mathbb{R} which is non-increasing and which satisfies

$$\left| \{x \in U \mid |f(x)| \geq s\} \right| = \left| \{t \in (0, |U|) \mid f^*(t) \geq s\} \right|.$$

If $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$, the Lorentz space $L^{p,q}(U)$ is the set of measurable functions $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which

$$\int_0^\infty (t^{1/p} f^*(t))^q \frac{dt}{t} < \infty \quad \text{if } q < \infty,$$

or

$$\sup_{t>0} t^{1/p} f^*(t) < \infty \quad \text{if } q = \infty.$$

A norm on $L^{p,q}(U)$ is given by

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,q}(U)} = \left\| t^{1/p} f^{**} \right\|_{L^q([0,\infty), dt/t)} \quad \text{where} \quad f^{**}(t) := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f^*(\tau) d\tau.$$

One verifies that

$$L^p = L^{p,p},$$

and that $L^{p,\infty}$ is the weak- L^p Marcinkiewicz space.

Moreover, we have the inclusions

$$L^{p,1} \subset L^{p,q'} \subset L^{p,q''} \subset L^{p,\infty} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 < q' < q'' < \infty;$$

and if U has finite measure, there holds for all q and q'

$$L^{p',q'}(U) \subset L^{p,q}(U) \quad \text{whenever} \quad p < p'.$$

Finally, if $q < \infty$, the space $L^{\frac{p}{p-1}, \frac{q}{q-1}}$ is the dual of $L^{p,q}$.

Similarly to Lebesgue spaces, Lorentz spaces obey a pointwise multiplication rule and a convolution product rule. More precisely, for $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$ and $1 \leq q_1, q_2 \leq \infty$, there holds

$$L^{p_1, q_1} \times L^{p_2, q_2} = L^{p, q} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} p^{-1} &= p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1} \\ q^{-1} &= q_1^{-1} + q_2^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

and

$$L^{p_1, q_1} * L^{p_2, q_2} = L^{p, q} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} p^{-1} &= p_1^{-1} + p_2^{-1} - 1 \\ q^{-1} &= q_1^{-1} + q_2^{-1}. \end{cases}$$

An interesting feature of Lorentz spaces is the possibility to generate them via interpolation of Lebesgue spaces. In particular, if $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $V \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ are open subsets, and if r_0, r_1, p_0, p_1 are real numbers satisfying

$$1 \leq r_0 < r_1 \leq \infty \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq p_0 \neq p_1 \leq \infty,$$

the following interpolation result holds. Let T be a linear operator which⁷ maps continuously $L^{r_j}(U)$ into $L^{p_j}(V)$. Then T maps continuously $L^{r, q}(U)$ into $L^{p, q}(V)$ for each $q \in [1, \infty]$ and every pair (p, r) such that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1-\theta}{p_0} + \frac{\theta}{p_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{r} = \frac{1-\theta}{r_0} + \frac{\theta}{r_1},$$

for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

Lorentz spaces offer the possibility to sharpen the classical Sobolev embedding theorem. More precisely, it can be shown (see [BL] and [Ta3]) that

$$W^{k, q}(\mathbb{R}^m) \subset L^{p, q}(\mathbb{R}^m)$$

is a continuous embedding as long as

$$1 \leq q \leq p < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{k}{m} = \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}.$$

Our study requires that we introduce Sobolev-Lorentz spaces. These spaces are defined analogously to the “standard” Sobolev spaces, but with the Lebesgue norms replaced by Lorentz norms. In an effort to simplify the presentation, we shall focus only on the two-dimensional unit disk \mathbb{D}^2 . Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in (1, \infty)$, and $q \in [1, \infty]$. The (homogeneous) Sobolev-Lorentz space $W^{m, (p, q)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ consists of all locally summable functions u on \mathbb{D}^2 such that $D^\alpha u$ exists in the weak sense and belongs to the Lorentz space $L^{p, q}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ for all multiindex α with $|\alpha| = m$. The norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{m, (p, q)}} := \sum_{|\alpha|=m} \|D^\alpha u\|_{L^{p, q}}$$

clearly makes $W^{m, (p, q)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ into a Banach space. The space $W^{0, (p, q)}$ is understood to be $L^{p, q}$. For notational convenience, we shall from now on omit to precise that we work on the unit disk \mathbb{D}^2 . This shall arise no confusion.

⁷for $j \in \{0, 1\}$.

We also focus on a case of particular interest to us, namely $(p, q) = (2, 1)$. Because $L^{2,1}$ is a subspace of L^2 , it follows immediately that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there holds

$$W^{m,(2,1)} \subset W^{m,2}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $W^{m,2}$ is the usual (homogeneous) Sobolev space. In [BW], the authors prove⁸ that $W^{1,(2,1)}$ is a subspace of $L^\infty \cap C^0$, so that $W^{m,(2,1)}$ is a subspace of $W^{m-1,\infty} \cap C^{m-1}$. Altogether, there holds

$$W^{m,(2,1)} \subset W^{m,2} \cap W^{m-1,\infty} \cap C^{m-1}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The Rellich-Kondrachov theorem states that $W^{1,2}$ is compact in L^r for all finite $r \geq 1$. By standard interpolation techniques, it ensues that

$$W^{m,2} \subset\subset W^{m-1,(p,q)} \quad \text{for} \quad \begin{cases} p = 1 = q \\ 1 < p < \infty, 1 \leq q \leq \infty. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

are compact inclusions for every $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

The embedding (A.1) shows that each element of $W^{m,(2,1)}$ has a well-defined trace on the boundary of the unit disk, for $m \geq 1$. If that trace is null, the said element belongs to the space $W_0^{m,(2,1)}$. In addition, it is easily seen that $W_0^{m,(2,1)}$ is the closure of C_c^∞ in $W^{m,(2,1)}$.

It is instructive to characterize the dual of the space $W_0^{m,(p,q)}$, which we shall denote $W^{-m,(p',q')}$, where (p', q') is the conjugate pair of (p, q) :

$$p' = (1 - p^{-1})^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad q' = (1 - q^{-1})^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Proposition I.1 *Suppose that T is an element of $W^{-m,(p',q')}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R})$, so that T is a bounded linear functional on $W_0^{m,(p,q)}$. For every $\delta > 0$, there exists an element P of $W^{1-m,(p',q')}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$T = \text{div } P, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and

$$\|P\|_{W^{1-m,(p',q')}} \leq \|T\|_{W^{-m,(p',q')}} + \delta. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof. This is a mere adaption of the analogous statement for the Lebesgue-Sobolev space $W^{m,p}$, ultimately following from the Hahn-Banach theorem. The reader is referred to Theorem 3.10 in [Ad1] for details. ■

We next bring into light an interesting Hodge decomposition result which follows from standard elliptic theory and the interpolation nature of Lorentz spaces (cf. Proposition 3.3.9 in [Hel]).

⁸see also Theorem 3.3.4 in [Hel].

Proposition I.2 *To every vector field $\vec{g} = (g_1, g_2) \in L^1(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ we associate the functions α , β , and h on \mathbb{D}^2 which are solutions of*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\alpha = \operatorname{div} \vec{g} & \Delta\beta = \operatorname{curl} \vec{g} & \text{in } \mathbb{D}^2 \\ \alpha = 0 & \beta = 0 & \text{on } \partial\mathbb{D}^2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} g_1 = \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\beta}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \\ g_2 = \frac{\partial\alpha}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial\beta}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}, \end{cases}$$

so that h is harmonic on \mathbb{D}^2 .

Then the operators

$$\vec{g} \mapsto \nabla\alpha, \quad \vec{g} \mapsto \nabla\beta, \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{g} \mapsto \nabla h$$

map continuously $L^{p,q}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ into itself for every choice of $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in [1, \infty]$.

This lemma is the central ingredient to obtain the following result.

Lemma A.1 *Let $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (1, \infty]$. Suppose that G is an element of $W^{-1,(p,q)}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ which satisfies (in the functional sense)*

$$\operatorname{div} G = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{D}^2.$$

Then there exists an element L in the space $L^{p',q'}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$G = \nabla^\perp L. \tag{A.7}$$

Proof. Let p' and q' be as in (A.4). We remind the reader that $W^{-1,(p,q)}$ is the dual of $W_0^{1,(p',q')}$.

A classical result of Laurent Schwartz guarantees the existence of L in \mathcal{D}' such that (A.7) holds in the sense of distributions. Owing to the density of $\mathcal{D} = C_c^\infty$ in $W_0^{1,(p',q')}$, it thus follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}^2} G \cdot F = - \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} L \operatorname{div} F, \quad \forall F \in W_0^{1,(p',q')}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^2). \tag{A.8}$$

Next, let f be an arbitrary element of $L^{p',q'}(\mathbb{R})$ with null average over the unit-disk. Choosing $\vec{g} = (f, 0)$ in Proposition I.2, we infer the existence of an element $F := (\alpha, \beta)$ in $W_0^{1,(p',q')}(\mathbb{D}^2, \mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{div} F = f \quad \text{and} \quad \|F\|_{W^{1,(p',q')}} \leq \|f\|_{L^{p',q'}}. \tag{A.9}$$

Altogether, (A.8) and (A.9) show that L acts linearly on $L^{p',q'}$ with the estimate

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} L f \right| \leq \|G\|_{W^{-1,(p,q)}} \|f\|_{L^{p',q'}}.$$

Since $L^{p,q}$ is the dual space of $L^{p',q'}$, the desired statement ensues. ■

A.3 Miscellaneous Identities

Lemma A.2 *Let $\vec{\Phi}$, \vec{n} , and \vec{H} be as in Theorem II.1. We set*

$$Q := \nabla \vec{H} - 3\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla \vec{H}) + \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}).$$

Then the following identities hold

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot Q = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge Q = -2 \nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla \vec{H}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Proof. Firstly, we note that

$$\nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha = \langle \vec{e}_1, \nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha \rangle \vec{e}_1 + \langle \vec{e}_2, \nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha \rangle \vec{e}_2 + \langle \vec{n}_\beta, \nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha \rangle \vec{n}_\beta,$$

so that

$$\star(\vec{n} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha) = \langle \vec{e}_1, \nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha \rangle \vec{e}_2 - \langle \vec{e}_2, \nabla^\perp \vec{n}_\alpha \rangle \vec{e}_1.$$

Whence,

$$\star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{n}_\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} -h_{22}^\alpha \\ h_{12}^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi} + \begin{pmatrix} h_{12}^\alpha \\ -h_{11}^\alpha \end{pmatrix} \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi}.$$

Accordingly, we find

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{n}_\alpha) = (h_{12}^\alpha - h_{12}^\alpha) \partial_{x_1} \vec{\Phi} \wedge \partial_{x_2} \vec{\Phi} = 0,$$

and

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{n}_\alpha) = -e^{2\lambda} (h_{11}^\alpha + h_{22}^\alpha) = -2e^{2\lambda} H^\alpha.$$

The last two identities yield

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi} \wedge \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}) = 0, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

and

$$\nabla \vec{\Phi} \cdot \star(\nabla^\perp \vec{n} \wedge \vec{H}) = -2e^{2\lambda} |\vec{H}|^2. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

For three indices $(a, b, c) \in \{x^1, x^2\}$, let

$$F(a, b, c) := \partial_a \vec{\Phi} \wedge \langle \vec{e}_b, \partial_c \vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_b.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} F(a, b, c) &= e^\lambda \langle \vec{e}_b, \partial_c \vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_a \wedge \vec{e}_b \\ &= -e^\lambda H^\alpha \langle \vec{n}_\alpha, \partial_c \vec{e}_b \rangle \vec{e}_a \wedge \vec{e}_b \quad \text{since } \vec{H} = H^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha \\ &= -e^\lambda H^\alpha h_{cb}^\alpha \vec{e}_a \wedge \vec{e}_b. \end{aligned}$$

Using this, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla\vec{\Phi} \wedge \left(\nabla\vec{H} - \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla\vec{H}) \right) &\equiv \nabla\vec{\Phi} \wedge \left(\langle \vec{e}_1, \nabla\vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_1 + \langle \vec{e}_2, \nabla\vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_2 \right) \\
&= F(x^1, x^1, x^1) + F(x^1, x^2, x^1) \\
&\quad + F(x^2, x^1, x^2) + F(x^2, x^2, x^2) \\
&= -e^\lambda H^\alpha h_{21}^\alpha \vec{e}_1 \wedge \vec{e}_2 - e^\lambda H^\alpha h_{12}^\alpha \vec{e}_2 \wedge \vec{e}_1 \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\nabla\vec{\Phi} \wedge \left(\nabla\vec{H} - 3\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla\vec{H}) \right) = -2\nabla\vec{\Phi} \wedge \nabla\vec{H}. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

An evident yet nonetheless useful identity is

$$\nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot \pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla\vec{H}) = 0,$$

thereby giving

$$\nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot \left(\nabla\vec{H} - 3\pi_{\vec{n}}(\nabla\vec{H}) \right) = \nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla\vec{H}. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Bringing altogether (A.11) and (A.13) yields the second part of (A.10). Deriving the first part of (A.10) requires a bit more work. Combining (A.12) and (A.14) shows that

$$\nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot Q = \nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla\vec{H} - 2e^{2\lambda} |\vec{H}|^2. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

For three indices $(a, b, c) \in \{x^1, x^2\}$, let

$$G(a, b, c) := \partial_a \vec{\Phi} \cdot \langle \vec{e}_b, \partial_c \vec{H} \rangle \vec{e}_b.$$

Just as above, we verify easily that

$$G(a, b, c) = e^{2\lambda} H^\alpha h_{cb}^\alpha \delta_{ab}.$$

Consequently, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla\vec{\Phi} \cdot \nabla\vec{H} &= G(x^1, x^1, x^1) + G(x^1, x^2, x^1) + G(x^2, x^1, x^2) + G(x^2, x^2, x^2) \\
&= e^{2\lambda} H^\alpha h_{11}^\alpha + e^{2\lambda} H^\alpha h_{22}^\alpha \\
&= 2e^{2\lambda} |\vec{H}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting this into (A.15) finally gives the sought after first identity in (A.10). ■

Lemma A.3 *Using the notation introduced in Section III.2.2, the Codazzi-Mainardi identity may be recast in the form*

$$e^{-2\lambda} \partial_{z^*} (e^{2\lambda} \vec{H}_0^* \cdot \vec{H}) = \vec{H} \cdot \partial_z \vec{H} + \vec{H}_0^* \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{H}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Proof. Consider the 1-form

$$\eta_\alpha := \langle \vec{e}_{z^*}, d\vec{n}_\alpha \rangle.$$

On one hand, there holds

$$\eta_\alpha = (\vec{e}_{z^*} \cdot \partial_z \vec{n}_\alpha) dz + (\vec{e}_{z^*} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha) dz^* \stackrel{(\text{III.37})}{=} -\frac{e^\lambda}{2} (H^\alpha dz + H_0^\alpha dz^*),$$

so that

$$d\eta_\alpha = -\frac{e^\lambda}{2} (H_0^\alpha \partial_z \lambda - H^\alpha \partial_{z^*} \lambda + \partial_z H_0^\alpha - \partial_{z^*} H^\alpha) dz \wedge dz^*. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

On the other hand, with (III.36) and (III.37), we find

$$\begin{aligned} d\eta_\alpha &= d\langle \vec{e}_{z^*}, d\vec{n}_\alpha \rangle = (\partial_z \vec{e}_{z^*} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha - \partial_{z^*} \vec{e}_{z^*} \cdot \partial_z \vec{n}_\alpha) dz \wedge dz^* \\ &= \frac{e^\lambda}{2} (H_0^\alpha \partial_z \lambda + H^\alpha \partial_{z^*} \lambda + \vec{H} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha - \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{n}_\alpha) dz \wedge dz^*. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the latter to (A.17) yields

$$2H_0^\alpha \partial_z \lambda = \partial_{z^*} H^\alpha - \partial_z H_0^\alpha - \vec{H} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha + \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{n}_\alpha. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

By antisymmetry, there holds⁹

$$H^\alpha \vec{H} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha = H^\alpha H^\beta \vec{n}_\beta \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha = 0,$$

and whence

$$H^\alpha \partial_{z^*} H^\alpha = H^\alpha \partial_{z^*} H^\alpha + H^\alpha \vec{H} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{n}_\alpha = \vec{H} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{H}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Similarly, we find

$$\begin{aligned} H^\alpha (\partial_z H_0^\alpha - \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{n}_\alpha) &= \partial_z (\vec{H}_0 \cdot \vec{H}) - H_0^\alpha \partial_z H^\alpha - H^\alpha \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{n}_\alpha \\ &= \partial_z (\vec{H}_0 \cdot \vec{H}) - \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{H}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Multiplying (A.18) throughout by H^α , summing over α , and using (A.19) and (A.20) gives after a few manipulations the (complex conjugate of the) desired

$$e^{-2\lambda} \partial_z (e^{2\lambda} \vec{H}_0 \cdot \vec{H}) = \vec{H} \cdot \partial_{z^*} \vec{H} + \vec{H}_0 \cdot \partial_z \vec{H}. \quad \blacksquare$$

⁹we “contextually” sum over repeated indices whenever appropriate.

Lemma A.4 *Using the notation of Section III.2, there holds*

$$-\Delta\vec{\Phi} = \nabla\vec{R} \bullet \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi} + \nabla S \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi}. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Proof. Note that for any 1-vector \vec{a} , we have

$$(\vec{a} \wedge \vec{e}_j) \bullet \vec{e}_i = (\vec{e}_i \mathbf{L} \vec{a}) \wedge \vec{e}_j + \vec{a} \wedge (\vec{e}_i \mathbf{L} \vec{e}_j) = (\vec{e}_i \cdot \vec{a}) \vec{e}_j + \delta_{ij} \vec{a}.$$

From this, and $\vec{e}_i := e^{-\lambda} \partial_{x^i} \vec{\Phi}$, it follows easily that whenever

$$\vec{V} := V^i \vec{e}_i + V^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha,$$

then

$$\begin{cases} (\vec{V} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}) \bullet \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} &= e^{2\lambda} (3V^i \vec{e}_i + 2V^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha) \\ (\vec{V} \wedge \nabla \vec{\Phi}) \bullet \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} &= e^{2\lambda} (V^2 \vec{e}_1 - V^1 \vec{e}_2) \equiv (\vec{V} \cdot \nabla \vec{\Phi}) \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}. \end{cases}$$

In particular, since $\vec{H} = H^\alpha \vec{n}_\alpha$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\vec{R} \bullet \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi} &\equiv -(\vec{L} \wedge \nabla \vec{\Phi} + 2\vec{H} \wedge \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi}) \bullet \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} \\ &= -(\vec{L} \cdot \nabla \vec{\Phi}) \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} - 2e^{2\lambda} \vec{H} \\ &= -\nabla S \nabla^\perp \vec{\Phi} - 2e^{2\lambda} \vec{H}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\nabla\vec{R} \bullet \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi} + \nabla S \nabla^\perp\vec{\Phi} = -2e^{2\lambda} \vec{H}.$$

Finally, there remains to observe that

$$\Delta\vec{\Phi} = 2e^{2\lambda} \vec{H}$$

to deduce the desired identity (A.21). ■

References

- [Ad1] Adams, Robert “Sobolev Spaces.” Academic Press 2003.
- [Ad2] Adams, Robert “A note on Riesz potentials.” *Duke Math. J.* 42 (1975), no. 4, 765-778.
- [BK] Bauer, Matthias; Kuwert, Ernst “Existence of minimizing Willmore surfaces of prescribed genus.” *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2003), no. 10, 553-576.
- [Be] Bethuel, Fabrice “Un résultat de régularité pour les solutions de l'équation de surface à courbure moyenne prescrite.” *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Série I Math.* 314 (1992), no. 13, 1003-1007.
- [BL] Bergh, J.; Löfström, J. “Interpolation Spaces: an introduction.” Springer, 1976.
- [Bla] Blaschke, Wilhelm “Vorlesungen Über Differential Geometrie III.” Springer (1929).
- [BPP] Bohle, Christoph; Peters, G. Paul; Pinkall, Ulrich “Constrained Willmore surfaces.” *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 32 (2008), 263-277.
- [BPU] Burstall, Francis; Pedit, Franz; Pinkall, Ulrich “Schwarzian derivatives and flows of surfaces.” *Contemp. Math.* 308 (2002), 39-61.
- [Bry1] Bryant, Robert L. “A duality theorem for Willmore surfaces.” *J. Diff. Geom.* 20 (1984), no. 1, 23–53.
- [Bry2] Bryant, Robert L. “Surfaces in conformal geometry.” *Amer. Math. Soc. Proc. Symp. Pure Maths* 48 (1988), 227-240. *J. Diff. Geom.* 20 (1984), no. 1, 23–53.
- [BW] Brezis, Haïm; Wainger S. “A note on limiting cases of Sobolev embeddings and convolutions inequalities.” *Comm. PDE* 5 (1980), 773-789.
- [Che] Chen, Bang-Yen “Some conformal invariants of submanifolds and their applications.” *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.* (4) 10 (1974), 380–385.
- [CLMS] Coifman, R.; Lions, P.-L.; Meyer, Y.; Semmes, S. “Compensated compactness and Hardy spaces.” *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) 72 (1993), no. 3, 247–286.
- [Fe] Federer, Herbert “Geometric Measure Theory.” Springer (1969).

- [FJM] Friesecke, Gero; James, Richard D.; Müller, Stefan “A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three-dimensional elasticity.” *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 55 (2002), no. 11, 1461–1506.
- [Ger] Germain, Sophie “Recherches sur la théorie des surfaces élastiques.” Courcier, Paris, 1821.
- [Gia] Giaquinta, Mariano “Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations and Nonlinear Elliptic Systems.” *Annals of Mathematics Studies*, 105, PUP, Princeton, 1983.
- [Haw] Hawking, S.W. “Gravitational radiation in an expanding universe.” *J. Math. Phys.* 9 (1968), 598–604.
- [Hel] Hélein, Frédéric “Harmonic Maps, Conservation Laws, and Moving Frames.” *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*, 150. Cambridge University Press (2002).
- [Hef] Helfrich, Wolfgang “Elastic properties of lipid bilayers: theory and possible experiments.” *Z. Naturforsch., C28* (1973), 693–703.
- [Hub] Huber, Alfred “On subharmonic functions and differential geometry in the large.” *Comment. Math. Helv.* 32 1957 13–72.
- [Hun] Hunt, R. A. “On $L(p, q)$ spaces.” *L’enseignement Mathématique XII* (1966), 249–276.
- [HI] Huisken, G.; Ilmanen, T. “The Riemannian Penrose inequality.” *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 1997, no. 20, 1045–1058.
- [Jo] Jost, Jürgen “Compact Riemann Surfaces” Universitext, Springer 2006.
- [LY] Li, Peter; Yau, Shing Tung “A new conformal invariant and its applications to the Willmore conjecture and the first eigenvalue of compact surfaces.” *Invent. Math.* 69 (1982), no. 2, 269–291.
- [MS] Müller, Stefan; Šverák, Vladimír “On surfaces of finite total curvature.” *J. Diff. Geom.* 42 (1995), no. 2, 229–258.
- [Pol] Polyakov, A.M. “Fine structure of strings.” *Nucl. Phys. B* 268 (1986), 1183.
- [PS] Pinkall, U.; Sterling, I. “Willmore surfaces.” *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, 9 (1987), no. 2, 38–43.
- [Ric] Richter, Jörg “Conformal maps of a Riemann surface into the space of quaternions.” Thesis, TU-Berlin, 1997.

- [Riv1] Rivière, Tristan “Conservation laws for conformally invariant variational problems.” *Invent. Math.*, 168 (2006), no 1, 1-22.
- [Riv2] Rivière, Tristan “Analysis aspects of the Willmore functional.” *Invent. Math.* 174 (2008), no. 1, 1-45.
- [Ru] Rusu, Raluca “An algorithm for the elastic flow of surfaces.” *Interface and Free Boundaries* 7 (2005), 229-239.
- [Sim] Simon, Leon “Existence of surfaces minimizing the Willmore functional.” *Comm. Anal. Geom.* 1 (1993), no. 2, 281–326.
- [Ta1] Tartar, Luc “An Introduction to Sobolev Spaces and Interpolation Spaces.” *Lectures notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana*, no. 3 (2007).
- [Ta2] Tartar, Luc “Remarks on oscillations and Stokes’ equation. Macroscopic modelling of turbulent flows.” (Nice, 1984), 24–31, *Lecture Notes in Phys.*, 230, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [Ta3] Tartar, Luc “Imbedding theorems of Sobolev spaces into Lorentz spaces.” *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat.* (8) 1 (1998), no. 3, 479–500.
- [Tho] Thomsen, G. “Über konforme Geometrie, I.” *Grundlagen der Konformen Flächentheorie. Abh. Math. Sem. Hamburg*, (1923) 31-56.
- [To1] Toro, Tatiana “Surfaces with generalized second fundamental form in L^2 are Lipschitz manifolds.” *J. Diff. Geom.*, 39 (1994), 65-101.
- [To2] Toro, Tatiana “Geometric conditions and existence of bilipschitz parametrisations.” *Duke Math. Journal*, 77 (1995), no. 1, 193-227.
- [Wei] Weiner, Joel “On a problem of Chen, Willmore, et al.” *Indiana U. Math. J.*, 27, no 1 (1978), 19-35.
- [Wen] Wente, Henry C. “An existence theorem for surfaces of constant mean curvature.” *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 26 1969 318–344.
- [Whi] White, James H. “A global invariant of conformal mappings in space.” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 38 (1973), 162–164.
- [Wil1] Willmore, T. J. “Note on embedded surfaces.” *Ann. Stiint. Univ. ”Al. I. Cuza” Iasi. Sect. I a Mat.* (N.S.) 11B 1965 493–496.
- [Wil2] Willmore, T. J. “*Riemannian Geometry.*” Oxford University Press (1997).