

EQUIVARIANT MIN-MAX HYPERSURFACE IN G -MANIFOLDS WITH POSITIVE RICCI CURVATURE

TONGRUI WANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we consider a connected orientable closed Riemannian manifold M^{n+1} with positive Ricci curvature. Suppose G is a compact Lie group acting by isometries on M with $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7$ for all $p \in M$. Then we show the equivariant min-max G -hypersurface Σ corresponding to the fundamental class $[M]$ is a multiplicity one minimal G -hypersurface with a G -invariant unit normal and G -equivariant index one. As an application, we are able to establish a genus bound for Σ , a control on the singular points of Σ/G , and an upper bound for the (first) G -width of M provided $n + 1 = 3$ and the actions of G are orientation preserving.

1. INTRODUCTION

Given a connected orientable closed Riemannian manifold (M^{n+1}, g_M) , minimizing the area within a non-trivial homology class is a natural way to construct minimal hypersurfaces (c.f. [11][33]). However, if M has positive Ricci curvature, it follows from the stability inequality that this minimization method can not be applied. In the 1960s, Almgren [1][2] proposed the *min-max theory* to find minimal submanifolds in the most general situation. Subsequently, the regularity for min-max hypersurfaces was improved by Pitts [27] ($n \leq 5$) and Schoen-Simon [31] ($n = 6$). Indeed, for $n \geq 7$, they showed the min-max minimal hypersurface is smooth embedded except for a singular set of codimension 7.

Due to the generality and abstractness of Almgren-Pitts min-max theory, many of the geometric properties of min-max hypersurfaces have not been understood until recently. For instance, in a closed manifold with positive Ricci curvature, a series of studies were set out to characterize the min-max hypersurfaces generated from one-parameter families. Specifically, using the Heegaard splitting, Marques-Neves [18] studied the index and genus of the min-max surface in certain 3-manifolds. Additionally, they also obtained sharp estimates for the width and rigidity results. In higher dimensional manifold M^{n+1} with positive Ricci curvature, Zhou determined the Morse index and multiplicity of the min-max hypersurface in [39] (for $3 \leq n + 1 \leq 7$) and [40] (for $n \geq 7$). Subsequently, Ketover-Marques-Neves [15] refined Zhou's results in dimension $3 \leq n + 1 \leq 7$ by showing the orientability of the min-max hypersurface using the catenoid estimates. In particular, the min-max hypersurface is an orientable closed minimal hypersurface of Morse index one and has the least area among all orientable closed minimal hypersurfaces. Furthermore, without any curvature assumption, the constructions in [18][39] were also employed by Mazet-Rosenberg [23] to show the least area minimal hypersurface is either stable or a min-max hypersurface of Morse index one.

Given a 3-manifold M with a finite group G acting by isometries, Pitts-Rubinstein [28][29] first assert the existence of a G -invariant minimal surface with estimates on its index and genus. The existence and regularity for minimal G -invariant surfaces (abbreviated as *G -surfaces*) were recently confirmed by Ketover [14] using the equivariant min-max under the smooth setting. More generally, suppose M^{n+1} is a closed Riemannian manifold with a

compact Lie group G acting by isometries so that $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7, \forall p \in M$. The equivariant min-max theory was also extended to this general scenario by Liu [17] in the smooth setting and by the author [34][35] in the Almgren-Pitts setting. In particular, the author showed an isomorphism between $H_{n+1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $\pi_1(\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2))$ in [34, Theorem 9], where $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the space of G -invariant n -cycles. Then it parallels the constructions of Almgren-Pitts [27] that the fundamental class $[M] \in H_{n+1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is corresponding to the *equivariant min-max width* $W^G(M) > 0$ of M , which can be realized by the area of some minimal G -invariant hypersurfaces (abbreviated as *G -hypersurfaces*) with multiplicities. Therefore, it now seems reasonable to investigate the geometric features of the equivariant min-max hypersurface, such as its area, multiplicity, index, and topology.

In this paper, our main result generalizes the characterization of the min-max hypersurface into an equivariant version (see Theorem 5.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M^{n+1}, g_M) be a connected orientable closed Riemannian manifold with positive Ricci curvature, and G be a compact Lie group acting by isometries on M so that $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7$ for all $p \in M$. Then the equivariant min-max hypersurface Σ corresponding to the fundamental class $[M] \in H_{n+1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a multiplicity one minimal G -hypersurface so that*

- (i) Σ has a G -invariant unit normal vector field;
- (ii) the equivariant Morse index of Σ (Definition 4.1) is one;
- (iii) Σ has the least area among all closed embedded minimal G -hypersurfaces with G -invariant unit normal vector fields.

Remark 1.2. We make some remarks for the above theorem:

- (i) If M has connected components $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^m$, we can take a component M_i and the Lie sub-group $G_i := \{g \in G : g \cdot M_i = M_i\}$. By applying the above theorem to M_i and G_i , we obtain a minimal G_i -invariant hypersurface Σ_i of multiplicity one. Additionally, one easily verifies that $G \cdot \Sigma_i \subset G \cdot M_i$ is a minimal G -hypersurface satisfying (i)-(iii) in Theorem 1.1 with $G \cdot M_i$ in place of M .
- (ii) Without the positive Ricci curvature assumption, we can combine the proof of Theorem 1.1 and the constructions in [23] to show the existence of a minimal G -hypersurface of the least area (counted with multiplicity) among all minimal G -hypersurfaces. The details will be discussed in another upcoming paper.

The existence of a G -invariant unit normal can help to distinguish the min-max G -hypersurface Σ and the fixed points set under certain \mathbb{Z}_2 actions. For instance, consider a positive Ricci curvature 3-ellipsoid M with its major axis (on x_1) sufficiently long and the other principal axes bounded by 2. Then the classical min-max theory shall provide the equator $\Gamma = \{x_1 = 0\} \cap M$ on the major axis as the min-max hypersurface. Although Γ is also invariant under the \mathbb{Z}_2 -reflections $(x_1, x') \mapsto (-x_1, x')$, it can not be the min-max \mathbb{Z}_2 -hypersurface since its unit normal is not \mathbb{Z}_2 -invariant. An interesting question is what exactly is the min-max \mathbb{Z}_2 -hypersurface in this case, and how does it relate to 2-min-max minimal hypersurfaces?

The characterizations of the Morse index and multiplicity for min-max hypersurfaces are crucial in the study of min-max theory. For instance, a key part in the proof of the Willmore conjecture by Marques-Neves [19] is to show the minimal surface in \mathbb{S}^3 constructed by the five-parameter families of min-max has Morse index 5. Additionally, by specifying generically the multiplicity ([41]) and index ([20][22]) of min-max hypersurfaces, the

multi-parameter min-max theory was used to establish the Morse theory for the area functional. In the equivariant case, the author [36] also proved general upper bounds for the G -index (Definition 4.1) of equivariant min-max hypersurfaces from multi-parameter families. Therefore, in light of Theorem 1.1 and [41], we conjecture that for a generic G -invariant Riemannian metric, the minimal G -hypersurface constructed from k -parameter families of equivariant min-max shall have multiplicity one, G -index k , and a G -invariant unit normal.

Moreover, it has been discovered in numerous studies that the Morse index of a minimal surface is related to its topology. For instance, in a closed manifold with positive Ricci curvature, Choi-Schoen [7] proved the area of a closed minimal surface can be bounded by its genus. Therefore, by Ejiri-Micallef [10, Theorem 4.3], the index of a such minimal surface is also bounded by its genus. Additionally, using the *conformal volume*, Yau (c.f. [32, Chapter VIII, Section 4]) obtained a genus bound for index one minimal surfaces in positive Ricci curvature manifolds. More generally, in an orientable 3-manifold with nonnegative Ricci curvature, it follows from the sharp estimate of Ros [30, Theorem 15] that a closed orientable minimal surface of index one must have genus ≤ 3 . For a complete two-sided minimal surface in \mathbb{R}^3 , Chodosh-Maximo showed in [5] that its genus and the number of ends give a lower bound on its index. We refer to [6][24] for more related research.

Hence, as an application, we use the conformal volume initiated by Li-Yau [16] in the orbit space to show a general genus bound of the equivariant min-max surface in a 3-manifold with positive Ricci curvature, which further indicates an upper bound of the G -width and a bound for the singular points of Σ/G (see Theorem 5.2).

Theorem 1.3. *Let (M^3, g_M) be a closed connected oriented Riemannian 3-manifold with positive Ricci curvature, and G be a finite group acting on M by orientation preserving isometries. Then the equivariant min-max hypersurface Σ corresponding to the fundamental class $[M]$ is a connected minimal G -hypersurface of multiplicity one with*

$$\text{genus}(\Sigma) \leq 4K, \quad W^G(M) = \text{Area}(\Sigma) \leq \frac{8\pi K}{c_M},$$

where $K := \max_{p \in M} \#G \cdot p \leq \#G$ is the number of points in a principal orbit of M , and $\text{Ric}_M \geq c_M > 0$. Additionally, the quotient space $\pi(\Sigma) = \Sigma/G$ is an orientable surface with finite cone singular points of order $\{n_i\}_{i=1}^k$ so that $\sum_{i=1}^k (1 - \frac{1}{n_i}) \leq 4$ and $\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) \leq 3$. In particular, if $\Sigma \subset M^{\text{prin}}$, then $\text{genus}(\Sigma) \leq 1 + 2K$.

The conformal method has been employed in many studies for the *volume spectrum*, i.e. the multi-parameter version of width. For the first width $W(M)$ in the volume spectrum, Glynn-Adey-Liokumovich [12] gave an upper bound using the min-conformal volume of the ambient manifold. In particular, if M is a closed surface, they showed the first width $W(M)$ can be bounded by the genus and area of M . Additionally, the conformal upper bounds for the volume spectrum were proved by Wang in [37].

The main idea for Theorem 1.1 is as follows. For the closed manifold M and the Lie group G in Theorem 1.1, we can take any closed embedded minimal G -hypersurface Σ in M and use the variation of its first eigenvector field to foliate a G -neighborhood of Σ . Using a half-space version of the equivariant min-max theory (Theorem 3.11), we argue by contradiction to show this local G -equivariant foliation can be extended to a continuous G -sweepout of M with mass no more than $\text{Area}(\Sigma)$ (if Σ has a G -invariant unit normal) or $2\text{Area}(\Sigma)$. Therefore, it follows from the equivariant min-max theory [34, Theorem 8] (see also [35, Theorem 4.20]) that the equivariant min-max hypersurface is the minimal

G -hypersurface of *least area* in the sense of (5.1). Additionally, if the equivariant min-max hypersurface does not admit a G -invariant unit normal, it must have even multiplicity by the constructions of equivariant min-max (Theorem 3.8). However, in this case, we can further use the catenoid estimates of Ketover-Marques-Neves [15] to add small G -invariant cylinders in the G -sweepouts (Proposition 4.7), which will strictly decrease the mass and give a contradiction.

The above idea shares the same spirit as in [39]. However, since the equivariant min-max theory was already established in a continuous version [34, Theorem 8], we do not need to invoke the smooth setting of min-max (c.f. [9]) as in [39, Section 2], but give a more self-contained equivariant min-max construction in half spaces (Theorem 3.11). Meanwhile, instead of using the discretization theorem as in [39, Theorem 5.8], we can more easily determine that the extension of the G -equivariant foliation is a G -sweepout.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we collect some notations and definitions of Lie group actions and geometric measure theory. In particular, we also introduce the G -equivariant sweepouts and G -width of M in a continuous version using the isomorphic map between $\pi_1(\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2))$ and $H_{n+1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Then we introduce in Section 3 the equivariant min-max theory developed by the author in [34][35] under the Almgren-Pitts setting with some modifications. In Section 4, we will generate a continuous G -sweepout with good properties from a given minimal G -hypersurface. Finally, the proof of the main theorem and its applications are given in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Professor Gang Tian for his constant encouragement. He also thanks Prof. Xin Zhou, Zhichao Wang, and Linsheng Wang for helpful discussions. Part of this work was completed while the author was visiting the Department of Mathematics at Cornell University, supported by the China post-doctoral grant 2022M722844. Thanks for its hospitality and for providing a good academic environment.

Funding. Project funded by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation 2022M722844.

2. PRELIMINARY

Let (M^{n+1}, g_M) be an orientable connected compact Riemannian $(n+1)$ -dimensional manifold and G be a compact Lie group acting isometrically on M . Denote by μ a bi-invariant Haar measure on G normalized to $\mu(G) = 1$. For the case that $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, it follows from [35, Lemma A.1] that M can be equivariantly and isometrically extended to a closed Riemannian manifold (N, g_N) with G acting on N by isometries. Therefore, we can assume M is a compact domain of a closed Riemannian G -manifold N .

2.1. Lie group actions. To begin with, we gather some definitions of Lie group actions, most of which are referred from [3][4].

It follows from [26] that there is an orthogonal representation $\rho : G \rightarrow O(L)$ and an isometric embedding $i : M \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^L$ for some $L \in \mathbb{N}$ so that i is equivariant, i.e. $i \circ g = \rho(g) \circ i$. For simplicity, we regard M as a subset of \mathbb{R}^L and denote the orthogonal action of $g \in G$ on $x \in \mathbb{R}^L$ as $g \cdot x$. We say a subset (hypersurface) $A \subset M$ is a G -subset (G -hypersurface) if $g \cdot A = A$ for all $g \in G$.

For any $p \in M$, let $G \cdot p := \{g \cdot p : g \in G\}$ be the orbit containing p and $G_p := \{g \in G : g \cdot p = p\}$ be the isotropy group of p . Note $G \cdot p$ is a closed submanifold of M and G_p is a Lie subgroup of G . We then say p has (G_p) orbit type, where (G_p) is the conjugacy class of G_p in G . By [3, Proposition 2.2.4], there is a (unique) minimal conjugacy class (P) of isotropy

groups so that $M^{prin} = M_{(P)} := \{p \in M : (G_p) = (P)\}$ is an open dense G -subset of M . We call any $G \cdot p \subset M^{prin}$ a *principal orbit* of M and denote by $\text{Cohom}(G)$ the co-dimension of a principal orbit, which is known as the *cohomogeneity* of the actions of G .

Let M/G be the quotient space, i.e. the *orbit space*, and π be the projection $\pi : M \rightarrow M/G$, $p \mapsto [p]$. It is well-known that M/G is a Hausdorff metric space with induced metric $\text{dist}_{M/G}([p], [q]) := \text{dist}_M(G \cdot p, G \cdot q)$.

Denote by $B_r(p)$, $B_r([p])$, and $\mathbb{B}_r^k(p)$ the geodesic ball in M (or in N if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$), the metric ball in M/G , and the Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^k respectively. Then we use the following notations:

- $\mathfrak{X}(M), \mathfrak{X}(U)$: the space of smooth vector fields compact supported in M or $U \subset M$;
- $\mathfrak{X}^G(M), \mathfrak{X}^G(U)$: the space of G -vector fields X in M or U , i.e. $g_*X = X, \forall g \in G$;
- $B_\rho^G(p)$: the open geodesic tube with radius ρ around the orbit $G \cdot p$ in M (or in N if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$);
- $\text{An}^G(p, s, t)$: the open tube $B_t^G(p) \setminus \overline{B_s^G(p)}$.

For any closed G -hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$, denote by $\mathbf{N}\Sigma$ its normal bundle with G acting on it by $g \cdot v := g_*v$ for all $g \in G, v \in \mathbf{N}\Sigma$. Let $\exp_\Sigma^\perp : \mathbf{N}\Sigma \rightarrow M$ be the normal exponential map of Σ . Note \exp_Σ^\perp is a G -equivariant diffeomorphism in a neighborhood of Σ .

2.2. Geometry measure theory. We refer [11][27][33] for the following definitions:

- $\mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$: the space of k -dimensional mod 2 flat chains in \mathbb{R}^L with support contained in M ;
- $\mathcal{Z}_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$: the space of $T \in \mathbf{I}_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $T = \partial U$ for some $U \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, i.e. the boundary type mod 2 n -cycles;
- $\mathcal{V}_k(M)$: the weak topological closure of the space of k -dimensional rectifiable varifolds in \mathbb{R}^L with support contained in M .

Let \mathcal{F} and \mathbf{M} be the *flat (semi-)norm* and the *mass* norm in $\mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ ([11, 4.2.26]). Define the \mathbf{F} -metric on $\mathcal{V}_k(M)$ as in [27, Page 66]. Then \mathbf{F} induces the weak topology on any mass bounded subset $\{V \in \mathcal{V}_k(M) : \|V\|(M) \leq C\}$, where $C > 0$ and $\|V\|$ is the Radon measure on M induced by V .

For any $T \in \mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we denote $|T|$ and $\|T\|$ as the integral varifold and the Radon measure induced by T . Then we define the \mathbf{F} -metric on $\mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ by

$$\mathbf{F}(S, T) := \mathcal{F}(S - T) + \mathbf{F}(|S|, |T|), \quad \forall S, T \in \mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

It follows from [27, Page 68] that for any $T, \{T_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Z}_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$,

$$(2.1) \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{F}(T_i, T) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{F}(T_i, T) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{M}(T_i) = \mathbf{M}(T).$$

For $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{F}, \mathcal{F}$, let $\mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbf{v}; \mathbb{Z}_2), \mathcal{Z}_n(M; \mathbf{v}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ be the space with topology induced by \mathbf{v} .

We say $T \in \mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ (or $V \in \mathcal{V}_k(M)$) is G -invariant if $g_\#T = T$ ($g_\#V = V$) for all $g \in G$. Then we have the following subspaces of G -invariant elements:

- $\mathbf{I}_k^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) := \{T \in \mathbf{I}_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) : g_\#T = T, \forall g \in G\}$;
- $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) := \{T \in \mathcal{Z}_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) : T = \partial U, \text{ for some } U \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)\}$;
- $\mathcal{V}_k^G(M) := \{V \in \mathcal{V}_k(M) : g_\#V = V, \forall g \in G\}$.

Note $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \subset \{T \in \mathcal{Z}_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) : g_\#T = T, \forall g \in G\}$. Since G acts by isometries, $\mathbf{I}_k^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2), \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and $\mathcal{V}_k^G(M)$ are closed subspaces with induced metrics $\mathbf{M}, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}$. Moreover, we have the following isoperimetric lemma (c.f. [34, Lemma 5]), which is also valid when $\partial M \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 2.1. *There are constants $\epsilon_M > 0$, $C_M > 1$ such that for any $T_1, T_2 \in \mathbf{I}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\partial T_1 = \partial T_2 = 0$, and*

$$\mathcal{F}(T_1 - T_2) < \epsilon_M,$$

there is a unique $Q \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, called the isoperimetric choice of T_1, T_2 , satisfying

- (i) $\partial Q = T_1 - T_2$,
- (ii) $\mathbf{M}(Q) \leq C_M \cdot \mathcal{F}(T_1 - T_2)$.

For any $V \in \mathcal{V}_n(M)$ and $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$, the first variation of V along X is given by

$$\delta V(X) := \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \|(F_t)_\# V\|(M) = \int_{G_n(M)} \operatorname{div}_S(X)(p) dV(p, S),$$

where $\{F_t\}$ are the diffeomorphisms generated by X , and $G_n(M)$ is the Grassmannian bundle of un-oriented n -planes over M . Suppose $V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$ is G -invariant and $U \subset M$ is an open G -subset, then we say

- V is *stationary* in U , if $\delta V(X) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$;
- V is *G -stationary* in U , if $\delta V(X) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}^G(U)$.

Clearly, a stationary G -varifold must be G -stationary. Meanwhile, for any $X \in \mathfrak{X}(U)$, let

$$(2.2) \quad X_G := \int_G (g^{-1})_* X d\mu(g).$$

A direct compute shows $X_G \in \mathfrak{X}^G(U)$ and $\delta V(X) = \delta V(X_G)$ for any $V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$ (c.f. [17, Lemma 2.2]). Hence, we have:

$$(2.3) \quad V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M) \text{ is stationary in } U \text{ if and only if it is } G\text{-stationary in } U.$$

2.3. G -Sweepouts and G -width. To define the equivariant sweepouts and width, we need to introduce a technical assumption:

Definition 2.2. For any \mathcal{F} -continuous map $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, define

$$\mathbf{m}^G(\Phi, r) := \sup\{\|\Phi(x)\|(B_r^G(p)) : x \in [0, 1], p \in M\},$$

where $B_r^G(p)$ is the geodesic r -neighborhood of $G \cdot p$ in M (or in N if $M \subset N$ has non-empty boundary). Then we say Φ has *no concentration of mass on orbits* if $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{m}^G(\Phi, r) = 0$.

By (2.1) and a continuous argument, we have the following lemma (c.f. [34, Lemma 8]), which is quite useful in Section 3.

Lemma 2.3. *If $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is \mathbf{F} -continuous, then Φ has no concentration of mass on orbits and $\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) < \infty$.*

2.3.1. Closed manifolds.

In this case, $\partial M = \emptyset$. Then for any \mathcal{F} -continuous closed curve $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, $\Phi(0) = \Phi(1)$, we can take $a_j = \frac{j}{3^k}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, 3^k$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{F}(\Phi(x) - \Phi(y)) \leq \epsilon_M, \quad \forall x, y \in [a_j, a_{j+1}],$$

where $\epsilon_M > 0$ is given by Lemma 2.1. By Lemma 2.1, there is $Q_j \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\partial Q_j = \Phi(a_{j+1}) - \Phi(a_j)$ and $\mathbf{M}(Q_j) \leq C_M \mathcal{F}(\Phi(a_{j+1}) - \Phi(a_j))$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, 3^k - 1$. Therefore, $Q := \sum_{j=0}^{3^k-1} Q_j \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ satisfies $\partial Q = 0$, which indicates $Q = [[M]]$ or 0 by the Constancy Theorem [33, 26.27]. Hence, we can correspond Φ to a homology class:

$$(2.5) \quad F_M(\Phi) := [Q] \in H_{n+1}(M^{n+1}; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

By the constancy theorem, $F_M(\Phi)$ does not depend on the choice of k . Moreover, by [34, Remark 2] and the arguments in [1], we have $F_M(\Phi) = F_M(\Phi')$ for any closed curve Φ' that is homotopic to Φ in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and F_M induces an isomorphism ([34, Theorem 9]):

$$F_M : \pi_1(\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)) \rightarrow H_{n+1}(M; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

In the above isomorphism, we do not need to specify the base point of $\pi_1(\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2))$. This is because $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the \mathcal{F} -path connected component of $\mathbf{I}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \cap \mathcal{Z}_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ containing 0 (by Lemma 2.1 and the contraction argument in [22, Claim 5.3]).

Definition 2.4 (G -sweepout). A closed \mathcal{F} -continuous curve $\Phi : S^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is said to be a G -sweepout of M if $F_M(\Phi) = [M] \neq 0$.

Remark 2.5. Since $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is \mathcal{F} -path connected, every two G -sweepouts are homotopic to each other in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Hence, the set of G -sweepouts of M is exactly the non-trivial homotopy class of closed curves in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Next, we introduce the min-max G -width of M which can be regarded as a critical value for the area functional with respect to *all* variations by (2.3).

Definition 2.6 (G -width). Let $\mathcal{P}^G(M)$ be the set of G -sweepouts of M with no concentration of mass on orbits. Then we define the G -width of M by

$$W^G(M) := \inf_{\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G(M)} \sup_{x \in S^1} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)).$$

2.3.2. Compact manifolds with boundary.

Now we consider the case that $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, and regard M as a compact domain of a closed Riemannian G -manifold N . Let F_N be given by (2.5), and $\nu_{\partial M}$ be the unit normal of ∂M pointing inward M . Then for $\eta > 0$ small enough, define

$$(2.6) \quad M_\eta := M \setminus \exp_{\partial M}^\perp([0, \eta] \cdot \nu_{\partial M}) = \{p \in M : \text{dist}_M(p, \partial M) \geq \eta\}.$$

Let $\Phi_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, $i = 1, 2$, be two \mathcal{F} -continuous curve so that $\Phi_i(0) = [[\partial M]]$ and $\Phi_i(1) = 0$. As the constructions in (2.4), we can associate Φ_i to $Q_i \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\partial Q_i = [[\partial M]]$. Then the Constancy Theorem implies $Q_i = [[M]]$. Therefore, the curves product (joint curve) $\Phi_2^{-1} \cdot \Phi_1$ satisfies $F_N(\Phi_2^{-1} \cdot \Phi_1) = 0$, and thus $\Phi_2^{-1} \cdot \Phi_1$ is homotopic to 0 in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(N; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Since $\text{spt}(\Phi_i(x)) \subset M$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ and $i = 1, 2$, we can apply the double cover argument in [22, Theorem 5.1] with Lemma 2.1 in place of [1, Corollary 1.14], and see the homotopy map between $\Phi_2^{-1} \cdot \Phi_1$ and 0 can be taken in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Thus Φ_1 and Φ_2 are homotopic to each other in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

Next, we introduce the following definition for G -manifold with non-empty boundary, which is generalized from the smooth min-max setting [39, Definition 2.1, 2.5].

Definition 2.7. Suppose M is a compact Riemannian G -manifold with boundary $\partial M \neq \emptyset$. Then we call a \mathcal{F} -continuous curve $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ a G -sweepout of $(M, \partial M)$, if

- (i) $\Phi(0) = [[\partial M]]$, $\Phi(1) = 0$;
- (ii) there exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a smooth G -invariant function $w : [0, \epsilon] \times \partial M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $w(0, \cdot) \equiv 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} w(0, \cdot) > 0$, so that $\Phi(x)$, $x \in [0, \epsilon]$, is induced by the smooth G -hypersurface $\exp_{\partial M}^\perp(w(x, \cdot) \nu_{\partial M})$;
- (iii) for any $x_0 \in (0, 1]$, there exists $\eta > 0$ so that $\text{spt}(\Phi(x)) \subset\subset M_\eta$ for all $x \in [x_0, 1]$.

Denote by $\mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ the set of G -sweepouts of $(M, \partial M)$ with no concentration of mass on orbits. Then we define the G -width of $(M, \partial M)$ by

$$W^G(M, \partial M) := \inf_{\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)} \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)).$$

Remark 2.8. As we mention before, any two G -sweepouts Φ_1, Φ_2 of $(M, \partial M)$ must homotopic to each other in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Moreover, by reparametrization, the foliation parts of Φ_i , $i = 1, 2$, are homotopic through $v_t := (1 - t)w_1 + tw_2$, where $t \in [0, 1]$ and $w_1, w_2 : [0, \frac{1}{3}] \times \partial M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are given by Definition 2.7. The non-foliation parts $\Phi_{i\perp}[\frac{1}{3}, 1]$ and $\exp_{\partial M}^\perp(v_t(\frac{1}{3}, \cdot)\nu_{\partial M})$ are all in M_η for some $\eta > 0$, and thus the homotopy between these parts can be taken in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_\eta; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ (c.f. the constructions in [22, Theorem 5.1] with Lemma 2.1). Therefore, we can take a homotopy map $H : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ so that $H(0, \cdot) = \Phi_1$, $H(1, \cdot) = \Phi_2$, and for every $t \in [0, 1]$, $H(t, \cdot)$ is a G -sweepout of $(M, \partial M)$.

3. EQUIVARIANT MIN-MAX THEORY

In this section, we introduce the equivariant min-max constructions in [34] (see [35][36] for modified versions). Then main purpose is to find an integral G -varifold $V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$ induced by a smooth embedded minimal G -hypersurface so that $\|V\|(M) = W^G(M)$ (or $W^G(M, \partial M)$ if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$). Since our definitions differ slightly from those in [34][35], we shall outline the essential steps for the sake of completeness.

Throughout this section, let $\mathcal{P}^G = \mathcal{P}^G(M)$ or $\mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$, $W^G = W^G(M)$ or $W^G(M, \partial M)$ depending on whether ∂M is empty. By reparametrization, we always assume the domain of $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G$ is $I = [0, 1]$, and if $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, then $\Phi_\perp[0, 1/3]$ are smooth G -hypersurfaces as in Definition 2.7(ii).

For any sequence $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G$, define the *width* of $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\mathbf{L}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) := \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)),$$

Then we say $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a *min-max* sequence if

$$\mathbf{L}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) = W^G.$$

The *image set* of $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) := \{V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M) : V = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\Phi_{i_j}(x_{i_j})| \text{ for some } i_j \rightarrow \infty, x_{i_j} \in I\}.$$

Moreover, we define the *critical set* of $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) := \{V \in \mathbf{\Lambda}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) : \|V\|(M) = \mathbf{L}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})\}.$$

3.1. Discrete min-max settings. To apply the equivariant min-max constructions in [34][35], we need the following discrete notations. Since we only consider curves in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we will restrict the notations to the 1-parameter case.

Denote by $I := [0, 1]$. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $I(1, j)$ be the cube complex on I with 1-cells and 0-cells (vertices) given by:

$$I(1, j)_1 := \{[0, 3^{-j}], [3^{-j}, 2 \cdot 3^{-j}], \dots, [1 - 3^{-j}, 1]\}, \quad I(1, j)_0 := \{[0], [3^{-j}], \dots, [1]\}.$$

The boundary homeomorphism ∂ is defined by $\partial[a, b] = [b] - [a]$. Then we denote by $I(2, j) = I(1, j) \otimes I(1, j)$ the cell complex on $I^2 = I \times I$. For any $\alpha = \alpha_1 \otimes \alpha_2 \in I(2, j)$, we say α is a p -cell, if $\dim(\alpha_1) + \dim(\alpha_2) = p$. Then the set of p -cells of $I(2, j)$ is denoted by $I(2, j)_p$, and the set of p -cells in $\alpha \in I(i, j)_q$ is denoted by α_p .

Let $J := [1/3, 1]$. Then we denote by $J(1, j)$ the cubical subcomplex containing all the cells of $I(1, j)$ supported in J . Similarly, the set of p -cells of $J(1, j)$ is denoted by $J(1, j)_p$.

Given any two vertices $x, y \in I(m, j)_0$, define the distance $\mathbf{d}(x, y) := 3^j \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i - y_i|$. For any map $\phi : I(1, j)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we define the \mathbf{M} -finessness of ϕ by

$$\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\phi) := \sup \{ \mathbf{M}(\phi(x) - \phi(y)) : \mathbf{d}(x, y) = 1, x, y \in I(1, j)_0 \}.$$

Suppose $S = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of maps $\varphi_i : I(1, k_i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ such that $k_i \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\varphi_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Then we use the following notations:

- $\mathbf{L}(S) := \limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in I(1, k_i)_0} \mathbf{M}(\varphi_i(x))$;
- $\mathbf{A}(S) := \{V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M) : V = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |\varphi_{i_j}(x_{i_j})| \text{ for some } i_j \rightarrow \infty, x_{i_j} \in I(1, k_{i_j})_0\}$;
- $\mathbf{C}(S) := \{V \in \mathbf{A}(S) : \|V\|(M) = \mathbf{L}(S)\}$.

For any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{n}(i, j) : I(1, i)_0 \rightarrow I(1, j)_0$ be the nearest projection, i.e.

$$\mathbf{d}(x, \mathbf{n}(i, j)(x)) = \inf \{ \mathbf{d}(x, y) : y \in I(m, j)_0 \}.$$

Then we define the discrete homotopy:

Definition 3.1. Given $\phi_i : I(1, k_i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, $i = 1, 2$, we say ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are 1-homotopic in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with \mathbf{M} -finessness δ if there exists a map

$$\psi : I(1, k)_0 \times I(1, k)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

for some $k \geq \max\{k_1, k_2\}$ such that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\psi) < \delta$ and $\psi([i-1], x) = \phi_i(\mathbf{n}(k, k_i)(x))$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $x \in I(1, k)_0$.

Definition 3.2. A sequence of mappings $S = \{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\phi_i : I(1, k_i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, is a

$$(1, \mathbf{M})\text{-homotopy sequence of mappings into } \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2),$$

if ϕ_i and ϕ_{i+1} are 1-homotopic in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with \mathbf{M} -finessness δ_i such that

- (i) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_i = 0$;
- (ii) $\sup \{ \mathbf{M}(\phi_i(x)) : x \in I(1, k_i)_0, i \in \mathbb{N} \} < +\infty$.

Definition 3.3. Let $S^j = \{\phi_i^j\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, $j = 1, 2$, be two $(1, \mathbf{M})$ -homotopy sequences of mappings into $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Then S^1 and S^2 are homotopic in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ if there exists a sequence $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

- (i) ϕ_i^1 is 1-homotopic to ϕ_i^2 in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with \mathbf{M} -finessness δ_i ;
- (ii) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \delta_i = 0$.

By the following discretization theorem from [34, Theorem 2], we can generate a $(1, \mathbf{M})$ -homotopy sequence of mappings into $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ from any $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G$.

Theorem 3.4 (Discretization Theorem). *Let $\Phi : I \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ be a continuous map in the flat topology so that $\sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) < \infty$ and Φ has no concentration of mass on orbits. Then there exists a sequence of maps*

$$\phi_i : I(1, j_i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2),$$

with $j_i < j_{i+1}$, and a sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to zero such that

- (i) $S = \{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a $(1, \mathbf{M})$ -homotopy sequence of mappings into $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with \mathbf{M} -finessness $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\phi_i) < \delta_i$;

(ii) *there exists some sequence $k_i \rightarrow +\infty$ such that for all $x \in I(1, j_i)_0$,*

$$\mathbf{M}(\phi_i(x)) \leq \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\Phi(y)) : \alpha \in I(1, k_i)_1, x, y \in \alpha\} + \delta_i,$$

which implies $\mathbf{L}(S) \leq \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x))$;

(iii) $\sup\{\mathcal{F}(\phi_i(x) - \Phi(x)) : x \in I(1, j_i)_0\} \leq \delta_i$;

(iv) $\Phi(0) = \phi_i([0]) = \psi_i(\cdot, [0])$, $\Phi(1) = \phi_i([1]) = \psi_i(\cdot, [1])$, *where ψ_i is the discrete homotopy map of ϕ_i and ϕ_{i+1} given by (i) with $\psi_i([0], \mathbf{n}(\cdot)) = \phi_i$, $\psi_i([1], \mathbf{n}(\cdot)) = \phi_{i+1}$.*

Moreover, let $K \subset M$ be a compact G -invariant domain with smooth boundary. Then for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in I(1, j)_1$, if $\text{spt}(\Phi(x)) \subset K$ for all $x \in \alpha$, then we can further make $\text{spt}(\phi_i(x)) \subset K$ for all $x \in \alpha \cap I(1, j_i)_0$.

Proof. The statements in (i)-(iii) follow directly from [34, Theorem 2]. Note the proof of [34, Theorem 2] is basically the combinatorial approach in [19, Theorem 13.1] with Lemma 2.1 in place of [1, Corollary 1.14] and $\text{dist}(G \cdot p, \cdot)$ in place of $\text{dist}(p, \cdot)$. Meanwhile, since the maps are defined on 1-dimensional cubical complex, (iv) follows from [19, Proposition 13.5(ii)] and the combinatorial constructions of [19, Theorem 13.1(iv)]. Moreover, these arguments would also carry over in the case $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, and thus (i)-(iv) are still valid when M has boundary. Finally, if K and $\alpha \in I(1, j)$ are given as in the last statement. Then we can apply the above discretization result to $\Phi \llcorner \alpha$ in K and $\Phi \llcorner (I \setminus \text{int}(\alpha))$ in M respectively. Note the boundary values are unchanged by (iv). Hence, the discrete maps defined in α and $I \setminus \text{int}(\alpha)$ can be connected together, which gives the last statement. \square

The following interpolation theorem (c.f. [34, Theorem 3]) suggests that a \mathbf{M} -continuous map into $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ can be generated from a discrete map with small \mathbf{M} -finess.

Theorem 3.5 (Interpolation Theorem). *For $m = 1, 2$, there exists a positive constant $C_0 = C_0(M, G, m)$ so that if $\phi : I(m, k)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ has $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\phi) < \epsilon_M$ with $\epsilon_M > 0$ given in Lemma 2.1, then there exists a map*

$$\Phi : I^m \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$$

continuous in the \mathbf{M} -topology satisfying:

- (i) $\Phi(x) = \phi(x)$ for all $x \in I(m, k)_0$;
- (ii) *if α is some j -cell in $I(m, k)$, then Φ restricted to α depends only on the values of ϕ assumed on the vertices of α ;*
- (iii) $\sup\{\mathbf{M}(\Phi(x) - \Phi(y)) : x, y \text{ lie in a common cell of } I(m, k)\} \leq C_0 \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\phi)$;
- (iv) *for any $\alpha \in I(m, k)_j$, if $\phi \llcorner \alpha_0 \equiv T \in \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a constant, then $\Phi \llcorner \alpha \equiv T$.*

We call the map Φ in Theorem 3.5 the *Almgren G -extension* of ϕ .

Proof. The statements in (i)-(iii) follow directly from [34, Theorem 3]. If $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, then the constructions in [35, Theorem 4.13] would carry over with $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and Lemma 2.1 in place of $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M, \partial M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and [35, Lemma 3.10]. If $\phi \llcorner \alpha_0 \equiv T \in \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a constant for some j -cell α , then for any 1-cell $\gamma_1 = [a, b] \in \alpha_1$, the isoperimetric choice $Q(\gamma_1)$ of $\phi(a)$ and $\phi(b)$ (Lemma 2.1) must be 0. Hence, for any cell $\beta \subset \alpha$, the map h_β constructed in [35, Theorem 4.13] is 0, which implies $\Phi \llcorner \alpha \equiv T$ by [1, 4.5]. \square

Using the discretization/interpolation theorem 3.4 and 3.5, we have the following corollary (c.f. [34, Corollary 1]):

Corollary 3.6. *Let $\Phi : I \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ be a \mathcal{F} -continuous map with no concentration of mass on orbits and $\sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) < \infty$. Suppose $S = \{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by Theorem 3.4 applied to Φ , and Φ_i is the Almgren G -extension of ϕ_i given by Theorem 3.5 for i sufficiently large. Then*

- (i) *for each i large enough, there is a relative homotopy map $H_i : I^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $H_i(0, \cdot) = \Phi$, $H_i(1, \cdot) = \Phi_i$, $H_i(\cdot, 0) \equiv \Phi(0) = \Phi_i(0)$, and $H_i(\cdot, 1) \equiv \Phi(1) = \Phi_i(1)$;*
- (ii) $\mathbf{L}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) = \mathbf{L}(S) \leq \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x))$.

Proof. Using Theorem 3.5 and the arguments of Almgren [1], we see [1, Theorem 8.2] is valid in our G -invariant settings (even if ∂M may be non-empty). Hence, the proof of [21, Corollary 3.9] would carry over with Theorem 3.4 and 3.5 in place of [21, Theorem 3.6, 3.6]. Thus, Φ_i is homotopic to Φ in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ for i -large, and (ii) is valid. Additionally, by (iv) in Theorem 3.4 and 3.5, we have $\Phi(0) = \phi_i([0]) = \Phi_i(0)$ and $\Phi(1) = \phi_i([1]) = \Phi_i(1)$ for all i -large. Therefore, combining (iv) in Theorem 3.4 and 3.5 with the homotopy constructions in [21, Proposition 3.3, 3.8], one easily verifies that the homotopy map H_i of Φ and Φ_i is relative to the boundary values. \square

Let $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G$ be any min-max sequence. If $\partial M = \emptyset$, then we can apply Corollary 3.6 to each Φ_i and obtain a sequence of \mathbf{M} -continuous curves $\{\Phi_j^i\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ relative homotopic to Φ_i in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and $\mathbf{L}(\{\Phi_j^i\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}) \leq \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x))$. Choose $j(i)$ sufficiently large so that $\sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_{j(i)}^i(x)) \leq \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) + \frac{1}{i}$. Hence, we have $\{\Phi_{j(i)}^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M)$ is a min-max sequence continuous in the \mathbf{M} -topology and so in the \mathbf{F} -topology.

For the case $\partial M \neq \emptyset$, we can apply the above arguments to each $\Phi_i \llcorner J$ in a G -submanifold M_{η_i} given by Definition 2.7(iii) with $x_0 = \frac{1}{3}$, and get $\Phi_{j(i)}^i : J \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbf{M}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ satisfying

- $\Phi_{j(i)}^i$ is relative homotopic to $\Phi_i \llcorner J$ in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$,
- $\sup_{x \in J} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_{j(i)}^i(x)) \leq \sup_{x \in J} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) + \frac{1}{i}$.

Since the homotopy map of $\Phi_{j(i)}^i$ and $\Phi_i \llcorner J$ is relative to the boundary values, we can define $\Phi_{j(i)}^i \llcorner [0, \frac{1}{3}] = \Phi_i \llcorner [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and see $\{\Phi_{j(i)}^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ is a sequence of \mathbf{F} -continuous min-max sequence.

Therefore, the above arguments give the following corollary, which implies we only need to consider the \mathbf{F} -continuous G -sweepouts.

Corollary 3.7. *The G -width defined in Definition 2.6 and 2.7 satisfies*

$$W^G = \inf \left\{ \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) : \Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G \text{ is } \mathbf{F}\text{-continuous} \right\}.$$

3.2. Min-max theorems. We now use the min-max method to construct a minimal G -hypersurface (with multiplicity) so that the width W^G is realized by its area.

3.2.1. Closed manifolds.

For the case that M is closed, it follows from Remark 2.5 and Corollary 3.7 that $\mathbf{\Pi} := \{\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G(M) \text{ is } \mathbf{F}\text{-continuous}\}$ is a *continuous G -homotopy class* in the sense of [34, Definition 5], and $W^G(M) = \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{\Pi})$ in the sense of [34, Definition 6]. Hence, we have the following min-max theorem by [34, Theorem 8]. (Note the assumptions on $M \setminus M^{prin}$ in [34, Theorem 8] can be removed by the modifications in [35], and the dimension assumption is modified in [36, Theorem 5.1].)

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose M is closed, i.e. $\partial M = \emptyset$, and $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7$ for all $p \in M$. Then there exists an integral G -varifold $V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$ so that*

$$\|V\|(M) = W^G(M), \quad \text{and} \quad V = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i |\Sigma_i|,$$

where $m, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are disjoint G -connected (Definition 4.4) smooth embedded closed minimal G -hypersurfaces. Moreover, if Σ_i does not admit a G -invariant unit normal vector field, then n_i is an even number.

Proof. We only need to show the last statement since the existence and regularity of V are given by [34, Theorem 8] (see also [36, Theorem 5.1]). Note the min-max varifold V is (G, \mathbb{Z}_2) -almost minimizing in annuli of *boundary type* in the sense of [34, Definition 10,11]. Hence, for each Σ_i , we can take a small G -tube $B_{2r}^G(p)$ with center $G \cdot p \subset \Sigma_i$ and $r \in (0, \frac{\text{inj}(G \cdot p)}{2})$ so that

- V is (G, \mathbb{Z}_2) -almost minimizing of boundary type in $B_{2r}^G(p)$;
- $B_t^G(p)$ has mean convex boundary for all $t \in (0, 2r)$;
- $B_{2r}^G(p) \cap \text{spt}(\|V\|) \subset \Sigma_i$, and $\partial B_r^G(p)$ is transversal to Σ_i .

Then by the constructions ([34, Proposition 2, 3]) and the consistency ([36, Proposition 4.19]) of G -replacements, there exists a sequence $\{T_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ so that

- (1) $T_j = \partial Q_j$ is locally mass minimizing in $B_r^G(p)$ with $Q_j \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$;
- (2) $|T_j| \rightarrow V$ in the sense of varifolds.

By compactness, let $T_j \rightarrow T = \partial Q$ in the flat topology with $Q \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Thus, we have $\text{spt}(T) \subset \text{spt}(V) = \cup_{i=1}^m \Sigma_i$, which implies $T = \sum_{i=1}^m n'_i [|\Sigma_i|]$ for some $n'_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ by the Constancy Theorem. As a boundary of $Q \in \mathbf{I}_{n+1}^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, we must have $n'_i = 0$ if Σ_i does not admit a G -invariant unit normal. Now we can use the slicing theory ([33, 28.5]) to take $s \in (r/2, r)$ so that $\mathbf{M}(\partial(T_j \llcorner B_s^G(p)))$ are uniformly bounded, and thus $T_j \llcorner B_s^G(p)$ converges up to a subsequence. Finally, because of (1), [38, Theorem 1.1] suggests $n_i \equiv n'_i \pmod{2}$, and thus the multiplicity n_i must be even for Σ_i without a G -invariant unit normal. \square

3.2.2. Compact manifolds with boundary.

Now we consider the case that $\partial M \neq \emptyset$. In this case, we make the assumption that

$$(3.1) \quad H_{\partial M} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad W^G(M, \partial M) > \text{Area}(\partial M),$$

where $H_{\partial M}$ is the mean curvature of ∂M with respect to the inward unit normal $\nu_{\partial M}$. By Corollary 3.7, we can take a min-max sequence $\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ that are continuous in the \mathbf{F} -topology. The strategy is to use the following proposition to deform $\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ into a new \mathbf{F} -continuous min-max sequence so that every $V \in \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$ is supported in a G -invariant subdomain $M_a \subset\subset M$. With this benefit, the min-max constructions can be restricted in the interior of M to build a closed minimal G -hypersurface realizing the width $W^G(M, \partial M)$. This deformation approach is based on the idea of [18, Lemma 2.2] and we list the details here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 3.9. *Suppose $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ satisfies (3.1). Then there exist a constant $a > 0$ and a min-max sequence $\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ continuous in the \mathbf{F} -topology so that*

- if $\mathbf{M}(\Phi_i^*(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta$ with $\delta = \frac{1}{4}(W^G(M, \partial M) - \text{Area}(\partial M))$, then $\text{spt}(\Phi_i^*(x)) \subset\subset M_a := \{p \in M : \text{dist}_M(p, \partial M) \geq a\}$.

Proof. Let $a > 0$ be small enough so that $d := \text{dist}_M(\partial M, \cdot)$ is a G -invariant smooth function in a $4a$ -neighborhood of ∂M . By (3.1), we can set $a > 0$ even smaller so that for any $r \in [0, 3a]$, $\partial M_r = d^{-1}(r)$ has positive mean curvature H_r with respect to the inner unit normal ∇d . Denote by A_r the second fundamental form of ∂M_r , and $c = \sup_{r \in [0, 3a], p \in \partial M_r} |A_r|(p)$. Then we take the function $\phi \geq 0$ as in [18, Lemma 2.2] so that

$$\phi' + c\phi \leq 0, \quad \phi(r) > 0 \text{ for } r < 2a, \quad \phi(r) = 0 \text{ for } r \geq 2a.$$

For any $p \in \text{int}(M) \setminus M_{3a}$ and n -subspace $S \subset T_p M$, let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an orthonormal basis of S , and $P : T_p M \rightarrow T_p \partial M_{d(p)}$ be the projection. Since $\dim(S \cap T_p \partial M_{d(p)}) \geq n - 1$, we can assume $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1} \cup \{e^*\}$ gives an orthonormal basis of $T_p \partial M_{d(p)}$, where e^* satisfies $\langle e^*, P(e_n) \rangle = |P(e_n)|$. Noting $\nabla d \perp T_p \partial M_{d(p)}$ and $\nabla_{\nabla d} \nabla d = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{div}_S(\phi \nabla d) &= \phi'(d(p)) \cdot \langle e_n, \nabla d \rangle^2 + \phi(d(p)) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \nabla_{e_i} \nabla d, e_i \rangle \\ (3.2) \quad &= \phi' \langle e_n, \nabla d \rangle^2 - \phi \sum_{i=1}^n A_{d(p)}(P(e_i), P(e_i)) \\ &= (\phi' + \phi A_{d(p)}(e^*, e^*)) \langle e_n, \nabla d \rangle^2 - \phi H_{d(p)} \\ &\leq (\phi' + c\phi) \langle e_n, \nabla d \rangle^2 - \phi H_{d(p)} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3.7, we can take any min-max sequence $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ continuous in the \mathbf{F} -metric. Then for each Φ_i , there exist $\epsilon_i > 0$ and $\eta_i \in (0, \frac{a}{8})$ so that

- (1) $\Phi_i \llcorner [0, 4\epsilon_i]$ are smooth G -hypersurfaces with $\mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) \leq \text{Area}(\partial M) + \delta$, $\forall x \in [0, 4\epsilon_i]$;
- (2) $\text{spt}(\Phi_i(x)) \subset\subset M_{2\eta_i}$ for all $x \in [\epsilon_i, 1]$.

Let κ_i be a cut-off function so that $\kappa_i(r) = 0$ for $r \leq \eta_i$, and $\kappa_i(r) = 1$ for $r \geq 2\eta_i$. Then the G -vector field $X_i := \kappa_i(d)\phi(d)\nabla d$ generates G -equivariant diffeomorphisms $\{F_t^i\}$. By (2) and (3.2), for any $x \in [\epsilon_i, 1]$ and $t_0 \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=t_0} \mathbf{M}((F_t^i)_{\#} \Phi_i(x)) &= \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \| (F_t^i)_{\#} (F_{t_0}^i)_{\#} \Phi_i(x) \| (M) \\ &= \int \text{div}_S(X_i) dV_{t_0, x} = \int \text{div}_S(\phi \nabla d) dV_{t_0, x} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_{t_0, x} := |(F_{t_0}^i)_{\#} \Phi_i(x)| \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M_{2\eta_i})$. Therefore,

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{M}((F_t^i)_{\#} \Phi_i(x)) \leq \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)), \quad \forall x \in [\epsilon_i, 1], \quad t \geq 0.$$

Since $M_{2\eta_i} \setminus M_{2a} \subset \text{spt}(X_i) \subset M_{\eta_i} \setminus \text{int}(M_{2a})$, we see $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_t^i(p) \in \partial M_{2a}$ for any $p \in M_{2\eta_i} \setminus M_{2a}$, and thus $F_{T_i}^i(M_{2\eta_i}) \subset M_a$ for some $T_i > 0$. Choose a smooth function $h_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, T_i]$ with $h_i \llcorner [0, \epsilon_i] = 0$, $h_i \llcorner [2\epsilon_i, 1] = T_i$. Then $\Phi_i^*(x) := (F_{h_i(x)}^i)_{\#} \Phi_i(x)$ satisfies:

- (a) $\Phi_i^*(x) = \Phi_i(x)$ for $x \in [0, \epsilon_i]$ (since $h_i = 0$);
- (b) $\mathbf{M}(\Phi_i^*(x)) \leq \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x))$ for all $x \in [\epsilon_i, 1]$ (by (3.3));
- (c) $\text{spt}(\Phi_i^*(x)) \subset\subset M_a$ for all $x \in [2\epsilon_i, 1]$ (by (2) and the definitions of T_i, h_i).

Clearly, $\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ is also an \mathbf{F} -continuous min-max sequence. Additionally, if $\mathbf{M}(\Phi_i^*(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta \geq \text{Area}(\partial M) + \delta$, then $x \in (4\epsilon_i, 1]$ by (1)(a)(b), and thus $\text{spt}(\Phi_i^*(x)) \subset\subset M_a$ by (c). \square

Next, we use the pull-tight arguments to make every $V \in \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$ stationary in M . By Proposition 3.9, the pull-tight procedure can be restricted in a G -subset $\text{int}(M_a)$.

Proposition 3.10. *Suppose $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ satisfies (3.1) and $\delta := \frac{1}{4}(W^G(M, \partial M) - \text{Area}(\partial M))$. Let $a > 0$ and $\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ be given by Proposition 3.9. Then there is an \mathbf{F} -continuous min-max sequence $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ with*

- (i) $\mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \subset \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \cap \mathcal{V}_n^G(M_a)$;
- (ii) every G -varifold $V \in \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$ is stationary in M ;
- (iii) if $\mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta$, then $\text{spt}(\Phi_i(x)) \subset \subset M_{\frac{a}{2}}$.

Proof. Let $C := \sup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{x \in I} \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i^*(x)) < \infty$ and $\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}} := \text{int}(M_{\frac{a}{2}})$ be a G -invariant open set of M . Define then $A := \{V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M) : \|V\|(M) \leq C\}$ and

$$A_0 := \{V \in A : V \text{ is stationary in } \mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}}\}.$$

Since G acts by isometries, A and A_0 are compact subset of $\mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$. Additionally, for any $V \in A$, it follows from (2.2) that $V \in A_0$ if and only if $\delta V(X) = 0, \forall X \in \mathfrak{X}^G(\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}})$. Hence, we can follow [19, Page 765] (or [27, Page 153]) with $\mathfrak{X}^G(\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}})$ in place of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$ to define a continuous map $X : A \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^G(\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}})$ and a continuous function $\eta : A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying

- $X(V) = 0$ and $\eta(V) = 0$, if $V \in A_0$;
- $\delta V(X(V)) < 0$ and $\eta(V) > 0$, if $V \in A \setminus A_0$;
- $\|(f_t^{X(V)})_{\#} V\|(M) < \|(f_s^{X(V)})_{\#} V\|(M)$ for all $V \in A$ and $0 \leq s < t \leq \eta(V)$,

where $\{f_t^{X(V)}\}$ are the equivariant diffeomorphisms generated by $X(V)$. Define then

$$H : I \times \{T \in \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbf{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2) : \mathbf{M}(T) \leq C\} \rightarrow \{T \in \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbf{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2) : \mathbf{M}(T) \leq C\},$$

$$H(t, T) := \left(f_{\eta(|T|)t}^{X(|T|)} \right)_{\#} T.$$

One easily verifies $H(0, T) = T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $\mathbf{M}(T) \leq C$, and

- if $|T|$ is stationary in $\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}}$, then $H(t, T) = T$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$;
- if $|T|$ is not stationary in $\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}}$, then $\mathbf{M}(H(1, T)) < \mathbf{M}(T)$.

Define $\Phi_i := H(1, \Phi_i^*)$. Note $X(V)$ is compact supported in $\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}}$ and $f_t^{X(V)} \llcorner (M \setminus \mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}}) = id$. Hence, Φ_i is also a G -sweepout of $(M, \partial M)$. Additionally, by the above constructions, one easily verifies that $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M; \partial M)$ is a min-max sequence continuous in the \mathbf{F} -topology, and $\mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \subset \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \cap A_0$. Moreover, it follows from Proposition 3.9 that $\mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \subset \mathcal{V}_n^G(M_a) \cap A_0$, which implies every $V \in \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$ is stationary in M . Finally, since the deformations $f_t^{X(V)}$ are restricted in $\mathring{M}_{\frac{a}{2}}$, the last bullet follows directly from Proposition 3.9 and the above constructions. \square

Finally, we can now show the equivariant min-max theorem for compact manifold M with boundary ∂M satisfying (3.1). The proof is generally the approach in [20, Theorem 3.8], and we list some necessary modifications.

Theorem 3.11. *Suppose $\partial M \neq \emptyset$ satisfies (3.1), and $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7$ for all $p \in M$. Then there exists an integral G -varifold $V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$ so that $\|V\|(M) = W^G(M, \partial M)$ and $V = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i |\Sigma_i|$, where $m, n_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\Sigma_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are disjoint smooth embedded closed minimal G -hypersurfaces in the interior of M .*

Proof. Let $a > 0$ and $\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ be given by Proposition 3.10 so that every $V \in \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$ is stationary in M and compactly supported in $\text{int}(M_{a_0})$ for $a_0 = \frac{a}{2}$. Let

$\delta = \frac{1}{4}(W^G(M, \partial M) - \text{Area}(\partial M)) > 0$. Then by reparametrization, we assume $\Phi_{i\perp}[0, \frac{1}{3}]$ foliates a neighborhood of ∂M so that

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) \leq \text{Area}(\partial M) + \delta = W^G(M, \partial M) - 3\delta, \quad \forall x \in [0, 1/3].$$

Denote by

$$\Phi'_i := \Phi_{i\perp} J.$$

By Definition 2.7, there exists $\eta_i \in (0, a_0)$ so that $\text{spt}(\Phi'_i(x)) \subset\subset M_{\eta_i}$ for all $x \in J$. Additionally, since the map $x \mapsto \mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x))$ is continuous (by (2.1)), we can take $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $|\mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x)) - \mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(y))| \leq \delta/4$ for all x, y in a common 1-cell of $J(1, k_i)$. Denote by U_i the union of 1-cells $\alpha \in J(1, k_i)_1$ so that $\mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x)) \leq W^G(M, \partial M) - 3\delta/4$ for all $x \in \alpha$, and $V_i := J \setminus U_i$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.10(iii), we have

$$\mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{spt}(\Phi'_i(x)) \subset M_{a_0}, \quad \forall x \in V_i.$$

By Lemma 2.3, we can apply Theorem 3.4 to each Φ'_i in the G -submanifold M_{η_i} and obtain a sequence of maps $\phi_j^i : J(1, k_j^i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with $k_j^i < k_{j+1}^i$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. The last statement in Theorem 3.4 indicates $\{\phi_j^i\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be chosen to satisfy $\text{spt}(\phi_j^i(x)) \subset M_{a_0}$ for all $x \in V_i \cap J(1, k_j^i)_0$. Moreover, we claim the following result:

Claim 1. *For j large enough, if $\mathbf{M}(\phi_j^i(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/2$ then $\text{spt}(\phi_j^i(x)) \subset M_{a_0}$.*

Proof of Claim 1. By the continuity of $x \mapsto \mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x))$ and Theorem 3.4(ii), if $\mathbf{M}(\phi_j^i(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/2$, then we have $\mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x)) > W^G(M, \partial M) - 3\delta/4$ for j large enough. Thus, such vertex x must be in V_i , so $\text{spt}(\phi_j^i(x)) \subset M_{a_0}$. \square

Additionally, we also have the following equality due to the lower semi-continuity of mass, the continuity of $x \mapsto \mathbf{M}(\Phi'_i(x))$, and Theorem 3.4(ii)(iii):

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \mathbf{F}(\phi_j^i(x), \Phi'_i(x)) : x \in J(1, k_j^i)_0 \} = 0.$$

Let $\Phi_j^i : J \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbf{M}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ be the Almgren G -extension of ϕ_j^i given by Theorem 3.5 for j -large. By Corollary 3.6, Φ_j^i and Φ'_i are *relative* homotopic in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathcal{F}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Therefore,

$$\tilde{\Phi}_i^j(x) := \begin{cases} \Phi_i(x), & x \in [0, 1/3], \\ \Phi_j^i(x), & x \in J = [1/3, 1], \end{cases}$$

is a well-defined \mathbf{F} -continuous G -sweepout of $(M, \partial M)$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and j -large, and thus

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} W^G(M, \partial M) &\leq \mathbf{L}(\{\tilde{\Phi}_j^i\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}) = \mathbf{L}(\{\Phi_j^i\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}) \\ &= \mathbf{L}(\{\phi_j^i\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}) \leq \sup \{ \mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) : x \in I \} \rightarrow W^G(M, \partial M), \end{aligned}$$

by (3.4) and Corollary 3.6.

Now, we take a subsequence $j(i) \rightarrow \infty$ and define $\tilde{\Phi}_i = \tilde{\Phi}_{j(i)}^i$, $S = \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\varphi_i := \phi_{j(i)}^i$, so that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\varphi_i) \rightarrow 0$ and

- (1) $C_i \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\varphi_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, where $C_i = C_0(M_{\eta_i}, G, 1)$ is given by Theorem 3.5;
- (2) if $\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/2$ then $\text{spt}(\varphi_i(x)) \subset M_{a_0}$ (by Claim 1);
- (3) $W^G(M, \partial M) = \mathbf{L}(\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})$ (by (3.6));
- (4) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \mathbf{F}(\varphi_i(x), \Phi_i(x)) : x \in J(1, k_{j(i)}^i)_0 \} = 0$ (by (3.5));
- (5) $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \mathbf{F}(\Phi_i(x), \Phi_i(y)) : x, y \in \alpha, \alpha \in I(1, k_{j(i)}^i) \} = 0$ (by the \mathbf{F} -continuity).

Combining (3)(4)(5) with (3.4), we have $\mathbf{C}(S) = \mathbf{C}(\{\Phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \subset \mathcal{V}_n^G(M_{2a_0})$ and every $V \in \mathbf{C}(S)$ is stationary in M .

Claim 2. *There exists $V \in \mathbf{C}(S)$ that is (G, \mathbb{Z}_2) -almost minimizing in annuli (of boundary type) in the sense of [34, Definition 11].*

Proof of Claim 2. Suppose none of $V \in \mathbf{C}(S)$ is (G, \mathbb{Z}_2) -almost minimizing in annuli in the sense of [34, Definition 11]. Then there is a new sequence $S^* = \{\varphi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of mappings $\varphi_i^* : J(1, l_i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ for some $l_i \geq k_{j(i)}^i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, such that

- (i) $\mathbf{L}(S^*) < \mathbf{L}(S) = W^G(M, \partial M)$;
- (ii) φ_i and φ_i^* are 1-homotopic in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ with \mathbf{M} -finenesses tending to zero, (Specifically, there is a map $\psi_i : I(1, l_i)_0 \times J(1, l_i)_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ so that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\psi_i) \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, $\psi_i([0], \cdot) = \varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i$, and $\psi_i([1], \cdot) = \varphi_i^*$, where $\mathbf{n}_i = \mathbf{n}(l_i, k_{j(i)}^i)$);
- (iii) $\text{spt}(\psi_i(t, x) - \varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)) \subset\subset M_{a_0}$, for any $t \in I(1, l_i)_0$ and $x \in J(1, l_i)_0$;
- (iv) for any $x \in J(1, l_i)_0$, if $\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)) < W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4$, then $\psi_i(\cdot, x) \equiv \varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)$ is a constant discrete homotopy at x .

Indeed, since each $V \in \mathbf{C}(S)$ is supported in M_{2a_0} , we can take G -annuli $\{\text{An}^G(p(V), r_i - s_i, r_i + s_i)\}_{i=1}^{27}$ in M_{a_0} as in [27, Theorem 4.10, Part 1], which implies all the deformations will be restricted in M_{a_0} . Using [35, Theorem 3.14] and $\text{dist}_M(G \cdot p, \cdot)$, we can make the constructions in [27, Theorem 4.10, Part 2-9] with G -invariant objects. Then the rest parts in [27, Theorem 4.10] are purely combinatorial which would carry over with M_{a_0} in place of M . This gives (i)-(iii). Moreover, by taking the constant ϵ_2 in [27, Theorem 4.10, Part 3] smaller than $\delta/8$, we have $\psi_i(\cdot, x) \equiv \varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)$ provided $\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)) < W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4$ (c.f. Part 10(c), Part 14 and 18 in [27, Theorem 4.10]).

Next, we can extend φ_i^* (for i -large) to an \mathbf{F} -continuous map $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \in \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$ so that $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \llcorner [0, 1/3] = \tilde{\Phi}_i \llcorner [0, 1/3] = \Phi_i \llcorner [0, 1/3]$. Indeed, take any 1-cell $\alpha = [x_0, x_1] \in J(1, l_i)_1$, we will construct the extension $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \llcorner \alpha$ separately in two cases.

Case 1: $\max\{\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x_0)), \mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x_1))\} < W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4$.

By (ii)(iv), we can define $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \llcorner \alpha := \tilde{\Phi}_i \circ f_\alpha$ as the extension of $\varphi_i^* \llcorner \alpha_0$, where $f_\alpha : \alpha = [x_0, x_1] \rightarrow [\mathbf{n}_i(x_0), \mathbf{n}_i(x_1)]$ is an affine transformation. Hence, in this case, we have

$$(3.7) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_i^* \llcorner \alpha \subset \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbb{Z}_2), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Phi}_i^*(x) = \tilde{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{n}_i(x)) \quad \forall x \in \alpha_0 = \{x_0, x_1\}.$$

In particular, $\tilde{\Phi}_i^*(1) = \tilde{\Phi}_i(1) = 0$ provided $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\psi_i) < W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4$, which holds for i -large. Additionally, it follows from (1), Theorem 3.5(i)(iii), and the choice of α that

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\tilde{\Phi}_i^*(x)) : x \in \alpha\} &= \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\tilde{\Phi}_i(x)) : x \in f_\alpha(\alpha)\} \\ &\leq \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i(x)) : x \in \partial f_\alpha(\alpha)\} + C_i \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\varphi_i) \\ &< W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4 + C_i \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\varphi_i) \\ &\leq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/5, \quad \text{for } i\text{-large,} \end{aligned}$$

where $C_i = C_0(M_{\eta_i}, G, 1)$ is given by Theorem 3.5.

Case 2: $\max\{\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x_0)), \mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x_1))\} \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4$.

Denote by $A_i \subset J$ the union of all 1-cells of this case in $J(1, l_i)_1$. Take i sufficiently large so that $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\psi_i) < \delta/4$ (by (ii)). Then $\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)) \geq W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/2$ for all $x \in J(1, l_i)_0 \cap A_i$. By (2) and (iii), we have $\varphi_i^*(x) = \psi_i^*([1], x)$ is supported in M_{a_0} for all $x \in J(1, l_i)_0 \cap A_i$. Applying Theorem 3.5 to $\varphi_i^* \llcorner [J(1, l_i)_0 \cap A_i]$ in M_{a_0} (for i -large) will give

an \mathbf{M} -continuous extension $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* : A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{a_0}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ so that

$$(3.9) \quad \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\tilde{\Phi}_i^*(x)) : x \in A_i\} \leq \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i^*(x)) : x \in J(1, l_i)_0 \cap A_i\} + C_0 \mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{M}}(\psi_i),$$

where $C_0 = C_0(M_{a_0}, G, 1) \geq 1$ is a uniform constant. Note for any $x \in \partial A_i$, we must have $\mathbf{M}(\varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x)) < W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/4$. Hence, by (iv) and Theorem 3.5(i),

$$(3.10) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_i^*(x) = \varphi_i^*(x) = \varphi_i \circ \mathbf{n}_i(x) = \tilde{\Phi}_i(\mathbf{n}_i(x)) \quad \forall x \in \partial A_i.$$

It now follows from (3.7)(3.10) that $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* : I \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is a well-defined \mathbf{F} -continuous map so that $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \llcorner [0, 1/3] = \tilde{\Phi}_i \llcorner [0, 1/3] = \Phi_i \llcorner [0, 1/3]$, $\tilde{\Phi}_i^*(1) = 0$, and $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \llcorner J \subset \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_{\eta_i}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, which implies $\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \in \mathcal{P}^G(M, \partial M)$. Therefore, by (3.4)(3.8)(3.9)(i)(ii),

$$W^G(M, \partial M) \leq \mathbf{L}(\{\tilde{\Phi}_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}) \leq \max\{W^G(M, \partial M) - \delta/5, \mathbf{L}(\{\varphi_i^*\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}})\} < W^G(M, \partial M),$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Thus, there must exist $V \in \mathbf{C}(S)$ that is (G, \mathbb{Z}_2) -almost minimizing in annuli (of boundary type) in the sense of [34, Definition 11]. Since $\mathbf{C}(S) \subset \mathcal{V}_n^G(M_{2a_0})$, the interior regularity result [34, Theorem 7] (modified in [36, Theorem 4.18]) indicates that V is an integral G -varifold induced by closed smooth embedded minimal G -hypersurfaces. \square

4. G -SWEEPOUTS IN POSITIVE RICCI CURVATURE G -MANIFOLDS

In this section, we always assume (M^{n+1}, g_M) is a closed connected orientable Riemannian manifold with positive Ricci curvature $\text{Ric}_M > 0$, and G is a compact Lie group acting on M isometrically so that $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7$ for all $p \in M$. The goal of us is to associate an \mathbf{F} -continuous G -sweepout to each closed minimal G -hypersurface in M .

To begin with, we collect some notations and classical results for minimal hypersurfaces. Let $\Sigma \subset M$ be a closed smooth embedded minimal hypersurface. Recall the second variation of Σ for the area functional is given by

$$(4.1) \quad \delta^2 \Sigma(X) := \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \right|_{t=0} \text{Area}(F_t(\Sigma)) = - \int_{\Sigma} \langle L_{\Sigma}(X^{\perp}), X^{\perp} \rangle,$$

where $L_{\Sigma} : \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^{\perp}(\Sigma)$ is the Jacobi operator of Σ , and $\{F_t\}$ are diffeomorphisms generated by $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Then we denote by

- $\text{Index}(\Sigma)$: the *Morse index* of Σ , i.e. the number of the negative eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) of L_{Σ} ;
- $\mu_1(\Sigma)$: the first eigenvalue of L_{Σ} .

If $\text{Index}(\Sigma) = 0$ or equivalently $\mu_1(\Sigma) \geq 0$, then we say Σ is *stable*.

For the case that $\Sigma \subset M$ is a G -invariant minimal hypersurface, we have $L_{\Sigma}(X) \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$, where $\mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$ is the space of normal G -vector fields on Σ . By restricting L_{Σ} to $\mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$, we make the following definition:

Definition 4.1. Let $\Sigma \subset M$ be a closed smooth embedded minimal G -hypersurface. The *equivariant Morse index* (or *G -index* for simplicity) $\text{Index}_G(\Sigma)$ is defined by the number of the negative eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) of $L_{\Sigma \llcorner} \mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$. Additionally, we denote $\mu_1^G(\Sigma)$ as the first eigenvalue of $L_{\Sigma \llcorner} \mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$.

Suppose Σ is a closed minimal G -hypersurface with a G -invariant unit normal ν , and u_1 is the first eigenfunction of L_{Σ} . Then for any $g \in G$, the G -invariance of Σ and ν indicates $u_1 \circ g$ is also the first eigenfunction of L_{Σ} . It is well-known that $\mu_1(\Sigma)$ has multiplicity one

and the first eigenfunction u_1 does not change sign. Hence, $u_1 \circ g = u_1$ for all $g \in G$, which suggests $u_1 \nu \in \mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$ and the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. *If Σ is a closed minimal G -hypersurface with a G -invariant unit normal ν . Then the first eigenfunction $u_1 > 0$ of L_Σ is G -invariant and $\mu_1(\Sigma) = \mu_1^G(\Sigma)$.*

Since we mainly consider the ambient manifolds with positive Ricci curvature, we collect the following useful results which are well-known to experts (c.f. [40, Section 2]).

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose (M^{n+1}, g_M) is a closed connected orientable Riemannian manifold. Let $\Sigma, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \subset M$ be closed embedded hypersurfaces. Then we have*

- (i) *if Σ is connected, then Σ is orientable if and only if it is 2-sided (i.e. Σ has a unit normal vector field);*
- (ii) *if Σ is connected and separates M , i.e. $M \setminus \Sigma$ has two connected components, then Σ is orientable.*

Moreover, suppose M has positive Ricci curvature. Then we have

- (iii) *if Σ is connected and orientable, then Σ separates M ;*
- (iv) *if Σ is minimal and 2-sided, then it can not be stable, i.e. $\mu_1(\Sigma) < 0$;*
- (v) *if Σ_1, Σ_2 are minimal hypersurfaces, then $\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 \neq \emptyset$;*

After involving the actions of G , a connected component of some G -hypersurface Σ may not be G -invariant. Hence, we introduce the following notions of equivariant connectivity.

Definition 4.4. Let $U \subset M$ be a G -invariant subset with connected components $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Then we say U is G -connected if for any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, there exists $g_{ij} \in G$ so that $g_{ij} \cdot U_j = U_i$. Additionally, we say $U' \subset U$ is a G -connected component (or G -component for simplicity) of U , if U' has the form of $\cup_{j=1}^l U_{i(j)}$ and is G -connected.

Note any G -subset U of M can be separated into some G -components. Additionally, by the above proposition, it is easy to show the following results:

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose (M^{n+1}, g_M) is a closed connected orientable Riemannian manifold with positive Ricci curvature, and G is a compact Lie group acting on M isometrically. Let $\Sigma \subset M$ be a closed embedded minimal G -hypersurface. Then Σ is connected and*

- *if Σ has a G -invariant unit normal, then Σ separates M into two G -components.*
- *if Σ does not admit a G -invariant unit normal, then $M \setminus \Sigma$ is G -connected.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.3(v) that Σ is connected. If Σ has a G -invariant unit normal ν , then by Lemma 4.3(i)(iii), $M \setminus \Sigma$ has two connected components M_1, M_2 , with ν pointing inward M_1 . Since ν and $M_1 \cup M_2$ are G -invariant, we have $g_* \nu = \nu$ and $g \cdot M_i = M_i$ for all $g \in G$ and $i \in \{1, 2\}$, which indicates each M_i is G -connected. If the unit normal ν exists but is not G -invariant, then there exists $g \in G$ so that $g_* \nu = -\nu$ pointing inward M_2 , which implies $g \cdot M_1 = M_2$, and thus $M_1 \cup M_2$ is G -connected. If Σ does not admit a unit normal, then $M \setminus \Sigma$ has only one component which is also G -connected. \square

Recall that, in [39], Zhou constructed sweepouts of M by separating orientable and non-orientable minimal hypersurfaces. It follows from [39, Lemma 3.3] that the orientability of a connected closed hypersurface is equivalent to the non-connectivity of its unit normal bundle. Hence, after involving the actions of G , we shall separate the constructions by the G -connectivity (Definition 4.4) of the unit normal bundle for minimal G -hypersurfaces.

Therefore, we denote

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{S}^G(M) := \left\{ \Sigma^n \subset M^{n+1} \mid \begin{array}{l} \Sigma \text{ is a closed smooth embedded} \\ \text{minimal } G\text{-hypersurface in } (M, g_M) \end{array} \right\}.$$

By Theorem 3.8, $\mathcal{S}^G(M) \neq \emptyset$ provided $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7, \forall p \in M$. Define then

$$\mathcal{S}_+^G(M) := \{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}^G(M) : \Sigma \text{ has a } G\text{-invariant unit normal}\},$$

and $\mathcal{S}_-^G(M) := \mathcal{S}^G(M) \setminus \mathcal{S}_+^G(M)$. It follows directly from Lemma 4.5 that

$$\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_-^G(M) \Leftrightarrow S\Sigma \text{ is } G\text{-connected} \Leftrightarrow M \setminus \Sigma \text{ is } G\text{-connected},$$

where $S\Sigma = \{v \in \mathbf{N}\Sigma : |v| = 1\}$ is the unit normal bundle of Σ .

Moreover, for any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_-^G(M)$, we can cut M along Σ to obtain a new manifold \widetilde{M} so that \widetilde{M} is locally isometric to M , G acts on \widetilde{M} by isometries, and $\partial\widetilde{M} \in \mathcal{S}_+^G(\widetilde{M})$ is a G -invariant double cover of Σ . Specifically, let $r > 0$ be small enough so that the normal exponential map $\exp_\Sigma^\perp : \mathbf{N}\Sigma \rightarrow M$ is a G -equivariant diffeomorphism on $B_{2r}(\Sigma) := \{p \in M : \text{dist}_M(\Sigma, p) < 2r\}$. Hence, we have

$$(4.3) \quad E : S\Sigma \times (-2r, 2r) \rightarrow B_r(\Sigma), \quad E(v, t) := \exp_\Sigma^\perp(t \cdot v)$$

is a double cover of $B_{2r}(\Sigma)$. Define the action of G on $S\Sigma \times (-2r, 2r)$ by $g \cdot (v, t) := (g_*v, t)$ for any $v \in S\Sigma$ and $t \in (-2r, 2r)$, which indicates E is G -equivariant and

$$(4.4) \quad \widetilde{\Sigma} = S\Sigma \times \{0\}$$

is a G -equivariant double cover of Σ . Let $E_r := E_\perp(S\Sigma \times (r, 2r))$ be a G -equivariant diffeomorphism on $B_{2r}(\Sigma) \setminus \text{Clos}(B_r(\Sigma))$. Then by gluing $M \setminus \text{Clos}(B_r(\Sigma))$ and $S\Sigma \times [0, 2r)$ on $B_{2r}(\Sigma) \setminus \text{Clos}(B_r(\Sigma))$ with E_r , we can define

$$(4.5) \quad \widetilde{M} := (M \setminus \text{Clos}(B_r(\Sigma))) \cup_{E_r} (S\Sigma \times [0, 2r)),$$

as a compact manifold with boundary $\partial\widetilde{M} = \widetilde{\Sigma}$. Then we have

$$(4.6) \quad F : \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M, \quad F := \begin{cases} id, & \text{in } M \setminus \text{Clos}(B_r(\Sigma)), \\ E, & \text{in } S\Sigma \times [0, 2r), \end{cases}$$

is a G -equivariant smooth map so that $F_\perp(\widetilde{M} \setminus \widetilde{\Sigma})$ gives a diffeomorphism to $M \setminus \Sigma$, and $F_\perp\widetilde{\Sigma}$ gives a double cover of Σ . Using F , we can pull back the metric g_M from M to \widetilde{M} so that F is a local isometry and G acts on \widetilde{M} by isometries. Thus, $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ is a minimal G -hypersurface in \widetilde{M} with an inward pointing G -invariant unit normal. In particular, $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_-^G(M)$ implies $S\Sigma$ and $M \setminus \Sigma$ are both G -connected, and thus \widetilde{M} is G -connected.

4.1. G -sweepouts correspond to $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}^G(M)$.

Proposition 4.6. *Given any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_+^G(M)$, there exists an \mathbf{F} -continuous G -sweepout $\Phi : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ of M so that*

- (i) $\Phi(0) = [[\Sigma]], \Phi(-1) = \Phi(1) = 0;$
- (ii) $\mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) \leq \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ with equality only if $x = 0$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, $M \setminus \Sigma$ has two G -components M_1 and M_2 so that the unit normal ν of Σ pointing inward M_1 . Additionally, it follows from Lemma 4.2 and 4.3 that the first eigenfunction $u_1 > 0$ of L_Σ is a G -invariant function satisfying $L_\Sigma u_1 = -\mu_1(\Sigma)u_1 > 0$.

Denote by d_\pm the signed distance function to Σ so that $d_\pm = \text{dist}_M(\Sigma, \cdot)$ in M_1 , and $d_\pm = -\text{dist}_M(\Sigma, \cdot)$ in M_2 . Let $X \in \mathfrak{X}^G(M)$ be a G -vector field with $X = (u_1 \circ n_\Sigma) \cdot \nabla d_\pm$

in a neighborhood of Σ , where n_Σ is the nearest projection (in M) to Σ . Then we consider the G -equivariant variation $\{\Sigma_t := F_t(\Sigma)\}_{t \in [-r, r]}$ of Σ , where $\{F_t\}$ are the G -equivariant diffeomorphisms generated by X . By the second variation formula (4.1), we have

$$\delta^2 \Sigma(X) = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} \text{Area}(\Sigma_t) = - \int_\Sigma u_1 L_\Sigma u_1 < 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \langle \vec{H}_{\Sigma_t}, \nabla d_\pm \rangle = L_\Sigma u_1 > 0,$$

where \vec{H}_{Σ_t} is the mean curvature vector field of Σ_t . Thus, for $r > 0$ small enough,

$$\text{Area}(\Sigma_t) < \text{Area}(\Sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \vec{H}_{\Sigma_t}, \nabla \text{dist}_M(\Sigma, \cdot) \rangle > 0, \quad \text{for all } t \in [-r, 0) \cup (0, r].$$

Define $\Phi(x) := [[\Sigma_x]] = (F_x)_\# [[\Sigma]] \in \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ for $x \in [-r, r]$, which is \mathbf{F} -continuous.

Since $u_1 > 0$, $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [-r, r]}$ is a smooth foliation of a G -neighborhood of Σ , and $\Sigma_t \subset M_1$ for $t > 0$, $\Sigma_t \subset M_2$ for $t < 0$. We now consider the compact manifolds $M'_1 := M_1 \setminus \{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [0, r]}$ and $M'_2 := M_2 \setminus \{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in (-r, 0]}$, whose boundary $\partial M'_i = \Sigma_{r_i}$, ($i \in \{1, 2\}$, $r_1 = r$, $r_2 = -r$), is a G -hypersurface with positive mean curvature pointing inward M'_i .

Suppose $W^G(M'_i, \partial M'_i) > \text{Area}(\Sigma_{r_i})$. Then by Theorem 3.11, there exists a closed minimal G -hypersurface Σ' in the interior of M'_i . Noting $\Sigma \cap \Sigma' = \emptyset$, we get a contradiction from Lemma 4.3(v). Therefore, $W^G(M'_i, \partial M'_i) \leq \text{Area}(\Sigma_{r_i})$. By Definition 2.7 and Corollary 3.7, there exist $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and an \mathbf{F} -continuous G -sweepout $\Phi_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M_i; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ so that $\Phi_i(0) = [[\Sigma_{r_i}]]$, $\Phi_i(1) = 0$, and

$$\sup\{\mathbf{M}(\Phi_i(x)) : x \in [0, 1]\} \leq W^G(M'_i, \partial M'_i) + \epsilon \leq \text{Area}(\Sigma_{r_i}) + \epsilon < \text{Area}(\Sigma).$$

Finally, by reparametrization, we have a well-defined map $\Phi : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$,

$$\Phi(x) := \begin{cases} \Phi_2(-\frac{3}{2}x - \frac{1}{2}), & x \in [-1, -\frac{1}{3}], \\ (F_{3rx})_\# [[\Sigma]], & x \in [-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}], \\ \Phi_1(\frac{3}{2}x - \frac{1}{2}), & x \in [\frac{1}{3}, 1], \end{cases}$$

continuous in the \mathbf{F} -topology satisfying (i) and (ii). Additionally, the arguments before Definition 2.4 and 2.7 indicate $F_M(\Phi) = [[M_2]] + [[M_1]] = [[M]]$, where F_M is given by (2.5). Hence, we have $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G(M)$. \square

Proposition 4.7. *Given any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n^G(M)$, there exists an \mathcal{F} -continuous G -sweepout $\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ of M with no concentration of mass on orbits so that*

- (i) $\Phi(0) = \Phi(1) = 0$;
- (ii) $\sup\{\mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) : x \in [0, 1]\} < 2\text{Area}(\Sigma)$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\Sigma} = S\Sigma \times \{0\}$ and \tilde{M} be given by (4.4)(4.5). Then \tilde{M} is G -connected, $\text{Area}(\tilde{\Sigma}) = 2\text{Area}(\Sigma)$, and $\tilde{\Sigma}$ has a G -invariant unit normal $\tilde{\nu}$ pointing inward \tilde{M} . Let $\tau : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}$ be the isometric involution, i.e. $\tau(v, 0) = (-v, 0)$ for $v \in S\Sigma$.

Using the constructions in Proposition 4.6 with \tilde{M} in place of M_1 , we get an \mathbf{F} -continuous G -sweepout $\tilde{\Phi} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_n^G(\tilde{M}; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ so that $\tilde{\Phi}(0) = [[\tilde{\Sigma}]]$, $\tilde{\Phi}(1) = 0$, and $\mathbf{M}(\tilde{\Phi}(x)) \leq 2\text{Area}(\Sigma)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ with equality only at $x = 0$. Additionally, for $t \in [0, 1/3]$, $\tilde{\Phi}(t) = \tilde{\Sigma}_t := [[\exp_{\tilde{\Sigma}}^\perp(t\tilde{u}\tilde{\nu})]]$, where $\tilde{u} = 3tr\tilde{u}_1$ and $\tilde{u}_1 : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is the G -invariant first eigenfunction of $L_{\tilde{\Sigma}}$ with eigenvalue $\mu_1(\tilde{\Sigma}) = \mu_1^G(\tilde{\Sigma}) < 0$.

Now, by the second variation formula (4.1), there are $\delta_0 \in (0, 1/3)$ and $C_0 > 0$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}(\tilde{\Phi}(t)) = \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}_t) &= \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - \frac{t^2}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}} \langle L_{\tilde{\Sigma}} \tilde{u}\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{u}\tilde{\nu} \rangle + O(t^3) \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - C_0 t^2 \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

for all $t \in (0, \delta_0)$. For any $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ (will be specified later), the \mathbf{F} -continuity of $\tilde{\Phi}$ and Proposition 4.6(ii) suggest the existence of $\epsilon > 0$ with

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbf{M}(\tilde{\Phi}(t)) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - \epsilon, \quad \forall t \in [\delta, 1].$$

Now, we will open up $\tilde{\Sigma}_t$, $t \in [0, \delta]$, at some orbit to decrease the area.

Specifically, let $G \cdot \tilde{p} \subset \tilde{\Sigma}^{prin}$ be any principal orbit of $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Then by the G -invariance of $\tilde{\nu}$ and [3, Corollary 2.2.2], $G \cdot \tilde{p} \subset \tilde{M}^{prin}$ is also a principal orbit in \tilde{M} . Note either $G \cdot \tilde{p} = G \cdot \tau(\tilde{p})$ or $G \cdot \tilde{p} \cap G \cdot \tau(\tilde{p}) = \emptyset$. Thus, we can define $P := G \cdot \tilde{p} \cup G \cdot \tau(\tilde{p})$ as a G -invariant submanifold in $\tilde{\Sigma}$ with dimension $n - l$. By assumptions, $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot \tilde{p}) = l + 1 \leq 7$.

Case 1: $3 \leq l \leq 6$. For any $r > 0, t \in [0, \delta]$, we define the following G -invariant sets:

- $\tilde{B}_r(P) := \{\tilde{q} \in \tilde{\Sigma} : \text{dist}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{q}, P) < r\} \subset \tilde{\Sigma}$;
- $\tilde{B}_{r,t}(P) := \{\exp_{\tilde{\Sigma}}^{\perp}((t\tilde{u}\tilde{\nu})(\tilde{q})) : \tilde{q} \in \tilde{B}_r(P)\} \subset \tilde{\Sigma}_t$;
- $\tilde{C}_{r,t}(P) := \{\exp_{\tilde{\Sigma}}^{\perp}((s\tilde{u}\tilde{\nu})(\tilde{q})) : \tilde{q} \in \tilde{B}_r(P), s \in [0, t]\}$.

Then for $R, \delta > 0$ small enough, it follows from the integral formula in [35, (C.4)] that

$$(4.9) \quad ctr^{l-1} \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{C}_{r,t}(P)) \leq Ctr^{l-1} \quad \text{and} \quad cr^l \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{B}_{r,t}(P)) \leq Cr^l,$$

for all $r \in [0, R], t \in [0, \delta]$, where $c, C > 0$ are constants depending on $\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{M}, P$. Define

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{r,t} := \left(\tilde{\Sigma}_t \setminus \tilde{B}_{r,t}(P) \right) \cup \tilde{C}_{r,t}(P) \cup \tilde{B}_r(P), \quad r \in [0, R], t \in [0, \delta].$$

By (4.7)(4.9), $\|\tilde{\Sigma}_{r,t}\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - C_0 t^2 - cr^l + Ctr^{l-1}$.

Note $Ctr^{l-1} \leq \frac{C_0}{2}t^2 + \frac{2C}{C_0}r^{2l-2}$ and $l \geq 3$ in this case. We can take $R > 0$ small enough so that $\frac{2C}{C_0}R^{l-2} < \frac{c}{2}$. Hence,

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma}_{r,t}\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - \frac{C_0}{2}t^2 - \frac{c}{2}r^l,$$

for all $t \in [0, \delta], r \in [0, R]$, and

$$\tilde{\Sigma}'_t := \begin{cases} \tilde{\Sigma}_{R,2t} & t \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2}], \\ \tilde{\Sigma}_{2R(1-t/\delta), \delta} & t \in [\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta], \end{cases} \quad \|\tilde{\Sigma}'_t\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) \leq \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - cR^l/2 & t \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2}], \\ \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - C_0\delta^2/2 & t \in [\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta]. \end{cases}$$

Set $\epsilon' := \min\{\epsilon, cR^l/2, C_0\delta^2/2\}$ and define $\tilde{\Phi}'(t) := [\tilde{\Sigma}'_t]$ for $t \in [0, \delta]$ in this case.

Case 2: $l = 2$. For $R > r > 0$ small enough, let $\eta_{r,R} : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the G -invariant logarithmic cut-off function defined by

$$\eta_{r,R}(\tilde{q}) := \begin{cases} 1 & \tilde{q} \notin \tilde{B}_R(P), \\ (\log r - \log(\text{dist}_{\tilde{\Sigma}}(\tilde{q}, P)))/(\log r - \log R) & \tilde{q} \in \tilde{B}_R(P) \setminus \tilde{B}_r(P), \\ 0 & \tilde{q} \in \tilde{B}_r(P), \end{cases}$$

which is also τ -invariant. Consider

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{r,R,t} := \exp_{\tilde{\Sigma}}^{\perp}(t\eta_{r,R}\tilde{u}\tilde{\nu}).$$

By [15, Proposition 2.5] and [35, (C.4)], we can take $R, \delta > 0$ small enough so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{\Sigma}_{r,R,t}\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) &\leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma} \setminus \tilde{B}_r(P)) + \frac{t^2}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}} |\nabla(\eta_{r,R}\tilde{u})|^2 - (\text{Ric}(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{\nu}) + |A|^2)(\eta_{r,R}\tilde{u})^2 \\
&\quad + Ct^3 \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}} 1 + |\nabla(\eta_{r,R}\tilde{u})|^2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma} \setminus \tilde{B}_r(P)) - C_1t^2 + C_2t^2 \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}} |\nabla\eta_{r,R}|^2 + t^2 \int_{\tilde{B}_R(P)} \tilde{u}\eta_{r,R}\nabla\tilde{u}\nabla\eta_{r,R} \\
&\quad + Ct^3 \int_{\tilde{\Sigma}} 1 + 2\eta_{r,R}^2|\nabla\tilde{u}|^2 + 2\tilde{u}^2|\nabla\eta_{r,R}|^2 \\
&\leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - cr^2 - C_1t^2 + \frac{C_3}{\log(R/r)}t^2 + C_4R^2t^2 + C_5t^3 + \frac{C_6}{\log(R/r)}t^3,
\end{aligned}$$

for all $r \in (0, R), t \in [0, \delta]$, where $c, C, C_i > 0$ are uniform constants depending on $\tilde{\Sigma}, \tilde{M}, P$. Set $R, \delta > 0$ even smaller so that $C_4R^2 < C_1/4$, $C_5\delta < C_1/4$, and $C_6\delta < C_3$. Then choose $r > 0$ small enough with $\frac{2C_3}{\log(R/r)} < \frac{C_1}{4}$. Thus,

$$\|\tilde{\Sigma}_{r,R,t}\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - cr^2 - \frac{C_1}{2}t^2 + \frac{2C_3}{\log(R/r)}t^2 \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - cr^2 - \frac{C_1}{4}t^2$$

for all $t \in [0, \delta]$, and

$$\tilde{\Sigma}'_t := \begin{cases} \tilde{\Sigma}_{r,R,2t} & t \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2}], \\ \tilde{\Sigma}_{2r(1-t/\delta), 2R(1-t/\delta), \delta} & t \in [\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta], \end{cases} \quad \|\tilde{\Sigma}'_t\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) \leq \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - cr^2 & t \in [0, \frac{\delta}{2}], \\ \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - C_1\delta^2/4 & t \in [\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta]. \end{cases}$$

In this case, set $\epsilon' := \min\{\epsilon, cr^2, C_1\delta^2/4\}$ and define $\tilde{\Phi}'(t) := [[\tilde{\Sigma}'_t]]$ for $t \in [0, \delta]$.

In both cases, we define $\tilde{\Phi}'_{\perp}[\delta, 1] = \tilde{\Phi}_{\perp}[\delta, 1]$ and see

$$(4.10) \quad \sup\{\|\tilde{\Phi}'(t)\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) : t \in [0, 1]\} \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - \epsilon'.$$

Additionally, by (2.1), $\tilde{\Phi}'$ is still an \mathbf{F} -continuous map with $\tilde{\Phi}' = [[\tilde{\Sigma}]]$, $\tilde{\Phi}'(1) = 0$.

Finally, we define $\Phi(x) := F_{\#}\tilde{\Phi}'(x)$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$, where $F : \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is the equivariant local isometry given by (4.6). Because $F : \tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow M \setminus \Sigma$ is an equivariant isometry, the arguments before Definition 2.4 and 2.7 indicate $F_M(\Phi) = F_{\#}([[\tilde{M}]]) = M$, where F_M is given by (2.5). Additionally, note $F : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a double cover and $\tilde{\Sigma}'_t \cap \tilde{\Sigma}$ is τ -invariant in both cases. Hence, by \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients and (4.10), we have $\Phi(0) = F_{\#}([[\tilde{\Sigma}]]) = 0$ and

$$\mathbf{M}(\Phi(x)) = \|\tilde{\Phi}'(x)\|(\tilde{M} \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}) \leq \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{\Sigma}) - \epsilon' = 2\text{Area}(\Sigma) - \epsilon'.$$

At last, since $\|\Phi(x)\|(B_r^G(p)) \leq \|\tilde{\Phi}'(x)\|(F^{-1}(B_r^G(p))) \leq 2\mathbf{m}^G(\Phi', r)$ for all $x \in [0, 1], p \in M$, we see $\mathbf{m}^G(\Phi, r) \leq 2\mathbf{m}^G(\tilde{\Phi}', r)$ and Φ has no concentration of mass on orbits. \square

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

Let $\mathcal{S}^G(M)$ be given in (4.2). Then we define

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{A}^G(M) := \inf_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}^G(M)} \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \text{Area}(\Sigma), & \text{if } \Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_+^G(M) \\ 2\text{Area}(\Sigma), & \text{if } \Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_-^G(M) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Theorem 5.1. *Let (M^{n+1}, g_M) be a closed connected orientable Riemannian manifold with positive Ricci curvature, and G be a compact Lie group acting on M isometrically so that $3 \leq \text{codim}(G \cdot p) \leq 7$ for all $p \in M$. Then the equivariant min-max hypersurface Σ corresponding to the fundamental class $[M]$ is a connected minimal G -hypersurface of multiplicity one with a G -invariant unit normal vector field so that*

$$\text{Index}_G(\Sigma) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Area}(\Sigma) = W^G(M) = \mathcal{A}^G(M).$$

Proof. By the min-max theorem 3.8, there exists an integral G -varifold $V \in \mathcal{V}_n^G(M)$ induced by a smooth embedded closed minimal G -hypersurface $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}^G(M)$ so that $\|V\|(M) = W^G(M)$. Since M has positive Ricci curvature, Lemma 4.3(v) indicates that Σ is connected, and thus $V = m|\Sigma|$ for some $m \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Suppose $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_-^G(M)$, then it follows from the last statement in Theorem 3.8 that m must be even, so $m \geq 2$. However, we have a contradiction $W^G(M) < 2\text{Area}(\Sigma) \leq \|V\|(M) = W^G(M)$ by Proposition 4.7. Therefore, $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}_+^G(M)$. By Proposition 4.6, we see $W^G(M) \leq \text{Area}(\Sigma) \leq \|V\|(M) = W^G(M)$, and thus $m = 1$. Additionally, by the definition of $\mathcal{A}^G(M)$ and Proposition 4.6, 4.7,

$$\mathcal{A}^G(M) \leq \text{Area}(\Sigma) = \|V\|(M) = W^G(M) \leq \mathcal{A}^G(M).$$

Now, it is sufficient to show $\text{Index}_G(\Sigma) = 1$. Suppose $\text{Index}_G(\Sigma) \geq 2$, and u_1, u_2 are the first two L^2 -orthonormal G -invariant eigenfunctions of $L_{\Sigma \lrcorner} \mathfrak{X}^{\perp, G}(\Sigma)$ with negative eigenvalues. Let $u_2 \nu$ be a G -invariant normal vector field on Σ which extends to a smooth vector field $X \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Then $X_2 := \int_G (g^{-1})_* X d\mu(g) \in \mathfrak{X}^G(M)$ gives an equivariant extension of $u_2 \nu$. Consider the equivariant diffeomorphisms $\{F_s^2\}$ generated by X_G and define $\Phi_s(t) := (F_s^2)_\# \Phi(t)$ for $t \in [-1, 1]$, where $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}^G(M)$ is the \mathbf{F} -continuous sweepout given by Proposition 4.6. Recall that in the proof of Proposition 4.6, $\Phi(t) = [|\Sigma_t|] = [F_t^1(\Sigma)]$ for $t \in [-1/3, 1/3]$, where $\{F_t^1\}$ are the equivariant diffeomorphism generated by $X_1 \in \mathfrak{X}^G(M)$ with $X_1 \lrcorner \Sigma = 3ru_1 \nu$ for some $r > 0$. Hence, for the smooth family $\{F_s^2(\Sigma_t)\}_{s \in [-\sigma, \sigma], t \in [-1/3, 1/3]}$, the area function $A(s, t) := \text{Area}(F_s^2(\Sigma_t)) = \mathbf{M}(\Phi_s(t))$ satisfies:

- $\nabla A(0, 0) = 0$ since Σ is minimal;
- $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} A(0, 0) = -9r^2 \int_{\Sigma} u_1 L_{\Sigma} u_1 < 0$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s^2} A(0, 0) = - \int_{\Sigma} u_2 L_{\Sigma} u_2 < 0$;
- $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial s \partial t} A(0, 0) = -3r \int_{\Sigma} u_2 L_{\Sigma} u_1 = 3r \mu_1(\Sigma) \int_{\Sigma} u_1 u_2 = 0$.

Therefore, we can set $\sigma, \delta > 0$ sufficiently small so that

$$\mathbf{M}(\Phi_s(t)) = \text{Area}(F_s^2(\Sigma_t)) < \text{Area}(\Sigma), \quad \forall t \in [-\delta, \delta], s \in (0, \sigma).$$

Moreover, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that $\mathbf{M}(\Phi(t)) \leq \text{Area}(\Sigma) - \epsilon$ for all $t \in [-1, -\delta] \cup [\delta, 1]$ by Proposition 4.6(ii). Hence, by setting $\sigma > 0$ even smaller, we have $\mathbf{M}(\Phi_{\sigma}(t)) = \mathbf{M}((F_{\sigma}^2)_\# \Phi(t)) < \text{Area}(\Sigma)$ for all $t \in [-1, 1]$. Note Φ_{σ} is an \mathbf{F} -continuous curve homotopic to Φ in $\mathcal{Z}_n^G(M; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Thus,

$$W^G(M) \leq \sup\{\mathbf{M}(\Phi_{\sigma}(t)) : t \in [-1, 1]\} < \text{Area}(\Sigma) = W^G(M),$$

which is a contradiction. So we have $\text{Index}_G(\Sigma) = 1$. □

As an application, we use the conformal volume to show a genus bound for the equivariant min-max minimal G -hypersurface Σ in Theorem 5.1 provided that $\dim(M) = 3$ and the actions of G are orientation preserving.

Theorem 5.2. *Let (M^3, g_M) be a closed connected oriented Riemannian 3-manifold with positive Ricci curvature, and G be a finite group acting on M by orientation preserving*

isometries. Then the equivariant min-max hypersurface Σ corresponding to the fundamental class $[M]$ is a connected closed minimal G -surface of multiplicity one satisfying

$$\text{genus}(\Sigma) \leq 4K \quad \text{and} \quad W^G(M) = \text{Area}(\Sigma) \leq \frac{8\pi K}{\inf_{|v|=1} \text{Ric}_M(v, v)},$$

where $K := \max_{p \in M} \#G \cdot p \leq \#G$ is the number of points in a principal orbit of M . Additionally, $\pi(\Sigma) = \Sigma/G$ is an orientable surface with finite cone singular points of order $\{n_i\}_{i=1}^k$ (i.e. locally modeled by $\mathbb{B}_1^2(0)$ quotient a cyclic rotation group \mathbb{Z}_{n_i}), so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_i}\right) \leq 4, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) \leq 3.$$

In particular, if $\Sigma \subset M^{\text{prin}}$, i.e. $k = 0$, then $\text{genus}(\Sigma) \leq 1 + 2K$.

Proof. By Theorem 5.1, Σ is a closed embedded connected minimal G -surface with a G -invariant unit normal ν so that $\text{Area}(\Sigma) = W^G(M)$ and $\text{Index}_G(\Sigma) = 1$. By Lemma 4.3, Σ has an induced orientation. Additionally, since the unit normal ν is G -invariant, the actions of G on Σ are also orientation preserving. Therefore, the orbifold $\underline{\Sigma}$ induced by (Σ, G) is an orientable closed 2-orbifold whose underlying space is the quotient distance space $(\pi(\Sigma), \text{dist}_{\Sigma/G})$.

Let Σ^{prin} be the union of principal orbits for the G -action on Σ , and $\underline{\Sigma}^{\text{prin}}$ be the orbifold induced by $(\Sigma^{\text{prin}}, G)$. Note an orbit $G \cdot p$ is principal in Σ (or M) if and only if the slice representation of G_p on $\mathbf{N}_p^\Sigma G \cdot p$ (or $\mathbf{N}_p G \cdot p$) is trivial (c.f. [3, Corollary 2.2.2]). Hence, by the G -invariance of ν , we see $\Sigma^{\text{prin}} \subset M^{\text{prin}}$ and thus $K = \#G \cdot p = \#G \cdot q$ for all $p \in \Sigma^{\text{prin}}$ and $q \in M^{\text{prin}}$. Additionally, it follows from [4, Chapter IV, Theorem 3.3] that there is an induced Riemannian metric $g_{\underline{\Sigma}}$ on $\underline{\Sigma}^{\text{prin}}$ so that $\pi : \Sigma^{\text{prin}} \rightarrow \underline{\Sigma}^{\text{prin}}$ is an Riemannian submersion. Moreover, since G acts on Σ by orientation preserving isometries, the singular points $\underline{\Sigma} \setminus \underline{\Sigma}^{\text{prin}}$ are a finite number of cone points $\{[p_i]\}_{i=1}^k$ of orders n_1, \dots, n_k . By the orbifold version of Gauss-Bonnet theorem (c.f. [8, Proposition 2.17]), we have

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{\pi(\Sigma)} K_{\underline{\Sigma}} dA_{g_{\underline{\Sigma}}} = 2\pi(\chi(\underline{\Sigma})) = 2\pi\left(2 - 2\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) - \sum_{i=1}^k \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_i}\right)\right),$$

where $K_{\underline{\Sigma}}$ is the Gauss curvature of $(\underline{\Sigma}^{\text{prin}}, g_{\underline{\Sigma}})$, and the integral is taken over $\underline{\Sigma}^{\text{prin}}$.

For any $r > 0$ small enough, let $\Sigma_r := \Sigma \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k B_r^G(p_i)$, and η_r be the G -invariant logarithmic cut-off function on Σ given by

$$\eta_r(p) := \begin{cases} 0, & d(p) \in [0, r] \\ 2 - \frac{2 \log d(p)}{\log r}, & d(p) \in (r, \sqrt{r}] \\ 1, & d(p) \in (\sqrt{r}, \infty) \end{cases},$$

where $d(p) := \text{dist}_\Sigma(p, \Sigma \setminus \Sigma^{\text{prin}}) = \text{dist}_\Sigma(p, \cup_{i=1}^k G \cdot p_i)$. Define then $\underline{\Sigma}_r := \underline{\Sigma} \setminus \cup_{i=1}^k B_r([p_i])$. Note $(\underline{\Sigma}_r, g_{\underline{\Sigma}})$ is a smooth Riemannian manifold (with boundary). We can take any conformal immersion $\phi : \underline{\Sigma}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^m$, $m \geq 2$, and define $P : \text{Conf}(\mathbb{S}^m) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0)$ by

$$P(h) := \frac{1}{\int_\Sigma \eta_r u_1} \left(\int_\Sigma (\eta_r u_1)(h_1 \circ \phi \circ \pi), \dots, \int_\Sigma (\eta_r u_1)(h_{m+1} \circ \phi \circ \pi) \right),$$

where $h = (h_1, \dots, h_{m+1}) \in \text{Conf}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ is any conformal diffeomorphism of \mathbb{S}^m (under the standard metric), and $u_1 : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the first (G -invariant) eigenfunction of L_Σ .

Since $u_1 > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{m+1} h_j^2 = 1$, one easily verifies P is well-defined. Meanwhile, for each $x \in \mathbb{B}^{m+1}$, define a conformal diffeomorphism $h_x \in \text{Conf}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ as in [25, (1.1)] by

$$h_x(y) = \frac{y + (\mu \langle x, y \rangle + \lambda)x}{\lambda(\langle x, y \rangle + 1)},$$

where $\lambda = (1 - |x|^2)^{-1/2}$ and $\mu = (\lambda - 1)|x|^{-2}$. Then we have a continuous map $f : \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0)$ given by $f(x) = P(h_x)$, which can be continuously extended to $\partial\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0) = \mathbb{S}^m$ by the identity map. Note $\text{Clos}(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0))$ is homotopic to $f(\text{Clos}(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0)))$, and $\text{Clos}(\mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0)) \setminus \{x\}$ is homotopic to \mathbb{S}^m for any $x \in \mathbb{B}_1^{m+1}(0)$. Hence, we must have f is surjective. In particular, there exists $h = (h_1, \dots, h_{m+1}) \in \text{Conf}(\mathbb{S}^m)$ so that $P(h) = 0$. Thus, $\{\tilde{h}_j := h_j \circ \phi \circ \pi\}_{j=1}^{m+1}$ are G -invariant smooth functions on Σ_r so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \tilde{h}_j^2 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Sigma} u_1 \cdot (\eta_r \tilde{h}_j) = 0, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, m+1.$$

Since $\text{Index}_G(\Sigma) = 1$, we see $\delta^2 \Sigma(\eta_r \tilde{h}_j \nu) \geq 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m+1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_{\sqrt{r}}} \text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 &\leq \int_{\Sigma} (\text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \eta_r^2 = \int_{\Sigma} (\text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} (\eta_r \tilde{h}_j)^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} |\nabla(\eta_r \tilde{h}_j)|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \left[(1 + \epsilon) |\nabla \tilde{h}_j|^2 \eta_r^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) |\nabla \eta_r|^2 \tilde{h}_j^2 \right] \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon) K \cdot \int_{\underline{\Sigma}_r} \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} |\nabla h_j \circ \phi|^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla \eta_r|^2 \\ &= 2(1 + \epsilon) K \cdot \text{Area}(\underline{\Sigma}_r; (h \circ \phi)^* g_{\mathbb{S}^{m+1}}) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla \eta_r|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is any constant, $\text{Area}(\underline{\Sigma}_r; (h \circ \phi)^* g_{\mathbb{S}^{m+1}})$ is the area of $\underline{\Sigma}_r$ under the conformal metric $(h \circ \phi)^* g_{\mathbb{S}^{m+1}}$, and the co-area formula is used in the last inequality. Let $A_c(m, \underline{\Sigma}_r)$ be the m -conformal area of Σ defined as in [16]:

$$A_c(m, \underline{\Sigma}_r) := \inf_{\phi} \sup_{h \in \text{Conf}(\mathbb{S}^m)} \text{Area}(\underline{\Sigma}_r; (h \circ \phi)^* g_{\mathbb{S}^m}),$$

where the infimum is taken over all non-degenerated conformal map ϕ of $\underline{\Sigma}_r$ into \mathbb{S}^m . Since $\phi : \underline{\Sigma}_r \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^m$ is arbitrary conformal immersion in the above computation, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_{\sqrt{r}}} \text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 \leq 2(1 + \epsilon) K \cdot A_c(m, \underline{\Sigma}_r) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla \eta_r|^2.$$

By [13, Chapter IV, Remark 5.5.1], every closed orientable surface can be conformally branched over \mathbb{S}^2 with degree $\lfloor (\text{genus} + 3)/2 \rfloor$, where $\lfloor a \rfloor$ is the integer part of $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$. It then follows from [16, Fact 1, 5] that $A_c(m, \underline{\Sigma}_r) \leq 4\pi \lfloor \frac{\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + 3}{2} \rfloor$, and thus

$$\int_{\Sigma_{\sqrt{r}}} \text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 \leq 4\pi(1 + \epsilon) K \cdot 2 \left\lfloor \frac{\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + 3}{2} \right\rfloor + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla \eta_r|^2.$$

Since $\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla \eta_r|^2 \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow 0$, we first take $r \rightarrow 0$ and then let $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, which gives

$$\int_{\Sigma} \text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 \leq 4\pi K \cdot 2 \left\lfloor \frac{\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + 3}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Denote by $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^2$ a local orthonormal basis on Σ . Since $\text{Ric}_M > 0$, we have

$$\text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \text{Ric}_M(e_i, e_i) - 2K_{\Sigma} > -2K_{\Sigma}$$

on Σ^{prin} , where K_{Σ} is the Gauss curvature of Σ . Therefore, by the co-area formula,

$$-2K \int_{\underline{\Sigma}} K_{\underline{\Sigma}} = -2 \int_{\Sigma} K_{\Sigma} < \int_{\Sigma} \text{Ric}_M(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 \leq 4\pi K \cdot 2 \left\lfloor \frac{\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + 3}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Then, it follows from the above strict inequality and the Gauss-Bonnet formula (5.2) that $\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) \leq 3$, $\sum_{i=1}^k (1 - \frac{1}{n_i}) \leq 4$, $\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + \sum_{i=1}^k (1 - \frac{1}{n_i}) < 5$, and

$$\text{genus}(\Sigma) = 1 + K \left[\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k (1 - \frac{1}{n_i}) \right] < 1 + 4K.$$

In particular, if $\Sigma \subset M^{prin}$, then $\sum_{i=1}^k (1 - \frac{1}{n_i}) = 0$ and $\text{genus}(\Sigma) = 1 + K(\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) - 1) \leq 1 + 2K$. Finally, we see

$$\begin{aligned} 2c_M W^G(M) &\leq \int_{\Sigma} \sum_{i=1}^2 \text{Ric}_M(e_i, e_i) \\ &\leq 4\pi K \cdot 2 \left\lfloor \frac{\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + 3}{2} \right\rfloor + 2K \int_{\underline{\Sigma}} K_{\underline{\Sigma}} \\ &= 4\pi K \cdot \left(2 - 2\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) - \sum_{i=1}^k (1 - \frac{1}{n_i}) + 2 \left\lfloor \frac{\text{genus}(\pi(\Sigma)) + 3}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \\ &\leq 16\pi K, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Ric}_M \geq c_M > 0$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] F. J. Almgren Jr. The homotopy groups of the integral cycle groups. *Topology*, 1(4):257–299, 1962.
- [2] F. J. Almgren Jr. The theory of varifolds. *Mimeographed notes*, 1965.
- [3] J. Berndt, S. Console, and C. E. Olmos. *Submanifolds and holonomy*, volume 21. CRC Press, 2016.
- [4] G. E. Bredon. *Introduction to compact transformation groups*. Academic press, 1972.
- [5] O. Chodosh and D. Maximo. On the topology and index of minimal surfaces. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 104(3):399–418, 2016.
- [6] O. Chodosh and D. Maximo. On the topology and index of minimal surfaces ii. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06572*, 2018.
- [7] H. I. Choi and R. Schoen. The space of minimal embeddings of a surface into a three-dimensional manifold of positive Ricci curvature. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 81(3):387–394, 1985.
- [8] D. Cooper, C. D. Hodgson, and S. Kerckhoff. *Three-dimensional orbifolds and cone-manifolds*, volume 5. Mathematical Society of Japan, 2000.
- [9] C. De Lellis and D. Tasnady. The existence of embedded minimal hypersurfaces. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 95(3):355–388, 2013.
- [10] N. Ejiri and M. Micallef. Comparison between second variation of area and second variation of energy of a minimal surface. *arXiv:0708.2188*, 2007.
- [11] H. Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer, 2014.

- [12] P. Glynn-Adey and Y. Liokumovich. Width, ricci curvature, and minimal hypersurfaces. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 105(1):33–54, 2017.
- [13] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Number 52. Springer Science & Business Media, 1977.
- [14] D. Ketover. Equivariant min-max theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.08692*, 2016.
- [15] D. Ketover, F. C. Marques, and A. Neves. The catenoid estimate and its geometric applications. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 115(1):1–26, 2020.
- [16] P. Li and S.-T. Yau. A new conformal invariant and its applications to the willmore conjecture and the first eigenvalue of compact surfaces. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 69(2):269–291, 1982.
- [17] Z. Liu. The existence of embedded G -invariant minimal hypersurface. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 60(1):1–21, 2021.
- [18] F. C. Marques and A. Neves. Rigidity of min-max minimal spheres in three-manifolds. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 161(14):2725–2752, 2012.
- [19] F. C. Marques and A. Neves. Min-max theory and the Willmore conjecture. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 683–782, 2014.
- [20] F. C. Marques and A. Neves. Morse index and multiplicity of min-max minimal hypersurfaces. *Cambridge Journal of Mathematics*, 4(4):463–511, 2016.
- [21] F. C. Marques and A. Neves. Existence of infinitely many minimal hypersurfaces in positive Ricci curvature. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 209(2):577–616, 2017.
- [22] F. C. Marques and A. Neves. Morse index of multiplicity one min-max minimal hypersurfaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 378:107527, 2021.
- [23] L. Mazet and H. Rosenberg. Minimal hypersurfaces of least area. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 106(2):283–316, 2017.
- [24] W. H. Meeks III, J. Perez, and A. Ros. Bounds on the topology and index of minimal surfaces. *Acta Mathematica*, 223(1):113–149, 2019.
- [25] S. Montiel and A. Ros. Minimal immersions of surfaces by the first eigenfunctions and conformal area. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 83(1):153–166, 1986.
- [26] J. D. Moore and R. Schlafly. On equivariant isometric embeddings. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 173(2):119–133, 1980.
- [27] J. T. Pitts. *Existence and regularity of minimal surfaces on Riemannian manifolds. (MN-27)*, volume 27. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- [28] J. T. Pitts and J. H. Rubinstein. Applications of minimax to minimal surfaces and the topology of 3-manifolds. In *Miniconference on geometry/partial differential equations, 2*, volume 12, pages 137–171. Australian National University, Mathematical Sciences Institute, 1987.
- [29] J. T. Pitts and J. H. Rubinstein. Equivariant minimax and minimal surfaces in geometric three-manifolds. *Bulletin (New Series) of the American Mathematical Society*, 19(1):303–309, 1988.
- [30] A. Ros. One-sided complete stable minimal surfaces. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 74(1):69–92, 2006.
- [31] R. Schoen and L. Simon. Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 34(6):741–797, 1981.
- [32] R. M. Schoen and S.-T. Yau. *Lectures on differential geometry*, volume 2. International press Cambridge, MA, 1994.
- [33] L. Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*. The Australian National University, Mathematical Sciences Institute, Centre . . . , 1983.
- [34] T. Wang. Min-max theory for G -invariant minimal hypersurfaces. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 32(9):1–53, 2022.
- [35] T. Wang. Min-max theory for free boundary G -invariant minimal hypersurfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07187*, 2022.08.
- [36] T. Wang. Equivariant morse index of min-max g -invariant minimal hypersurfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07638*, 2022.10.
- [37] Z. Wang. Conformal upper bounds for the volume spectrum. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 31(4):992–1012, 2021.
- [38] B. White. Currents and flat chains associated to varifolds, with an application to mean curvature flow. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 148(1):41–62, 2009.
- [39] X. Zhou. Min-max minimal hypersurface in (M^{n+1}, g) with $Ric \geq 0$ and $2 \leq n \leq 6$. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 100(1):129–160, 2015.

- [40] X. Zhou. Min-max hypersurface in manifold of positive Ricci curvature. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 105(2):291–343, 2017.
- [41] X. Zhou. On the multiplicity one conjecture in min-max theory. *Annals of Mathematics*, 192(3):767–820, 2020.

INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, WESTLAKE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, WESTLAKE UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU, ZHEJIANG, 310024, CHINA

Email address: wangtongrui@westlake.edu.cn