

# SOBOLEV SPACES OF ISOMETRIC IMMERSIONS OF ARBITRARY DIMENSION AND CO-DIMENSION

ROBERT L. JERRARD AND MOHAMMAD REZA PAKZAD

ABSTRACT. We prove the  $C_{loc}^1$  regularity and developability of  $W_{loc}^{2,p}$  isometric immersions of  $n$ -dimensional flat domains into  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  where  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$ . We also prove similar rigidity and regularity results for scalar functions of  $n$  variables for which the rank of the Hessian matrix is *a.e.* bounded by some  $k < n$ , again assuming  $W_{loc}^{2,p}$  regularity for  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$ . In particular this includes results about the degenerate Monge-Ampère equation,  $\det D^2u = 0$ , corresponding to the case  $k = n - 1$ .

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Main results	4
1.3. Some examples	5
1.4. Remarks on notation, and an outline of proofs	7
2. Degenerate Hessians for Sobolev isometric immersions	10
3. Degenerate Cartesian maps	12
4. Dense weak flat foliation	19
5. Pointwise weak developability	21
6. Strong developability	23
References	29

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Background.** The question of rigidity vs. flexibility of isometric immersions has been studied in differential geometry since the end of 19th century. It was already known, as established by Darboux, among others, that smooth surfaces in the three dimensional space which are isometric to a piece of plane are *developable*, i.e. they are locally foliated as a ruled surface by straight segments aligned at each point in one of the principal directions. New developments in the mid-20th century highlighted the very fact that this *rigidity* statement relies strongly on the regularity of the surface. In particular, it followed from the results of Nash [28] and Kuiper [21] that there exist many  $C^1$  isometric embeddings of a given flat  $n$ -dimensional domain into  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  (and hence into  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  for any  $k \geq 1$ ) with arbitrarily

small upper bound on the diameter of the image, a property which rules out the developability of the image. On the other hand, the developability of co-dimension one isometric immersions of flat  $n$ -dimensional domains was essentially established by Chern and Lashof [5, Lemma 2] and Hartman and Nirenberg [13, Lemma 2], who also provided more detailed results in the case  $n = 2$  of surfaces. In [33], a generalized developability result for  $C^2$  isometric immersions of a Euclidean domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  into Euclidean spaces  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ ,  $k < n$  was established.

A natural question arises, which consists in asking what would be the critical regularity threshold at which the distinction between *rigidity* and *flexibility* à la Nash and Kuiper is withheld. The most straightforward path would be to discuss this question for Hölder regular isometries of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ ,  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Some progress is made in this direction, but the problem of the critical value of  $\alpha$  is still open. While a careful analysis of the iteration methods of Nash and Kuiper have lead to flexibility results for surfaces for  $\alpha < 1/13$  [3] and then for  $\alpha < 1/7$  [6], it has only been established that  $C^{1,\alpha}$  isometric immersions of 2 dimensional flat domains into the three dimensional space are rigid if  $\alpha > 2/3$  [2, 3, 6]. In a different but related vein, Pogorelov showed that  $C^1$  surfaces with total zero curvature are developable [30, Chapter II] and [31, Chapter IX]. If one only assumes Hölder regularity, it seems there is no consensus on what the critical exponent should be, as it has been conjectured to be  $\alpha = 1/3, 1/2$  or  $2/3$ .

One could also consider other function spaces which lie somewhat below  $C^2$ . In particular, Sobolev isometries arise in the study of nonlinear elastic thin films. Kirchhoff's plate model put forward in the 19th century [20] consists in minimizing the  $L^2$  norm of the second fundamental form of isometric immersions of a 2d domain into  $\mathbb{R}^3$  under suitable forces or boundary conditions. In other words, using the modern terminology, the space of admissible maps for this model is that of  $W^{2,2}$  isometric immersions (See also [10, 22]).

Quite strong results are known about regularity and rigidity of *codimension 1* isometric immersions, as summarized in the following

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $U \in W^{2,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$  be an isometric immersion, where  $\Omega$  is a bounded Lipschitz domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then  $U \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1/2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ . Moreover, for every  $x \in \Omega$ , either  $DU$  is constant in a neighborhood of  $x$ , or there exists a unique  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional hyperplane  $\mathbb{P} \ni x$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $DU$  is constant on the connected component of  $x$  in  $\mathbb{P} \cap \Omega$ .*

This was proved in by Liu and Pakzad [24], and followed earlier results [29] of the second author that established the  $n = 2$  case of Theorem 1, drawing on work of Kirchheim in [19] on  $W^{2,\infty}$  solutions to degenerate Monge-Ampère equations, discussed below.

The result is optimal in the sense that it fails for  $W^{2,p}$  isometries with  $p < 2$ .

**Remark 1.1.** *In [27] it was established for  $n = 2$  that the  $C^1$  regularity can be extended up to the boundary if the domain is of class  $C^{1,\alpha}$ . This does not hold true anymore for merely  $C^1$  regular domains.*

Isometric immersions of flat domains are closely related to the degenerate Monge-Ampère equation

$$(1.1) \quad \det(D^2u) = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega,$$

or more generally to the Hessian rank inequality

$$(1.2) \quad \text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

This is equivalent to the degenerate Monge-Ampère equation when  $k = n - 1$ , but for  $k < n - 1$  is a stronger condition. As we recall in Section 2, it is satisfied by the components  $U^m$  of an isometric immersion  $U : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  of co-dimension  $k$  (see Proposition 2.1), and many rigidity properties of isometric immersions can be deduced solely from the weaker condition (1.2).

In order to discuss Sobolev solutions with lower regularity than the assumptions of the above theorem, it is helpful to study distributional and measure theoretic variants of condition (1.1) including (in 2-dimensional domains)

$$(1.3) \quad \text{Det}(D^2u) := -\frac{1}{2}\text{curl}^T \text{curl}(Du \otimes Du) = 0$$

for  $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ ; or

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\Omega} \phi_{x_1}(x, Du)u_{x_k x_2} - \phi_{x_2}(x, Du)u_{x_k x_1} dx = 0 \quad \text{for all } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^2) \text{ and } k = 1, 2$$

for  $u \in W^{2,1}(\Omega)$ . Both of these imply (1.1) if  $u \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(\Omega)$ . It turns out that (1.1), even in the weak form (1.4), is strong enough to imply rigidity, as shown in the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .*

*If  $u \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(\Omega)$  and  $\det D^2u = 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ , then  $u \in C^1(\Omega)$  and for every point  $x \in \Omega$ , there exists either a neighborhood of  $x$ , or a segment passing through  $x$  and joining  $\partial\Omega$  at both ends, on which  $Du$  is constant.*

*More generally, the same conclusions hold if we merely assume that  $u \in W^{2,1}(\Omega)$  and  $u$  satisfies (1.4).*

Theorem 2 was established for  $u \in W_{loc}^{2,2}(\Omega)$  by the second author in [29], see also Kirchheim [19]. The final assertion of the theorem, concerning  $W^{2,1}$  functions, is in fact a special case of a more general result from [18], that applies in the (larger) class of Monge-Ampère functions, introduced by Fu [11] and developed in [17, 18]. If one considers not the distributional condition (1.4) but just the pointwise Monge-Ampère equation (1.1), then the  $W^{2,2}$  hypothesis of [29] is optimal. Indeed, conic solutions to (1.1) exist if the regularity is assumed to be only  $W^{2,p}$  for  $p < 2$  (see Example 1 below). One could even construct more sophisticated solutions by gluing these conic singularities in a suitable manner, using Vitali's covering theorem (Example 2). Furthermore, Liu and Malý [23] have established the existence of strictly convex  $W^{2,p}$  solutions to (1.1) (but not to (1.3)) when  $p < 2$ . In the meantime, it is known [9] that for  $p < 2$ ,  $W^{2,p}$  solutions to (1.3) exist which are not  $C^1$  and fail to satisfy the developability statement of Theorem 2 at a given point in the domain.

What interests us in this paper are regularity and rigidity results in the manner of Theorems 1 and 2 for arbitrary  $1 \leq k < n$ , under Sobolev regularity assumptions. We note that the case  $k = 0$  is trivial, and that there is no rigidity whenever  $k \geq n$ , see for example [33].

The proof in [24] of Theorem 1 was based on induction on the dimension of slices of the domain and careful and detailed geometric arguments, applying the  $W_{loc}^{2,2}$  case of Theorem

2 to two dimensional slices. These methods cannot be adapted to the solutions of (1.2) even for  $k = 1$ , since one loses some natural advantages when working with (1.2) rather than with the isometries themselves as done in [24]: the solution  $u$  is no more Lipschitz and being just a scalar function, one loses the extra information derived from the length preserving properties of isometries. On the other hand, contrary to the case of  $k = 1$ , regularity and developability of the Sobolev solutions to (1.2) does not directly lead to the same results for the corresponding isometries (see [29]).

Hence, the problems of regularity and developability of Sobolev isometric immersions of co-dimension higher than 1, and also of the developability of Sobolev solutions to (1.2) for  $k > 1$ , are more involved and could not be tackled through the methods discussed in [29, 24]. In this paper, we adapt methods of geometric measure theory, applied by the first author in [17, 18] to the class of Monge-Ampère functions, to overcome the above obstacles for  $k > 1$  and tackle both of the isometry and rank problems for Sobolev regular solutions simultaneously.

**Remark 1.2.** *It was proved furthermore in [29] that any  $W^{2,2}$  isometry on a convex 2d domain can be approximated in strong norm by smooth isometries. The convexity assumption can be weakened to e.g. piece-wise  $C^1$  regularity of the boundary, see also [14, 15, 16]. A generalization of these results to the co-dimension one case were obtained in [24]. It could be expected that the results of this paper could help in proving similar density statements in higher co-dimensions, but that would be more technically challenging than the previous cases.*

**1.2. Main results.** We first introduce a few fundamental definitions.

**Definition 1.3.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be an open set and  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We say the set  $P \subset \Omega$  is a  $j$ -plane in  $\Omega$  whenever  $P$  is the connected component of the intersection of  $\Omega$  and a  $j$ -dimensional affine subspace  $\mathbb{P}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We will generally write  $P$  to denote a  $j$ -plane in  $\Omega$  for some subset  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\mathbb{P}$  to denote a complete  $j$ -plane.*

**Definition 1.4.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n > 1$ ,  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We say a mapping  $w \in C^0(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  is  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated whenever  $0 \leq k < n$  is an integer and there exists disjoint subsets  $F_j, j = 0, \dots, k$  of  $\Omega$ , such that the following properties hold:*

$$(i) \quad \Omega = \bigcup_{j=0}^k F_j,$$

$$(ii) \quad \text{For all } j \in \{0, \dots, k\}, \Omega_j := \bigcup_{m=0}^j F_m \text{ is open,}$$

$$(iii) \quad \text{For all } j \in \{0, \dots, k\} \text{ and every } x \in F_j, \text{ there exists at least one } (n - j)\text{-plane } P \text{ in } \Omega_j \text{ such that } x \in P \text{ and } w \text{ is constant on } P.$$

*We say a mapping is flatly foliated when it is  $(n - k)$ -foliated for some integer  $k$ .*

**Remark 1.5.** *Note that a straightforward conclusion of the above definition is that  $F_j$  is closed in  $\Omega_j$  for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ .*

**Definition 1.6.** *Let  $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n > 1$ ,  $N \geq 1$ , and let  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We say a mapping  $y \in C^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$  is  $(n - k)$ -developable whenever  $Dy : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N \times n} \cong \mathbb{R}^{nN}$  is*

$(n - k)$ -flatly foliated. We say a mapping is developable when it is  $(n - k)$ -developable for an integer  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ .

We will later introduce weaker versions of the notions defined in Definitions 1.4 and 1.6 for mappings which are not necessarily of the required regularity.

The following two theorems sum up the main contribution of this paper. The first theorem concerns Sobolev isometric immersions of Euclidean domains and extends Theorem 1 to arbitrary codimension.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and that  $U \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  is an isometric immersion, so that  $U$  satisfies*

$$U_{x^i} \cdot U_{x^j} = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

*If  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  then  $U \in C^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$ , and  $U$  is  $(n - k)$ -developable.*

The next theorem is a similar statement concerning scalar functions and generalizes to arbitrary  $n$  and  $k$  those parts of Theorem 2 that concern the (pointwise) degenerate Monge-Ampère equation (1.1). This result is new whenever  $n > 2$ , even for  $k = 1$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and that  $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies*

$$(1.5) \quad u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\Omega) \text{ with } p \geq \min\{2k, n\} \quad \text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k \text{ a.e.}$$

*for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ . Then  $u \in C^1(\Omega)$ , and  $u$  is  $(n - k)$ -developable.*

**Remark 1.7.** *One interesting feature of these results is that the Sobolev regularity  $W^{2,p}$  can be much below the required  $W^{2,n+\varepsilon}$  for obtaining  $C^1$  regularity by Sobolev embedding theorems. The argument used in [29, Lemma 2.1] to show the continuity of the derivatives of the given Sobolev isometry is no more generalizable to our case. In [29], the  $C^1$  regularity is shown as a first step towards the proof of developability. Here, on the other hand, we first show a weaker version of developability for the mapping and use it to show the  $C^1$  regularity.*

**Remark 1.8.** *In Example 1 below, we show that if  $u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$  satisfies  $\text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k$  a.e., and if  $p < k + 1$ , then  $u$  may fail to be  $C^1$ . These examples in particular imply that the condition  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  in Theorem 4 cannot be weakened if  $k = 1$  or  $k = n - 1$ . We believe however that it can be weakened if  $k \in \{2, \dots, n - 2\}$ . Indeed, it seems likely that the conclusions of the theorem continue to hold under the assumption that*

$$(1.6) \quad u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\Omega) \text{ with } p \geq k + 1 \quad \text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k \text{ a.e.}$$

### 1.3. Some examples.

**Example 1.** For any  $k < n$  and  $1 \leq p < k + 1$ , there exists  $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and  $\text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k$  a.e., but such that the conclusions of the theorem fail. Indeed, consider  $u$  of the form

$$u(x^1, \dots, x^n) = u_0(x^1, \dots, x^{k+1}) \quad \text{for } u_0 \in C_{loc}^2(\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \setminus \{0\}) \text{ homogeneous of degree 1.}$$

One easily checks that  $u \in \cup_{p < k+1} W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and it is clear that  $Du$  is not continuous on the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x^1 = \dots, x^{k+1} = 0\}$ , unless it is constant.

One could generalize the above example by gluing conic singularities in the following manner:

**Example 2.** By Vitali's covering theorem, we choose a covering  $\mathcal{B} := \{B(a_i, r_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$  of non-overlapping balls so that  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B(a_i, r_i)$  is of Lebesgue measure zero. We define  $v_0 : \mathbb{R}^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$  by

$$v_0(x) := \begin{cases} a_i + r_i(x - a_i)/|x - a_i| & \text{if } x \in B(a_i, r_i), \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It can be easily verified that  $v_0 \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^{k+1})$  for all  $1 \leq p < k+1$  and that  $v_0 = Du_0$  for a scalar function. Let  $u(x^1, \dots, x^n) := u_0(x^1, \dots, x^{k+1})$ . Then  $u \in W_{loc}^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  for  $1 \leq p < k+1$ ,  $\text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k$ , but  $Du$  is not continuous on the set  $\{a_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k-1}$ .

One might naively hope that for every  $k < n$ , the set  $\{x \in \Omega : \text{rank}(D^2u) = k\}$  is foliated by  $n - k$ -planes on which  $Du$  is constant. This is not at all the case.

**Example 3.** Consider  $u : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form  $u(x, y) = F(x)$  where  $F' = f : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a *strictly increasing* Lipschitz continuous function such that  $\{x \in (0, 1) : f'(x) = 0\}$  has positive measure. For example, fix an open dense set  $O \subset (0, 1)$  whose complement has positive measure, and let  $f(x) := \mathcal{L}^1((0, x) \cap O)$ , so that  $f$  is Lipschitz continuous and

$$f'(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for a.e. } x \in O \\ 0 & \text{for a.e. } x \notin O. \end{cases}$$

For a function of this form, we have  $u \in W^{2,\infty}$ , with

$$Du(x, y) = (f(x), 0), \quad D^2u(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix} f'(x) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{a.e.}$$

so that  $\text{rank}(D^2u) \leq 1$  a.e., and  $\text{rank}(D^2u) = 0$  on a dense set of positive measure. However, there is no 2-dimensional set on which  $Du$  is locally constant; rather, for every  $\xi \in \text{Im}(Du)$ , where  $\text{Im}(\cdot)$  denotes the image,  $Du^{-1}\{\xi\}$  is the line segment  $f^{-1}\{\xi\} \times (0, 1)$ .

**Example 4.** Consider again  $u : (0, 1)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form  $u(x, y) = F(x)$ , where  $F' = f$  and  $f(x) := \mathcal{L}^1((0, x) \setminus O)$ , where  $O$  is as in Example 3 above. Then  $f$  is Lipschitz continuous and

$$f'(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for a.e. } x \in O \\ 1 & \text{for a.e. } x \notin O. \end{cases}$$

Then in the notation of Definition 1.4 below,  $\Omega = \Omega_1$ , and  $\Omega_0 = O \times (0, 1)$ . Thus  $\Omega_0$  is a dense subset of  $\Omega_1$ , and  $F_1 = \Omega_1 \setminus \Omega_0$  is nowhere dense in  $\Omega_1$ .

More generally, given  $0 \leq j < k \leq n$ , one can write down examples in the same spirit defined on the unit cube in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , such that  $\Omega_j$  is dense in  $\Omega_k$ .

**Example 5.** Fix a  $C^2$  map  $\vec{v} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $\vec{v}(0) = 0$ ,  $v'(z) \neq 0$  for  $z \neq 0$ , and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{\vec{v}'}{|v'|}$  does not exist. For example, we may take  $\vec{v}(z) = (z^5 \cos(1/z), z^5 \sin(1/z))$ .

Now set  $\Omega = (-1, 1)^3$ , and let  $u(x, y, z) = (x, y) \cdot \vec{v}(z)$ . Then we can write  $Du(x, y, z) = (\vec{v}(z), (x, y) \cdot \vec{v}'(z))$ . Thus level sets of  $Du$  are the plane  $z = 0$ , together with the line segments

$$\{x, y, z) : z = z_0, (x, y) \cdot \vec{v}'(z_0) = c\}, \quad z_0 \neq 0, c \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is also easy to check that  $u$  is  $C^2$ ,  $\text{rank}(D^2u) = 2$  if  $z \neq 0$  and  $\text{rank}(D^2u) = 0$  if  $z = 0$ .

(Note also,  $\tilde{u} := u + z^2$  has all the same properties as  $u$  described above, except that  $\text{rank}(D^2u) = 1$  when  $z = 0$ .)

This example show that (in notation to be introduced later)  $\bar{\Omega}^k$  may contain planes of dimension greater than  $n - k$  on which  $Du$  is a.e. constant. By contrast, the previous example shows that it may also happen that  $\bar{\Omega}^k \setminus \Omega^k$  is foliated by planes of dimension  $n - k$ .

Also, we can see from this example that the  $(n - k)$ -planes that locally foliate  $\Omega^k$  may oscillate wildly as one approaches points in  $\bar{\Omega}^k$  at which  $\text{rank}(D^2u) < k$ .

**1.4. Remarks on notation, and an outline of proofs.** Throughout the paper, we will often simply write “measurable”, “almost everywhere”, without specifying the Hausdorff measure at use, when the latter is clear from the context. Many of our arguments take place in a product space  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ , where  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\ell$  is a positive integer. In this setting we will think of  $\Omega$  and  $\mathbb{R}^\ell$  as “horizontal” and “vertical”, respectively, and we will use subscripts  $h$  and  $v$  accordingly. For example, we will write  $p_h, p_v$  to designate projections of  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$  onto the horizontal and vertical factors, respectively:

$$(1.7) \quad p_h(x, \xi) := x, \quad p_v(x, \xi) := \xi.$$

If  $w \in L^p(\Omega)$  for some  $p < \infty$ , then a Lebesgue point of  $w$  will mean a point  $x$  such that

$$(1.8) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \int_{B_r(x)} |w(y) - w(x)|^p dy := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^n(B_r(x))} \int_{B_r(x)} |w(y) - w(x)|^p dy = 0.$$

Thus, we always understand “Lebesgue point” in an  $L^p$  sense. We assume that every function  $w$  appearing in this paper is precisely represented. Thus  $w$  always equals its Lebesgue value at every point where the Lebesgue value exists. If  $u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ , there is a set  $E$  such that  $\text{Cap}_p(E) = 0$  and every point of  $\Omega \setminus E$  is a Lebesgue point of  $Du$ . The capacity estimate implies that  $\mathcal{H}^{n-p+\varepsilon}(E) = 0$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . These facts can be found for example in Ziemer [34], Theorem 3.3.3 and 2.6.16 respectively, or in [7].

To describe the proof, it is useful to introduce several weaker versions of the the notions of flatly foliated, defined above.

**Definition 1.9.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n > 1$ ,  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We say a measurable mapping  $w : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  is densely weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated whenever there exist some  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$  and disjoint subsets  $F_j, j = 0, \dots, k$  of  $\Omega$ , such that*

$$(1.9) \quad \Omega = \bigcup_{j=0}^k F_j,$$

and in addition, the following properties hold for every  $j$ :

$$(1.10) \quad \Omega_j := \bigcup_{m=0}^j F_m \text{ is open,}$$

and

(1.11)

for every  $x$  in some dense subset of  $F_j$ , there exists at least one  $n - j$ -plane  $P$  in  $\Omega_j$   
such that  $x \in P$  and  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant on  $P$ .

**Definition 1.10.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $n > 1$ ,  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We say a measurable mapping  $w : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  is pointwise weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated whenever there exist some  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$  and disjoint subsets  $F_j, j = 0, \dots, k$  of  $\Omega$ , such that (1.9) and (1.10) hold, and

(1.12)

for every  $x \in F_j$ , there exists at least one  $n - j$ -plane  $P$  in  $\Omega_j$   
such that  $x \in P$  and  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant on  $P$ .

**Remark 1.11.** The definitions require that the values of  $w$  are well defined for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. points on the given  $n - j$ -planes in  $\Omega$ . As noted above, this is the case if we assume that e.g.  $w \in W_{loc}^{1, k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  and  $w$  is precisely represented, since in that case the set of points that fail to be Lebesgue points of  $w$  has dimension less than  $n - k$ .

We start in Section 2 by showing that if  $U \in W^{2,2}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  is an isometric immersion for  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $w = DU$  satisfies

$$\text{rank}(Dw) \leq k \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

This is a classical fact for smooth maps. As a consequence, both of our main results reduce to the study of maps  $w : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  for some  $\ell$ , such that

(1.13)

$$\text{rank}(Dw(x)) \leq k \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \quad w = (Du^1, \dots, Du^q) \text{ for some } q \geq 1.$$

A main challenge we must address is to find a way to extract information from the hypotheses (1.13) under conditions of low regularity. We carry this out making extensive use of the machinery of geometric measure theory, including in particular some results from Giaquinta, Modica and Souček [12], Fu [11] and the first author [18] about the related topics of Cartesian maps and Monge-Ampère functions.

To explain the role of geometric measure theory, we first outline the basic argument on a formal level. Toward that end, consider a smooth map  $w = (Du^1, \dots, Du^q)$  such that  $\text{rank}(Dw) = k$  everywhere, and further suppose that

- $\text{Image}(w)$  is a smooth embedded  $k$ -dimensional submanifold  $\Gamma_v \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $\text{Im}(w)$  denotes the image of  $w$ , and
- For every  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ ,  $\Gamma_h(\xi) := w^{-1}\{\xi\}$  is a smooth  $(n - k)$ -dimensional submanifold of  $\Omega$ .

These assumptions are far stronger than one can reasonably expect, but in any case they are certainly consistent with the condition that  $\text{rank}(Dw) = k$ . For every  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ , and for every  $x \in \Gamma_h(\xi)$ , basic calculus implies that

(1.14)

$$\text{Im}(Dw(x)) = T_\xi \Gamma_v$$

and

(1.15)

$$\ker(Dw(x)) = T_x \Gamma_h(\xi).$$



Moreover, the symmetry of  $D^2u^i(x)$  implies that  $\ker(D^2u^i(x)) = [\text{Im}(D^2u^i(x))]^\perp$ , if we identify, in the natural way, the horizontal and vertical spaces to which  $T_\xi\Gamma_v$  and  $T_x\Gamma_h(\xi)$  belong. Thus

$$T_x\Gamma_h(\xi) = \ker(Dw(x)) = \cap_{i=1}^q \ker(D^2u^i(x)) = \cap_{i=1}^q [\text{Im}(D^2u^i(x))]^\perp.$$

The space on the right is completely determined by  $T_\xi\Gamma_v$  — in fact it can be written  $\cap_{i=1}^q [P_i T_\xi\Gamma_v]^\perp$ , where  $P_i$  denotes orthonormal projection of  $\mathbb{R}^{nq} = (\mathbb{R}^n)^q$  onto the  $i$ th copy of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus the tangent space  $T_x\Gamma_h(\xi)$  does not depend at all on  $x \in \Gamma_h(\xi)$ , but only on  $\xi$ . Since the tangent space is constant,  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$  must be a union of  $n - k$ -planes in  $\Omega$ , all orthogonal to  $\cap_{i=1}^q [P_i T_\xi\Gamma_v]^\perp$ .

The rigorous version of this argument starts in Section 3, where we use the machinery of geometric measure theory to establish facts about

- the structure of  $\Gamma_v$  and  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$ , which in our actual proof will be, not exactly the image and the level sets of  $w$ , but closely related sets; and
- the relationship between their tangent spaces and the derivatives of  $w$ , along the lines of (1.14) and (1.15) above

that are (barely) strong enough to justify some form of the proof sketched above. These arguments apply to general mappings (without a gradient structure)  $w \in W^{1,k+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  such that  $\text{rank}(Dw) \leq k$  a.e. Under these assumptions, we obtain  $\Gamma_v$  and  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$  as, essentially, the vertical projection and horizontal slices, respectively, of a set

$$\Gamma := \{(x, w(x)) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of both } w \text{ and } Dw\}.$$

(See (3.5), (3.4) for the actual definitions.) Appealing to results of Giaquinta, Modica and Souček [12], we find that  $\Gamma$  is  $n$ -rectifiable, and that an integral  $n$ -current  $G_w$ , canonically associated to the graph of  $w$  and carried by  $\Gamma$ , has no boundary in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ . Then the rectifiability of  $\Gamma_v$  and of  $\mathcal{H}^k$  almost every  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$  follows from classical results and the definitions of these sets, as does a version of (1.14). Additional work is required to establish a version of (1.15) and to show that the slices  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$  have enough regularity (in particular, they carry integer  $n - k$ -currents with no boundary) to conclude from the constancy of the tangent spaces that they are in fact planar.

In Section 4, we use these facts to prove that if  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,k+1}$  satisfies (1.13), then  $w$  is densely weakly  $(n - k)$  flatly foliated. More precisely, we define

$$\Omega^k := \{x \in \Omega : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of } w \text{ and } Dw, \text{ and } \text{rank}(Dw) = k\},$$

and we give a rigorous version of the formal argument sketched above to show, roughly speaking, that  $\Omega^k$  is almost everywhere foliated by level sets of  $w$  that are  $n - k$ -planes in  $\Omega$ . (We remark that this is the *only* place in the paper where we use the gradient structure of  $w$ .) To deduce that  $w$  is densely weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated, we define  $F_k := \bar{\Omega}^k$  and  $\Omega_{k-1} := \Omega \setminus F_k$ , and we note that  $\text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k - 1$  a.e. in  $\Omega_{k-1}$ . Hence the above machinery could be re-applied to the new set with the new rank condition. More generally,

letting  $\Omega_k = \Omega$ , and for  $j \in \{k, \dots, 0\}$ , defining (working downwards)

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega^j &:= \{x \in \Omega_j : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of } Du \text{ and } D^2u, \text{ and } \text{rank}(D^2u) = j\}, \\ F_j &:= \bar{\Omega}^j \cap \Omega_j, \\ \Omega_{j-1} &:= \Omega_j - F_j = \Omega_j - \bar{\Omega}^j,\end{aligned}$$

we obtain a partition of  $\Omega$  into disjoint sets  $F_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$  such that every  $F_j$ , has a dense subset foliated by  $n - j$ -planes on which  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant.

Following this, we prove in Section 5 that if  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,k+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  is *densely* weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated, then  $w$  is *pointwise* weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated. (In fact here we only need  $W_{loc}^{1,p}$  for some  $p > k$ .) The hypothesis already yields a partition of  $\Omega$  into sets  $F_j$  satisfying properities (1.9), (1.10), and so the point is to show that (1.11) together with the assumed Sobolev regularity implies (1.12). To do this, we obtain a planar level set of  $w$  through a given point as a limit of planar level sets through nearby points. We remark that it is possible, as illustrated in Example 3, for  $F_k$  to contain a subset of  $\Omega \setminus \Omega^k$  of positive measure to be foliated by  $n - k$ -planes on which  $w$  is constant.

The arguments of Sections 3, 4 and 5 require only the weaker regularity assumption (1.6), and this hypothesis is sharp in a sense; this follows from Example 1 below. The stronger assumption (1.5) is needed for Section 6, in which prove that if  $p = \min\{2k, n\}$  and  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  is *pointwise* weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated, then  $w$  is continuous, and hence  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated. This will complete the proof of our main results. For the proof, we first show show that if a point  $x \in F_k$  is contained in two distinct  $n - k$ -planes in  $\Omega$  on which  $w$  is *a.e.* constant, then the two constants are in fact equal. (Example 5 shows that this situation can in fact arise.) It follows rather easily from this that the restriction of  $w$  to  $F_k$  is  $C^0$ , and indeed that the same holds in  $F_j$  for all  $j \leq k$ . To conclude that  $w$  is continuous in  $\Omega$ , it remains to show that it is continuous at points of  $\partial\Omega_j \cap \Omega$ . This is a little more subtle, and is proved by showing that any such discontinuity is inconsistent with the  $p$ -quasicontinuity of  $w$ , given facts we have already established about  $w$ .

The condition  $p \geq \{2k, n\}$  is sharp for the results of Section 6, at least for certain values of  $k$ , including  $k = 2, 4, 8$ . This follows from Examples 6 - 8 in Section 6. These results however apply to vector-valued maps  $w : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  that are pointwise a.e. flatly foliated. As suggested above, we believe that if one considers maps that in addition possess a gradient structure, that is, maps of the form  $w = (Du^1, \dots, Du^q)$  for some  $q$ , then it should be possible to weaken the regularity requirements.

**Acknowledgments.** The first author was partially supported by the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada under operating grant 261955. The work performed on the project by the second author was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1210258.

## 2. DEGENERATE HESSIANS FOR SOBOLEV ISOMETRIC IMMERSIONS

In this section we prove a proposition that reduces the case of isometries to that of maps whose Hessian satisfies a degeneracy condition. This is a variant of a classical lemma of Cartan [4], which concerns smooth maps and has a correspondingly stronger conclusion.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Assume that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a bounded open set, and that  $U \in W^{2,2}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  is an isometric immersion of  $\Omega$  into  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , i.e.  $U$  satisfies*

$$(2.1) \quad U_{x^i} \cdot U_{x^j} = \delta_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}.$$

Let  $w := DU : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \cong \mathbb{R}^\ell$  for  $\ell = n(n+k)$ . Then

$$\text{rank}(Dw) \leq k \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

In the proof of this result only, to simplify notation we will write  $U_{,i}$  to denote partial differentiation with respect to the  $i$ th coordinate direction.

*Proof.* We will first establish the following identity:

$$(2.2) \quad U_{,ij} \cdot U_{,kl} - U_{,il} \cdot U_{,jk} = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k, l \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Let  $U_m \in C^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  be a sequence of mappings converging to  $U$  in the  $W^{2,2}$ -norm, and let  $g_{ij}^m := U_{m,i} \cdot U_{m,j}$ . Twice differentiating  $g_{ij}^m$  we obtain for all  $i, j, k, l$ :

$$g_{ij,kl}^m = U_{m,ikl} \cdot U_{m,j} + U_{m,ik} \cdot U_{m,jl} + U_{m,il} \cdot U_{m,jk} + U_{m,i} \cdot U_{m,jkl}.$$

Permuting the indices and canceling the terms in third derivatives yields:

$$g_{ij,kl}^m + g_{kl,ij}^m - g_{il,jk}^m - g_{jk,il}^m = -2(U_{m,ij} \cdot U_{m,kl} - U_{m,il} \cdot U_{m,jk}).$$

Passing to the limit as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , we observe that the left hand side converges in the sense of distributions to 0, while the right side converges in  $L^1$  to  $-2(U_{,ij} \cdot U_{,kl} - U_{,il} \cdot U_{,jk})$ . This establishes (2.2). Our second observation is that

$$(2.3) \quad U_{,ij} \cdot U_{,k} = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

This is straightforward to see, as differentiating the isometry constraint (2.1) we obtain for all  $i, j, k$ :

$$0 = U_{,ik} \cdot U_{,j} + U_{,i} \cdot U_{,jk} = U_{,ij} \cdot U_{,k} + U_{,i} \cdot U_{,kj} = U_{,ki} \cdot U_{,j} + U_{,k} \cdot U_{,ji},$$

where the two last identities are obtained by permutations in  $i, j, k$  and all three are valid a.e. in  $\Omega$ . Now, adding the first two identities and subtracting the third implies (2.3), considering that  $U_{,ij} = U_{,ji}$  for all choices of  $i, j$  a.e. in  $\Omega$ .

In order to proceed, for any  $x \in \Omega$  for which the identities (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) are valid- hence for a.e.  $x \in \Omega$  -, we define the orthogonal space to the image  $U(\Omega)$  at the point  $U(x)$  to be:

$$O(x) := \text{span} \langle U_{,1}(x), \dots, U_{,n}(x) \rangle^\perp,$$

and the symmetric bilinear form  $\mathcal{B}(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow O(x)$  by

$$\mathcal{B}(x)(V, W) = W \cdot D^2U(x)V := \sum_{m=1}^{n+k} (W \cdot D^2U^m(x)V) \vec{e}_m,$$

where  $U = (U^1, \dots, U^{n+k})$ . Evidently (2.3) implies that  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  takes values in  $O(x)$ . On the other hand (2.2) implies that for all  $X, W, Y, Z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have

$$\mathcal{B}(x)(X, W) \cdot \mathcal{B}(x)(Y, Z) - \mathcal{B}(x)(X, Z) \cdot \mathcal{B}(x)(Y, W) = 0,$$

i.e. the symmetric bilinear form  $\mathcal{B}(x)$  is flat with respect to the Euclidean scalar product on  $O(x)$ . Hence, we can apply a result due to E. Cartan [4] (See also [33, Lemma 1] for a proof), to obtain that

$$\dim(\ker \mathcal{B}(x)) \geq \dim(\mathbb{R}^n) - \dim(O(x)) = n - k,$$

where

$$\ker(\mathcal{B}(x)) := \{V \in \mathbb{R}^n; \mathcal{B}(x)(V, W) = 0 \ \forall W \in \mathbb{R}^n\} = \ker(Dw(x)).$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

### 3. DEGENERATE CARTESIAN MAPS

In this section,  $\Omega$  is as usual a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $w$  is a map satisfying

$$(3.1) \quad w \in W_{loc}^{1,k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell), \quad \text{rank}(Dw) \leq k \text{ a.e.}$$

for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  and some  $\ell \geq 1$ . We will use the notation

$$(3.2) \quad \Lambda_w := \{x \in \Omega : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of both } w \text{ and } Dw\}$$

$$(3.3) \quad \Gamma := \{(x, w(x)) : x \in \Lambda_w\} \subset \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$$

$$(3.4) \quad \Gamma_h(\xi) := \{x \in \Lambda_w : w(x) = \xi\}$$

$$(3.5) \quad \Gamma_v := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\ell : \mathcal{H}^{n-k}(\Gamma_h(\xi)) > 0\}$$

$$(3.6) \quad \Omega^k = \{x \in \Lambda_w : \text{rank}(Dw(x)) = k\}.$$

The main result of this section, stated below, will be used to make precise the formal arguments discussed in Section 1.4. Terminology appearing in the proposition will be recalled after its statement.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Assume that  $w$  satisfies (3.1). Then  $\Gamma_v$  is  $k$ -rectifiable, and for  $\mathcal{H}^k$  a.e.  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ , the following hold:*

$$(3.7) \quad \Gamma_h(\xi) \text{ is } \mathcal{H}^{n-k}\text{-measurable and } n-k\text{-rectifiable}$$

$$(3.8) \quad T_\xi \Gamma_v = \text{Im}(Dw(x)) \text{ and } \ker(Dw(x)) = T_x \Gamma_h(\xi), \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-k} \text{ a.e. in } \Gamma_h(\xi).$$

In addition, for  $\mathcal{H}^k$  a.e.  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ , there exists an integral current  $H_\xi$  in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ , defined explicitly in (3.24) below, represented by integration over  $\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi)$  such that  $\partial H_\xi = 0$ . Finally,

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{L}^n \left( \Omega^k \setminus \cup_{\xi \in \Gamma_v^*} \Gamma_h(\xi) \right) = 0,$$

where

$$(3.10) \quad \Gamma_v^* := \{\xi \in \Gamma_v : \partial H_\xi = 0, \text{ and (3.7) and (3.8) hold.}\}.$$

This is related to results in [18], proved in the more abstract setting of Monge-Ampère functions. Here, we are able to exploit the Sobolev regularity and results of Giaquinta *et al* [12] to extract more information than in [18], such as conclusions (3.8), which are new. We also believe that the arguments given here are more transparent than those of [18].

**Remark 3.2.** We emphasize that  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_v$  may differ from the graph  $\{(x, w(x)) : x \in \Omega\}$  and the image  $w(\Omega)$  by sets of positive  $\mathcal{H}^n$  measure. Indeed, [25] establishes the existence of a continuous mapping  $w \in W^{1,n}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^n)$  with vanishing Jacobian (i.e.  $k = n - 1$ ), for which  $w(\Omega)$  has positive measure. In this construction, the bulk of the image is obtained by applying  $w$  to the null set  $\Omega \setminus \Lambda_w$ , and in fact Proposition 3.1 shows that  $\Gamma_v$  is an  $n - 1$ -rectifiable set.

We start by recalling some definitions. For more background, one can consult for example [12] for a general introduction to geometric measure theory in product spaces and whose notation we have tried to follow.

If  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^L$  for some  $L$ , then we say that  $\Gamma \subset U$  is  $j$ -rectifiable if

$$\Gamma \subset M_0 \cup \bigcup_{q=1}^{\infty} f_q(\mathbb{R}^j), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{H}^j(M_0) = 0 \text{ and } f_q : \mathbb{R}^j \rightarrow U \text{ is Lipschitz.}$$

It is a standard fact that a  $j$ -rectifiable set  $\Gamma$  has a  $j$ -dimensional approximate tangent plane, denoted  $T_y\Gamma$ , at  $\mathcal{H}^j$  almost every  $y \in \Gamma$ .

If  $\mathbb{P}$  is a  $j$ -dimensional plane in some  $\mathbb{R}^L$ , then a *unit  $j$ -vector orienting  $\mathbb{P}$*  is a  $j$ -vector (that is, an element of the space  $\Lambda_j\mathbb{R}^L$ ) of the form  $\tau = \tau_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_j$ , where  $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^j$  form an orthonormal basis for the tangent space to  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}^j(U)$  denote the space of smooth, compactly supported  $j$ -forms on  $U$ .

Heuristically,  $j$ -currents supported in  $U$  are “generalized submanifolds” of dimension  $j$ , defined by duality to  $\mathcal{D}^j(U)$ . Integer multiplicity (henceforth abbreviated as *i.m.*) rectifiable currents are those which are represented by a superposition of rectifiable sets. More precisely, an *i.m.* rectifiable  $j$ -current  $T$  in  $U$  is a bounded linear functional on  $\mathcal{D}^j(U)$  that may be represented in the form

$$(3.11) \quad T(\phi) = \int_{\Gamma} \langle \phi, \tau \rangle \theta \, d\mathcal{H}^n$$

where

- $\Gamma$  is a  $j$ -rectifiable set,
- $\theta : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a  $\mathcal{H}^j$ -measurable function, locally integrable with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^j \llcorner \Gamma$ ; and
- $\tau$  is a  $\mathcal{H}^j$ -measurable function from  $\Gamma$  into the space  $\Lambda_j\mathbb{R}^L$  of  $j$ -vectors on  $\mathbb{R}^L$ , such that  $\tau(y)$  is a unit  $j$ -vector that orients the approximate tangent space  $T_y\Gamma$ , for a.e.  $y \in \Gamma$ .

In (3.11), we write  $\langle \phi(y), \tau(y) \rangle$  to denote the dual pairing between a  $j$ -covector  $\phi(y) \in \Lambda^j\mathbb{R}^L$  and a  $j$ -vector  $\tau(y) \in \Lambda_j\mathbb{R}^L$ ; see (3.15) below for a concrete definition in the product space setting.

When (3.11) holds, we say that  $T$  is represented by integration over  $\Gamma$ .

We next introduce notation needed to write these objects more explicitly, and in particular to write currents and differential forms in the product space  $U \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ . For  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , we define

$$(3.12) \quad I(j, m) := \{\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j) : 1 \leq \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_j \leq m\}.$$

If  $\alpha \in I(j, m)$  then  $|\alpha| := j$ . We will think of  $I(0, m)$  as consisting of a single element, “the empty multiindex”, which we will denote 0.

If  $S = (S_j^i)$  is an  $\ell \times n$  matrix (with  $i$  running from 1 to  $\ell$  and  $j$  from 1 to  $n$ ) and  $\beta \in I(j, \ell), \gamma \in I(j, n)$  for some  $j$  then

$$(3.13) \quad S_\gamma^\beta = (S_{\gamma_i}^{\beta_i})_{i,i'=1}^j, \quad M_\gamma^\beta(S) := \det S_\gamma^\beta.$$

We refer to  $M_\gamma^\beta(S)$  as a *minor* of  $S$  of order  $j$ .

We will write points in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$  in the form  $(x, \xi)$ , and we will write  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$  and  $\{\varepsilon_j\}_{j=1}^\ell$  to denote the standard bases for the spaces

$$\mathbb{R}_h^n := \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}_v^\ell := \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$$

of “horizontal” and “vertical” vectors. For  $\alpha \in I(j, n)$ , we set

$$dx^\alpha := dx^{\alpha_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx^{\alpha_j}, \quad e_\alpha := e_{\alpha_1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{\alpha_j}$$

and similarly  $d\xi^\beta$  and  $e_\beta$ , for  $\beta \in I(j, \ell)$ . Thus, for example, every  $n$ -form in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$  may be written

$$(3.14) \quad \phi = \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n} \phi_{\alpha\beta}(x, \xi) dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta,$$

where it is understood that  $\alpha \in I(*, n)$  and  $\beta \in I(*, \ell)$ . The dual pairing appearing in (3.11) is defined by

$$(3.15) \quad \left\langle \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n} \phi_{\alpha\beta} dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta, \sum_{|\delta|+|\gamma|=n} \tau^{\delta\gamma} e_\delta \wedge \varepsilon_\gamma \right\rangle = \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|=n} \phi_{\alpha\beta} \tau^{\alpha\beta}.$$

Given  $\alpha \in I(j, n)$ , we will write  $\bar{\alpha}$  to denote the complementary multiindex, such that  $(\alpha, \bar{\alpha})$  is a permutation of  $(1, \dots, n)$ , and we write  $\sigma(\alpha, \bar{\alpha})$  to denote the sign of this permutation. Hence  $\bar{\alpha}$  and  $\sigma(\alpha, \bar{\alpha})$  are characterized by the conditions

$$|\alpha| + |\bar{\alpha}| = n \quad \text{and} \quad dx^\alpha \wedge dx^{\bar{\alpha}} = \sigma(\alpha, \bar{\alpha}) dx^1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx^n.$$

We then define the  $n$ -current  $G_w$  by

$$(3.16) \quad G_w(\phi dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta) = \sigma(\alpha, \bar{\alpha}) \int_\Omega \phi(x, w(x)) M_{\bar{\alpha}}^\beta(Dw) dx,$$

for  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $|\alpha| + |\beta| = n$ . (We use the convention that  $M_0^0(Dw) = 1$ .)

We will repeatedly use the fact that

$$(3.17) \quad G_w(\phi dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta) = 0 \quad \text{if } |\beta| \geq k + 1,$$

which is a direct consequence of (3.1). A computation (see [12], section 3.2.1) shows that

$$G_w(\phi) = \int_{\Lambda_w} W^* \phi, \quad \text{for every } n\text{-form } \phi \text{ in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell, \text{ where } W(x) := (x, w(x))$$

and the pullback  $W^* \phi$  is defined pointwise in  $\Lambda_w$ . Thus,  $G_w$  formally looks like integration over the (oriented) graph of  $w$ ; this is the motivation for the definition of  $G_w$ . The next lemma collects some useful observations of Giaquinta, Modica and Souček [12] which clarify the sense in which this is, and is not, the case.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Assume that  $w$  satisfies (3.1). Then:*

- (1) The restriction of  $W(x) = (x, w(x))$  to  $\Lambda_w$  maps  $\mathcal{L}^n$  null sets to  $\mathcal{H}^n$  null sets.
- (2)  $\Gamma$  is  $n$ -rectifiable.
- (3) For  $\mathcal{H}^n$  a.e. point  $W(x) \in \Gamma$ , with  $x \in \Lambda_w$ ,

$$(3.18) \quad T_{W(x)}\Gamma = \text{Im}(DW(x))$$

- (4)  $G_w$  is an i.m. rectifiable  $n$ -current represented by integration over  $\Gamma$ . Indeed, for every compactly supported  $n$ -form  $\phi$  in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ ,

$$(3.19) \quad G_w(\phi) = \int_{\Gamma} \langle \phi, \tau \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n, \quad \text{where} \quad \tau(x, \xi) = \frac{W_{x^1}(x) \wedge \dots \wedge W_{x^n}(x)}{|W_{x^1}(x) \wedge \dots \wedge W_{x^n}(x)|}.$$

- (5) If  $K$  is a compact subset of  $\Omega$ , then  $\|G_w\|(K \times \mathbb{R}^\ell) = \mathcal{H}^n(\Gamma \cap (K \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)) < \infty$ , where  $\|G_w\|$  denotes the total variation measure associated to  $G_w$ .

*Proof.* It follows from assumption (3.1) that  $w$  is a.e. approximately differentiable, and all minors of  $Dw$  are locally integrable. These are exactly the hypotheses of results in Giaquinta *et. al.* [12], see in particular sections 3.1.5 and 3.2.1 which establish all the conclusions of the lemma.  $\square$

Under the conditions of Lemma 3.3, the set  $\Gamma$  which carries  $G_w$  can differ from the actual graph  $\{(x, w(x)) : x \in \Omega\}$  by a set of positive  $\mathcal{H}^n$  measure; see for example [25]. As we show below, it is nonetheless true that the current  $G_w$  associated to  $\Gamma$  has no boundary in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ . For this we need the full strength of assumption (3.1); for Lemma 3.3 above, it in fact suffices to assume that  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,k}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *If  $w$  satisfies (3.1) and  $G_w$  is the  $n$ -current defined in (3.16), then*

$$(3.20) \quad \partial G_w = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell.$$

**Remark 3.5.** *The Lemma implies that if  $u$  is a scalar function and  $w = Du$  satisfies (3.1), then  $u$  is a Monge-Ampère function, see [11, 18].*

*Proof.* We must check that

$$(3.21) \quad 0 = G_w(d(\phi dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta)) = G_w(\phi_{x^i} dx^i \wedge dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta) + G_w(\phi_{\xi^j} d\xi^j \wedge dx^\alpha \wedge d\xi^\beta)$$

for all  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  and  $\alpha, \beta$  such that  $|\alpha| + |\beta| = n - 1$ . The terms on the right-hand side have the form

$$(3.22) \quad \int_{\Omega} \phi_{x^i}(x, w) \cdot (\text{minor of order } |\beta|) + \int_{\Omega} \phi_{\xi^i}(x, w) \cdot (\text{minor of order } |\beta| + 1).$$

If  $|\beta| \geq k + 1$  then the assumption that  $\text{rank}(Dw) \leq k$  a.e. implies that all such terms vanish, and hence that (3.21) holds. If  $|\beta| \leq k$ , then let  $w_q$  be a sequence of smooth functions converging to  $w$  in  $W_{loc}^{1,k+1}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ . For each  $w_q$ , (3.21) holds (with  $w$  replaced by  $w_q$ ). Also, all minors of  $Dw_q$  appearing in (3.22) have order at most  $k + 1$ , and hence converge in  $L_{loc}^1$  to the corresponding minors of  $Dw$ . And we can arrange after passing to a subsequence that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \phi_{x^i}(x, w_q(x)) &\rightarrow \phi_{x^i}(x, w(x)) \\ \phi_{\xi^j}(x, w_q(x)) &\rightarrow \phi_{\xi^j}(x, w(x)) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \mathcal{L}^n \text{ a.e. } x, \text{ as } q \rightarrow \infty$$

for all  $i$  and  $j$ . These terms are also pointwise bounded uniformly in  $q$  (by  $\|\nabla\phi\|_\infty$ ). We can thus send  $q \rightarrow \infty$  to conclude that (3.21) holds for  $w$ .  $\square$

Below, we write  $J_k p_v$  for the  $k$ -dimensional Jacobian (in the sense of [8] 3.2.22) of  $p_v : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_v^\ell$ , the point being that we implicitly restrict the domain of  $p_v$  to  $\Gamma$ . Similarly, for  $A \subset \mathbb{R}_v^\ell$ , we understand  $p_v^{-1}(A)$  to mean  $\{(x, \xi) \in \Gamma : \xi \in A\}$ .

We can now prove Proposition 3.1. In doing so, we establish a number of additional facts that we record here:

**Lemma 3.6.** *Assume that  $w$  satisfies (3.1) and let  $G_w$ ,  $\Gamma_v$  and  $\Gamma_h$  be defined, respectively, as in (3.16), (3.5) and (3.4). Then there exist measurable mappings  $\tau_v : \Gamma_v \rightarrow \Lambda_k \mathbb{R}_v^\ell$  and  $\tau_h : p_v^{-1}(\Gamma_v) \rightarrow \Lambda_{n-k}(\mathbb{R}_h^n)$  such that  $\tau_v$  and  $\tau_h$  are a.e. unit simple multivectors orienting  $T_\xi \Gamma_v$  and  $T_{(x, \xi)}(\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi))$ , and*

$$(3.23) \quad G_w(\chi d\xi^\beta \wedge \psi) = \int_{\Gamma_v} H_\xi(\psi) \langle d\xi^\beta, \tau_v \rangle \chi d\mathcal{H}^k$$

for  $\beta \in I(k, \ell)$ ,  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^{n-k}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_v^\ell)$  and  $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , where

$$(3.24) \quad H_\xi(\psi) := \int_{\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi)} \langle \psi, \tau_h \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-k} \quad \text{for } \psi \in \mathcal{D}^{n-k}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell).$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.6. 1.* Given that  $\Gamma$  is rectifiable, see Lemma 3.3, the measurability and rectifiability of  $\Gamma_v$  are immediate consequences of [8] 3.2.31, and then the a.e. measurability and rectifiability of  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$  follow directly from [8] 3.2.22(2).

Next, the coarea formula [8] 3.2.22(3) states that for any  $\mathcal{H}^n \llcorner \Gamma$ -integrable function  $g$ ,

$$\int_\Gamma g J_k p_v d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_{\Gamma_v} \left( \int_{p_v^{-1}\{\xi\}} g d\mathcal{H}^{n-k} \right) d\mathcal{H}^k.$$

It follows that

$$(3.25) \quad J_k p_v(x, \xi) > 0 \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-k} \text{ a.e. in } \Gamma_h(\xi), \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^k \text{ a.e. } \xi \in \Gamma_v.$$

Moreover,

$$(3.26) \quad T_\xi \Gamma_v = p_v(T_{(x, \xi)} \Gamma) = \text{Im}(Dw(x)), \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-k} \text{ a.e. in } \Gamma_h(\xi), \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^k \text{ a.e. } \xi \in \Gamma_v,$$

using [8] 3.2.22(1) for the first equality, and (3.18) for the second.

**2.** Let  $\tau_v : \Gamma_v \rightarrow \Lambda_k \mathbb{R}_v^\ell$  be any fixed measurable unit simple  $k$ -vectorfield that orients  $T_\xi \Gamma_v$  a.e.. We will construct  $\mathcal{H}^n$ -measurable  $\tau_h : p_v^{-1}(\Gamma_v) \rightarrow \Lambda_{n-k}(\mathbb{R}_h^n)$  characterized (up to null sets) by the identity

$$(3.27) \quad \langle d\xi^\beta \wedge dx^\alpha, \tau(x, \xi) \rangle = J_k p_v(x, \xi) \langle d\xi^\beta, \tau_v(\xi) \rangle \langle dx^\alpha, \tau_h(x, \xi) \rangle$$

for all multiindices such that  $|\beta| = n - |\alpha| = k$ , where  $\tau$  was defined in (3.19). In fact, since  $\tau_v$  and  $\tau$  are measurable, this identity automatically the measurability of  $\tau_h$ .

To prove (3.27), we fix some point  $(x, \xi) \in p_v^{-1}(\Gamma_v)$  such that  $\text{rank}(Dw(x)) = k$  and (3.18) holds. These conditions hold  $\mathcal{H}^n$  a.e. by (3.25) and Lemma 3.3. We will find  $\tau_h$  by first selecting a basis  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$  for  $\mathbb{R}_h^n$  with a number of good properties, and then defining

$$(3.28) \quad \tau_i := DW(x)b_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad \tau_h := \tau_{k+1} \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_n.$$



In view of (3.18), any such  $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is a basis for  $T_{(x,\xi)}\Gamma$ . We choose  $\{b_i\}$  to satisfy the following:

- $\{b_i\}_{i=k+1}^n$  are an orthonormal basis for  $\ker(Dw(x))$ .
- $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^k$  are orthogonal to  $\ker(Dw(x))$ , and are chosen so that  $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^k$  are orthonormal.
- $b_1, \dots, b_k$  are ordered so that  $Dw(x)b_1 \wedge \dots \wedge Dw(x)b_k$  is a positive multiple of  $\tau_v(\xi)$ .
- $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  is positively oriented with respect to the standard basis  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ .

The first two conditions can be satisfied since  $\text{rank}(Dw(x)) = k$ . The third condition can be achieved due to (3.8), by changing the sign of  $b_1$  if necessary. Having fixed  $\{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ , we can adjust the sign of  $b_{k+1}$  to arrange the final condition.

We now verify (3.27). Note that  $\tau_i = DW(x)b_i = (b_i, Dw(x)b_i) \in \mathbb{R}_h^n \times \mathbb{R}_v^\ell$ . It follows that  $\tau_i = (b_i, 0)$  for  $i > k$ , and hence that  $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are orthonormal. This and the ordering of  $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  imply that  $\tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_n = \tau(x, \xi)$ .

Also, it is a fact that  $J_k p_v = |p_v \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_v \tau_k|$ ; this is a straightforward consequence of the definition of the Jacobian. Since  $|\tau_v(\xi)| = 1$  and  $p_v \tau_i = Dw(x)b_i$ , the ordering of  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  implies that

$$\tau_v(\xi) = \frac{p_v \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_v \tau_k}{|p_v \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_v \tau_k|} = \frac{p_v \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge p_v \tau_k}{J_k p_v(x, \xi)}.$$

Since  $p_v \tau_i = 0$  for  $i > k$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(x, \xi) &= \tau_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \tau_n \\ &= (p_h \tau_1 + p_v \tau_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (p_h \tau_k + p_v \tau_k) \wedge \tau_h \\ &= J_k p_v(x, \xi) \tau_v \wedge \tau_h + (\text{terms involving at most } k-1 \text{ vertical vectors}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the claim (3.27) follows by letting  $d\xi^\beta \wedge dx^\alpha$  act by duality on both sides of the above expression, since

$$\langle d\xi^\beta \wedge dx^\alpha, \text{terms involving at most } k-1 \text{ vertical vectors} \rangle = 0.$$

**3.** We will now show that if  $|\beta| = n - |\alpha| \geq k$ , then

$$(3.29) \quad \int_{\Gamma} \langle \phi d\xi^\beta \wedge dx^\alpha, \tau \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n = \int_{p_v^{-1}\Gamma_v} \langle \phi d\xi^\beta \wedge dx^\alpha, \tau \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n \quad \text{for } \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

This is clear if  $|\beta| = n - |\alpha| > k$ , in which case both sides vanish. For  $|\beta| = k$ , this follows from a classical argument, dating back at least to Fu [11], which we recall for the convenience of the reader. First, we rewrite the left-hand side in terms of slices  $\langle G_w, q_\beta, \cdot \rangle$  of  $G_w$  by level sets of  $q_\beta$ , where  $q_\beta(x, \xi) = (\xi^{\beta_1}, \dots, \xi^{\beta_k}) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . This leads to

$$(3.30) \quad \int_{\Gamma} \langle \phi d\xi^\beta \wedge dx^\alpha, \tau \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n = G_w(d\xi^\beta \wedge \phi dx^\alpha) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle (\phi dx^\alpha) dy.$$

Fix some  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ . We will write  $q_i(x, \xi) = \xi^i$  and  $q_{\beta,i}(x, \xi) = (q_\beta(\xi), \xi^i) \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ . We claim that

$$(3.31) \quad \left\langle \langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle, q_i, s \right\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}.$$

To see this, note that that for  $\mathcal{L}^{k+1}$  a.e.  $(y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\left\langle \langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle, q_i, s \right\rangle = \langle G_w, q_{\beta,i}, (y, s) \rangle$$

(see [8] 4.3.5). Then basic properties of slicing imply that for any  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^{n-k-1}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  and  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}} \langle G_w, q_{\beta,i}, (y, s) \rangle (\psi) \chi(y, s) dy ds = G_w(\chi \circ q_{\beta,i} d\xi^\beta \wedge d\xi^i \wedge \psi) \stackrel{(3.17)}{=} 0.$$

It follows that for every  $\psi$  as above,

$$\left\langle \langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle, q_i, s \right\rangle (\psi) = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (y, s) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Then (3.31) follows by considering a countable dense subset of  $\mathcal{D}^{n-k-1}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ .

Now according to Solomon's Separation Lemma (Lemma 3.3 of [32]), it is a consequence of (3.31) that for  $\mathcal{L}^k$  a.e.  $y$ , every indecomposable component of  $\langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle$  is carried by a level set of  $q_i$ . Since this holds for all  $i$ , we infer that for a.e.  $y$ , every indecomposable component of  $\langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle$  is carried by  $p_v^{-1}\{\xi\}$  for some  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ . From general properties of slicing, each such indecomposable component can be represented by integration with respect to  $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}$  over  $p_v^{-1}\{\xi\}$ . In particular, for each such indecomposable component,  $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}(p_v^{-1}\{\xi\}) > 0$ , so  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ . Hence  $\langle G_w, q_\beta, y \rangle$  is carried by  $p_v^{-1}\Gamma_v$ . We combine this fact with (3.30) to deduce (3.29).

4. We now prove (3.23). Thus, for  $\beta \in I(k, \ell)$ ,  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^{n-k}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  and  $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , we find from (3.19), (3.27), (3.29) and the coarea formula [8] 3.2.22 that

$$\begin{aligned} G_w(\chi d\xi^\beta \wedge \psi) &= \int_{p_v^{-1}\Gamma_v} \langle d\xi^\beta \wedge \psi, \tau \rangle \chi d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \int_{p_v^{-1}\Gamma_v} \langle \psi, \tau_h(x, \xi) \rangle \langle d\xi^\beta, \tau_v(\xi) \rangle J_k p_v(x, \xi) \chi(\xi) d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_v} \left( \int_{p_v^{-1}\{\xi\}} \langle \psi, \tau_h \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-k} \right) \langle d\xi^\beta, \tau_v \rangle \chi d\mathcal{H}^k \end{aligned}$$

This is (3.23).

5. Since  $\partial G_w = 0$  in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ , it follows from (3.23) that

$$\int_{\Gamma_v} \partial H_\xi(\psi) \langle d\xi^\beta, \tau_v \rangle \chi(\xi) \mathcal{H}^k = 0$$

for all  $\psi \in \mathcal{D}^{n-k}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ ,  $\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , and  $\beta \in I(k, \ell)$ . For every such  $\psi$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{H}_\xi(\psi) = 0$  for  $\mathcal{H}^k$  a.e.  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ . By considering a countable dense subset of  $\mathcal{D}^{n-k}(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , we conclude that

$$(3.32) \quad \partial H_\xi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell, \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^k \text{ a.e. } \xi \in \Gamma_v.$$

This in turn implies that for  $\mathcal{H}^k$  a.e.  $\xi \in \Gamma_v$ ,  $\tau_h(x, \xi)$  orients the approximate tangent space at  $(x, \xi)$  to the rectifiable set  $\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi)$  for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}$  a.e.  $x \in \Gamma_h(\xi)$ . Projecting this statement

onto the horizontal component, and recalling and the choice of  $\{\tau_i\}$  in Step 1 above, we deduce that

$$T_x \Gamma_h(\xi) = \text{span}\{p_h \tau_i\}_{i=k+1}^n = \text{span}\{b_i\}_{i=k+1}^n = \ker(Dw(x)).$$

This completes the proof of (3.8), recalling that we have already verified (3.26).

6. Finally, comparing (3.16) and (3.23),

$$\int_{\Lambda_w} \phi(x, w(x)) M_\alpha^\beta(Dw) dx = \pm \int_{\Gamma_v} \left( \int_{\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi)} \phi(x, \xi) \langle dx^\alpha, \tau_h \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{n-k} \right) \langle d\xi^\beta, \tau_v \rangle d\mathcal{H}^k$$

if  $|\beta| = n - |\alpha| = k$ , for  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ . By an approximation argument, this also holds for  $\phi \in L^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  with compact support. Also, we may replace  $\Gamma_v$  by  $\Gamma_v^*$ , defined in (3.10), since it follows from what we have already proved that the latter has full  $\mathcal{H}^k$  measure in  $\Gamma_v$ . We deduce that for any compact set  $K \subset \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^\ell$ , if we define

$$\Omega_{\alpha, \beta, K}^k := \{x \in \Lambda_w : (x, w(x)) \in K, M_\alpha^\beta(Dw(x)) \neq 0\}$$

then

$$\mathcal{L}^n \left( \Omega_{\alpha, \beta, K}^k \setminus \cup_{\xi \in \Gamma_v^*} \Gamma_h(\xi) \right) = 0.$$

Since

$$\Omega^k = \bigcup_{|\beta| = n - |\alpha| = k} \bigcup_{K \text{ compact}} \Omega_{\alpha, \beta, K}^k,$$

and indeed this can be written as a countable union via a suitable sequence of compact sets  $\{K_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ , this implies (3.9).  $\square$

#### 4. DENSE WEAK FLAT FOLIATION

The main result of this section is the following.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and that*

$$(4.1) \quad w \in W_{loc}^{1, k+1}(\Omega), \quad \text{rank}(Dw) \leq k \quad \text{a.e.}$$

for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ , and

$$(4.2) \quad w = (Du^1, \dots, Du^q) \text{ for some } q \geq 1.$$

Then  $w$  is densely weakly  $(n-k)$ -flatly foliated.

This will be a straightforward consequence of the following lemma, which gives a more detailed description of  $w$  in the set  $\Omega^k$  in which  $Dw$  has maximal rank  $k$ , see (3.6).

**Lemma 4.2.** *Assume that  $w$  satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 4.1.*

*Then for  $\mathcal{L}^n$  a.e.  $x \in \Omega^k$ ,  $w^{-1}\{w(x)\}$  coincides, up to a  $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}$  null set, with a countable union of  $(n-k)$ -planes in  $\Omega$ , all of them parallel to  $\ker(Dw(x))$ .*

*In particular, for  $\mathcal{L}^n$  a.e.  $x \in \Omega^k$ ,  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}$  a.e. constant on the  $n-k$ -plane in  $\Omega$  that passes through  $x$  and whose tangent space is  $\ker(Dw(x))$ .*

This is essentially proved in [18] in the case  $k = 1, n = 2$ .

Note that for  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,k+1}$ , the set of points that fail to be Lebesgue points of  $w$  has dimension less than  $n - k$ , as discussed in Section 1.4, so the conclusions of the proposition make sense.

The proof of Lemma uses the geometric measure theory results of the previous section to give a rigorous version of the formal argument sketched in the introduction. It is the only point in this paper at which we use the gradient structure (4.2) of  $w$ .

In the proof we will identify  $\mathbb{R}_h^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}_v^\ell$  via the natural isomorphism  $e_i \leftrightarrow \varepsilon_i$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.2. 1.* We fix  $\xi \in \Gamma_v^*$ , defined in (3.10), and we first claim that

$$(4.3) \quad T_x \Gamma_h(\xi) \text{ is } \mathcal{H}^{n-k} \text{ a.e. constant for } x \in \Gamma_h(\xi).$$

Indeed, since  $D^2 u^i(x)$  is symmetric for every  $i$ , at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}$  a.e.  $x \in \Gamma_h(\xi)$  we have

$$T_x \Gamma_h(\xi) \stackrel{(3.8)}{=} \ker(Dw(x)) \stackrel{(4.2)}{=} \cap_{i=1}^q \ker(D^2 u^i(x)) = \cap_{i=1}^q [\text{Im}(D^2 u^i(x))]^\perp.$$

Moreover, if we write  $P^i : (\mathbb{R}^n)^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  to denote orthonormal projection of  $\mathbb{R}^{nq} = (\mathbb{R}^n)^q$  onto the  $i$ th copy of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $D^2 u^i(x) = P^i \circ Dw(x)$ . Thus

$$\text{Im}(D^2 u^i(x)) = \text{Im} P^i \circ Dw(x) = P^i(\text{Im}(Dw_i)) \stackrel{(3.8)}{=} P^i(T_\xi \Gamma_v).$$

The term on the right depends only on  $\xi$ , so (4.3) follows from the previous two identities.

**2.** For  $\xi \in \Gamma_v^*$ , we will write  $T(\xi) := \cap_{i=1}^j [P^i(T_\xi \Gamma_v)]^\perp = T_x \Gamma_h(\xi)$  for a.e.  $x \in \Gamma_h(\xi)$ . We next claim that

$$(4.4) \quad \text{if } \xi \in \Gamma_v^*, \text{ then } \Gamma_h(\xi) \text{ is a union of } (n - k)\text{-planes in } \Omega, \text{ all parallel to } T(\xi).$$

Since the current  $H_\xi$  from Proposition 3.1 is represented by integration over  $\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi)$ , it suffices to show that every indecomposable component of  $H_\xi$  is supported on exactly a set of the form  $\{\xi\} \times P$ , where  $P$  is an  $(n - k)$ -plane in  $\Omega$  with tangent space  $T(\xi)$ .

This follows from (4.3) and the fact that  $\partial H_\xi = 0$  in  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , by classical arguments that we have already seen in the proof of Proposition 3.6. In detail, by changing coordinates we may arrange that  $T_x \Gamma_h(\xi) = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-k}\}$  for a.e.  $x \in \Gamma_h(\xi)$ . Since  $H_\xi$  is carried by  $\{\xi\} \times \Gamma_h(\xi)$ , it follows that for  $H_\xi(\phi \wedge df) = 0$  for every  $n - k - 1$ -form  $\phi$  with compact support in  $\Omega$ , whenever  $f$  has the form  $f(x) = x^j$  for some  $j \in \{n - k + 1, \dots, n\}$ . In this situation, Solomon's Separation Lemma (Lemma 3.3 of [32]) states that every indecomposable component of  $H_\xi$  is carried by a level set of  $f$ . It follows that every indecomposable piece of  $H_\xi$  is contained in an  $n - k$  plane in which  $x^j$  is constant for all  $j = n - k + 1, \dots, n$  (in the coordinates we have chosen, which depended on  $\xi$ .) described above. This completes the proof of (4.4).

**3.** Now the conclusions of the lemma follow directly from (4.4), the definition (3.4) of  $\Gamma_h(\xi)$ , which implies in particular that  $w$  is a.e. constant in each of these sets, and (3.9), which asserts that  $\cup_{\xi \in \Gamma_v^*} \Gamma_h(\xi)$  contains almost every point of  $\Omega^k$ .  $\square$

Having Lemma 4.2 at hand, the proof that  $w$  is densely weakly flatly foliated is straightforward.

*Proof of Proposition 4.1. 1.* We recall from Definition 1.9 that the definition of densely weakly flatly foliated involves a partition of  $\Omega$  into sets  $F_j$  such that  $\Omega_j := \cup_{m=0}^j F_m$  is open

for every  $j$ , and satisfying a property recalled in (4.8) below. We define these sets as follows. As before,

$$\Omega^k := \{x \in \Omega : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of } w \text{ and } Dw, \text{ and } \text{rank}(D^2u(x)) = k\}.$$

We also let  $\Omega_k = \Omega$ , and for  $j \in \{k-1, \dots, 0\}$ , we recursively define (working downwards)

$$(4.5) \quad \Omega_j = \Omega_{j+1} - \bar{\Omega}^{j+1}$$

$$(4.6) \quad \Omega^j = \{x \in \Omega_j : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of } Du \text{ and } D^2u, \text{ and } \text{rank}(D^2u) = j\},$$

Finally, we set

$$(4.7) \quad F_j := \bar{\Omega}^j \cap \Omega_j = \Omega_j \setminus \Omega_{j-1}.$$

This indeed defines a partition of  $\Omega$  such that every  $\Omega_j$  is open, as required.

Note that by our convention  $F_k = \bar{\Omega}^k$ .

We must show that for every  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ ,

$$(4.8) \quad \text{for every } x \text{ in a dense subset of } F_j, \text{ there exists at least one } n-j\text{-plane } P \text{ in } \Omega_j \\ \text{such that } x \in P \text{ and } w \text{ is } \mathcal{H}^{n-j} \text{ a.e. constant on } P.$$

Observe for every  $j \leq k$ ,  $\Omega_j$  is open, and  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,j+1}(\Omega_j; \mathbb{R}^\ell) \subset W_{loc}^{1,k+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$ , with  $\text{rank}(Dw) \leq j$  a.e. in  $\Omega_j$ . In other words,  $w|_{\Omega_j}$  satisfies (4.1) with  $k$  replaced by  $j$ , and hence Lemma 4.2 holds, with  $k$  replaced by  $j$  in  $\Omega^j \subset \Omega_j$ . It follows that

$$(4.9) \quad \text{for every } x \text{ in a full measure subset of } \Omega^j, \text{ there exists at least one } n-j\text{-plane } P \text{ in } \Omega_j \\ \text{such that } x \in P \text{ and } w \text{ is } \mathcal{H}^{n-j} \text{ a.e. constant on } P.$$

Since  $\Omega^j$  is manifestly dense in  $F_j$ , to deduce (4.8) from (4.9) it suffices to prove that every full measure subset of  $\Omega^j$  is in fact dense in  $\Omega^j$ .

To see this, consider some  $x_0 \in \Omega^j$ , and fix  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\text{rank}(A) \geq j$  for all matrices with  $|A - Dw(x_0)| < \delta_0$ . Then for every  $r > 0$  such that  $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_j$ , since  $x_0$  is a Lebesgue point of  $w$  and  $Dw$ , the set

$$\{x \in B_r(x_0) : x \text{ is a Lebesgue point of } w \text{ and } Dw, \text{ and } |Dw(x) - Dw(x_0)| < \delta_0\}$$

has positive measure. Since  $\text{rank}(Dw) \leq j$  a.e. in  $B_r(x_0) \subset \Omega_j$ , the above set intersects  $\Omega^j$  in a set of positive measure. Since  $x_0$  and  $r$  were arbitrary, this completes the proof of (4.8).  $\square$

## 5. POINTWISE WEAK DEVELOPABILITY

In this section we will prove the following statement, which is an important step in establishing Theorem 4.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Assume that*

$$(5.1) \quad w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell), \quad \text{rank}(Dw) \leq k \quad \text{a.e.}$$

*for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  and some  $p > k$ . If  $w$  is densely weakly  $(n-k)$ -flatly foliated, then  $w$  is pointwise weakly  $(n-k)$ -flatly foliated.*

**Remark 5.2.** *In view of Definition 1.6, we could say that Propositions 2.1, 4.1 and 5.1 together imply a pointwise weak developability result for  $W^{2,k+1}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  isometric immersions, and also for such  $u \in W^{2,k+1}$  such that  $\text{rank}(D^2u) \leq k$  a.e.*

The Proposition will follow from a couple of lemmas.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Assume that  $k, n$  are integers such that  $1 \leq k < n$ . Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ , and for  $r > 0$  let  $S := U \times B_r^k$  for some  $r > 0$ .*

*Assume that  $w \in W^{1,p}(S; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $p > k$ , and for  $i = 1, 2$  let  $\zeta_i : U \rightarrow B_s^k$  be continuous functions. Then (writing points in  $S$  in the form  $x = (y, z)$  with  $y \in U, z \in B_s^k$ )*

$$\left( \int_U |w(y, \zeta_1(y)) - w(y, \zeta_2(y))|^p dy \right)^{1/p} \leq C \|w\|_{W^{1,p}(S)} \|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|_{L^\infty(U)}^\alpha$$

for  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{k}{p}$ , for a constant  $C$  depending only on  $k$  and  $p$ .

*Proof.* We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{W^{1,p}(S)}^p &\geq \int_U \|w(y, \cdot)\|_{W^{1,p}(B_r^k)}^p dy \\ &\geq C^{-1} \int_U \frac{|w(y, \zeta_1(y)) - w(y, \zeta_2(y))|^p}{|\zeta_1(y) - \zeta_2(y)|^{\alpha p}} dy \end{aligned}$$

by the ( $k$ -dimensional) Sobolev Embedding, from which we also know that the constant  $C$  depends only on  $p$  and  $k$  and in particular is independent of  $r$ .  $\square$

Our next lemma will be used again in Section 6.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Assume that  $\Omega$  is a bounded, open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and that  $w \in W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $p > j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  and some  $\ell$ .*

*Assume also that  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , and that there exists a sequence of points  $(x_m) \subset \Omega$  and values  $(\xi_m) \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$  such that  $x_m \rightarrow x_0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $w = \xi_m$  at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. point on an  $(n-j)$ -plane  $P_m$  in  $\Omega$  that contains  $x_m$ .*

*Then exists, and  $w = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \xi_m$  at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. point on some  $n-j$  plane  $P$  in  $\Omega$  that contains  $x_0$ . (In particular,  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \xi_m$  exists.)*

*Proof.* Let  $\xi_m \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$  denote the value of  $w$  on  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. point of  $P_m$ , and let  $\mathbb{P}_m$  denote the  $(n-j)$ -plane such that  $P_m$  is a connected component of  $\mathbb{P}_m \cap \Omega$ .

Since the Grassmannian of unoriented  $(n-j)$ -dimensional subspaces in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is compact, we may assume, after passing to subsequences (still labelled  $(P_m), (\xi_m)$ ) that there is a  $(n-j)$ -plane  $\mathbb{P}$  passing through  $x_0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$  in the Hausdorff distance on  $B_R(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , for every  $R > 0$ . Now let  $P$  be the  $(n-j)$ -plane in  $\Omega$  consisting of the connected component of  $\mathbb{P} \cap \Omega$  that contains  $x_0$ .

We may arrange, after a translation and a rotation, that  $x_0 = 0$  and  $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{R}^{n-j} \times \{0\}$ , and we write  $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}_y^{n-j} \times \mathbb{R}_z^j$  as in Lemma 5.3. Fix a connected, relatively open set  $U \subset P$ , containing  $x_0$  and having compact closure in  $\Omega$ . Then there exists an open ball  $B_r^j$  such that  $S := U \times B_r^j \Subset \Omega$ . The convergence  $\mathbb{P}_m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$  implies that for every sufficiently large  $m$ , there is an affine function  $\zeta_m : U \rightarrow B_r^j$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_m \cap S = \{(y, \zeta_m(y)) : y \in U\}$ , and moreover that  $\|\zeta_m\|_{L^\infty(U)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

Also, for  $m$  large enough that  $x_m \in S$ , we have that  $P_m \cap S$  is nonempty, and hence (since  $S \subset \Omega$  is convex and  $P_m$  is a connected component of  $\mathbb{P}_m \cap \Omega$ ) that  $\mathbb{P}_m \cap S = P_m \cap S \subset P_m$ . So  $w = \xi_m$   $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. in  $\mathbb{P}_m \cap S$ , and by applying Lemma 5.3 to  $\zeta = 0$  and  $\zeta_m$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U |w(y, 0) - \xi_m|^p dy &= \int_U |w(y, 0) - w(y, \zeta_m(y))|^p dy \\ &\leq C \|w\|_{W^{1,p}(S)}^p \|\zeta_m\|_{L^\infty(U)}^{\alpha p} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{j}{p}$ . It follows that there exists some  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$  such that  $\xi_m \rightarrow \xi$ , and moreover that  $w(\cdot, 0) = \xi$  a.e. on  $U$ . Since  $U$  was arbitrary, it follows that  $w = \xi$  at  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. point of  $P$ . □

Now we complete the

*Proof of Proposition 5.1.* By assumption,  $\Omega$  is partitioned into sets  $F_j$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, n-k$  such that  $\Omega_j := \cup_{m=0}^j F_m$  is open for every  $j$ , and in addition, there is a dense subset of  $F_j$  in which every point is contained in a  $n-j$ -plane in  $\Omega_j$  on which  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant.

To prove the Proposition (with the same partition  $(F_j)$  of  $\Omega$ ), it suffices to show that every point in  $F_j$  is contained in a  $n-j$ -plane in  $\Omega_j$  on which  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant. This follows directly from Lemma 5.4, since every point in  $F_j$  satisfies the hypotheses of the lemma, with  $\Omega$  replaced by  $\Omega_j$ . □

**Remark 5.5.** *We note in passing that a slightly more careful version of the above argument would prove the following statement: For every  $x \in \Omega^j$  as defined in (4.6),  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant on the  $n-j$ -plane in  $\Omega_j$  that passes through  $x$  and whose tangent space is  $\ker(Dw(x))$ , and the constant value is equal to  $w(x)$ .*

## 6. STRONG DEVELOPABILITY

In this section we prove the following

**Proposition 6.1.** *Assume that  $\Omega$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and that  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$ . If  $w$  is pointwise weakly  $(n-k)$ -flatly foliated, then  $w$  is continuous. As a result, if  $P$  is any  $n-j$ -plane in  $\Omega_j$  (as in Definition 1.10) on which  $w$  is  $\mathcal{H}^{n-j}$  a.e. constant, then in fact  $w$  is constant on  $P$ . In particular,  $w$  is  $(n-k)$ -flatly foliated.*

For the convenience of the reader, the proof will be split in a series of Lemmas which will follow and will be completed in Lemma 6.7. This will complete the proof of Theorems 3 and 4, which follow immediately from combining Propositions 4.1, 5.1 and 6.1 and, for Theorem 3 only, Proposition 2.1 as well.

The following examples shows that the condition  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  cannot be weakened, at least for certain values of  $n$  and  $k$ .

**Example 6.** Consider the map  $w : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow S^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  defined by

$$w(x) = H\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) \quad \text{if } x \neq 0, \quad w(0) = 0,$$

where  $H : S^3 \rightarrow S^2$  is the Hopf fibration. Recall that every level set of  $H$  has the form  $\{(z, \zeta) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^4 : |z|^2 + |\zeta|^2 = 1, \alpha z = \beta \zeta\}$  for some fixed  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$  (one of which can always be taken to equal 1). From this one easily checks that  $w$  is a 2-plane passing through the origin, and that the intersection of any two level sets is  $\{0\}$ . Thus,  $w$  is pointwise weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated (see Definition 1.10) with  $n = 4, k = 2$  and  $F_2 = \mathbb{R}^4, F_0 = F_1 = \emptyset$ , and  $w \in W^{1,p}$  for all  $p < 4 = \min\{2k, n\}$ . But clearly  $w$  is not continuous.

This example shows the hypothesis  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  of Proposition 6.1 cannot be weakened when  $n = 2k = 4$ .

**Example 7.** Next, for  $n \geq 5$  define  $w_1 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  by  $w_1(x^1, \dots, x^n) = w(x^1, \dots, x^4)$  where  $w$  is the function from the above example. Then  $w_1$  is pointwise weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated with  $k = 2$  and  $F_2 = \mathbb{R}^n, F_0 = F_1 = \emptyset$ . Also,  $w_1 \in W_{loc}^{1,p}$  for all  $p < 4 = \min\{2k, n\}$ . But again  $w_1$  is not continuous.

So the condition  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  cannot be weakened whenever  $k = 2$  and  $n > 4$ .

**Example 8.** One can construct a function similar to that of Example 6 when  $n = 2k = 8$  or 16 by using Hopf fibrations  $S^7 \rightarrow S^4$  and  $S^{15} \rightarrow S^8$ , and similarly a function similar to the one in Example 7 when  $n > 2k = 8$  or 16. It follows that the condition  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  cannot be weakened whenever  $k = 4$  or 8 and  $n \geq 2k$ .

**Remark 6.2.** One can check that the  $w : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\ell$  constructed in the above examples are not gradients of scalar functions. In fact we conjecture that if we add to Proposition 6.1 the assumption that  $w = Du$  for some scalar function  $u$ , then the conclusions of the proposition should still be true if we merely assume  $p \geq k + 1$ .

The next lemma, whose proof is very similar to that of Lemma 5.3, still only needs the minimal regularity assumptions  $p > k$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** Assume that  $k, n$  are integers such that  $1 \leq k < n$ . Let  $\Omega$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and assume that  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $p > k$ . Finally, assume that  $P$  is an  $n - k$ -plane in  $\Omega$  such that  $w = \xi$  a.e. on  $P$  for some  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ .

If  $x \in P$  is a Lebesgue point of  $|Dw|^p$ , then  $x$  is a Lebesgue point of  $w$ , and  $w(x) = \xi$ .

*Proof.* We may assume after a translation and a rotation that  $P$  is a connected component of  $\Omega \cap (\mathbb{R}^{n-k} \times \{0\})$ , and that  $x = 0$ . Fix  $R > 0$  such that  $B_R^{n-k} \times B_R^k \subset \Omega$ , and let  $\alpha = 1 - \frac{k}{p}$ . Then for any positive  $r < R$ , writing  $[f]_\alpha$  to denote the  $\alpha$ -Hölder seminorm,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r^{n-k} \times B_r^k} |w - \xi|^p dy dz &= \int_{B_r^{n-k}} \left( \int_{B_r^k} |w(y, z) - w(y, 0)|^p dz \right) dy \\ &\leq \int_{B_r^{n-k}} \left( \int_{B_r^k} |z|^{p\alpha} [w(y, \cdot)]_\alpha^p dz \right) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by the  $k$ -dimensional Sobolev embedding,

$$\int_{B_r^k} |z|^{p\alpha} [w(y, \cdot)]_\alpha^p dz \leq Cr^{\alpha p - k} \int_{B_r^k} |Dw(y, z)|^p dz = Cr^{\alpha p} \int_{B_r^k} |Dw(y, z)|^p dz$$



with a constant  $C$  independent of  $r$ . Thus

$$\int_{B_r^{n-k} \times B_r^k} |w - \xi|^p dy dz \leq r^{\alpha p} \int_{B_r^{n-k} \times B_r^k} |Dw|^p dy dz .$$

Since  $x$  is a Lebesgue point of  $|Dw|^p$ , the right-hand side is bounded by  $Cr^{p\alpha}$  for all small  $r$ , proving the lemma.  $\square$

The restriction  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  in Proposition 6.1 arises from the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.4.** *Assume that  $\Omega$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and that  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $\ell$  and some  $p \geq 1$ . Suppose that for  $i = 1, 2$ , there exist values  $\xi^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , planes  $P_i$  in  $\Omega$  of dimension  $n - k$  such that*

$$P_1 \cap P_2 \neq \emptyset, \quad \text{and} \quad w = \xi^i, \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-k} \text{ a.e. in } P_i$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . If  $p \geq \min\{n, 2k\}$  then  $\xi_1 = \xi_2$ .

*Proof. 1.* We first consider the case  $2k < n$ .

Let  $x_0 \in \Omega \cap P_1 \cap P_2$ . Any two planes of dimension  $n - k$  that intersect at a point must intersect along a plane of dimension  $n - 2k$ . We may assume after a translation that  $x_0$  is the origin, and after a rotation that  $P_1 \cap P_2 = \mathbb{R}^{n-2k} \times \{0\}$ . We write  $y$  and  $z$  respectively to denote points in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-2k}$  and in  $\mathbb{R}^{2k}$ , and we fix  $r$  and  $s$  such that  $B_r^{n-2k} \times B_s^{2k} \subset \Omega$ . Then for  $\mathcal{H}^{n-2k+1}$  a.e.  $(y, \sigma) \in B_r^{n-2k} \times (0, s)$ ,

$$\text{ess osc}_{\{y\} \times \partial B_\sigma^{2k}} |w| \geq |\xi_1 - \xi_2|,$$

so that by the Sobolev embedding theorem,

$$|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{2k} \leq C\sigma \int_{\{y\} \times \partial B_\sigma^{2k}} |Dw|^{2k} d\mathcal{H}^{2k-1}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r^{n-2k} \times B_s^{2k}} |Dw|^{2k} &= \int_{B_r^{n-2k}} \int_0^s \int_{\{y\} \times \partial B_\sigma^{2k}} |Dw|^{2k} d\mathcal{H}^{2k-1} d\sigma dy \\ &\geq c|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^{2k} \int_{B_r^{n-2k}} \int_0^s \frac{1}{\sigma} d\sigma dy. \end{aligned}$$

The left-hand side is finite, so it follows that  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2| = 0$ .

**2.** The case  $2k \geq n$  is similar but easier. Here, all we can say about any two  $n - k$ -planes with nonempty intersection is that their intersection must contain a point  $x_0$ . Hence, the essential oscillation of  $w$  on a.e. small sphere centered at  $x_0$  is bounded below by  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2|$ , and as a result

$$(6.1) \quad \int_{B_s^n(x_0)} |Dw|^n = \int_0^s \int_{\partial B_\sigma^n(x_0)} |Dw|^n \geq c|\xi_1 - \xi_2|^n \int_0^s \frac{1}{\sigma} d\sigma.$$

We conclude as before that  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2| = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.5.** *If  $2k \geq n$ , then a small modification of the above proof shows that the conclusion remains true if we assume  $w = \xi_1$  a.e. in  $P_1$  and that  $w = \xi_2$  at  $\mathcal{H}^1$  a.e. point of a connected, relatively open subset  $U \subset P_2$ , with  $P_1 \cap \bar{U} \neq \emptyset$ . Indeed, these hypotheses imply the existence of an open line segment containing  $x_0$  on which  $w = \xi_1$  a.e., and a second open line segment with an endpoint at  $x_0$  on which  $w = \xi_2$  a.e., and these conditions imply that the essential oscillation of  $w$  on a.e. small sphere centered at  $x_0$  is bounded below by  $|\xi_1 - \xi_2|$ , allowing us to conclude as in (6.1).*

Our next result follows rather easily from the above two lemmas.

**Lemma 6.6.** *Assume that  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$ . If  $w$  is pointwise weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated, then there exists a function  $\bar{w} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that*

$$(6.2) \quad \bar{w}|_{F_j} \text{ is continuous for every } j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$$

and

$$(6.3) \quad \bar{w} = w \text{ a.e. in } \Omega.$$

*In particular, for every  $x \in F_j$ , there is an  $n - j$  plane in  $\Omega_j$  containing  $x$  on which  $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(x)$  everywhere, where  $F_j$  and  $\Omega_j$  are given as in Definition 1.10.*

*Proof. 1.* We define  $\bar{w}$  by requiring that

$$\bar{w}(x) = \xi \text{ if } x \in F_j \text{ and } w = \xi \text{ a.e. on some } n - j\text{-plane } P \text{ in } \Omega_j \text{ passing through } x.$$

We claim that that  $\bar{w}$  is well-defined. Towards this end, note that every  $x$  belongs to a unique  $F_j$  by (1.9) and hence by (1.11) belongs to at least one  $n - j$ -plane in  $F_j$  on which  $w$  is a.e. constant. Then by Lemma 6.4, the values of  $w$  on any two such planes must agree a.e., so the claim follows.

**2.** It follows from the definition of  $\bar{w}$  and Lemma 6.3 that  $w = \bar{w}$  at every Lebesgue point of  $|Dw|^p$ , which implies (6.3).

**3.** To verify that (6.2) holds, assume toward a contradiction that  $\bar{w}|_{F_j}$  is not continuous at some point  $x_0 \in F_j$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(x_m)$  in  $F_j$  such that

$$|x_m - x_0| < \frac{1}{m}, \quad |\bar{w}(x_m) - \bar{w}(x_0)| \geq c_0$$

for some  $c_0 > 0$ . Let  $\xi_m := \bar{w}(x_m)$ , and let  $P_m$  be a  $n - j$  plane in  $\Omega_j$  such that  $\bar{w} = \xi_m$  on  $P_m$ . Then

$$(6.4) \quad P_m \cap B_{1/m}(x_0) \neq \emptyset \quad w = \xi_m \text{ a.e. on } P_m.$$

Then Lemma 5.4 implies that there exists some exactly  $(n - j)$ -plane  $P'$  in  $\Omega_j$  and some  $\xi' \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$x_0 \in P', \quad \xi_m \rightarrow \xi', \quad \text{and } w = \xi' \text{ } \mathcal{H}^{n-j} \text{ a.e. on } P'.$$

The definition of  $\bar{w}$  implies that  $\bar{w}(x_0) = \xi'$ . This however is impossible, since  $\xi_m \rightarrow \xi'$  and  $|\xi_m - \bar{w}(x_0)| \geq c_0$  for all  $m$ . This contradiction shows that  $\bar{w}|_{F_j}$  is continuous on  $F_j$ .  $\square$

Our next goal is to show that the function  $\bar{w}$  found above is continuous in all of  $\Omega$ . This will directly imply the continuity of  $w$ , and hence will conclude the proof of our main results.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Assume that  $w \in W_{loc}^{1,p}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  for some  $p \geq \min\{2k, n\}$  and that  $w$  is pointwise weakly  $(n - k)$ -flatly foliated. Let  $\bar{w}$  be the function found in Lemma 6.6. Then  $\bar{w}$  is continuous in  $\Omega$ , and as a result,  $w$  is continuous in  $\Omega$ .*

Before giving the proof, we recall that every  $f \in W^{1,p}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^\ell)$  is  $p$ -quasicontinuous, which means that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists an open set  $O \subset \Omega$  such that  $\text{Cap}_p(O) < \varepsilon$  and  $f|_{\Omega \setminus O}$  is continuous. For the definition and the few properties of capacity that are needed for our argument (e.g. the above statement) refer to [7], unless another reference is provided.

The idea of the proof below is to show that, given what we already know about  $w$ , if it is discontinuous anywhere, then it must fail to be  $p$ -quasicontinuous, for  $p = \min\{2k, n\}$ , which is impossible. That is, we will argue (in the more difficult case  $2k < n$ ) that, in view of (6.2), any discontinuity of  $\bar{w}$  would involve the intersection of (the closure of) portions of planes on which  $\bar{w}$  is constant, one having dimension at least  $n - k$  and the other dimension at least  $n - k + 1$ . This would lead to a discontinuity set for  $w$  of dimension at least  $n - 2k + 1$ , along which the discontinuity cannot be eliminated by cutting out an open set of small enough  $p$ -capacity, the point being that a set of  $p$ -capacity zero has dimension strictly less than  $n - 2k + 1$ .

*Proof of Lemma 6.7.* First, since  $\bar{w} = w$  a.e., if  $\bar{w}$  is continuous, then every  $x \in \Omega$  is a Lebesgue point of  $w$ , and the Lebesgue value at  $x$  equals  $\bar{w}(x)$ . So  $w = \bar{w}$  pointwise in  $\Omega$ , and the continuity of  $w$  follows. Thus we only need to show that  $\bar{w}$  is continuous.

It is convenient to write  $F_{\geq j} := \bigcup_{m \geq j} F_m$ , and similarly  $F_{> j} := \bigcup_{\ell > j} F_m = F_{\geq j+1}$ . With this notation, we will prove that by (downward) induction on  $j$  that

$$(6.5) \quad \bar{w}|_{F_{\geq j}} \text{ is continuous for every } j \in \{k, \dots, 0\}$$

which in particular will imply that  $\bar{w}$  is continuous on  $F_{\geq 0} = \Omega$ .

From Lemma 6.6 we already know that (6.5) holds for  $j = k$ . Now we assume by induction that  $\bar{w}|_{F_{> j}}$  is continuous for some nonnegative  $j < k$ , and we prove that  $\bar{w}|_{F_{\geq j}}$  is continuous.

**Step 1.** We first show that

$$(6.6) \quad \text{if } P \text{ is an } n - j\text{-plane in } \Omega_j \text{ for which } \bar{w} = \xi \text{ on } P, \text{ then } \bar{w} = \xi \text{ on } \bar{P} \cap F_{> j}.$$

This is a key point of the proof. In the case  $2k \geq n$ , this follows in a straightforward way from Remark 6.5, so we focus on the case  $2k < n$ .

**Step 1a.** Assume toward a contradiction that (6.6) fails, so that for some  $n - j$ -plane  $P$  in  $\Omega_j$  and  $x_0 \in \bar{P} \cap F_{> j}$  such that

$$(6.7) \quad \bar{w} = \xi \text{ on } P, \text{ and } \bar{w}(x_0) = \xi_0, \quad \text{for some } \xi \neq \xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^\ell.$$

Then  $x_0 \in F_i$  for some  $i > j$ , so there exists an  $n - i$ -plane  $P_0$  in  $\Omega_i$  such that  $x_0 \in P_0$  and  $\bar{w} = \xi_0$  in  $P_0$ .

We may assume that

$$(6.8) \quad P \cap P_0 = \emptyset$$

because if there exists some  $y_0 \in P \cap P_0$ , then since both  $P$  and  $P_0$  are relatively open, we could apply Lemma 6.4 on a small ball containing  $y_0$  to conclude that  $\xi = \xi_0$ .

We may also assume (after a translation) that  $x_0 = 0$ . We write  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_0$  to denote the planes (of dimension  $n - j$  and  $n - i$  respectively) that contain  $P$  and  $P_0$ , and we let  $d$  denote the dimension of  $\mathbb{P} \cap \mathbb{P}_0$ , so that  $d \geq n - i - j \geq n - 2k + 1$ , recalling that  $j < i \leq k$ . Also,  $d < n - i = \dim(\mathbb{P}_0) < n - j$ .

We can arrange by a suitable rotation that

$$\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{R}^{n-j} \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbb{P} \cap \mathbb{P}_0 = \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We will write points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in the form  $x = (y, z)$  with  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$ .

By the induction hypothesis, we may fix  $r > 0$  so small that  $B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d} \subset \Omega_i$  and

$$(6.9) \quad |\overline{w}(x) - \xi| > \delta := \frac{1}{2}|\xi_0 - \xi| \quad \text{for all } x \in (B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d}) \cap F_{>j}.$$

Let  $B$  be a relatively open ball in  $P \cap (B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d})$ , and let  $B_0$  denote the orthogonal projection of  $B$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}$ , so that  $B_0$  is a relatively open subset of  $B_r^d \times \{0\}$ .

**Step 1b.** We claim that for every  $y \in B_0$ , the restriction of  $w$  to  $\{y\} \times B_r^{n-d}$  is discontinuous.

This is a consequence of the following two facts, which we will prove below. First,

$$(6.10) \quad \forall y \in B_0, \quad (\{y\} \times B_r^{n-d}) \cap \partial_{\mathbb{P}} P \text{ is nonempty,}$$

where  $\partial_{\mathbb{P}} P$  denotes the boundary of  $P$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ . Second,

$$(6.11) \quad w \text{ is discontinuous at every point of } \partial_{\mathbb{P}} P \cap (B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d}).$$

(Recall that  $w$  is identified with its precise representative, and that the complement of the set of Lebesgue points has dimension less than  $n - p - \varepsilon$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and in particular is a  $\mathcal{H}^{n-p+1}$  null set.)

To prove (6.10), we first note that the definition of  $B_0$  implies directly that

$$(6.12) \quad (\{y\} \times B_r^{n-d}) \cap P \text{ is nonempty for } y \in B_0.$$

Also, the definitions imply that

$$(6.13) \quad B_r^d \times \{0\} \subset P_0.$$

This is verified by noting that  $P_0 \cap (B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d})$  is nonempty, since  $x_0 = (0, 0) \in P_0$ , and that in addition  $P_0$  is a connected, relatively open subset of  $\mathbb{P}_0 \cap \Omega_i$ . Since  $(B_r^d \times \mathbb{R}^{n-d}) \subset \Omega_i$ , it follows that  $P_0$  contains  $\mathbb{P}_0 \cap (B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d})$ , which implies (6.13).

From (6.13) and (6.8) we see that  $(y, 0) \notin P$ , and hence that

$$(6.14) \quad (\{y\} \times B_r^{n-d}) \cap (\mathbb{P} \setminus P) \text{ is nonempty.}$$

Since  $P$  is a connected, relatively open subset of  $\mathbb{P}$ , the claim (6.10) follows from (6.12) and (6.14).

To prove (6.11), fix  $z \in \partial_{\mathbb{P}} P \cap (B_r^d \times B_r^{n-d})$ , and note that  $z \in \Omega_i \setminus \Omega_j$ , since  $P$  is by definition a connected component of  $\mathbb{P} \cap \Omega_j$ , and  $\Omega_j$  is open. Thus  $z \in F_m$  for some  $j < m \leq i$ , and so there exists an  $n - m$  plane  $P_1$  in  $\Omega_m$  containing  $z$ , and on which  $w = \overline{w}(z)$   $\mathcal{H}^{n-m}$  a.e.. So every ball around  $z$  contains points at which  $w = \overline{w}(z)$ . Similarly, (6.9) implies that every ball around  $z$  contains points at which  $w = \xi \neq \overline{w}(z)$ . Therefore (6.11) follows, completing Step 1b.

We now establish (6.6). Since  $w$  is  $p$ -quasicontinuous, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a set  $S$  such that the restriction of  $w$  to  $\Omega \setminus S$  is continuous, and  $\text{Cap}_p(S) < \varepsilon$ . By Step 1b, the orthogonal projection of  $S$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \{0\}$  must contain the open ball  $B_0$ . Note that  $p$ -capacity is not increased by orthogonal projection, e.g. by [26, Theorem 3] (See also [1, Chapter 5] for further discussion of this type of results). Therefore it follows that  $\text{Cap}_p(B_0) < \varepsilon$  for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and hence that  $\text{Cap}_p(B_0) = 0$ . This however is false, as a set with zero  $p$ -capacity has  $H^s$  measure 0 for every  $s > n - p$ , and the dimension  $d$  of  $B_0$  satisfies  $d \geq n - 2k + 1 > n - p$ . So we have proved (6.6).

**Step 2.** We now use (6.6) to prove the continuity of  $\bar{w}$  on  $F_{\geq j}$ .

Clearly  $F_{\geq j}$  is partitioned as  $F_{> j} \cup F_j$ . Since  $\Omega_j$  is open and  $F_j = \Omega_j \cap F_{\geq j}$ , we see that  $F_j$  is relatively open and  $F_{> j}$  relatively closed in  $F_{\geq j}$ . Thus, in view of the induction hypothesis and Lemma 6.6, it suffices to check that if  $x_0 \in F_{> j}$  and  $(x_m)$  is a sequence in  $F_j$  converging to  $x_0$ , then  $\bar{w}(x_m) \rightarrow \bar{w}(x_0)$ .

Thus we fix some  $x_0 \in F_i$  for some  $i > j$ , and we assume toward a contradiction, that there is a sequence  $(x_m)$  in  $F_j$  such that

$$x_m \rightarrow x_0, \quad |\bar{w}(x_m) - \bar{w}(x_0)| \geq c_0 > 0 \quad \text{for all } m.$$

The definition of  $\bar{w}$  implies that there exists an  $n - i$ -plane  $P$  in  $\Omega_i$  such that  $x_0 \in P \subset \Omega_i$ ,  $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(x_0)$  everywhere on  $P$ , and  $w = \bar{w}(x_0)$  almost everywhere on  $P$ . It further implies that for each  $x_m$ , there exists a  $n - j$ -plane  $P_m$  in  $\Omega_j$  such that  $x_m \in P_m$ , and on which  $\bar{w} = \xi_m := \bar{w}(x_m)$  everywhere, and  $w = \xi_m$  almost everywhere.

For each  $m$  we write  $\mathbb{P}_m$  to denote the  $n - j$ -plane such that  $P_m$  is a connected component of  $\Omega_j \cap \mathbb{P}_m$ . We now consider two cases.

**Case 1.** There exists some  $\delta > 0$  and a subsequence  $(m_q)$  such that  $\mathbb{P}_{m_q} \cap B_\delta(x_0) \subset \Omega_j$  for every  $q$ .

If this holds, then it follows from Lemma 5.4, with  $\Omega$  replaced by  $B_\delta(x_0)$ , that there exists some  $n - j$ -plane in  $B_\delta(x_0)$  that contains  $x_0$ , and on which  $w = \lim \xi_{m_q}$  a.e.. This however would imply that  $\bar{w}(x_0) = \lim \xi_{m_q}$ , which is impossible.

**Case 2.** Next we suppose that Case 1 does not hold.

Then for every  $q$  there is some  $m_q$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{m_q} \cap B_{1/q}(x_0) \not\subset \Omega_j.$$

For  $q$  large enough that  $B_{1/q}(x_0) \subset \Omega = \Omega_j \cup F_{> j}$ , it must then be the case that  $\bar{P}_{m_q} \cap F_{> j} \cap B_{1/q}(x_0) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $y_{m_q} \in \bar{P}_{m_q} \cap F_{> j} \cap B_{1/q}(x_0)$ .

By Step 1, we know that  $\bar{w}(y_{m_q}) = \bar{w}(x_{m_q})$ .

Also, by construction,  $y_{m_q} \rightarrow x_0$  as  $q \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, since  $y_{m_q} \in F_{> k}$  for every  $q$ , it follows from the induction hypothesis that  $\bar{w}(x_0) = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(y_{m_q}) = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \bar{w}(x_{m_q})$ , which is impossible in view of the choice of the sequence  $(x_m)$ . Hence  $\bar{w}$  is continuous as claimed.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] D.R. Adams and L.I. Hedberg, *Function Spaces and Potential Theory*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften (Book 314), Springer, 1999.
- [2] Yu. F. Borisov, *The parallel translation on a smooth surface. III.*, Vestnik Leningrad. Univ. **14** (1959) no. 1, 34–50.

- [3] Yu. F. Borisov, *Irregular surfaces of the class  $C^{1,\beta}$  with an analytic metric*, (Russian) Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **45** (2004), no. 1, 25–61; translation in Siberian Math. J. **45** (2004), no. 1, 19–52.
- [4] E. Cartan, *Bull. Soc. Math. France.* **46**, 125, (1919); **48**, 132, (1920).
- [5] S.S. Chern and R.K. Lashof, *On the Total Curvature of Immersed Manifolds*, American Journal of Mathematics, **79**, (1957) No. 2., 306–318.
- [6] S. Conti, C. De Lellis and L. Székelyhidi Jr.,  *$h$ -principle and rigidity for  $C^{1,\alpha}$  isometric embeddings*, To appear in the Proceedings of the Abel Symposium 2010.
- [7] L.C. Evans and R.F. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, 1992.
- [8] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1969.
- [9] I. Fonseca and J. Malý, *From Jacobian to Hessian: distributional form and relaxation*, Riv. Mat. Univ. Parma, **7**, (2005), 4\*, 45–74.
- [10] G. Friesecke, R. James and S. Müller, *A theorem on geometric rigidity and the derivation of nonlinear plate theory from three dimensional elasticity*, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math., **55** (2002), 1461–1506.
- [11] J.H.G. Fu, *Monge-Ampère functions I*, Indiana Univ. Math. Jour., **38**, no. 3, (1989), 745–771.
- [12] M. Giaquinta, G. Modica and J. Soucek, *Cartesian Currents in the Calculus of Variations I*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [13] P. Hartman and L. Nirenberg, *On spherical image maps whose Jacobians do not change sign*, Amer. J. Math., **81** (1959), 901–920.
- [14] P. Hornung, *Approximating  $W^{2,2}$  isometric immersions*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, **346** (2008), no. 3-4, 189–192.
- [15] P. Hornung, *Fine level set structure of flat isometric immersions*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **199** (2011), 943–1014.
- [16] P. Hornung, *Approximation of flat  $W^{2,2}$  isometric immersions by smooth ones*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **199** (2011), 1015–1067.
- [17] R.L. Jerrard, *Some remarks on Monge-Ampère functions*, Singularities in PDE and the calculus of variations, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, **44**, (2008), 89–112.
- [18] R.L. Jerrard, *Some rigidity results related to Monge-Ampère functions*, Canad. J. Math. **62**, no. 2, (2010), 320–354
- [19] B. Kirchheim, *Geometry and Rigidity of Microstructures*. Habilitation Thesis, Leipzig, (2001), Zbl pre01794210.
- [20] G. Kirchhoff. *Über das gleichgewicht und die bewegung einer elastischen scheinbe*, J. Reine Angew. Math., (1850), 51–88.
- [21] N. H. Kuiper, *On  $C^1$ -isometric imbeddings. I, II.*, Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A. **58**, (1955) 545–556, 683–689.
- [22] M. Lewicka and M. Pakzad, *Scaling laws for non-Euclidean plates and the  $W^{2,2}$  isometric immersions of Riemannian metrics*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations (2010).
- [23] Z. Liu and J. Malý, private communication.
- [24] Z. Liu and M. R. Pakzad, *Rigidity and regularity of co-dimension one Sobolev isometric immersions*, To appear in Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5), DOI Number: 10.2422/2036-2145.201302.001, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1302.0075v2.pdf>
- [25] J. Malý and O. Martio, *Lusin’s condition (N) and mappings of the class  $W^{1,n}$* , J. Reine Angew. Math., **458**, (1995), 19–36.
- [26] N.G. Meyers, *Continuity of Bessel potentials*, Israel Journal of Mathematics, **11**, (1972), Issue 3, 271–283.
- [27] S. Müller and M.R. Pakzad, *Regularity properties of isometric immersions*, Math. Z., **251** (2005), no. 2, 313–331 .
- [28] J. Nash,  *$C^1$  isometric imbeddings*, Ann. Math., **60**, (1954), 383–396.
- [29] M.R. Pakzad, *On the Sobolev space of isometric immersions*, J. Differential Geom., **66**, (2004) no. 1, 47–69.
- [30] A.V. Pogorelov, *Surfaces with bounded extrinsic curvature* (Russian), Kharhov, 1956.
- [31] A.V. Pogorelov, *Extrinsic geometry of convex surfaces*, Translation of mathematical monographs vol. 35, American Math. Soc., 1973.

- [32] B. Solomon, *new proof of the Closure Theorem for integral currents*, *Indiana Univ. Math. Jour.*, **33**, no. 3, (1984), 393–418.
- [33] S.C. Venkataramani, T.A. Witten, E.M. Kramer and R.P. Geroch, *Limitations on the smooth confinement of an unstretchable manifold*, *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, no. 7, (2000), 5107–5128.
- [34] W. P. Ziemer *Weakly differentiable functions. Sobolev spaces and functions of bounded variation*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 120. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA  
*E-mail address:* `rjerrard@math.toronto.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, PITTSBURGH, PA  
*E-mail address:* `pakzad@pitt.edu`