

## GREEN'S FUNCTIONS ON MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS

YIFAN GUO

ABSTRACT. We show that for the Green's function on an area-minimizing boundary, it is bounded below universally by the Euclidean Green's function. We also obtain asymptotics of the Green's function near the pole and infinity. These are done by proving a  $C^\alpha$  convergence of the Green's functions under the convergence of area-minimizing boundaries. For converging multiplicity 1 stationary varifolds, we have  $L^p$  convergence of the Green's functions, but there are examples of stationary varifolds on which the lower bounds and asymptotics may fail. An application of the lower bound will be given in [9].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We are interested in behaviors of Green's functions on minimal submanifolds with singularities. To be specific, we are concerned with universal lower bounds, asymptotics near the pole and infinity as well as convergence of Green's functions under the convergence of minimal submanifolds. We will be focusing on minimal submanifolds which are area-minimizing boundaries. Convergence is also true for stationary varifolds in  $L^p$  sense but we don't have lower bounds and asymptotics. We will discuss such examples.

To start off, Littman, Stampacchia and Weinberger [11] showed that the Green's function of a uniformly elliptic operator on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded below and above by  $c|x - y|^{2-n}$  where  $c$  depends only on the dimension and the ellipticity constant. Our first result generalizes the bounds to the Green's function of Laplacian on area-minimizing boundaries.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\Sigma$  be an area-minimizing boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $G(x, y)$  be its Green's function. Then there exists  $c = c(n) > 0$  so that for all  $x \neq y \in \text{spt } \Sigma$ , we have*

$$c(n)|x - y|^{2-n} \leq G(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n}|x - y|^{2-n}.$$

*If equality holds in the second inequality at  $x \neq y$  then  $\Sigma$  is a hyperplane.*

This lower bound can have possible applications in the study of minimal hypersurfaces. One such application is given in [9] in which positive Jacobi fields are bounded below by some multiple of Green's function at infinity and hence it decays no faster than  $|x|^{2-n}$ .

It is a well-known result of Cheng, Li and Yau [3] that the Green's function of minimal submanifolds  $M^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  are bounded above by  $\frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n}|x - y|^{2-n}$  i.e. the Euclidean Green's function. They proved this by comparing the heat kernels on minimal submanifolds with the heat kernel on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and integrating the time variable. One can also directly compare the Green's functions on minimal submanifolds and  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Using this method the upper bound of Green's functions can be generalized to stationary varifolds.

For completeness, we include the details of the proof in Section 3 and discuss the rigidity case when equality holds. This is used in showing the existence and uniqueness of a global Green's function on stationary varifolds cf. Theorem 3.3.

Another property of Green's function that we are interested in is the behavior near the pole and infinity. We are able to show that the Green's function is asymptotically conical, i.e. they behave like the Green's function on the tangent cone. More precisely, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\Sigma$  be an area-minimizing boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $G(x, y)$  be its Green's function. Then we have for any  $x \in \text{spt } \Sigma$*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} G(x, y) |y - x|^{n-2} = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n \Theta(\Sigma, x)}$$

and

$$\lim_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} G(x, y) |y|^{n-2} = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n \Theta(\Sigma, \infty)}$$

where  $\Theta(\Sigma, x)$  is the density of  $\Sigma$  at  $x$  and  $\Theta(\Sigma, \infty)$  is the density at infinity.

We remark that this theorem does not depend on uniqueness of tangent cones type results since the Green's function on a minimal hypercone with the pole at the vertex only depends on the density of the cone at origin cf. Lemma 5.1. The assumption on  $\Sigma$  being an area-minimizing boundary is to guarantee the  $C^\alpha$  estimates and hence we can talk about the values of Green's function at any point in  $\text{spt } \Sigma$ . In general, the Green's function is only continuous near regular points cf. Example 7.1.

We are also interested in convergence of Green's functions under the convergence of minimal submanifolds. In fact, both Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 are consequences of the following convergence theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $M_i, M$  be integral stationary varifolds satisfying (3), (4) and (5) and denote the corresponding Green's functions by  $G_i, G$ . Assume that  $M_i \rightarrow M$  as varifolds, and  $\text{reg } M_i \ni x_i \rightarrow x_0 \in \text{reg } M$ . Then we have  $G_i(x_i, \cdot) \rightarrow G(x_0, \cdot)$  in  $L^q$  on compact subsets for  $1 \leq q < \frac{n}{n-2}$  in the sense of Definition 2.8. Moreover, the convergence is smooth in a neighborhood of a regular point of  $M$ .*

*If  $M_i, M$  are the associated varifolds of area-minimizing boundaries  $\Sigma_i, \Sigma$ , then  $G_i(x_i, \cdot) \rightarrow G(x_0, \cdot)$  in  $C^\alpha$  on compact subsets away from  $x_0$  and  $x_0$  can be taken as any point in  $\text{spt } \Sigma$ .*

Finally, we want to point out that there are parallel results for Green's functions on complete noncompact manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature and Euclidean volume growth. In particular, Li and Yau [12] showed that the Green's functions of such manifolds are globally bounded below and above by  $d(x, y)^{2-n}$ , where the constants only depend on the dimension and the volume growth rate. Using the frequency functions, Colding and Minicozzi [4] proved that the Green's functions of such manifolds are asymptotic to  $\frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n \Theta} d(x, y)^{2-n}$  at infinity where  $\Theta$  is the volume ratio at infinity. In [5], Ding showed that if a sequence of Ricci non-negative manifolds converge in Gromov-Hausdorff topology to a limit space, then the corresponding Green's functions converge. This also gives another proof of the result of Colding and Minicozzi [4] and is the same approach that we adopt here.

The outline of the rest of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we give some backgrounds on Sobolev spaces and Poisson equations on stationary varifolds. In section 3, we discuss the existence and uniqueness as well as some basic properties of Green's function on stationary varifolds. In section 4, we show that the Green's functions converge under convergence of stationary varifolds. In section 5, we prove the asymptotics of Green's function near the pole and at infinity. In section 6, we prove the lower bounds on of Green's functions area-minimizing boundaries. In section 7, we discuss some examples of minimal submanifolds where the Green's function has no lower bound or asymptotics.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to his advisor, Richard Schoen, for constant support and many helpful discussions.

#### 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Varifolds and currents.** We recall some basic concepts about varifolds and currents in geometric measure theory cf. [6] and [16]. Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  be open. We consider an integral rectifiable  $n$ -varifold  $M$  in  $U$  with its weight measure  $\mu_M$  and density function  $\Theta(M, x)$ . Let  $f \in C^1(U)$ . We denote the Euclidean gradient of  $f$  at  $x$  by  $Df(x)$  and for  $x \in \text{spt } M$  so that  $T_x M$  exists, we denote the projection of  $Df(x)$  onto  $T_x M$  by  $\nabla f(x)$ . We say that  $M$  is *stationary* if for any  $X \in C_c^1(U; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  we have

$$(1) \quad \int_U \text{div}_M X d\mu_M = 0$$

where  $\text{div}_M X = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle D_{e_i} X, e_i \rangle$  with  $e_i, i = 1, \dots, n$  being an orthonormal basis of  $T_x M$ .

Let  $\omega_n$  be the volume of the  $n$ -dimensional unit ball,  $B_R(x)$  denote the open ball in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  of radius  $R$  centered at  $x$  and  $B_R = B_R(0)$ . By the monotonicity formula for stationary varifolds, the function

$$(2) \quad r \mapsto \frac{\mu_M(B_r)}{\omega_n r^n} \text{ is non-decreasing}$$

and hence the limit

$$\Theta(M, x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_M(B_r)}{\omega_n r^n}$$

exists.

The regular set of  $M$  is defined as

$$\text{reg } M = \{x \in \text{spt } M : \exists r > 0, \text{ spt } M \cap B_r(x) \text{ is a } C^1 \text{ manifold}\}$$

and the singular set is the complement:  $\text{sing } M = \text{spt } M \setminus \text{reg } M$ .

We say that a varifold  $M$  has multiplicity 1 if

$$(3) \quad \Theta(M, x) = 1 \quad \forall x \in \text{reg } M.$$

We will also make the following assumptions on stationary varifolds for later reference:

$$(4) \quad \mu_M(\text{sing } M) = 0$$

and

$$(5) \quad \exists V > 0 \text{ s.t. } \mu_M(B_1(x)) \leq V \quad \forall x \in \text{spt } M.$$

Finally, an  $n$ -rectifiable current  $\Sigma$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  is called an *area-minimizing boundary* if  $\Sigma$  is area-minimizing and  $\Sigma = \partial[U]$  for some  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  open. Note that the associated varifold of an area-minimizing boundary always satisfies (3), (4) and (5).

**2.2. Sobolev spaces on varifolds.** In [13, 14], Menne discussed Sobolev spaces on general varifolds in a thorough way. We recall the definitions and properties of Sobolev spaces on varifolds in our setting.

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ ,  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  be open and  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $U$ . We say that a function  $f \in L^p_{loc}(U, \mu_M)$  is in  $W^{1,p}_{loc}(M)$  if there exists  $F \in L^p_{loc}(U, \mu_M; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  so that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $K \subset U$  compact, there is  $g \in \text{Lip}(U)$  so that

$$\|f - g\|_{L^p(K, \mu_M)} + \|F - Dg\|_{L^p(K, \mu_M)} < \epsilon.$$

The Sobolev norm is defined as

$$\|f\|_{W^{1,p}(M)} = \|f\|_{L^p(U, \mu_M)} + \|F\|_{L^p(U, \mu_M)}.$$

The Sobolev space with zero boundary value  $W_0^{1,p}(M)$  is the closure of Lipschitz functions with compact support under the norm  $\|\cdot\|_{W^{1,p}(M)}$ .

**Remark 2.2.** If  $M$  satisfies (4) and  $f \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(M)$ , then  $F(x) = \nabla f(x)$  for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$  where  $\nabla f$  is the weak derivative of  $f$  on  $\text{reg } M$ . This can be seen by taking  $K$  to be supported in a small neighborhood of a regular point in Definition 2.1. Hence in the sequel we let  $\nabla f$  denote the  $F$  in Definition 2.1.

The Sobolev functions on varifolds share the same properties as those on Euclidean spaces. We summarize those which are useful in later applications.

**Proposition 2.3** (Menne [13] Remark 5.6). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $U$  satisfying (4) and  $f, g \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(M)$  for  $p \in [1, \infty]$ . Then*

- (i) *For any  $q \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $1/p + 1/q = 1$  and  $h \in W^{1,q}_{loc}(M)$ , we have  $fh \in W^{1,1}_{loc}(M)$  and  $\nabla(fh) = f\nabla h + h\nabla f$ .*
- (ii) *For any  $h \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\text{Lip } h < \infty$ , we have  $h \circ f \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(M)$  and  $\nabla(h \circ f) = h'(f(x))\nabla f(x)$ .*
- (iii) *We have  $\{f^+, f^-, |f|\} \subset W^{1,p}_{loc}(M)$ . If  $f \in W_0^{1,p}(M)$ , then  $\{f^+, f^-, |f|\} \subset W_0^{1,p}(M)$ .*
- (iv)  *$\nabla(f + g) = \nabla f + \nabla g$ .*

For Sobolev functions, we have the integration by parts formula.

**Proposition 2.4** (Menne [13] Remark 8.27). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $U$  satisfying (4),  $X \in C^1_c(U; \mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  and  $f \in W^{1,1}_{loc}(M)$ . Then*

$$\int \nabla f \cdot X d\mu_M = - \int f \text{div}_M X d\mu_M.$$

**Theorem 2.5** (Michael-Simon [15]). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary  $n$ -varifold in  $U$  satisfying (4) with  $n \geq 2$ . Then for any  $f \in W_0^{1,p}(M)$  with  $1 \leq p < n$ , we have*

$$\|f\|_{L^{np/(n-p)}(U, \mu_M)} \leq C(n) \|\nabla f\|_{L^p(U, \mu_M)}.$$

We also have Rellich compactness for Sobolev spaces on stationary varifolds.

**Theorem 2.6** (Menne [14] Theorem 7.11, 7.21). *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  be open and  $M$  be an integral stationary  $n$ -varifold in  $U$  with  $n \geq 2$ . Then for any  $1 \leq p < n$ , bounded subsets in  $W_{loc}^{1,p}(M)$  (resp.  $W_0^{1,p}(M)$ ) have compact closure in  $L_{loc}^q(U, \mu_M)$  (resp.  $L^q(U, \mu_M)$ ) where  $1 \leq q < \frac{np}{n-p}$ .*

We would like to extend the Rellich compactness theorem above to a sequence of converging multiplicity 1 stationary varifolds. First we need a way to identify the converging varifolds.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  be a bounded open set,  $M_i, M$  be integral stationary varifolds in  $U$  so that  $M$  satisfies (3) and (4) and  $M_i \rightarrow M$  as varifolds. We define  $S_\delta = \{x \in U : d(x, \text{sing } M) < \delta\}$ . For any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist  $\delta_i > 0$  and  $\delta_i$ -Gromov-Hausdorff approximations  $\phi_i : \text{spt } M \rightarrow \text{spt } M_i$  so that  $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\phi_i : \text{spt } M \setminus S_\delta \rightarrow \text{spt } M_i \setminus S_\delta$  is a smooth diffeomorphism so that for any  $\delta > 0$  fixed,  $\phi_i|_{\text{spt } M \setminus S_\delta} \rightarrow \text{id}|_{\text{spt } M \setminus S_\delta}$  smoothly.*

*Proof.* By [16, Chapter 4 Theorem 7.5] we have  $\text{spt } M_i \rightarrow \text{spt } M$  locally in Hausdorff distance. This implies that  $\text{spt } M_i \rightarrow \text{spt } M$  in Gromov-Hausdorff distance. Thus there exists  $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$  and  $\delta_i$  Gromov-Hausdorff approximations  $\phi_i : \text{spt } M \rightarrow \text{spt } M_i$ . Using multiplicity 1 assumption and Allard regularity, we can take  $\phi_i$  to be smooth on an exhaustion of  $\text{reg } M$  which converges to the identity map in  $C^k$  for any  $k$ .  $\square$

We introduce the notion of  $L^p$  convergence of functions on a sequence of converging stationary varifolds.

**Definition 2.8** (Ding [5]). *Let  $M_i, M$  be integral stationary varifolds in  $U$  satisfying (3) and (4) such that  $M_i \rightarrow M$  as varifolds. We say that functions  $f_i \in L^p(U, \mu_{M_i})$  converge to  $f \in L^p(U, \mu_M)$  in  $L^p$  if for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can decompose  $f_i = g_i + h_i$  so that  $g_i \circ \phi_i \rightarrow g$  in uniformly and  $\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \|h_i\|_{L^p(\mu_{M_i})} \leq \epsilon$ .*

**Lemma 2.9** (Rellich compactness for converging varifolds). *Let  $M_i, M$  be integral stationary varifolds in  $U$  so that  $M$  satisfies (3), (4) and (5) and  $M_i \rightarrow M$  as varifolds. Suppose there is  $W \subset U$  open so that  $\bar{W}$  is compact and  $\sup_i \|f_i\|_{W^{1,p}(M_i \llcorner W)} \leq C$  then there exists a subsequence still denoted by  $f_i$  and  $f \in L^q(W, \mu_M)$  so that  $f_i \rightarrow f$  in  $L^q$  for  $1 \leq q < \frac{np}{n-p}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $1 \leq q < \frac{np}{n-p}$  be fixed. Since  $\text{sing } M$  is closed, we can choose  $\eta \in C_c^\infty(U)$  be such that  $\eta = 0$  on  $\text{sing } M$ ,  $\eta > 0$  on  $W \setminus \text{sing } M$ , and  $\text{spt } \eta = \bar{W}$ .

By Sard's theorem, we choose  $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0$  so that  $M \cap \eta^{-1}(\epsilon_i)$  is smooth submanifold of  $M$  and  $\eta^{-1}[\epsilon_i, \infty) \cap S_{\delta_i} = \emptyset$ .

Let  $E_i = M \llcorner \eta^{-1}[\epsilon_i, \infty)$ . Then  $E_i$  is a smooth manifold with smooth boundary. By Lemma 2.7  $f_i \circ \phi_i$  is a  $W^{1,p}$  function on  $E_i$  that satisfies

$$\|f_i \circ \phi_i\|_{W^{1,p}(E_i)} \leq C.$$

Let  $j$  be a fixed index. By Rellich compactness theorem for smooth manifolds with smooth boundary, cf. [1], there is a subsequence still denoted by  $f_i \circ \phi_i$  converges in  $L^q(E_j, \mu_M)$  to  $f \in L^q(E_j, \mu_M)$ . By diagonal method, there exist  $f \in L^q(W, \mu_M)$  and a subsequence  $f_i \circ \phi_i$  that converges to  $f$  in  $L^q(E_j, \mu_M)$  for any  $j$ . By Theorem 2.5,  $\|f_i\|_{L^{q'}(W, \mu_{M_i})} \leq C$  for  $q < q' < \frac{n}{n-2}$ . Since  $\{\eta^{-1}[t, \infty)\}_{t>0}$  is an exhaustion of  $W \setminus \text{sing } M$  and  $\mu_M(W) < \infty$  by assumption (5), we have  $\mu_M(W \setminus \eta^{-1}[t, \infty)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . Thus for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , as one takes  $j$  large and  $i > N(j)$

$$\|f_i|_{M_i \setminus \phi_i(E_j)}\|_{L^q(W, \mu_{M_i})} \leq \mu_{M_i}(W \setminus \eta^{-1}[\epsilon_j/2, \infty))^{1-q/q'} \|f_i\|_{L^{q'}(W, \mu_{M_i})}^{q/q'} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Applying Egorov theorem to  $f_i \circ \phi_i|_{E_j}$  we see that there is a subset of  $F_j \subset E_j$  so that  $\mu(E_j \setminus F_j) < \epsilon$  and  $f_i \circ \phi_i \rightarrow f$  uniformly in  $F_j$ . Thus the decomposition  $f_i = f_i|_{\phi_i(F_j)} + f_i|_{M_i \setminus \phi_i(F_j)}$  satisfies Definition 2.8. This shows  $f_i \rightarrow f$  in  $L^q$ .  $\square$

**2.3. Poisson equations on stationary varifolds.** We are going to discuss solutions to the Poisson equations on stationary varifolds. Most of the results have the same forms and follow from the same proofs as in the Euclidean space with some modifications. We only indicate the necessary modifications and leave the details to the readers.

Through out this section,  $U$  denotes an open set in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  and  $M$  denotes an integral stationary varifold in  $U$ . Let  $\Delta$  denote the Laplace-Beltrami operator on  $\text{reg } M$ . We say that function  $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$  solves the equation  $-\Delta u = f$  on  $M$  if

$$(6) \quad \int \nabla u \cdot \nabla \phi d\mu_M = \int f \phi d\mu_M \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(U).$$

By Proposition 2.4, this can also be written as

$$\int u \Delta \phi d\mu_M = - \int f \phi d\mu_M \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(U).$$

We also say that  $-\Delta u \leq f$  on  $M$  if we have  $\leq$  sign in (6) for all nonnegative  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(U)$ .

For any  $v \in W_0^{1,2}(M)$ , we define the energy as

$$E(v) = \frac{1}{2} \int |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_M + \int f u d\mu_M$$

**Proposition 2.10** (Solution to the Dirichlet problem). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $U$  satisfying (4), (5). Then for any  $f \in \text{Lip}(U)$  there exists a unique  $u \in W_0^{1,2}(M)$  so that  $-\Delta u = f$  on  $M$  and  $E(u) = \min_{v \in W_0^{1,2}(M)} E(v)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is to consider a minimizing sequence of the energy functional. We need to use Theorem 2.5 and the assumption (5) to show the energy is bounded below. Using the compactness Theorem 2.9, we get a limit  $u$ . By lower semi-continuity of the norm in the Hilbert space  $W_0^{1,2}(M)$ ,  $u$  is a minimizer and satisfies (6) by a variation argument. Uniqueness follows from Theorem 2.13.  $\square$

Let  $J_0 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be defined as

$$J_0(r) = \begin{cases} c \exp[(r^2 - 1)^{-1}] & |r| \leq 1 \\ 0 & |r| > 1. \end{cases}$$

We set  $J(x) = J_0(|x|) \in C_c^\infty(B_1)$  and  $J_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-n}J(x/\epsilon)$ . We choose  $c$  so that

$$\int_{B_1 \cap \mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\}} J(x) d\mathcal{H}^n(x) = 1.$$

**Lemma 2.11** (Weyl's lemma). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  satisfying (4), (5) and  $v \in L_{loc}^1(M)$  satisfy*

$$(7) \quad \int v \Delta \phi d\mu_M = 0 \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k}).$$

For  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , we write

$$v_\epsilon(x) = \int J_\epsilon(x-y)v(y)d\mu_M(y) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+k}.$$

Then we have

- (i)  $v_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$ .
- (ii)  $Dv_\epsilon(x) = \int DJ_\epsilon(x-y)v(y)d\mu_M(y)$ .
- (iii) As  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ ,  $v_\epsilon(x) \rightarrow \Theta(M, x)v(x)$  for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$ .
- (iv)  $v_\epsilon \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$  is a solution to  $\Delta v_\epsilon = 0$  in the sense of (6).
- (v) If  $v(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $v = 0$ .

*Proof.* (i) and (ii) Since  $\sup_x |D^k J_\epsilon(x-y)v(y)| \leq C(n, k, \epsilon)|v(y)|$  for  $k \geq 0$ , by dominated convergence we have  $D^k v_\epsilon(x) = \int D^k J_\epsilon(x-y)v(y)d\mu_M(y)$  for any  $k$ . Thus  $v_\epsilon(x) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$ .

(iii) Let  $x_0 \in \text{reg } M$  and  $\rho > 0$  be such that  $\text{spt } M \cap B_\rho(x_0) \subset \text{reg } M$ . We pull back  $v_\epsilon$  and  $v$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  via a local chart on  $\text{spt } M \cap B_\rho(x_0) \subset \text{reg } M$ . Since we have uniform control on the local chart, we have  $v_\epsilon \rightarrow \Theta v$  in  $L^1(B_\rho(x_0))$  by modifying the standard mollifier theory cf. [7, Lemma 7.2]. Thus  $v_\epsilon(x) \rightarrow \Theta(M, x)v(x)$  for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$ .

(iv) Let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  be arbitrary. Since  $v_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$ , we have  $v_\epsilon \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$ . Then using (ii), Proposition 2.4, Fubini's Theorem, and definition of  $v$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \nabla v_\epsilon(x) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) &= \iint \nabla J_\epsilon(x-y)v(y)d\mu_M(y) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) \\ &= \iint \nabla J_\epsilon(x-y) \cdot \nabla \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) v(y) d\mu_M(y) \\ &= - \iint \Delta J_\epsilon(x-y) \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) v(y) d\mu_M(y) \\ &= - \iint \Delta J_\epsilon(x-y) v(y) d\mu_M(y) \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We see that  $v_\epsilon \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$  is a solution to  $\Delta v_\epsilon = 0$ .

(v) We have for any  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $R > 2$  so that for any  $|x| \geq R$ ,  $|v(x)| \leq \delta$ . Then for  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ ,  $|x| \geq 2R$  we have

$$|v_\epsilon(x)| \leq \delta \int J_\epsilon(x-y)d\mu_M(y) \leq \delta \epsilon^{-n} \mu_M(B_\epsilon(x)) \leq \omega_n V \delta$$



where in the last inequality we use the monotonicity (2) and the assumption (5). We apply Theorem 2.13 to  $v_\epsilon$  to see that  $v_\epsilon = 0$ . On the other hand, since  $v_\epsilon \rightarrow \Theta v$  for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$  by (iii), we have  $v = 0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.12** (Caccioppoli inequality). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $U$ . Let  $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$  solve  $-\Delta u = f$  in  $M$  for  $f \in L^2(U, \mu_M)$ . Then for any  $R > 0$  such that  $B_{2R}(x) \subset\subset U$ , we have*

$$\int_{B_R(x)} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_M \leq C \left( \frac{1}{R^2} \int_{B_{2R}(x)} u^2 d\mu_M + R^2 \int_{B_{2R}(x)} f^2 d\mu_M \right)$$

where  $C$  is an absolute constant.

*Proof.* We take  $\phi = \psi^2 u$  in (6) with  $\psi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2R}(x))$ ,  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$  and  $\psi = 1$  on  $B_R(x)$ . The conclusion follows from Hölder's inequality.  $\square$

Next, we need the a priori estimate for subsolutions to Poisson equations. This also gives a weak maximum principle for subharmonic functions.

**Theorem 2.13** (A priori estimate). *Let  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $U$  satisfying (4). Let  $u \in W^{1,2}(M)$  satisfy  $-\Delta u \leq f$  for  $f \in L^q(U, \mu_M)$  with  $q > n/2$ . We define  $\sup_{\partial M} u$  as the minimal  $l$  such that  $u - l \in W_0^{1,2}(M)$ . Then there exists  $C = C(n, q, M)$  such that*

$$\sup_{\text{spt } M} u \leq \sup_{\partial M} u^+ + C \|f\|_{L^q(U, \mu_M)}.$$

*Proof.* This theorem follows from the same argument as [7, Theorem 8.15 and 8.16]. In applying the argument, we are able to take the test functions due to Proposition 2.3. We also need to replace the Euclidean Sobolev inequality by the Michael-Simon Sobolev inequality Theorem 2.5.  $\square$

For general stationary varifolds, there is no universal Poincaré inequality and hence Harnack inequality may not be true cf. Example 7.1. However, for area-minimizing boundaries, Bombieri and Giusti [2] showed that Poincaré inequality holds and hence we have the following Harnack inequality and  $C^\alpha$  estimates.

**Theorem 2.14** (Bombieri-Giusti [2]). *Let  $\Sigma$  be an area-minimizing boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $u$  be a solution to  $-\Delta u = f$  on  $\Sigma \llcorner B_R$  with  $f \in L^q(B_R, \mu_\Sigma)$  for  $q > n/2$  and  $u \geq 0$ . Then there exists  $\beta = \beta(n) \in (0, 1)$ ,  $C = C(n, q)$  so that*

$$\sup_{B_{\beta R}} u \leq C \left( \inf_{B_{\beta R}} u + R^{2-\frac{n}{q}} \|f\|_{L^q(B_R, \mu_\Sigma)} \right).$$

Moreover,  $u$  is  $C^\alpha$  for  $\alpha = \alpha(n, q) \in (0, 1)$  and for any  $\Omega \subset\subset B_R$  open, there exists  $C = C(n, q, d(\Omega, \partial B_R))$  such that

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\Omega)} \leq C (\|u\|_{L^2(B_R, \mu_\Sigma)} + \|f\|_{L^q(B_R, \mu_\Sigma)}).$$

Here we take the  $\alpha$  semi-norm using the extrinsic Euclidean distance.

*Proof.* In [2], Bombieri and Giusti proved the Harnack inequality for the  $f = 0$  case. One can modify the proof following [7, Theorem 8.17 and Theorem 8.18] to show the



Harnack inequality we have here. The necessary modifications are to use the Michael-Simon Sobolev inequality and the Neumann type Sobolev inequality as well as the abstract John-Nirenberg inequality developed in [2]. The  $C^\alpha$  estimates follows from the same proof as in [7, Theorem 8.24] once we have the Harnack inequality.  $\square$

### 3. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF GREEN'S FUNCTION

For the sake of completeness, we prove the existence and uniqueness of Green's function on stationary varifolds. The proof is the same as in Euclidean space except we need to show a uniform upper bound on Dirichlet Green's function. The key ingredient is the following lemma. We define the function  $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  as

$$\Gamma(x, y) = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n} |x - y|^{2-n}.$$

This is the Green's function when restricted to  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $M$  be a stationary varifold. Then for all  $x, y \in \text{reg } M$  we have*

$$\Delta_x \Gamma(x, y) = -\frac{1}{\omega_n} \frac{|(x - y)^\perp|^2}{|x - y|^{n+2}}$$

where  $(x - y)^\perp$  is the projection of  $x - y$  to  $T_x M^\perp$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we take  $y = 0$  and denote  $r = |x|$ . Let  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be an orthonormal frame of  $T_x M$ . Then  $Dr = r^{-1}x$  and  $\nabla r = r^{-1}x^\top$ . Hence using the mean curvature is 0, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta r &= \sum_{i=1}^n \langle D_{e_i} \nabla r, e_i \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle D_{e_i} (r^{-1}x^\top), e_i \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n r^{-1} \langle D_{e_i} (x - x^\perp), e_i \rangle - r^{-2} \langle x, e_i \rangle^2 \\ &= nr^{-1} + \sum_{i=1}^n r^{-1} \langle x^\perp, D_{e_i} e_i \rangle - |\nabla r|^2 \\ &= nr^{-1} - |\nabla r|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta r^{2-n} &= (2-n)r^{1-n}(\Delta r + (1-n)r^{-1}|\nabla r|^2) \\ &= (2-n)nr^{-n}(1 - |\nabla r|^2) \\ &= (2-n)nr^{-n-2}|x^\perp|^2. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Theorem 3.2** (Dirichlet Green's function). *Let  $n \geq 3$  and  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  satisfying (4) and (5). Let  $R > 0$  be fixed. We write  $\Omega = M \llcorner B_R$ .*

(i) *There exists a unique function  $G_R : \text{reg } \Omega \times \text{reg } \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  satisfying: for any  $x \in \text{reg } \Omega$ ,  $r > 0$  we have*

$$(8) \quad G_R(x, \cdot) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega \llcorner B_r(x)^c) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \quad p \in [1, \frac{n}{n-1})$$

and  $\Delta_y G_R(x, y) = -\delta_x(y)$  in the sense that for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B_R)$ ,

$$(9) \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla_y G_R(x, y) \cdot \nabla \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) = \phi(x).$$

Moreover, the function  $G_R$  has the following properties.

(ii) For any  $x \in \text{reg } \Omega$ , we have

$$G_R(x, y) = \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma(x, y) (1 + o(1)) \text{ as } y \rightarrow x.$$

(iii) For any  $x, y \in \text{reg } \Omega$

$$(10) \quad G_R(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma(x, y).$$

*Proof.* (i) Let  $x \in \text{reg } M$  and  $\rho > 0$  be small so that  $\text{spt } M \cap B_{3\rho}(x) \subset \text{reg } M \cap B_R$ . Let  $g$  be the Dirichlet Green's function of the smooth manifold with boundary  $\text{spt } M \cap \overline{B_{3\rho}(x)}$ . The existence of such function is standard e.g. one can repeat the argument in [8, Theorem 1.1]. Since  $M$  has multiplicity  $\Theta(M, x)$  near  $x$ , we have  $g_0 = \Theta(M, x)^{-1} g$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta g_0 = -\delta_x & M \perp B_{3\rho}(x) \\ g_0 = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_{3\rho}(x). \end{cases}$$

Let  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho}(x))$  be such that  $\chi = 1$  on  $B_\rho(x)$  and  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ . We define

$$(11) \quad G_0 = \chi g_0.$$

By the construction in [8], we know that  $G_0 \in C^\infty(\text{spt } M \cap B_{2\rho}(x) \setminus \{x\}) \cap W_0^{1,p}(M \perp B_{2\rho}(x))$  for  $p \in [1, \frac{n}{n-1})$ . By Proposition 2.10, let  $h \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$  be the solution to

$$(12) \quad \Delta h = -g_0 \Delta \chi - 2\nabla g_0 \cdot \nabla \chi.$$

We define  $G = G_0 + h$ . Since  $h \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ , we have  $G \in W^{1,2}(\Omega \setminus B_r(x)) \cap W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$  for any  $r > 0$  and  $p \in [1, \frac{n}{n-1})$  which is (8). (11) and (12) show that  $G = G_0 + h$  satisfies (9).

In order to show that  $G \geq 0$ , we first show that the function  $G$  constructed above satisfies (ii). By Theorem 2.13,  $h$  is uniformly bounded near  $x$ . Since  $g = \Theta(M, x) g_0$  is the Dirichlet Green's function on the ‘‘multiplicity 1’’ manifold  $\text{spt } M \cap B_{3\rho}(x)$ ,  $g(y)$  is asymptotic to  $\Gamma(x, y)$  as  $y \rightarrow x$ . This proves (ii) for the constructed  $G$ .

Applying Theorem 2.13 to  $\sup_{\partial B_r(x)} G - G$  on  $\Omega \setminus B_r(x)$  for  $r$  small enough and letting  $r \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\inf_{\Omega} G(x, \cdot) \geq 0$ . This finishes the existence part.

For uniqueness, suppose  $G_1, G_2$  are 2 functions satisfying (8) and (9). Fix  $x \in \text{reg } \Omega$ . By (9),  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot)$  is harmonic near  $x$ . Since  $x \in \text{reg } M$ , by elliptic regularity  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot)$  is smooth in  $B_r(x)$  for  $r$  small. Thus  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot) \in W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ . Since  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot)$  is harmonic, by Theorem 2.13 we have  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot) = 0$ .

The uniqueness also proves (ii).

(iii) By (ii), for any  $x \in \text{reg } \Omega$ , there exists an increasing positive function  $r(\epsilon)$  satisfying  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} r(\epsilon) = 0$  so that for  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough, we have  $G_R(x, y) < \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma_{\epsilon, x}(y)$  in  $B_{r(\epsilon)}(x)$  where

$$\Gamma_{\epsilon, x}(y) = \Gamma(x, y) + \epsilon |x - y|^{2-n}.$$

In view of Lemma 3.1, we have  $\Delta\Gamma_{\epsilon,x} \leq 0$ . By Theorem 2.13, we have  $G_R(x, y) \leq \Gamma_{\epsilon,x}(y)$  in  $\Omega \setminus B_{r(\epsilon)}(x)$ . Letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we get (10).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $n \geq 3$  and  $M$  be an integral stationary varifold in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  satisfying (4) and (5).*

(i) *There exists a unique function  $G : \text{reg } M \times \text{reg } M \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  satisfying: for any  $x \in \text{reg } M$ ,  $r > 0$  we have*

$$(13) \quad G(x, \cdot) \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M \setminus B_r(x)^c) \cap W_{loc}^{1,p}(M) \quad p \in [1, \frac{n}{n-1}),$$

$$(14) \quad G(x, y) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } y \rightarrow \infty,$$

and  $\Delta_y G(x, y) = -\delta_x$  in the sense that for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$

$$(15) \quad \int \nabla_y G(x, y) \cdot \nabla \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) = \phi(x).$$

Moreover, the function  $G$  has the following properties.

(ii) *For any  $x, y \in \text{reg } M$*

$$(16) \quad G(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma(x, y).$$

*If equality holds at  $x, y \in \text{reg } M$ ,  $x \neq y$ , then  $y \in T_x M$  and  $T_x M$  is a multiplicity  $\Theta(M, x)$  plane contained in  $M$ .*

(iii)  *$G(x, y) = G(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in \text{reg } M$ .*

(iv) *Let  $u \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$  be a solution to*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f & M \\ u \rightarrow 0 & |x| \rightarrow \infty \end{cases}$$

*where  $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$  and  $\text{spt } f$  is compact. Then*

$$u(x) = \int G(x, y) f(y) d\mu_M(y)$$

*for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$ .*

*Proof.* (i) We first show the existence. Let  $x \in \text{reg } M$  be fixed. By Theorem 3.2, for each  $R > 0$ , there exists Dirichlet Green's function  $G_R$  on  $M \setminus B_R(x)$  and  $G_R = G_0 + h_R$  where  $G_0$  is as in (11) and  $h_R$  is as in (12). By Theorem 3.2,  $h_R(y) \leq \Theta(M, x)^{-1} \Gamma(x, y)$  for  $|x - y| \geq 2\rho$ . Let  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed. By Theorem 2.13,  $\|h_R\|_{L^\infty(B_i(x))} \leq C(n, i)$ . By Lemma 2.12, we have  $\|h_R\|_{W^{1,2}(M \setminus B_i(x))} \leq C(n, i)$ . By Theorem 2.9 and weak compactness of the Hilbert spaces  $W^{1,2}(M \setminus B_i(x))$  and taking diagonal subsequence, there exists  $R_j \rightarrow \infty$  and  $h \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$ , so that  $h_{R_j} \rightarrow h$  in  $L^2(B_i(x))$  and weakly in  $W^{1,2}(B_i(x))$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since both  $G_0$  and  $h$  satisfy (13), we see that  $G$  satisfies (13). By weak convergence,  $h$  satisfies the equation (12). Since  $G = G_0 + h$ , we know that  $G$  satisfies the equation  $\Delta G = -\delta$  in the sense of (15). By equation (12) and elliptic estimates,  $h_{R_j} \rightarrow h$  smoothly near a regular point. Hence in view of (4),  $G_R \rightarrow G$  almost everywhere. Since  $G_R$  satisfies (10) for each  $R$ , we see that  $G$  satisfies (16) and hence (14).

For uniqueness, suppose  $G_1, G_2$  are 2 functions satisfying (13), (14) and (15). Fix  $x \in \text{reg } M$ . (15) shows that  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot)$  is harmonic. Since  $x \in \text{reg } M$ , elliptic regularity shows that  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot)$  is smooth in  $B_r(x)$  for  $r$  small. Hence (13) implies  $G_1 - G_2 \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(M)$ . Applying Theorem 2.13 to  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot)$  on  $B_R(x)$  and let  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , we get  $G_1(x, \cdot) - G_2(x, \cdot) = 0$  using (14).

(ii) Since  $G = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} G_{R_j}$  and each  $G_{R_j}$  satisfies (10), we see that  $G$  satisfies (16).

Now suppose there are  $x \neq y \in \text{reg } M$  so that the equality in (16) holds. We set

$$w(z) = \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma(x, z) - G(x, z).$$

Then we have  $w \geq 0$  and  $w(y) = 0$ . By Lemma 3.1, we have  $\Delta w \leq 0$  in  $B_R(x) \setminus B_\rho(x)$  for  $\rho < |x - y| < R$ . Since  $y$  is a regular point, we apply the classical strong maximum principle of superharmonic functions to get  $w \equiv 0$  in a neighborhood  $W$  of  $y$  in  $\text{reg } M$ . By Lemma 3.1

$$-\frac{1}{\omega_n \Theta(M, x)} \frac{|(x - z)^\perp|^2}{|x - z|^{n+2}} = \Delta \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma(x, z) = \Delta G(x, z) = 0 \quad \text{in } W.$$

Thus  $(x - z)^\perp = 0$  for all  $z \in W$ . Integrating this equation implies that  $W$  is open in the  $n$ -dimensional cone  $C(W) = \{x + r(z - x) : z \in W, r \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$ . Since  $W$  is minimal,  $C(W)$  is also minimal and  $W \subset C(W) \cap \text{reg } M$ . By analyticity of minimal submanifolds, we have  $C(W) \subset \text{spt } M$ . Since  $C(W)$  is a cone with its vertex at  $x \in \text{reg } M$ , we must have  $C(W)$  is flat. Thus  $C(W) \subset T_x M$ . By analyticity again,  $T_x M \subset \text{spt } M$ . Since  $G(x, z) = \frac{1}{\Theta(M, x)} \Gamma(x, z)$  for all  $z \in T_x M \cap \text{reg } M$ , we have  $T_x M$  is a multiplicity  $\Theta(M, x)$  plane contained in  $M$ .

(iii) Let  $\phi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$ . Let  $R$  be large such that  $\text{spt } \phi \cup \text{spt } \psi \subset B_R$ . We write  $\Omega = M \llcorner B_R$ . For any  $x \in \text{reg } \Omega$ , we have

$$\int_\Omega G(x, y) d\mu_M(y) \leq C(n) \int_\Omega |x - y|^{2-n} d\mu_M(y) \leq C(n) \int_{B_{2R}(x)} |x - y|^{2-n} d\mu_M(y) \leq C(n, M, R)$$

where we use (ii) in the first inequality and Exercise 4.5 of [16] in the last inequality. Then we have

$$\iint_{B_R \times B_R} G(x, y) d\mu_M(x) d\mu_M(y) \leq C(n, M, R) \mu_M(B_R) < \infty.$$

Thus for any  $f \in L^\infty(B_R, \mu_M)$ ,  $\int_{B_R} G(x, y) f(x) d\mu_M(x) \in L^1(\Omega)$ . Taking  $X = \phi D\psi - \psi D\phi$  in (1), using (15) and Fubini's theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Delta \psi(y) \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) &= \int \Delta \phi(x) \psi(x) d\mu_M(x) \\ &= - \int \Delta \phi(x) \int G(x, y) \Delta \psi(y) d\mu_M(y) d\mu_M(x) \\ &= - \int \Delta \psi(y) \int G(x, y) \Delta \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) d\mu_M(y). \end{aligned}$$

We denote  $v(x) = \phi(x) + \int G(y, x) \Delta \phi(y) d\mu_M(y)$ . Then  $v(x) \in L^1_{loc}(M)$ . Since  $\phi$  has compact support and by (ii)

$$\left| \int G(y, x) \Delta \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) \right| \leq C(n) \|\Delta \phi\|_{L^1} |x|^{2-n} \quad \text{for } |x| \geq 2R,$$

we have  $|v(x)| \leq C|x|^{2-n}$  for  $|x| \geq 2R$ . Hence by Lemma 2.11, we have  $v(x) = \phi(x) + \int G(y, x) \Delta \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) = 0$  for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$ .

Now, (15) and Proposition 2.4 imply

$$\int G(y, x) \Delta \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) = \int G(x, y) \Delta \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) \quad \text{for } \mu_M\text{-a.e. } x \in \text{reg } M.$$

Applying Lemma 2.11 to  $G(x, \cdot) - G(\cdot, x)$ , we have  $G(x, y) = G(y, x)$  for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x, y \in \text{reg } M$ . Since  $G$  is smooth on  $\text{reg } M$ , we have  $G(x, y) = G(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in \text{reg } M$ .

(iv) Let  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$ . By Fubini's Theorem, (iv), (9) and that  $-\Delta u = f$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \Delta \phi(x) \int G(x, y) f(y) d\mu_M(y) d\mu_M(x) \\ &= \int f(y) \int G(x, y) \Delta \phi(x) d\mu_M(x) d\mu_M(y) \\ &= - \int f(y) \phi(y) d\mu_M(y) \\ &= \int \Delta \phi(x) u(x) d\mu_M(x) \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 2.11 to  $v(x) = u(x) - \int G(x, y) f(y) d\mu_M(y)$ , we obtain for  $\mu_M$ -a.e.  $x \in \text{reg } M$

$$u(x) = \int G(x, y) f(y) d\mu_M(y).$$

□

To end this section, we record for later reference, a simple lemma on the Green's function of the union of 2 stationary varifolds.

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $M_1, M_2$  be integral stationary varifolds satisfying (3), (4) and (5) and  $G_1, G_2$  be the corresponding Green's function. Then the Green's function  $G$  on  $M = M_1 + M_2$  as a varifold is*

$$G(x, y) = \begin{cases} G_1(x, y) & x, y \in \text{reg } M_1 \setminus \text{spt } M_2 \\ G_2(x, y) & x, y \in \text{reg } M_2 \setminus \text{spt } M_1 \\ 0 & x \in \text{reg } M_1 \setminus \text{spt } M_2, y \in \text{reg } M_2 \setminus \text{spt } M_1 \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* The function  $G$  defined as in the Lemma satisfies (13) (14) and (15). Thus by uniqueness of Green's function Theorem 3.3, this is the Green's function on  $M$ . □

#### 4. CONVERGENCE OF GREEN'S FUNCTION

In this section, we prove convergence of Green's function under convergence of minimal submanifolds.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $M_i, M$  be integral stationary varifolds satisfying (3), (4) and (5) and denote the corresponding Green's functions by  $G_i, G$ . Assume that  $M_i \rightarrow M$  as varifolds, and  $\text{reg } M_i \ni x_i \rightarrow x_0 \in \text{reg } M$ . Then we have  $G_i(x_i, \cdot) \rightarrow G(x_0, \cdot)$  in  $L^q$  on compact subsets for  $1 \leq q < \frac{n}{n-2}$  in the sense of Definition 2.8. Moreover, the convergence is smooth in a neighborhood of a regular point of  $M$ .*

*If  $M_i, M$  are the associated varifolds of area-minimizing boundaries  $\Sigma_i, \Sigma$ , then  $G_i(x_i, \cdot) \rightarrow G(x_0, \cdot)$  in  $C^\alpha$  on compact subsets away from  $x_0$  and  $x_0$  can be taken as any point in  $\text{spt } \Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $M_i \rightarrow M$  as multiplicity 1 varifolds and  $\text{reg } M_i \ni x_i \rightarrow x_0 \in \text{reg } M$ , by Allard's regularity, there exists  $\rho > 0$  so that  $\text{spt } M_i \cap B_{3\rho}(x_i) \rightarrow \text{spt } M \cap B_{3\rho}(x_0)$  smoothly. We choose  $\chi \in C_c^\infty(B_{2\rho}(x_0))$  such that  $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$  and  $\chi = 1$  on  $B_\rho(x_0)$ .

By uniqueness of Green's function Theorem 3.3, we can decompose  $G_i(x_i, \cdot) = G_{0,i} + h_i$  where  $G_{0,i} = \chi g_i$  with  $g_i$  the Dirichlet Green's function on  $\text{spt } M_i \cap B_{3\rho}(x_i)$  and  $h_i$  satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta h_i = -g_i \Delta \chi - 2\nabla g_i \cdot \nabla \chi & M_i \\ 0 \leq h_i(x) \leq \Gamma(x, x_i) & |x - x_i| \geq 2\rho. \end{cases}$$

By smooth convergence of  $M_i$  near  $x$ , we have  $G_{0,i} \rightarrow G_0$  smoothly on compact sets away from  $x_0$  and strongly in  $L^q$  for  $1 \leq q < \frac{n}{n-2}$  where  $G_0 = \chi g$  and  $g$  is the Dirichlet Green's function of  $\text{spt } M \cap B_{3\rho}(x_0)$ . On the other hand, let  $R > 0$  be fixed. By Theorem 2.13, we have  $\|h_i\|_{L^\infty(B_R(x_i))} \leq C(n, R)$  and by Lemma 2.12, we have  $\|h_i\|_{W^{1,2}(M_i \llcorner B_R(x_i))} \leq C(n, R)$ . By Rellich compactness Lemma 2.9, there is a subsequence  $\{i_j\}$  so that  $h_{i_j} \rightarrow h_\infty$  strongly in  $L^q$  on  $B_R(x_0)$  for any  $R > 0$  and  $1 \leq q < \frac{n}{n-2}$ . Hence  $h_\infty \in L^q_{loc}(\mu_M)$  satisfies for any  $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$

$$\int h_\infty \Delta \phi d\mu_M = - \int \phi (g \Delta \chi + 2\nabla g \cdot \nabla \chi) d\mu_M.$$

Since each  $h_i$  satisfies an elliptic equation,  $h_{i_j}$  converges to  $h_\infty$  smoothly near a regular point by elliptic estimates. Thus  $0 \leq h_\infty(x) \leq \Gamma(x, x_0)$  for  $|x - x_0| \geq 2\rho$ . Let  $G$  be the Green's function on  $M$  and define  $h = G(x_0, \cdot) - G_0 \in W^{1,2}_{loc}(M)$ . Then  $h$  satisfies equation (12) and decay (14). Defining  $v(x) = h(x) - h_\infty(x)$  we see that  $v$  satisfies the condition for Lemma 2.11 (v). Hence  $v = 0$  i.e.  $h_\infty = h$ . Thus  $G_{i_j}(x_{i_j}, \cdot) = G_{0,i_j} + h_{i_j}$  converges to  $G(x_0, \cdot) = G_0 + h$  in  $L^q$  and smoothly near regular points.

By the same argument as above, for any subsequence of  $h_i$  there is a further subsequence that converge to some  $h'$  and  $G_0 + h'$  is the Green's function on  $M$ . Thus  $G_i(x_i, \cdot) \rightarrow G(x_0, \cdot)$  without taking subsequences.

If  $M_i, M$  are area-minimizing boundary, then we have  $\|h_i\|_{C^\alpha(B_R(x_i))} \leq C(n, R)$  by Theorem 2.14 and Arzela-Ascoli implies that  $h_i$  converge to  $h$  subsequentially in  $C^\alpha$ . The conclusion follows from the fact that  $G_{0,i}$  converge to  $G_0$  smoothly away from  $x_0$ .  $\square$

## 5. ASYMPTOTICS FOR GREEN'S FUNCTION ON AREA-MINIMIZING BOUNDARIES

In this section, we are going to derive the asymptotics of Green's function on area-minimizing boundaries.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $C$  be an integral stationary varifold satisfying (4) (5) which is also a cone. Then the Green's function on  $C$  has a canonical extension to 0 given by*

$$G(0, y) = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n\Theta(C, 0)}|y|^{2-n}.$$

*Proof.* We show that  $-\Delta G(0, \cdot) = \delta_0$ . Consider the polar coordinate  $x = r\omega$  on  $C$  where  $r = |x|$  and  $\omega = \frac{x}{|x|}$ . We have  $\Delta_C = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{n-1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_L$  where  $L = C \cap S^n$  is the link of the cone. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_C r^{2-n}\Delta\varphi &= \int_0^R r^{2-n} \int_L \left( \frac{\partial^2\varphi}{\partial r^2} + \frac{n-1}{r}\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_L\varphi \right) (r\omega) r^{n-1} d\omega dr \\ &= \int_L \int_0^R r^{2-n} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r^{n-1} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial r} \right) dr d\omega + \int_0^R r^{-n} \int_L \Delta_L\varphi d\omega dr \\ &= - \int_L \int_0^R \frac{\partial r^{2-n}}{\partial r} r^{n-1} \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial r} dr d\omega \\ &= (n-2) \int_L \int_0^R \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial r} dr d\omega \\ &= (2-n)|L|\varphi(0). \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from  $|L| = n\Theta(C, 0)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\Sigma$  be an area-minimizing boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $G(x, y)$  be its Green's function. Then for any  $x \in \text{spt } \Sigma$ , we have*

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow x} G(x, y)|y-x|^{n-2} = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n\Theta(\Sigma, x)}$$

and

$$\lim_{|y| \rightarrow \infty} G(x, y)|y-x|^{n-2} = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n\Theta(\Sigma, \infty)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $y_i \in \Sigma$  be such that  $y_i \rightarrow x$ . We set  $\lambda_i = |y_i - x|$ . Consider  $\Sigma_i = \lambda_i(\Sigma - x)$  and  $\tilde{y}_i = \frac{y_i - x}{|y_i - x|}$ . Let  $G_i$  be the Green's function of  $\Sigma_i$ . Then  $G_i(0, \tilde{y}_i) = G(x, y_i)|y_i - x|^{n-2}$ . Since  $\Sigma_i$  are area-minimizing boundary and  $\lambda_i \rightarrow 0$ , there exist a subsequence  $\{i'\}$ , an oriented boundary area-minimizing cone  $C$  and  $y \in \text{spt } C \cap S^n$  so that  $\Sigma_{i'} \rightarrow C$  and  $\tilde{y}_{i'} \rightarrow y$ . By Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 5.1 we have  $G_{i'}(0, \tilde{y}_{i'}) \rightarrow G(0, y) = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n\Theta(C, 0)}$ . This yield the first limit.

The second limit follows from the same argument with blowing up replaced by blowing down. We omit the details.  $\square$

## 6. LOWER BOUNDS OF GREEN'S FUNCTIONS ON AREA-MINIMIZING BOUNDARIES

In this section, we prove the following lower bounds of Green's functions on area-minimizing boundaries. We also discuss slightly the upper bound in this case.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\Sigma$  be an area-minimizing boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $G(x, y)$  be its Green's function. Then there exists  $c = c(n) > 0$  so that for all  $x \neq y \in \text{spt } \Sigma$ , we have*

$$c(n)|x-y|^{2-n} \leq G(x, y) \leq \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n}|x-y|^{2-n}.$$



If equality holds in the second inequality at  $x \neq y$  then  $\Sigma$  is a hyperplane.

*Proof.* Suppose no such  $c(n) > 0$  exists. Then for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exist an area-minimizing boundary  $\Sigma_i$  and  $x_i, y_i \in \text{spt } \Sigma_i$  so that  $G_i(x_i, y_i) < i^{-1}|x_i - y_i|^{2-n}$ . We consider  $\tilde{\Sigma}_i = \lambda_i(\Sigma_i - x_i)$  where  $\lambda_i = |x_i - y_i|$ . Then the Green's function of  $\tilde{\Sigma}_i$  satisfies  $\tilde{G}_i(0, \tilde{y}_i) < i^{-1}$  where  $\tilde{y}_i = \frac{y_i - x_i}{|y_i - x_i|}$ . Since  $\{\tilde{\Sigma}_i\}$  is a sequence of area-minimizing boundary, there exists a subsequence of  $i$ , some area-minimizing boundary  $\Sigma$  and  $y \in \Sigma \cap S^n$  so that  $\tilde{\Sigma}_i \rightarrow \Sigma$  and  $\tilde{y}_i \rightarrow y$ . By Theorem 4.1, we have  $\tilde{G}_i(0, \cdot) \rightarrow G(0, \cdot)$  in  $C^\alpha(K)$  for any  $K \subset \Sigma \setminus \{0\}$ . In particular,  $\tilde{G}_i(0, \tilde{y}_i) \rightarrow G(0, y)$ . Since  $\tilde{G}_i(0, \tilde{y}_i) < i^{-1}$ , we have  $G(0, y) = 0$ . However, by Harnack inequality Theorem 2.14, this implies  $G(0, \cdot) = 0$  on  $\Sigma \setminus \{0\}$ , a contradiction.

The upper bound follows from (16) of Theorem 3.3 and the  $C^\alpha$  continuity of Green's function.

To show the rigidity of the upper bound, we again consider the function  $w(z) = \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n}|x - z|^{2-n} - G(x, z)$ . This function is superharmonic by Lemma 3.1. By Theorem 2.14, we have  $w = 0$ . Then by Theorem 5.2, we have  $\Theta(\Sigma, \infty) = 1$  and  $\Sigma$  is  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .  $\square$

## 7. EXAMPLES AND REMARKS

In this section, we discuss some examples of Green's functions on minimal submanifolds to see that the conditions in our main theorems are necessary.

### 7.1. Green's functions are only continuous on the regular part in general.

In our existence and uniqueness theorem for Green's functions i.e. Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.3, the Green's function are defined purely on  $\text{reg } M$  (hence almost everywhere by assumption (4)). The following example shows that the Green's function is in general not continuous at singular points.

**Example 7.1.** Let  $P_1 \cup P_2$  be unions of 2 distinct  $n$ -planes through 0 in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+k}$  for some  $k \geq 1$ . Since  $P_1 \cup P_2$  is a minimal cone, we can apply Lemma 5.1 to see that  $\frac{1}{2n(n-2)\omega_n}|y|^{2-n}$  is the natural extension of Green's function on  $P_1 \cup P_2$  to 0. This is not continuous as we fix  $y$  away from  $P_1 \cap P_2$  and vary  $x$  near 0 since by Lemma 3.4

$$G(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n}|x - y|^{2-n} & x, y \in P_1 \setminus P_2 \text{ or } x, y \in P_2 \setminus P_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For area minimizing boundaries, such singularities are ruled out by the Harnack inequality 2.14. The lack of Harnack inequality in high codimension also lead to the failure of lower bound at infinity c.f. Remark 7.4.

**7.2. Convergence of Green's function fails under convergence with high multiplicity.** In Theorem 4.1, we require  $M$  to have multiplicity 1 in order to get the convergence of Green's functions. In the following example, the Green's functions do not converge under the simplest convergence with high multiplicity without singularity forming.

**Example 7.2.** Let  $M_\epsilon$  be the union of 2 parallel planes  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\} \cup \{x_{n+1} = \epsilon\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  for  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ . Then as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $M_\epsilon \rightarrow M$  where  $M$  is the plane  $\{x_{n+1} = 0\}$  with multiplicity 2. By Lemma 3.4, the Green's function on  $M_\epsilon$  is

$$G_\epsilon(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n(n-2)\omega_n} |x-y|^{2-n} & x, y \in \{x_{n+1} = 0\} \text{ or } x, y \in \{x_{n+1} = \epsilon\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In view of Lemma 5.1, the Green's function on  $M$  is

$$G(x, y) = \frac{1}{2n(n-2)\omega_n} |x-y|^{2-n}.$$

Therefore,  $G_\epsilon$  does not converge to  $G$ .

**7.3. Lower bounds only hold for codimension 1 area minimizers.** The lower bounds for Green's function in Theorem 6.1 are restricted to area-minimizing boundaries which are codimension 1 multiplicity 1 area minimizers. We show by the following example that lower bounds for Green's function is not true for high codimension area minimizers.

**Example 7.3.** Let  $\Sigma$  be the Lawlor's neck constructed in [10]. For our purpose, we only need to know that  $\Sigma$  is a connected smooth special Lagrangian submanifold in  $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ , and in particular an area-minimizing  $n$ -dimensional submanifold. The tangent cone at infinity of  $\Sigma$  is the union of two  $n$ -planes  $P_1 \cup P_2$  which intersects only at 0. By Lemma 3.4, the Green's function  $G_\infty$  on  $P_1 \cup P_2$  satisfies

$$(17) \quad G_\infty(x, y) = 0 \text{ for } x \in P_1 \setminus P_2 \text{ and } y \in P_2 \setminus P_1.$$

In fact, this shows that  $G_\infty$  does not have a lower bound as in Theorem 6.1, but we would like to have an example that is more nontrivial. We fix a pair of  $x, y \in P_1 \cup P_2$  as in (17). Let  $G$  be the Green's function on  $\Sigma$ . Since  $\frac{1}{R_i}\Sigma \rightarrow P_1 \cup P_2$  for  $R_i \rightarrow \infty$ , we choose  $x_i, y_i \in \frac{1}{R_i}\Sigma$  be such that  $x_i \rightarrow x$  and  $y_i \rightarrow y$ . Then by Theorem 4.1, we have  $R_i^{n-2}G(R_i x_i, R_i y_i) = G_i(x_i, y_i) \rightarrow G_\infty(x, y) = 0$ . Thus the lower bound in Theorem 6.1 does not hold for  $\Sigma$ .

**Remark 7.4.** The failure of the lower bounds in Theorem 6.1 in high codimension is due to the lack of Harnack inequality. When the Harnack inequality is true for all rescaling limits of a submanifold and the limits are multiplicity 1, the same argument as in Theorem 6.1 works and we should have a lower bound for the Green's function where the constant depends on the submanifold.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Aubin. Nonlinear analysis on manifolds. Monge-Ampère equations. Vol. 252. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [2] E. Bombieri and E. Giusti. Harnack's inequality for elliptic differential equations on minimal surfaces. *Invent. Math.*, 15 (1): 24-46, 1972.
- [3] S.Y. Cheng, P. Li, and S.T. Yau. Heat Equations on Minimal Submanifolds and Their Applications. *Amer. J. Math.*, 106(5) : 1033-1065, 1984.
- [4] T. Colding and W. Minicozzi II Large Scale Behavior of Kernels of Schrödinger Operators. *Amer. J. Math.*, 119.6 (1997): 1355-1398

- [5] Y. Ding. Heat kernels and Green's functions on limit spaces. *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, 10.3 (2002): 475-514.
- [6] H. Federer. *Geometric measure theory*. Springer, 2014.
- [7] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*. Vol. 224. No. 2. Berlin: Springer, 1977
- [8] M. Grüter, and K. Widman. The Green function for uniformly elliptic equations. *Manuscr. Math.*, 37(3): 303-342, 1982
- [9] Y. Guo. On polynomial solutions to the minimal surface equation. arxiv preprint
- [10] G. Lawlor. The angle criterion. *Invent. Math.*, 95(2):437-46, 1989.
- [11] W. Littman, G. Stampacchia, and H. Weinberger. Regular points for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Ann. Sc. norm. super. Pisa - Cl. sci.*, 17(1-2): 43-77, 1963.
- [12] P. Li and S.-T. Yau. On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator. *Acta Math.* 156(3-4): 153-201, 1986.
- [13] U. Menne. Sobolev functions on varifolds *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3), 113(6):725-774, 2016.
- [14] U. Menne. Weakly differentiable functions on varifolds, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 65(3):977-1088, 2016
- [15] J. Michael and L. Simon . Sobolev and mean-value inequalities on generalized submanifolds of  $R^n$ . *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*. 26(3):361-79, 1973.
- [16] L. Simon. *Introduction to geometric measure theory*. NTU Lectures 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ROWLAND HALL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, IRVINE, CA 92697, USA

*Email address:* yifag15@uci.edu