

TITLE: Co-dimension one area-minimizing currents with $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary having Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature.

AUTHOR: Leobardo Rosales, Keimyung University

ABSTRACT: We study n -dimensional area-minimizing currents T in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} , with boundary ∂T satisfying two properties: ∂T is locally a finite sum of $(n-1)$ -dimensional $C^{1,\alpha}$ orientable submanifolds which only meet tangentially and with same orientation, for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$; ∂T has mean curvature $= h\nu_T$ where h is a Lipschitz scalar-valued function and ν_T is the generalized outward pointing normal of ∂T with respect to T . We give a partial boundary regularity result for such currents T . We show that near any point x in the support of ∂T , either the support of T has very uncontrolled structure, or the support of T near x is the finite union of orientable $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary with disjoint interiors and common boundary points only along the support of ∂T .

KEYWORDS: Currents; Area-minimizing; Boundary Regularity.

MSC numbers: 28A75; 49Q05; 49Q15;

1 Introduction

This work continues the topic introduced and studied in [9]. We consider n -dimensional area-minimizing locally rectifiable currents T in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with boundary ∂T satisfying two properties as follows. First, we suppose there is an $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ so that ∂T can locally be written as a finite sum of $C^{1,\alpha}$ orientable $(n-1)$ -dimensional (embedded) submanifolds which meet only tangentially with equal orientation; we thus say that T has $C^{1,\alpha}$ *tangentially immersed boundary*, see Definition 3.1. Second, we suppose T has *Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature*, see Definition 3.6; this means that ∂T has generalized mean curvature $H_{\partial T} = h\nu_T$ where h is Lipschitz and ν_T is the generalized outward pointing unit normal of ∂T with respect to T (see Lemma 3.1 of [3] and (2.9) of [4] for the existence of ν_T).

The main result we aim to prove we heuristically state as follows:

Theorem 4.33 *Suppose T is an n -dimensional area-minimizing locally rectifiable current in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary ∂T for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, where ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature. Also*




Figure 1: An illustration of the conclusions of Theorem 4.33.

suppose x is a singular point of ∂T , and near x the support of T equals a finite union of orientable $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary. Then near x , the support of T equals a finite union of orientable $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary, which pairwise meet only along common boundary points.

Figure 1 shows a current satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 4.33. There, T is given by integrating over three surfaces-with-boundary, with orientation as illustrated. Over two of the surfaces, T is given multiplicity one, whereas in the remaining surface T is given multiplicity two over a region of that surface as labeled. Thus, T has tangentially immersed boundary consisting of four curves. The better way to understand Theorem 4.33 is through the contrapositive: at any point x in the support of ∂T near which the support of T is not as in Figure 1, T near x must have complicated structure; perhaps for example having infinite topology at x .

Previously, Theorem 4.33 was shown in case $\alpha = 1$, see Theorem 5.3 of [9]. In case $n = 2$, Theorem 6.5 of [9] shows that Theorem 4.33 holds for general $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Hence, to prove Theorem 4.33 we only need to consider the case $n \geq 3$, with in particular $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

1.1 Proof of Theorem 4.33

The proof of Theorem 4.33 follows the general strategy set by the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9]. The key is to consider *half-regular* singular points of ∂T . These points are defined in Lemma 3.5, which we roughly describe:

Lemma 3.5: *Suppose T is an n -dimensional area-minimizing locally rectifiable current in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary ∂T for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. If x is a singular point of ∂T , then for any $\rho > 0$ there exists \mathbf{x} in the singular set of ∂T with $|\mathbf{x} - x| < \rho$ and a non-empty open set $U \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ so that $\mathbf{x} \in \partial U$ and the support of ∂T in U is a union of disjoint non-empty $(n - 1)$ -dimensional submanifolds; we call such an \mathbf{x} a half-regular point of T .*

This is Lemma 3.8 of [9], but we give it here for convenience. A version of Lemma 3.5 also appears as Lemma 1 of [7] in the context of two-dimensional solutions to the c -Plateau problem in space. To prove Theorem 4.33, we must show the following asymptotic description of T at half-regular points.

Lemma 4.1: *Suppose T is an n -dimensional area-minimizing locally rectifiable current in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary ∂T for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, where ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature. If \mathbf{x} is a half-regular point of T , then every tangent cone of T at \mathbf{x} is a sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation (see Definition 3.2).*

Succinctly, Definition 3.2 defines a *sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation* to be a current given by integrating over a union of half-hyperplanes meeting along a common $(n - 1)$ -dimensional subspace of \mathbf{R}^{n+1} , where the half-hyperplanes are oriented analogously to Figure 1.

The proof of Lemma 4.1 follows through naturally. Suppose for contradiction that (after translation) $0 \in \text{spt } \partial T$ is a half-regular point of T with a tangent cone which is not a sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation. Then we will see that Theorem 3.4 implies that (after rotation) T near 0 is supported in the graph of a function u defined off \mathbf{R}^n . By definition of half-regular points, we conclude there is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ subset $\Omega \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ with $0 \in \partial\Omega$ so that $\text{spt } \partial T \cap (\Omega \times \mathbf{R})$ is a union of *disjoint* non-empty $(n - 1)$ -dimensional submanifolds contained in the graph of u . The proof of Theorem 4.32 then concludes by applying a generalization of the Hopf boundary point lemma to ∂T at 0, using that ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature.

Given Lemma 4.1, then the proof of Theorem 4.33 follows word-for-word as in the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9], which shows Theorem 4.33 in case $\alpha = 1$.

Indeed, the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9] is very geometric, given Lemma 5.1 of [9] which concludes the same asymptotic result at half-regular points as Lemma 4.1 but in case $\alpha = 1$. Thus, the majority of our work involves proving Lemma 4.1.

The proof of Lemma 5.1 of [9] concludes by applying the usual Hopf boundary point lemma (see for example Lemma 3.4 of [6]), since $\alpha = 1$ in that case. Here, to prove Lemma 4.1 for general $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, we must apply a more general version of the Hopf boundary point lemma recently proved by the author in [8]. We state the needed version as Lemma A.16 for convenience in the Appendix. Succinctly, as needed here, Lemma A.16 states that the Hopf boundary point lemma holds for $C^{1,\alpha}$ weak solutions s of equations of the form

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i (a^{ij} \overline{D}_j s) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c^i \overline{D}_i s + ds = 0$$

over a $C^{1,\alpha}$ domain, where the a^{ij} are (as usual) $C^{0,\alpha}$ and uniformly elliptic, c^i are bounded, but we can assume $d \in L^q$ for some $q > n - 1$. More generally, [8] shows the Hopf boundary point lemma holds assuming the lower-order coefficients are merely in a *Morrey space*.

1.2 Future Work

A tempting conjecture to make is that the conclusion of Theorem 4.33 holds without the initial regularity assumption.

Conjecture: *Suppose T is an n -dimensional area-minimizing locally rectifiable current in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} with $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary ∂T for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, where ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature. If x is a singular point of ∂T , then near x the support of T equals a finite union of orientable $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary, which pairwise meet only along common boundary points.*

However, much work is needed in this direction. It may at least be possible to show that T has unique tangent cone at every singular point x of ∂T . Contrarily, there is no hope to extend the present results in the case of general n -dimensional area-minimizing currents in \mathbf{R}^{n+k} ; this is discussed in the last paragraph of Section 1.3 of [9].

1.3 Outline

We start in §2 by setting some notation, as well as recalling a few well-known facts about currents we shall need. Next, in §3 we precisely define $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundaries and boundaries having Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature; these are Definitions 3.1,3.6 respectively. We as well state for convenience the results from [9] which we shall need. In §4 we state and prove our main results, beginning with the asymptotic description near half-regular points Lemma 3.5 and concluding with the statement of our main result Theorem 4.33. We note that we omit the explicit proof of Theorem 4.33, as it is virtually identical to the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9]. Finally, in the Appendix, for convenience we make some calculations in Lemma A.1 needed in the proof of Lemma 3.5, and state the general Hopf boundary point lemma needed here in Lemma A.16.

1.4 Acknowledgements

This work was partly conducted by the author while visiting the Korea Institute for Advanced Study, as an Associate Member.

2 Notation

We list basic notation and terminology we shall use throughout.

- \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{R} will denote the natural and real numbers respectively. We shall let $n \in \mathbf{N}$ with $n \geq 2$. In this section we will let $\hat{n} \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- We shall typically write points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. Depending on context, we shall let

$$\mathbf{R}^{\hat{n}} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{n}}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{n}} \in \mathbf{R}\}.$$

We shall typically write points

$$\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}) = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}, 0, 0, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{n-2} \text{ (if } n \geq 3),$$

$$z = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}) = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1}, 0, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}, \text{ and}$$

$$y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_n, 0) \in \mathbf{R}^n.$$

We will let 0 denote the zero vector in different dimensions, depending on context.

- If $n \geq 3$, for each $\hat{n} \in \{n-2, n-1, n\}$ let $\mathbf{p}_{\hat{n}} : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{\hat{n}}$ denote the projection

$$\mathbf{p}_{\hat{n}}(x) = (x_1, \dots, x_{\hat{n}}).$$

- Let e_1, \dots, e_{n+1} be the standard basis vectors for \mathbf{R}^{n+1} .
- For $A \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, let $\text{clos } A$ denote the closure of A .
- We shall let $B_\rho(x)$ be the open ball in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} of radius $\rho > 0$ centered at x . For $x \in \mathbf{R}^{\hat{n}}$, we write $B_\rho^{\hat{n}}(x) = B_\rho(x) \cap \mathbf{R}^{\hat{n}}$.
- For $x \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and $\lambda > 0$, we let $\eta_{x,\lambda} : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ be the map $\eta_{x,\lambda}(\hat{x}) = \frac{\hat{x}-x}{\lambda}$. We shall make use of $\eta_{-x,1}$, which is translation by x .
- We let $* : \bigwedge_n \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ be the Hopf map

$$* \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i (-1)^{i-1} e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i-1} \wedge e_{i+1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{n+1} \right) = (-1)^n \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_i e_i.$$

Note that $*(e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_n) = e_{n+1}$.

- We shall let D denote differentiation generally over \mathbf{R}^{n+1} or $\mathbf{R}^{\hat{n}}$, depending on context. In the proof of Lemmas 4.1,A.1,A.16 we will let \overline{D} denote differentiation over \mathbf{R}^{n-1} and \underline{D} differentiation over \mathbf{R}^{n-2} , for emphasis.

Also in the proof of Lemmas 4.1,A.1 we will consider functions $F = F(y, p)$ with $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ (in particular, for G^{ij} and H as in (4.17)). We denote with $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ the following derivatives: $\overline{D}_k F$ is the derivative of F with respect to the y_k -variable; $D_n F$ is the derivative of F with respect to the y_n -variable; $\frac{\partial F}{\partial p_k}$ is the derivative of F with respect to the p_k -variable.

- $\mathcal{H}^{\hat{n}}$ shall denote \hat{n} -dimensional Hausdorff measure in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} .

We now give notation related to currents in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} . For a thorough introduction to currents, see [5],[10].

- Recall that $\mathcal{D}^{\hat{n}}(U)$ denotes for $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ an open set the smooth \hat{n} -forms compactly supported in U .

- For T a current in $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ an open set and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, we denote $f_{\#}T$ the push-forward current of T by f ; we shall frequently make use of $\eta_{x,\lambda\#}T$ and in particular the translation $\eta_{-x,1\#}T$.
- We say a current \mathbb{C} is a cone if $\eta_{0,\lambda\#}\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}$ for every $\lambda > 0$.
- Given an orientable \hat{n} -dimensional submanifold $M \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, we denote $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ the associated multiplicity one current, given an orientation.
- Denote by $\mathbf{E}^{\hat{n}}$ the \hat{n} -dimensional current in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} given by $\mathbf{E}^{\hat{n}}(\omega) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^{\hat{n}}} \langle \omega, e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_{\hat{n}} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{\hat{n}}$ for $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{\hat{n}}(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$.
- For $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ an open set and T an \hat{n} -dimensional current in U , we let μ_T denote the associated mass measure of T . This is given for \hat{U} an open subset of U by $\mu_T(\hat{U}) = \sup_{\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{\hat{n}}(\hat{U}), |\omega| \leq 1} T(\omega)$. As usual, we set $\text{spt } T = \text{spt } \mu_T$.

For A a μ_T -measurable set, we let $T \llcorner A$ denote the restriction current $(T \llcorner A)(\omega) = \int_A \langle \omega, \vec{T} \rangle d\mu_T$ for $\omega \in \mathcal{D}^{\hat{n}}(U)$, where \vec{T} is the orientation vector of T .

Given $x \in U$, we denote the density of T at x by

$$\Theta_T(x) = \lim_{\rho \searrow 0} \frac{\mu_T(B_\rho(x))}{\rho^{\hat{n}} \mathcal{H}^{\hat{n}}(B_1^{\hat{n}}(0))},$$

whenever this limit exists.

- Given $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ an open set, we let $\mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}(U)$ be the set of \hat{n} -dimensional currents T so that $T, \partial T$ are respectively \hat{n} - and $(\hat{n} - 1)$ -rectifiable integer multiplicity.

For $T \in \mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}$, we let $T_x T$ denote the approximate tangent space of T for the μ_T -almost-every $x \in U$ such that this space exists; naturally, we let $T_x^\perp T$ denote the orthogonal complement of $T_x T$ in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} .

- For $T \in \mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}(U)$, we denote δT to be the first variation of mass, given by

$$\delta T(X) = \int \text{div}_T X d\mu_T$$

for $X \in C_c^1(U; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$.

We say that T has mean curvature $H_T : U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ if H_T is μ_T -measurable and if

$$\delta T(X) = \int X \cdot H_T \, d\mu_T$$

for every $X \in C_c^1(U; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$

- For $T \in \mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}(U)$, we let $\text{reg } T$ denote the regular set of T : the set of $x \in \text{spt } T$ so that there is a $\rho > 0$ such that $T \llcorner B_\rho(x) = \theta \llbracket M \rrbracket$ for $\theta \in \mathbf{N}$ and M an \hat{n} -dimensional orientable (embedded) C^1 submanifold of $B_\rho(x)$. We define the singular set $\text{sing } T = \text{spt } T \setminus \text{reg } T$.
- We say $T \in \mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}(U)$ is area-minimizing if $\mu_T(\hat{U}) \leq \mu_R(\hat{U})$ whenever $\hat{U} \subset U$ is an open set with $\text{clos } \hat{U} \subset U$ and $R \in \mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}(U)$ with $\partial R = \partial T$ and $\text{spt}(T - R) \subset \hat{U}$.
- For $T \in \mathbf{I}_{\hat{n},loc}(U)$ area-minimizing there is, by Lemma 3.1 of [3] (see as well (2.10) of [4]), a $\mu_{\partial T}$ -measurable vectorfield $\nu_T : U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ satisfying $|\nu_T| \leq 1$ for $\mu_{\partial T}$ -almost-everywhere so that

$$\delta T(X) = \int \nu_T \cdot X \, d\mu_{\partial T}$$

for every $X \in C_c^1(U; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$. We call ν_T the generalized outward pointing normal of ∂T with respect to T . Note that since $|\delta T(X)| \leq \int |X \wedge \vec{\partial T}| \, d\mu_{\partial T}$ by Lemma 3.1 of [3] (see also (2.9) of [4]) for $X \in C_c^1(U; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$, we conclude $\nu_T(x) \in T_x^\perp \partial T$ for $\mu_{\partial T}$ -almost-every $x \in U$.

3 Definitions and previous results

We now state for convenience the necessary results and definitions from [9]. We begin by defining precisely what it means to have $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary.

Definition 3.1. *Let $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ be an open subset and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. We define $\mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ to be the set of area-minimizing $T \in \mathbf{I}_{n,loc}(U)$ so that ∂T is*

locally $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed: for every $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$ there is $\rho > 0$, an orthogonal rotation Q , and $N \in \mathbf{N}$ so that

$$\partial T \llcorner B_\rho(x) = (-1)^n \sum_{\ell=1}^N m_\ell \left[(\eta_{-x,1} \circ Q \circ \Phi_{T,\ell})_\# (\mathbf{E}^{n-1} \llcorner B_\rho^{n-1}(0)) \right] \llcorner B_\rho(x),$$

where for each $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ we have $m_\ell \in \mathbf{N}$, and $\Phi_{T,\ell} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_\rho^{n-1}(0); \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ is the map

$$\Phi_{T,\ell}(z) = (z, \varphi_{T,\ell}(z), \psi_{T,\ell}(z)),$$

where $\varphi_{T,\ell}, \psi_{T,\ell} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_\rho^{n-1}(0))$ satisfy

$$\varphi_{T,\ell}(0) = \psi_{T,\ell}(0) = 0 \text{ and } D\varphi_{T,\ell}(0) = D\psi_{T,\ell}(0) = 0.$$

This is Definition 3.1 of [9] in case $k = 1$. Observe that we could define what it means for a current to have $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary in general. But we include the requirement that $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ must be area-minimizing for future brevity. Observe that if $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ then the approximate tangent space $T_x \partial T$ exists for every $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$.

In order to clearly state our results, we will state Definition 3.3. First, to better understand Definition 3.3 and for convenience, we state Lemma 3.2 of [9].

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $\mathbb{C} \in \mathbf{I}_{n,loc}(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ is an area-minimizing cone with $\partial \mathbb{C} = m(-1)^n Q_\# \mathbf{E}^{n-1}$ for some $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and an orthogonal rotation Q . Then \mathbb{C} is of one of the following two forms:*

- (1) *There is $N \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and distinct orthogonal rotations Q_1, \dots, Q_N about \mathbf{R}^{n-1} so that*

$$\mathbb{C} = \sum_{k=1}^N m_k (Q \circ Q_k)_\# (\mathbf{E}^n \llcorner \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : y_n > 0\}),$$

where $m_1, \dots, m_N \in \mathbf{N}$ satisfy $\sum_{k=1}^N m_k = m$.

- (2) *There is $\theta \in \mathbf{N}$ so that*

$$\mathbb{C} = Q_\# \left((m + \theta) \mathbf{E}^n \llcorner \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : y_n > 0\} + \theta \mathbf{E}^n \llcorner \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : y_n < 0\} \right).$$

Proof. See the proof of Lemma 3.2 of [9]. □

We thus give the following definition:

Definition 3.3. *Suppose $\mathbb{C} \in \mathbf{I}_{n,loc}(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$. If \mathbb{C} is as in (1) of Lemma 3.2, then we say that \mathbb{C} is a sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation. If \mathbb{C} is as in (2) of Lemma 3.2, then we say that \mathbb{C} is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity.*

We now state the main result of [9], which is needed to prove Lemma 3.5. We need Theorem 3.4 so that we can apply the general Hopf boundary point lemma of [8] to prove Lemma 3.5.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ be an open set, $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$. Suppose $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$ and that T at x has a tangent cone which is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity (as in Definition 3.3). Then there is a $\rho \in \text{dist}(0, \text{dist}(x, \partial U))$ and a solution to the minimal surface equation $u \in C^\infty(B_\rho^n(0))$ with $u(0) = 0$ and $Du(0) = 0$ such that*

$$\text{spt } T \cap B_\rho(x) = \eta_{-x,1}(Q(\text{graph}_{B_\rho^n(0)} u)) \cap B_\rho(x)$$

for an orthogonal rotation Q . The orientation vector for T is given by

$$*\vec{T}(\tilde{x}) = Q \left(\left(\frac{-Du}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{p}_n(Q^{-1}(\tilde{x}-x))} \right)$$

if $\tilde{x} \in \text{spt } T \cap B_\rho(x)$.

Proof. This is Theorem 3.18 of [9]. Note that we should have, as stated above, $\mathbf{p}_n(Q^{-1}(\tilde{x}-x))$ and not $\text{proj}_{\mathbf{R}^n} \tilde{x}$ as stated in [9]. \square

Next, we state a lemma which consequentially defines (and shows the existence of) *half-regular* points at the boundary of $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}$ near any singular point of ∂T . As previously noted, half-regular points were previously used to prove a main result of [9], which we wish to extend here in Theorem 4.33. Lemma 3.5 is a simpler, but sufficient, version of Lemma 3.8 of [9].

Lemma 3.5. *Let U be an open subset of \mathbf{R}^{n+1} , $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$. Suppose $x \in \text{sing } \partial T$ and that $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(x, \partial U))$ is as in Definition 3.1, so that*

$$\partial T \llcorner B_\rho(x) = (-1)^n \sum_{\ell=1}^N m_\ell \left[(\eta_{-x,1} \circ Q \circ \Phi_{T,\ell})_\# (\mathbf{E}^{n-1} \llcorner B_\rho^{n-1}(0)) \right] \llcorner B_\rho(x)$$

for $N, m_1, \dots, m_N \in \mathbf{N}$, an orthogonal rotation Q , and $\Phi_{T,\ell} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_\rho^{n-1}(0); \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, N$. Then there is $\mathbf{z} \in B_\rho^{n-1}(0)$, a radius $\sigma \in (0, \rho - |\mathbf{z}|]$, and distinct $\ell, \tilde{\ell} \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ so that

- $(\eta_{-x,1} \circ Q \circ \Phi_{T,\ell})(B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cup (\eta_{-x,1} \circ Q \circ \Phi_{T,\tilde{\ell}})(B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \subset \text{reg } \partial T$,
- $\Phi_{T,\ell}(B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cap \Phi_{T,\tilde{\ell}}(B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) = \emptyset$,
- $\Phi_{T,\ell}(\partial B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cap \Phi_{T,\tilde{\ell}}(\partial B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \neq \emptyset$.

With this, we say any point

$$\mathbf{x} \in \Phi_{T,\ell}(\partial B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cap \Phi_{T,\tilde{\ell}}(\partial B_\sigma^{n-1}(\mathbf{z}))$$

is half-regular.

Proof. Follows directly from the statement of Lemma 3.8 of [9]. □

Finally, we precisely define what it means for an area-minimizing current T to have boundary with Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature. This and Definition 3.1 are our main concepts.

Definition 3.6. *Let U be an open subset of \mathbf{R}^{n+1} , and suppose $T \in \mathbf{I}_{n,\text{loc}}(U)$ is area-minimizing. We say ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature if ∂T has mean curvature $H_{\partial T} = h\nu_T$ for $h : U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ a Lipschitz function, where $\nu_T : U \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the generalized outward pointing normal of ∂T with respect to T ; this means that*

$$\int \text{div}_{\partial T} X \, d\mu_{\partial T} = \int X \cdot (h\nu_T) \, d\mu_{\partial T}$$

for all $X \in C_c^1(U; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$.

The assumption that T is area-minimizing in Definition 3.6 is merely to guarantee the existence of the generalized outward pointing unit normal ν_T of ∂T with respect to T ; see Lemma 3.1 of [3] and (2.10) of [4]. Definition 3.6 is a more specific version of Definition 4.1 of [9], which does not require h to be Lipschitz.

4 Main results and proofs

We now put our two main concepts together, and study co-dimension one area-minimizing currents T with boundary being both $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed and having co-oriented Lipschitz mean curvature. Again, our main result is Theorem 4.33, which states that near any $x \in \text{sing } \partial T$ of such a current T , either T near x exhibits a reasonable amount of regularity (as in Figure 1) or $\text{spt } T$ near x must be extremely irregular. To prove Theorem 4.33, we must prove Theorem 4.32, which states that the boundary ∂T of any such current T is regular near any point $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$ such that T at x has tangent cone which is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity. Given Theorem 4.32, then the proof of Theorem 4.33 is virtually identical to the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9].

To prove Theorem 4.32 we must prove Lemma 4.1, which shows that if $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$ is half-regular (see Lemma 3.5), then every tangent cone of T at x must be a sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation. The proof of Lemma 4.1 will take the majority of this section.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ be an open set, and suppose $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ where ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature $H_{\partial T} = h\nu_T$. For any $x \in \text{sing } \partial T$, there is $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(x, \partial U))$ so that for any half-regular $\mathbf{x} \in \text{sing } \partial T \cap B_\rho(x)$ (see Lemma 3.5), every tangent cone of T at \mathbf{x} is the sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation (see Definition 3.3).*

Proof. Suppose (after translation) $x = 0 \in \text{sing } \partial T$. Observe that $\mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U) \subseteq \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\beta}(U)$ for each $\beta \in (0, \alpha]$. Replacing α with any $\hat{\alpha} \in (0, \min\{\alpha, \frac{n-2}{n-1}\})$, we can then suppose by Definition 3.1, and after a rotation if necessary, that there is a $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(0, \partial U))$ such that there are $N, m_1, \dots, m_N \in \mathbf{N}$ and maps $\Phi_{T,\ell}(z) = (z, \varphi_{T,\ell}(z), \psi_{T,\ell}(z))$ for $z \in B_\rho^{n-1}(0)$ and each $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ so that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial T \llcorner B_\rho(0) &= (-1)^n \sum_{\ell=1}^N m_\ell \Phi_{T,\ell\#}(\mathbf{E}^{n-1} \llcorner B_\rho^{n-1}(0)) \llcorner B_\rho(0) \\ &\text{with } \varphi_{T,\ell}, \psi_{T,\ell} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_\rho^{n-1}(0)) \text{ for } \alpha \in \left(0, \frac{n-2}{n-1}\right), \text{ satisfying} \\ &\varphi_{T,\ell}(0) = \psi_{T,\ell}(0) = 0 \text{ and } \overline{D}\varphi_{T,\ell}(0) = \overline{D}\psi_{T,\ell}(0) = 0; \end{aligned}$$

recall that we shall let \overline{D} denote differentiation over \mathbf{R}^{n-1} , for emphasis (see the ninth item in §2). We can also choose $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(x, \partial U))$ sufficiently small depending on $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$, to be determined later, so that

$$(4.3) \quad \|\overline{D}\varphi_{T,\ell}\|_{C(B_{\rho}^{n-1}(0))}, \|\overline{D}\psi_{T,\ell}\|_{C(B_{\rho}^{n-1}(0))} < \epsilon.$$

Suppose $\mathbf{x} \in \text{spt } \partial T \cap B_{\rho/4}(0)$ is a half-regular point. Thus, by Lemma 3.5 there is $\mathbf{z} \in B_{\rho/4}^{n-1}(0)$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\rho}{12})$ such that (after relabeling)

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(\mathbf{x})| &= 3\sigma, \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \Phi_{T,1}(\partial B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cap \Phi_{T,2}(\partial B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})), \\ \Phi_{T,1}(B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cup \Phi_{T,2}(B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) &\subset \text{reg } \partial T, \text{ and} \\ \Phi_{T,1}(B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \cap \Phi_{T,2}(B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) &= \emptyset; \end{aligned}$$

note that in applying Lemma 3.5 we have replaced σ with 3σ .

Consider any tangent cone \mathbb{C} of T at \mathbf{x} . Then \mathbb{C} is area-minimizing and by (4.2) there is an orthogonal rotation Q so that

$$\partial \mathbb{C} = \left(\sum_{\{\ell \in \{1, \dots, N\} : \mathbf{x} \in \Phi_{T,\ell}(B_{\rho}^{n-1}(0))\}} m_{\ell} \right) (-1)^n Q_{\#} \mathbf{E}^{n-1}.$$

We conclude by Lemma 3.2 and Definition 3.3 that \mathbb{C} is either a sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation or a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity. Suppose for contradiction that \mathbb{C} is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity. After applying Theorem 3.4 to T at \mathbf{x} , our goal is to apply Lemma A.16 (a Hopf boundary point lemma) to ∂T at \mathbf{x} , with (4.4) in mind, in order to yield a contradiction. To properly do so will require that we carefully set some notation.

Proceeding, and to be clear, we assume for contradiction by (4.2),(4.3) that there is $m, \theta \in \mathbf{N}$ so that

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{C} &= (Q \circ R)_{\#} \left((m + \theta) \mathbf{E}^n \llcorner \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : y_n > 0\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \theta \mathbf{E}^n \llcorner \{y \in \mathbf{R}^n : y_n < 0\} \right) \\ &\text{for an orthogonal rotation } R \text{ about } \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \\ &\text{and an orthogonal rotation } Q \text{ with } \|Q - I_{n+1}\| < \mathcal{C}\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

where I_{n+1} is the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ identity matrix and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$; note that we mean R fixes \mathbf{R}^{n-1} . Also, Q is such that $Q(\mathbf{R}^{n-1}) = T_{\mathbf{x}}\partial T$. Observe as well that if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small then $|\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(R^{-1}(Q^{-1}(z)))| \geq 2$ for all $z \in \partial B_3^{n-1}(0)$. We can thus take S an orthogonal rotation so that by (4.4)

$$(4.6) \quad S \left(\frac{\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(R^{-1}(Q^{-1}(\eta_{\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(\mathbf{x}), \sigma}(\mathbf{z}))))}{|\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(R^{-1}(Q^{-1}(\eta_{\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(\mathbf{x}), \sigma}(\mathbf{z}))))|} \right) = e_{n-1},$$

$$S(e_n) = e_n, \quad S(e_{n+1}) = e_{n+1}.$$

We shall use S so that we can define a region $\hat{\Omega}$ over which we can apply Lemma A.16 as stated.

We now translate and rotate T so that we can apply Lemma A.16 at the origin. Define the orthogonal rotation and the current respectively

$$(4.7) \quad \hat{Q} = S \circ R^{-1} \circ Q^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{T} = (\hat{Q} \circ \eta_{\mathbf{x}, \sigma})_{\#} T.$$

We now choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$, as well as $\mathbf{z} \in B_{\rho/4}^{n-1}(0)$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\rho}{12})$ as described if necessary, so that the following three occur.

First, choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small so that by (4.3),(4.4),(4.6),(4.7) (in particular the first identity of (4.6)) we have for each $\ell = 1, 2$

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & (B_1^{n-2}(0) \times (-3, 3)) \cap (\mathbf{p}_{n-1} \circ \hat{Q} \circ \eta_{\mathbf{x}, \sigma} \circ \Phi_{T, \ell})(B_{3\sigma}^{n-1}(\mathbf{z})) \\ & = \{z \in B_1^{n-2}(0) \times (-3, 3) : z_{n-1} > w_\ell(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))\} \subset B_7^{n-1}(0) \\ & \text{where } w_\ell \in C^{1, \alpha}(B_1^{n-2}(0)) \text{ satisfies} \\ & w_\ell(0) = 0, \quad \underline{D}w_\ell(0) = 0, \quad \text{and } \|w_\ell\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(B_1^{n-2}(0))} < \epsilon; \end{aligned}$$

recall that we shall let \underline{D} denote differentiation over \mathbf{R}^{n-2} , for emphasis (see the ninth item in §2). The functions w_ℓ shall be used to define the region $\hat{\Omega}$ over which we shall apply Lemma A.16. But the next step will be necessary to define $\hat{\Omega}$.

Second, taking $\sigma > 0$ smaller and \mathbf{z} closer to \mathbf{x} in that direction if necessary (more specifically, replacing σ with $\hat{\sigma} \in (0, \sigma)$ and \mathbf{z} with $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{x} + \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{3}(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(\mathbf{x}))$), we can assume $\mathbf{z} \in B_{\rho/4}^{n-1}(0)$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\rho}{12})$ are such that (4.4),(4.8) still hold while by (4.2),(4.5),(4.6),(4.7) we have that Definition 3.1 holds for \hat{T} at the origin with radius = 8 : there are

$\hat{N}, \hat{m}_1, \dots, \hat{m}_{\hat{N}} \in \mathbf{N}$ and maps $\Phi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(z) = (z, \varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(z), \psi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(z))$ for $z \in B_8^{n-1}(0)$ and each $\ell = 1, \dots, \hat{N}$ so that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial \hat{T} \lrcorner B_8(0) &= (-1)^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\hat{N}} \hat{m}_\ell \Phi_{\hat{T}, \ell\#}(\mathbf{E}^{n-1} \lrcorner B_8^{n-1}(0)) \lrcorner B_8(0) \\ &\text{with } \varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}, \psi_{\hat{T}, \ell} \in C^{1, \alpha}(B_8^{n-1}(0)) \text{ satisfying} \\ \varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(0) &= \psi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(0) = 0, \quad \overline{D}\varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(0) = \overline{D}\psi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(0) = 0, \text{ and} \\ \|\varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(B_8^{n-1}(0))}, \|\psi_{\hat{T}, \ell}\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(B_8^{n-1}(0))} &< \epsilon; \end{aligned}$$

note that $8\sigma < \frac{3\rho}{4}$ and $\hat{N} \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. After relabeling, we define and conclude by (4.4), (4.7), (4.8), (4.9) and Definition 3.1 that

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} w(\xi) &= \max\{w_1(\xi), w_2(\xi)\} \text{ for } \xi \in B_1^{n-2}(0), \\ \Omega &= \{z \in B_1^{n-2}(0) \times (-3, 3) : z_{n-1} > w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))\}, \\ 0 &\in \Phi_{\hat{T}, 1}(\partial\Omega) \cap \Phi_{\hat{T}, 2}(\partial\Omega), \\ \Phi_{\hat{T}, 1}(\Omega) \cup \Phi_{\hat{T}, 2}(\Omega) &\subset \text{reg } \partial \hat{T}, \text{ and} \\ \Phi_{\hat{T}, 1}(\Omega) \cap \Phi_{\hat{T}, 2}(\Omega) &= \emptyset, \\ &\text{with } w \in C^{1, \alpha}(B_1^{n-2}(0)) \text{ satisfying} \\ w(0) &= 0, \quad \underline{D}w(0) = 0, \text{ and } \|w\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(B_1^{n-2}(0))} < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We will later modify the function w , for technical reasons, in order to define the region $\hat{\Omega}$ over which we will apply Lemma A.16 to yield a contradiction.

Third, we can also assume $\mathbf{z} \in B_{\rho/4}^{n-1}(0)$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{\rho}{12})$ are such that (4.8), (4.9), (4.10) continue to hold while Theorem 3.4 holds for \hat{T} at the origin with radius = 8. More specifically, by (4.5), (4.6), (4.7) and Theorem 3.4 there is $u \in C^\infty(B_8^n(0))$ so that

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{spt } \hat{T} \cap B_8(0) &= \text{graph}_{B_8^n(0)} u \cap B_8(0), \\ u(0) &= 0 \text{ and } Du(0) = 0 \text{ with } \|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))} < \epsilon, \\ * \hat{T}(y, u(y)) &= \frac{(-Du(y), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |Du(y)|^2}} \text{ for } (y, u(y)) \in B_8(0); \end{aligned}$$

note that we specifically used $S(e_{n+1}) = e_{n+1}$ by (4.6). The graph of u , together with Definition 3.6, will allow us to compute the appropriate

uniformly elliptic weak equation satisfied by ∂T (heuristically speaking), to which we will apply Lemma A.16.

Consider $\varphi_{\hat{T},\ell}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Our goal is to show that we can apply Lemma A.16 to $s = \varphi_{\hat{T},2} - \varphi_{\hat{T},1}$ at the origin. For this, fix $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and for simplicity of notation (until otherwise stated) write $\varphi = \varphi_{\hat{T},\ell}$. We must show φ satisfies a divergence-form equation. We do so in the following four steps, which will require setting some notation.

First note that by (4.9),(4.11) with $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small we have

$$(4.12) \quad \Phi_{\hat{T},\ell}(\Omega) = \{(z, \varphi(z), u(z, \varphi(z))) : z \in \Omega\}.$$

To further simplify notation, define for $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $z \in \Omega$

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{h}(y) &= \sigma h\left((\hat{Q} \circ \eta_{\mathbf{x},\sigma})^{-1}(y, u(y))\right), \\ u_i(y) &= D_i u(y) = e_i \cdot Du(y) \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ \varphi_j(z) &= \overline{D}_j \varphi(z) = e_j \cdot \overline{D} \varphi(z) \text{ and} \\ \partial_j(z) &= (e_j, \varphi_j(z), u_j(z, \varphi(z)) + u_n(z, \varphi(z))) \varphi_j(z) \\ &\text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where recall for emphasis we let \overline{D} be the gradient over \mathbf{R}^{n-1} .

Second, consider the downward pointing unit normal of the graph of φ over Ω within the graph of u . This is given by $\nu(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D} \varphi(z))$ for $z \in \Omega$ where we define $\nu : B_8^n(0) \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ by

$$(4.14) \quad \nu(y, p) = \frac{\left((p, -1, 0) + \left(\frac{(p, -1) \cdot Du(y)}{1 + |Du(y)|^2} \right) (-Du(y), 1) \right)}{\sqrt{1 + |p|^2 - \frac{((p, -1) \cdot Du(y))^2}{1 + |Du(y)|^2}}}$$

for $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$.

Third, we define the matrix giving the metric tensor of $\Phi_{T,\ell}(B_8^{n-1}(0))$, and the entries of its inverse. For each $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$ define

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} g(p, q) &= I_{n-1} + (1 + q_n^2)pp^T + q_n(p\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)^T + \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)p^T) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)^T, \text{ and} \\ g^{ij}(p, q) &= e_i \cdot g(p, q)^{-1} e_j \text{ for } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where I_{n-1} is the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ identity matrix; g is generally invertible, but we may by (4.9),(4.11) restrict g to $|p|, |q|$ small. Consequentially, we can choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$(4.16) \quad \|g(p, q) - I_{n-1}\| < \epsilon \text{ and } \|g(p, q)^{-1} - I_{n-1}\| < \epsilon$$

for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ whenever $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$ and $q \in B_\epsilon^n(0)$.

Fourth, we apply Definition 3.6. Take any $\zeta \in C_c^1(\Omega)$. Using Definition 3.6 with the vector field

$$X(x) = Z(x)\zeta(\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(x))e_n \text{ for } x \in \Omega \times \mathbf{R}^2,$$

where $Z : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a function of the form $Z(x) = Z(x_n, x_{n+1})$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, we can show using as well (4.7),(4.9)-(4.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} g^{ij}(\overline{D}\varphi(z), Du(z, \varphi(z))) \\ \times D_{\partial_i(z)}(\zeta(z)e_n) \cdot \partial_j(z) \\ \times \sqrt{\det(g(\overline{D}\varphi(z), Du(z, \varphi(z))))} \end{array} \right\} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z) \\ &= \int \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \hat{h}(z, \varphi(z), u(z, \varphi(z))) \\ \times \nu(z, \varphi(z), u(z, \varphi(z))) \cdot \zeta(z)e_n \\ \times \sqrt{\det(g(\overline{D}\varphi(z), Du(z, \varphi(z))))} \end{array} \right\} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Computing using (4.13),(4.14), we conclude φ is a weak solution over Ω to the divergence-form equation

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i(G^{ij}(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z))\overline{D}_j\varphi(z)) = H(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z)) \text{ with} \\ & G^{ij}(y, p) = \sqrt{\det(g(p, Du(y)))}g^{ij}(p, Du(y)) \text{ and} \\ & H(y, p) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \hat{h}(y, u(y)) \left(\frac{1 + \left(\frac{(p,-1) \cdot Du(y)}{1+|Du(y)|^2} \right) u_n(y)}{\sqrt{1 + |p|^2 - \frac{((p,-1) \cdot Du(y))^2}{1+|Du(y)|^2}}} \right) \\ \times \sqrt{\det(g(p, Du(y)))} \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, where

$G^{ij} \in C^\infty(B_8^n(0) \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$ for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and

$H : B_8^n(0) \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is Lipschitz.

Choosing $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small, we conclude by (4.11),(4.16) that

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} G^{ij}(y,p)\hat{p}_i\hat{p}_j \geq \frac{3}{4}|\hat{p}|^2 \text{ for all } \hat{p} \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$$

whenever $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$.

Before we set and consider $s = \varphi_{\hat{T},2} - \varphi_{\hat{T},1}$ (to which we shall apply Lemma A.16), we must use (4.17) to derive second derivative estimates for φ . Since $\varphi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ by (4.9), then standard Schauder theory together with (4.17),(4.18) imply $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$. One can show this more directly using the gradient estimates from [6] and difference quotient methods. The calculations which follow illustrate the argument.

Define and conclude by (4.10) with $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{w}(\xi) &= 2w(\xi) + 4\epsilon|\xi|^{1+\alpha} \text{ for } \xi \in B_1^{n-2}(0) \text{ where} \\ \hat{w} &\in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1^{n-2}(0)) \text{ satisfies} \\ \hat{w}(0) &= 0, \quad \underline{D}\hat{w}(0) = 0 \text{ and } \|\underline{D}\hat{w}\|_{C(B_1^{n-2}(0))} < 6\epsilon, \\ \hat{\Omega} &= \{z \in B_1^{n-2}(0) \times (-3, 3) : z_{n-1} > \hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))\}, \\ \hat{\Omega} &\subset \Omega \cap \{z \in B_1^{n-2}(0) \times (0, 3) : z_{n-1} > 2\epsilon|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)|^{1+\alpha}\}, \\ \text{and } \text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z}) &\subset \Omega \text{ when } \hat{z} \in \hat{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show the last claim. Fix $\hat{z} \in \hat{\Omega}$, then the fifth item of (4.19) implies $\hat{z}_{n-1} > 0$. Moreover, for any $z \in \text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})$ we have by (4.10) and the definition of $\hat{w}, \hat{\Omega}$ with $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) \in (0, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned} z_{n-1} &= w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)) + \hat{z}_{n-1} + z_{n-1} - \hat{z}_{n-1} \\ &\quad + w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(\hat{z})) - w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)) - w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(\hat{z})) \\ &\geq w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)) + \hat{z}_{n-1} - |z_{n-1} - \hat{z}_{n-1}| \\ &\quad - \epsilon|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(\hat{z}) - \mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)| - w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(\hat{z})) \\ &\geq w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)) + \frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{2} - w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(\hat{z})) \\ &> w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)) + 2\epsilon|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)|^{1+\alpha} \geq w(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)). \end{aligned}$$

We now note that $\hat{\Omega}$ is precisely the region over which we shall apply Lemma A.16. But now we bound the second derivative of φ over $\hat{\Omega}$.

Since $\text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z}) \subset \Omega$, we can consider $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z}))$ and integrate (4.17) against $\overline{D}_k \zeta$ with $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ fixed. Recalling that $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$ by Schauder theory, then using integration by parts we can define and conclude with $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ fixed that

$$\varphi_k = \overline{D}_k \varphi \in C^{1,\alpha}(\text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z}))$$

is a weak solution over $B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})$ to the equation

$$(4.20) \quad \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i (A^{ij} \overline{D}_j \varphi_k) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i (B^i \varphi_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i F^i$$

where by (4.9),(4.17) for $z \in \text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})$ and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ we define

$$A^{ij}(z) = G^{ij}(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z)) + \sum_{\hat{j}=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\partial G^{i\hat{j}}}{\partial p_j} \right) (z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z)) \overline{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi(z)$$

$$A^{ij} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})),$$

$$B^i(z) = \sum_{\hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (D_n G^{i\hat{j}})(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z)) \overline{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi(z)$$

$$B^i \in C^{0,\alpha}(\text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})),$$

$$F^i(z) = \delta_{ik} H(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z)) - \sum_{\hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (\overline{D}_k G^{i\hat{j}})(z, \varphi(z), \overline{D}\varphi(z)) \overline{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi(z)$$

$$F^i \in C^{0,\alpha}(\text{clos } B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z}));$$

observe that we use the notation for derivatives discussed in the ninth item of §2. We now use (4.20) together with standard Schauder estimates from [6] to bound $|\overline{D}\varphi_k(\hat{z})|$.

We must thus observe the equation (4.20) is uniformly elliptic, for which we use the calculations of Lemma A.1. To see this, note that (4.9),(4.19) with $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small imply $(z, \varphi(z)) \in B_{\frac{\epsilon}{8}}^n(0)$ and $\overline{D}\varphi(z) \in B_{\frac{\epsilon}{4}}^{n-1}(0)$ for each $z \in B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})$. We conclude by (4.9),(4.18),(A.5) and the definition of A^{ij} above that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} A^{ij}(z) p_i p_j \geq \frac{1}{2} |p|^2 \text{ for all } p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1},$$

when $z \in B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})$, if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small. Recalling that

$$\varphi_k = \overline{D}_k \varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell} \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2 \text{ and } k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\},$$

then the demonstrated uniform ellipticity of the A^{ij} together with (4.9), (4.11), (4.15), (4.16), (4.17), (4.20) means that we can apply Theorem 8.32 of [6] over $B_{\frac{\hat{z}_{n-1}}{4}}^{n-1}(\hat{z})$. We conclude there is a $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depending on n , $\sup_{B_8^n(0) \times B_\epsilon^n(0)} |H|$, and the Lipschitz constant of H so that for each $\ell = 1, 2$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$

$$(4.21) \quad |\overline{D} \overline{D}_k \varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}(\hat{z})| \leq \frac{\mathcal{C}}{\hat{z}_{n-1}} \text{ for } \hat{z} \in \hat{\Omega};$$

note that we in particular used $\|\varphi_{\hat{T}, \ell}\|_{C^{1, \alpha}(B_8^{n-1}(0))}, \|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))} < \epsilon$.

Now define and conclude by (4.9), (4.19)

$$(4.22) \quad s = \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2} - \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1} \in C^{1, \alpha}(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega}).$$

Observe as well by (4.10), (4.12), (4.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset &= \Phi_{\hat{T}, 1}(\hat{\Omega}) \cap \Phi_{\hat{T}, 2}(\hat{\Omega}) \\ &= \{(z, \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z), u(x, \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z))) : z \in \hat{\Omega}\} \\ &\quad \cap \{(z, \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z), u(x, \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z))) : z \in \hat{\Omega}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude $\varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z) \neq \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z)$ for each $z \in \hat{\Omega}$. After relabeling, we can suppose together with (4.9) that

$$(4.23) \quad s(z) > s(0) = 0 \text{ for each } z \in \hat{\Omega} \text{ and } \overline{D}s(0) = 0.$$

We wish to apply Lemma A.16 (a Hopf boundary point lemma) to s at the origin. To do so, we must verify that s satisfies a uniformly elliptic equation with $C^{0, \alpha}$ top order coefficients, and appropriately bounded lower order coefficients.

Using (4.17) and one-dimensional calculus, we conclude s is a weak solution over $\hat{\Omega}$ to the equation

$$(4.24) \quad \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i (a^{ij} \overline{D}_j s) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c^i \overline{D}_i s + ds = 0$$

where we define for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.25) \quad a^{ij}(z) &= \int_0^1 \left\{ \begin{aligned} &G^{ij}(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) \\ &+ \sum_{\hat{j}=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\partial G^{i\hat{j}}}{\partial p_j} \right) (Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \end{aligned} \right\} dt, \\
c^i(z) &= - \int_0^1 \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (D_n G^{i\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \\ &+ \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} \right) (Y(t, z), P(t, z)) \end{aligned} \right\} dt, \\
d(z) &= - \int_0^1 \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{i, \hat{j}=1 \\ i, \hat{j}=1}}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i \left((D_n G^{i\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \right) \\ &+ (D_n H)(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) \end{aligned} \right\} dt, \\
&\text{with } Y(t, z) = (z, t\varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z) + (1-t)\varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z)), \\
&P(t, z) = t\overline{D}\varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z) + (1-t)\overline{D}\varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z), \\
&\text{and } P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) = e_{\hat{j}} \cdot P(t, z) \text{ for each } \hat{j} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\},
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$. Observe that by (4.9),(4.19) we have

$$(4.26) \quad Y(t, z) \in B_5^n(0) \text{ and } P(t, z) \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small. We conclude by (4.9),(4.18),(4.25),(A.5) that

$$(4.27) \quad \sum_{i, j=1}^{n-1} a^{ij}(z) p_i p_j \geq \frac{1}{2} |p|^2 \text{ for all } p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$$

when $z \in \hat{\Omega}$, if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small. We as well have that $Y(t, 0) = 0$ and $P(t, 0) = 0$ for each $t \in [0, 1]$ by (4.9), and so by (4.11),(4.15),(4.17) we have

$$(4.28) \quad a^{ij}(0) = \delta_{ij} = a^{ji}(0) \text{ for each } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}.$$

In order to apply Lemma A.16, we must now consider the boundedness of the coefficients of the equation given in (4.25).

First, we readily conclude by (4.9),(4.17) that

$$(4.29) \quad a^{ij} \in C^{0, \alpha}(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega}) \text{ and } c^i \in L^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$$

for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. We as well claim $d \in L^q(\hat{\Omega})$ for each $q \in (n-1, \frac{n-2}{\alpha})$. This is not immediately evident, and so we carefully verify in what follows.

We can compute in (4.25) that

$$\begin{aligned}
d(z) &= - \int_0^1 dt \\
&\overbrace{\left(\sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (\bar{D}_{\hat{i}} D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \right)}^{(a)} \\
&+ \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (D_n^2 G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{i}}(t, z) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \quad (b) \\
(4.30) \quad &+ \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}=1}^{n-1} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &(D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) \\ &\times (t \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z) + (1-t) \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z)) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (c) \\
&+ \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}, k=1}^{n-1} \left\{ \begin{aligned} &\left(\frac{\partial D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}}{\partial p_k} \right) (Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \\ &\times (t \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_k \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z) + (1-t) \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_k \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z)) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (d) \\
&+ (D_n H)(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) \quad (e)
\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \hat{\Omega}$. Consider the function

$$\mathcal{P}(z) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)|^\alpha} \text{ for } z \in \hat{\Omega} \text{ with } \mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0.$$

We will show there is $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depending on n , the C^2 norm of the $G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$, $\epsilon > 0$, and the Lipschitz constant of H so that $|d(z)| \leq \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}(z)$ for all $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ with $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0$. We consider each term (a)-(e) labelled above as follows:

- (a) Note that $G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}} \in C^\infty(B_8^n(0) \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$ for each $\hat{i}, \hat{j} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ by (4.17). Also recall $Y(t, z) \in B_5^n(0)$ and $P(t, z) \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$ by (4.26) for each $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$. We conclude there is $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depending on n and

$$\max_{\hat{i}, \hat{j} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \|\bar{D}_{\hat{i}} D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\|_{C^2(B_5^n(0) \times B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0))}$$

so that for each $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ with $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0$

$$\left| \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (\bar{D}_{\hat{i}} D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \right| \leq \mathcal{C} \leq \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}(z);$$

we as well used $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \in B_1^{n-2}(0)$ for each $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ and the definition of $P_{\hat{j}}$ given in (4.25).

- (b) We argue exactly as in (a), and conclude by (4.17),(4.19),(4.26) that for each $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ with $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0$

$$\left| \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (D_n^2 G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{i}}(t, z) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \right| \leq \mathcal{C} \leq \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}(z)$$

where $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depends on n and $\max_{\hat{i}, \hat{j} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \|D_n^2 G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\|_{C^2(B_5^n(0) \times B_6^{n-1}(0))}$.

- (c) Using (4.9),(4.19),(4.21),(4.25),(4.26) and (A.5) from Lemma A.1 we compute for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ with $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}=1}^{n-1} (D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}})(Y(t, z), P(t, z)) (t \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2}(z) + (1-t) \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_{\hat{j}} \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}(z)) \right| \\ & \leq (n-1)^2 |Y(t, z)| \left(\frac{\mathcal{C}}{z_{n-1}} \right) \leq \mathcal{C}(n-1)^2 \left(\frac{(1+\epsilon)|z|}{z_{n-1}} \right) \\ & \leq (1+\epsilon) \mathcal{C}(n-1)^2 \left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)| + z_{n-1}}{z_{n-1}} \right) \\ & = (1+\epsilon) \mathcal{C}(n-1)^2 \left(\frac{|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)|}{z_{n-1}} + 1 \right) \\ & \leq (1+\epsilon) \mathcal{C}(n-1)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon |\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)|^\alpha} + \mathcal{P}(z) \right) \\ & = (1+\epsilon) \mathcal{C}(n-1)^2 \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon} + 1 \right) \mathcal{P}(z) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$ is as in (4.21).

- (d) We compute as in (c) using (4.9),(4.19),(4.21),(4.25),(4.26) and (A.5) from Lemma A.1 to conclude that for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ with $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}, k=1}^{n-1} \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}}{\partial p_k} \right) (Y(t, z), P(t, z)) P_{\hat{j}}(t, z) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. \times (t \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_k \varphi_{\hat{T}, 2} + (1-t) \bar{D}_{\hat{i}} \bar{D}_k \varphi_{\hat{T}, 1}) \right\} \right| \\ & \leq \epsilon \mathcal{C}(n-1)^3 \frac{|Y(t, z)|}{z_{n-1}} \leq (1+\epsilon) \mathcal{C}(n-1)^3 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \right) \mathcal{P}(z) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$ is as in (4.21).

(e) We estimate using (4.17),(4.19),(4.26) for $t \in [0, 1]$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$ with $\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0$

$$|(D_n H)(Y(t, z), P(t, z))| \leq \mathcal{C} \leq \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}(z)$$

where $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depends on the Lipschitz constant of H .

These five calculations show as claimed that there is a $\mathcal{C} > 0$ depending only on n ,

$$\max_{\hat{i}, \hat{j} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \|\overline{D}_{\hat{i}} D_n G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\|_{C^2(B_5^n(0) \times B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0))}, \max_{\hat{i}, \hat{j} \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \|D_n^2 G^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\|_{C^2(B_5^n(0) \times B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0))},$$

$\epsilon > 0$, and the Lipschitz constant of H (see (4.17)) so that

$$|d(z)| \leq \mathcal{C}\mathcal{P}(z) = \frac{\mathcal{C}}{|\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)|^\alpha} \text{ for } z \in \hat{\Omega} \text{ with } \mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z) \neq 0.$$

However, since $\alpha \in (0, \frac{n-2}{n-1})$ by (4.2), then

$$(4.31) \quad d \in L^q(\hat{\Omega}) \text{ for each } q \in \left(n-1, \frac{n-2}{\alpha}\right)$$

as claimed. We can now apply Lemma A.16.

Lastly, we can thus compute using (4.11),(4.15),(4.16),(4.17),(4.25),(4.26) and (A.5) that

$$\|a^{ij}\|_{C(\hat{\Omega})} \leq \mathcal{C} \text{ for each } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$. This together with

$$(4.19),(4.22),(4.23),(4.24),(4.27),(4.28),(4.29),(4.31)$$

contradict Lemma A.16, if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small in (4.3). We conclude that for each half-regular $\mathbf{x} \in \text{spt } \partial T \cap B_\rho(x)$, every tangent cone of T at \mathbf{x} must be a sum of half-hyperplanes with constant orientation after rotation. \square

Having shown Lemma 4.1, then proving our main result Theorem 4.33 follows proving Theorem 5.3 of [9]. As in [9], it is convenient and of interest to first prove the following theorem, which is a generalization of Theorem 5.2 of [9].

Theorem 4.32. *Suppose $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is an open set, and suppose $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ where ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature. If $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$ and T at x has tangent cone which is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity (as in Definition 3.3), then $x \in \text{reg } \partial T$.*

Proof. The proof is exactly as the proof of Theorem 5.2 of [9]. Since the proof is brief, we include it here for convenience.

Suppose for contradiction $x \in \text{sing } \partial T$ and that T at x has tangent cone which is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity. Theorem 3.4 implies there is $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(x, \partial U))$ so that T at every $\hat{x} \in B_\rho(x) \cap \text{spt } \partial T$ has unique tangent cone which is a hyperplane with constant orientation but non-constant multiplicity. However, by Lemma 3.5 we can find a half-regular $\mathbf{x} \in B_\rho(x) \cap \text{sing } \partial T$. This contradicts Lemma 4.1. \square

We are now ready to state our main result.

Theorem 4.33. *Suppose $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $U \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is an open set, and suppose $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ where ∂T has Lipschitz co-oriented mean curvature. Suppose $x \in \text{spt } \partial T$ and that there exists $\rho \in (0, \text{dist}(x, \partial U))$ and C^1 hypersurfaces-with-boundary M_1, \dots, M_A in $B_\rho(x)$ so that either:*

- (1) $\text{spt } T \cap B_\rho(x) = \bigcup_{a=1}^A (\text{clos } M_a) \cap B_\rho(x)$, or
- (2) $\text{spt } T \cap B_\rho(x) \subseteq \bigcup_{a=1}^A (\text{clos } M_a) \cap B_\rho(x)$ and $T_x^\perp \partial T \not\subseteq T_x M_a$ for each $a \in \{1, \dots, A\}$ such that $x \in \text{clos } M_a$.

Then there is $\sigma \in (0, \rho)$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \{1, \dots, 2\Theta_T(x)\}$ so that

$$\text{spt } T \cap B_\sigma(x) = \bigcup_{b=1}^{\mathcal{B}} (\text{clos } W_b) \cap B_\sigma(x)$$

for orientable $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary $W_1, \dots, W_{\mathcal{B}}$ in $B_\sigma(x)$. For each $b \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{B}\}$ we have $x \in \partial W_b$ and $W_b \cap \text{spt } \partial T \subset \text{reg } \partial T$. Furthermore, for each $b, \bar{b} \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{B}\}$ we have

$$(\text{clos } W_b) \cap (\text{clos } W_{\bar{b}}) \cap B_\sigma(x) \subseteq (\partial W_b) \cap (\partial W_{\bar{b}}) \cap B_\sigma(x).$$

Proof. The proof is virtually word-for-word the same as the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9]. Assuming (after translation) that $x = 0 \in \text{spt } \partial T$ and (after rotation) $T_0 \partial T = \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, then the proof here as in Theorem 5.3 of [9] is geometric, by considering slices of T with respect to two-dimensional planes along perpendicularly to \mathbf{R}^{n-1} . To complete the proof, we only need to change references to two ingredients which are different here. First, the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9] applies Theorem 5.2 of [9] at several points; we simply replace these references with the generalization Theorem 4.32 above. Second, the second-to-the-last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9] applies the boundary regularity for stationary varifolds with $C^{1,1}$ boundary of [1]. At this instance, we must instead apply the boundary regularity for stationary varifolds with $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary of [2].

All other calculations, in particular all other references to facts from [9] itself, apply to $T \in \mathbf{TI}_{n,loc}^{1,\alpha}(U)$ with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. For example, the proof of Theorem 5.3 of [9] begins by referencing Lemma 3.9 of [9], which holds for all $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. \square

A Appendix A

We present here two lemmas, for the sake of making the proof of Lemma 4.1 more readable. The first, Lemma A.1, is a set of calculations we use in order to apply Lemma A.16. The second, Lemma A.16, is a version of the general Hopf boundary point lemma from [8], which we include here for convenience.

To state Lemma A.1, recall the notation for various derivatives set in the ninth item of §2.

Lemma A.1. *For each $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $q \in \mathbf{R}^n$ define the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix $g(p, q)$ and the entries of the inverse by*

$$(A.2) \quad \begin{aligned} g(p, q) &= I_{n-1} + (1 + q_n^2)pp^T + q_n (p\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)^T + \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)p^T) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)\mathbf{p}_{n-1}(q)^T, \\ g^{ij}(p, q) &= e_i \cdot g(p, q)^{-1} e_j \text{ for } i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \end{aligned}$$

where I_{n-1} is the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ identity matrix; note that g is generally invertible, but we will in what follows consider g with $|p|, |q|$ small.

There is $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small so that if

$$(A.3) \quad u \in C^\infty(B_8^n(0)) \text{ with } Du(0) = 0 \text{ and } \|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))} < \epsilon,$$

and if we set for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$

$$(A.4) \quad G^{ij}(y, p) = \sqrt{\det(g(p, Du(y)))} g^{ij}(p, Du(y)),$$

then for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ we have

$$(A.5) \quad |(D_n G^{ij})(y, p)|, \left| \left(\frac{\partial D_n G^{ij}}{\partial p_k} \right) (y, p) \right| \leq |y| \text{ and } \left| \left(\frac{\partial G^{ij}}{\partial p_k} \right) (y, p) \right| \leq 1$$

when $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$.

Proof. We begin by observing that we can choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small so that by (A.2)

$$(A.6) \quad \|g(p, q) - I_{n-1}\| \leq \epsilon \text{ and } \|g(p, q)^{-1} - I_{n-1}\| \leq \epsilon$$

whenever $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$ and $q \in B_\epsilon^n(0)$.

Next, using $g(p, Du(y))g(p, Du(y))^{-1} = I_{n-1}$ and Jacobi's equation

$$D_n(\det g(p, Du(y))) = \text{trace} \left(g(p, Du(y))^T D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \right)$$

we compute

$$(A.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & (D_n G^{ij})(y, p) \\ &= \frac{\text{trace} \left(g(p, Du(y))^T D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \right)}{2\sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))}} g^{ij}(p, Du(y)) \\ & \quad - \begin{cases} \sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))} \\ \times e_i \cdot g(p, Du(y))^{-1} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \right) g(p, Du(y))^{-1} e_j. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We can thus choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small so that by (A.3), (A.6)

$$(A.8) \quad |(D_n G^{ij})(y, p)| \leq \mathcal{C} \|D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\|$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$, for each $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$.

We now compute $D_n(g(p, Du(y)))$. For simplicity denote

$$(A.9) \quad \begin{aligned} u_n(y) &= D_n u(y), & \bar{D}u(y) &= \mathbf{p}_{n-1}(Du(y)), \\ u_{nn}(y) &= D_n^2 u(y), & \text{and } \bar{D}u_n(y) &= \bar{D}D_n u(y), \end{aligned}$$

Then by (A.2) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} g(p, Du(y)) &= I + (1 + u_n(y)^2)pp^T + u_n(y)(p\bar{D}u(y)^T + \bar{D}u(y)p^T) \\ &\quad + \bar{D}u(y)\bar{D}u(y)^T, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(A.10) \quad \begin{aligned} D_n(g(p, Du(y))) &= 2u_n(y)u_{nn}(y)pp^T + u_{nn}(p\bar{D}u(y)^T + \bar{D}u(y)p^T) \\ &\quad + u_n(y)(p\bar{D}u_n(y)^T + \bar{D}u_n(y)p^T) \\ &\quad + \bar{D}u_n(y)\bar{D}u(y)^T + \bar{D}u(y)\bar{D}u_n(y)^T \end{aligned}$$

whenever $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $y \in B_8^n(0)$.

Now to bound $(D_n G)(y, p)$, we see that (A.3),(A.9),(A.10) imply if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small

$$(A.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\| &\leq \mathcal{C}\|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))}|Du(y)| \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}\|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))}^2|y| \leq \epsilon|y| \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$, for each $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$. This together with (A.3),(A.8) implies

$$(A.12) \quad |(D_n G^{ij})(y, p)| \leq \mathcal{C}\epsilon|y| \leq |y|$$

for each $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$, if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small.

Next, we bound $\left| \left(\frac{\partial G^{ij}}{\partial p_k} \right) (y, p) \right|$. Compute by (A.2),(A.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k} \right) (p, Du(y)) &= (1 + u_n(y)^2)(e_k p^T + p e_k^T) \\ &\quad + u_n(y)(e_k \bar{D}u(y)^T + \bar{D}u(y) e_k^T). \end{aligned}$$

This together with $g(p, Du(y))g(p, Du(y))^{-1} = I$ and (A.2),(A.3),(A.6) gives

$$(A.13) \quad \left\| \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k} \right) (p, Du(y)) \right\| + \left\| \left(\frac{\partial g^{-1}}{\partial p_k} \right) (p, Du(y)) \right\| \leq \mathcal{C}\epsilon$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$, for each $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$ if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small. We can thus compute as in (A.7) using (A.6),(A.13)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \left(\frac{\partial G^{ij}}{\partial p_k} \right) (y, p) \right| \\
& \leq \frac{\left| \text{trace} \left(g(p, Du(y))^T \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k} \right) (p, Du(y)) \right) \right|}{2\sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))}} |g^{ij}(p, Du(y))| \\
\text{(A.14)} \quad & + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))} \\ \times \|g(p, Du(y))^{-1}\| \left\| \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k} \right) (p, Du(y)) \right\| \|g(p, Du(y))^{-1}\| \end{array} \right. \\
& \leq \mathcal{C}\epsilon \leq 1
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$, for each $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$ if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small.

Lastly, let us bound $\left| \left(\frac{\partial D_n G^{ij}}{\partial p_k} \right) (y, p) \right|$. Compute by (A.9),(A.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial p_k} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \right) &= 2u_n(y)u_{nn}(y) (e_k p^T + p e_k^T) \\
&+ u_{nn}(y) (e_k \bar{D}u(y)^T + \bar{D}u(y) e_k^T) \\
&+ u_n(y) (e_k \bar{D}u_n(y)^T + \bar{D}u_n(y) e_k^T).
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude by (A.3) if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial p_k} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \right) \right\| &\leq \mathcal{C} \|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))} |Du(y)| \\
\text{(A.15)} \quad &\leq \mathcal{C} \|u\|_{C^2(B_8^n(0))}^2 |y| \\
&\leq \epsilon |y|
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$, for each $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$. Differentiating the identity (A.7) with respect to the p_k -variable, using again Jacobi's equation, gives that $\left(\frac{\partial D_n G^{ij}}{\partial p_k} \right) (y, p)$ is the sum of the terms

$$\bullet \frac{\text{trace} \left(\left(\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k} \right) (p, Du(y)) \right)^T D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \right)}{2\sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))}} g^{ij}(p, Du(y)),$$

- $\frac{\text{trace}\left(g(p, Du(y))^T \frac{\partial}{\partial p_k} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right)\right)}{2\sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))}} g^{ij}(p, Du(y)),$
- $-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\text{trace}\left(g(p, Du(y))^T D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right)}{4(\det g(p, Du(y)))^{3/2}} \\ \times \text{trace}\left(g(p, Du(y))^T \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k}\right)(p, Du(y))\right) g^{ij}(p, Du(y)), \end{array} \right.$
- $\frac{\text{trace}\left(g(p, Du(y))^T D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right)}{2\sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))}} \left(\frac{\partial g^{ij}}{\partial p_k}\right)(p, Du(y)),$
- $-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\text{trace}\left(g(p, Du(y))^T \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial p_k}\right)(p, Du(y))\right)}{2\sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))}} \\ \times e_i \cdot g(p, Du(y))^{-1} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right) g(p, Du(y))^{-1} e_j, \end{array} \right.$
- $-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))} \\ \times e_i \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial p_k} \left(g(p, Du(y))^{-1}\right) \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right) g(p, Du(y))^{-1} e_j, \end{array} \right.$
- $-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))} \\ \times e_i \cdot g(p, Du(y))^{-1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial p_k} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right)\right) g(p, Du(y))^{-1} e_j, \end{array} \right.$
- $-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt{\det g(p, Du(y))} \\ \times e_i \cdot g(p, Du(y))^{-1} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right) \left(\frac{\partial g^{-1}}{\partial p_k}\right)(p, Du(y)) e_j. \end{array} \right.$

Observe that each term contains either

$$D_n(g(p, Du(y))) \text{ or } \frac{\partial}{\partial p_k} \left(D_n(g(p, Du(y)))\right).$$

We can thus compute using (A.3),(A.6),(A.11),(A.13),(A.15)

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial D_n G^{ij}}{\partial p_k}\right)(y, p) \right| \leq \mathcal{C} \epsilon |y| \leq |y|$$

where $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(n) > 0$, for $y \in B_8^n(0)$ and $p \in B_\epsilon^{n-1}(0)$ if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ is sufficiently small. This together with (A.12),(A.14) gives (A.5). \square

Finally, we need a more general Hopf boundary point lemma than the usual one (found for example in Lemma 3.4 of [6]). For this, we refer to [8]. However, we won't need as general of a result as found in Theorem 4.1 of [8], and so for convenience we state here the more precise Hopf boundary point lemma which we presently need.

Lemma A.16. *Suppose $\hat{w} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1^{n-2}(0))$ satisfies $\hat{w}(0) = 0$ and $\underline{D}\hat{w}(0) = 0$, and let*

$$\hat{\Omega} = \{z \in B_1^{n-2}(0) \times (0, 3) : z_{n-1} > \hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))\}.$$

Also suppose $q > n - 1$, and with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ suppose

- $a^{ij} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega})$, $c^i \in L^\infty(\hat{\Omega})$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, and $d \in L^q(\hat{\Omega})$,
- $\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} a^{ij}(z)p_i p_j \geq \frac{1}{2}|p|^2$ for all $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$,
- $a^{ij}(0) = a^{ji}(0)$ for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$.

There is an $\epsilon > 0$ depending on n and $\max_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \|a^{ij}\|_{C(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega})}$ such that if $\|\underline{D}\hat{w}\|_{C(B_1^{n-2}(0))} < \epsilon$, and if $s \in C^{1,\alpha}(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega})$ is a weak solution over $\hat{\Omega}$ to the equation

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i (a^{ij} \overline{D}_j s) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} c^i \overline{D}_i s + ds = 0$$

with $s(z) > s(0) = 0$ for all $z \in \hat{\Omega}$, then $\overline{D}s(0) \neq 0$.

Proof. We merely sketch the proof, and refer to [8]. Define the function $\hat{s} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1}))$ by

$$\hat{s}(z) = s(z + \hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))e_{n-1}) \text{ for } z \in B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1});$$

note since $\hat{w}(0) = 0$ and $\|\underline{D}\hat{w}\|_{C(B_1^{n-2}(0))} < \epsilon$, then we can choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n) > 0$ sufficiently small so that $\{z + \hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))e_{n-1} : z \in B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1})\} \subset \hat{\Omega}$.

Consider the map

$$\hat{W}(z) = z + \hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))e_{n-1} \text{ for } z \in B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1}),$$

and the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D}_i \hat{s}(z) &= (\overline{D}_i s)(\hat{W}(z)) + \overline{D}_i(\hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)))(\overline{D}_{n-1} s)(\hat{W}(z)) \\ &= (\overline{D}_i s)(\hat{W}(z)) + \overline{D}_i(\hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z)))\overline{D}_{n-1} \hat{s}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Then defining the function

$$\hat{d}(z) = \max\{0, d(\hat{W}(z))\} \text{ for } z \in B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1})$$

and using \hat{W} as a change of variables, we can show $\hat{s} \in C^{1,\alpha}(B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1}))$ is a weak solution over $B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1})$ to an equation of the form

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \overline{D}_i (\hat{a}^{ij} \overline{D}_j \hat{s}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \hat{c}^i \overline{D}_i \hat{s} + \hat{d} \hat{s} \leq 0,$$

where the coefficients satisfy

- $\hat{a}^{ij} \in C^{0,\alpha}(\text{clos } B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1}))$, $\hat{c}^i \in L^\infty(B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1}))$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, and $\hat{d} \in L^q(B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1}))$, since $\hat{w} \in C^{1,\alpha}(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega})$;
- $\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \hat{a}^{ij}(z) p_i p_j \geq \frac{1}{4} |p|^2$ for all $p \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $z \in \hat{\Omega}$, using $\|\underline{D}\hat{w}\|_{C(B_1^{n-2}(0))} < \epsilon$ with $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small depending on n and $\max_{i,j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}} \|a^{ij}\|_{C(\text{clos } \hat{\Omega})}$;
- \hat{d} is weakly non-positive over $B_1^{n-1}(e_{n-1})$ (see Definition 2.5 of [8]);
- $\hat{a}^{ij}(0) = \hat{a}^{ji}(0)$ for each $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, since $\hat{w}(0) = 0$ and $\underline{D}\hat{w}(0) = 0$.

Moreover, we still have $\hat{s}(z) > \hat{s}(0) = s(0) = 0$, since $\hat{w}(0) = 0$. We can thus apply Lemma 3.3 of [8] (with $n-1$ in place of n), using as well Remarks 2.2, 4.2(i) of [8], to conclude

$$0 \neq \overline{D}\hat{s}(0) = \overline{D}(s(z + \hat{w}(\mathbf{p}_{n-2}(z))))|_{z=0} = \overline{D}s(0),$$

using again $\hat{w}(0) = 0$ and $\underline{D}\hat{w}(0) = 0$. □

References

- [1] Allard, W.K.: On the first variation of a varifold-boundary behavior. *Ann. of Math.* 95, 417-491 (1972)
- [2] Bourni, T.: Allard-type boundary regularity for $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundaries. *Adv. Calc. Var.* 9, 143-161, (2016)

- [3] Brothers, J.E.: Existence and structure of tangent cones at the boundary of an area-minimizing integral current. *Indiana U. Math. J.* 26, 1027-1044, (1977)
- [4] Ecker, K.: Area-minimizing integral currents with movable boundary parts of prescribed mass. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré-An.* 6, 261-293 (1989)
- [5] Federer, H.: *Geometric Measure Theory*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg (1969)
- [6] Gilbarg D., Trudinger N.S.: *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg (1983)
- [7] Rosales, L.: Two-dimensional solutions to the c -Plateau problem in \mathbf{R}^3 . *Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom.* 50, 129-163 (2016)
- [8] Rosales, L.: Generalizing Hopf's boundary point lemma. *Can. Math. Bulletin* *to appear* (2017)
- [9] Rosales, L.: Co-dimension one area-minimizing currents with $C^{1,\alpha}$ tangentially immersed boundary. *J. Geom. Anal.* *to appear* (2018)
- [10] Simon, L.: *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*. Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University, Australia, (1984)