

ON OPEN MANIFOLDS ADMITTING NO COMPLETE METRIC WITH POSITIVE SCALAR CURVATURE

YUGUANG SHI, JIAN WANG, RUNZHANG WU, AND JINTIAN ZHU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we investigate the topological obstruction problem for positive scalar curvature and uniformly positive scalar curvature on open manifolds. We present a definition for open Schoen-Yau-Schick manifolds and prove that there is no complete metric with positive scalar curvature on these manifolds. Similarly, we define weak Schoen-Yau-Schick manifolds by analogy, which are expected to admit no complete metrics with uniformly positive scalar curvature.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Riemannian geometry, a fundamental question revolves around determining which types of open manifolds do not support complete metrics with positive scalar curvature (*hereafter*, *PSC*) or uniformly positive scalar curvature (*hereafter*, *UPSC*). Recent progresses have focused on the extension of topological obstructions on closed manifolds to non-compact cases, a summary of which is provided below.

A common method for generating non-compact manifolds from closed ones involves performing connected sum operations. The initial exploration of obstructions to PSC on such manifolds stemmed from the Liouville theorem in conformal geometry. Lesourd, Unger, and Yau [LUY20] established a link between the Liouville theorem and the generalized Geroch conjecture, which states that $\mathbb{T}^n \# X$ cannot admit complete PSC metrics for any manifold X . Initially, this conjecture was confirmed in three dimension using the minimal surface method, later refined by Chodosh and Li [CL20] up to dimension seven through Gromov's μ -bubble method. Notably, Wang and Zhang [WZ22] resolved the generalized Geroch conjecture with an additional spin assumption for all dimensions. Analogous conjectures arise when replacing the n -torus \mathbb{T}^n with certain generalizations such as the Schoen-Yau-Schick (SYS) manifolds [CL20, Che22] or aspherical manifolds [CCZ23].

In addition to connected sum operations, various other techniques exist for constructing non-compact manifolds from closed ones, including sub-manifold removal or product formations. For instance, Gromov and Lawson demonstrated in [GL83, Example 6.9] that removing a sub-torus from the n -torus \mathbb{T}^n results in an obstruction of any complete PSC metric. Conversely,

Y. Shi is partially supported by National Key R&D Program of China 2020YFA0712800. J. Zhu is partially supported by the start-up fund from Westlake University.

Cecchini, Råde, and Zeidler [CRZ23] proved, for $n \leq 7$ but excluding $n = 4$, that $M^n \times \mathbb{R}$ does not have complete PSC metrics when M itself is a closed manifold without any PSC metric. This result offers a positive resolution to the Rosenberg-Stolz conjecture.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that the topological obstructions for PSC remain invariant under domination maps, i.e., maps between two manifolds with non-zero degrees (in this paper, we only consider maps of degrees ± 1). For instance, Gromov proposed the “non-compact domination conjecture” [Gro23, Section 4.7], suggesting that if a compact orientable manifold cannot be dominated by compact manifolds with $Sc > 0$, then it cannot be dominated by complete manifolds with $Sc > 0$. Examples include closed enlargeable manifolds and closed SYS manifolds, which cannot be dominated by a manifold with a complete PSC metric.

In a broader sense, Gromov also introduced the positive scalar curvature domination problems [Gro23, Section 1.5], posing questions about which spaces X^n and classes $h \in H_m(X)$ ¹ can or cannot be dominated by complete Riemannian manifolds with $Sc > 0$.

To summarize, the aforementioned research efforts aim to understand how PSC obstructions can persist from closed manifolds to non-compact manifolds. In this paper, we aim to expand upon this compact-to-noncompact paradigm in SYS manifolds.

1.1. Generalization of SYS. Closed SYS manifold was initially introduced by Schoen and Yau [SY79] for the dimension-reduction argument and later applied by Schick [Sch98] to construct a counterexample to the unstable Gromov-Lawson-Rosenberg conjecture.

Extending this line of inquiry to open manifolds aligns with the compact-to-noncompact philosophy. Gromov [Gro23, Section 5.10] notably outlined a potential extension of Schoen-Yau’s dimension-reduction argument to complete open manifolds, hinting at the possibility of defining open SYS manifolds. Nevertheless, the prospect faces uncertainties, particularly concerning the existence of area-minimizing hypersurfaces within each Borel-Moore homology class. Thus, we explore an alternative approach rooted in the concept of exhaustion.

Recall that a closed orientable manifold M^n is said to be *SYS* if there are cohomology classes $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-2} \in H^1(M)$ such that the homology class

$$\tau := [M] \frown (\beta_1 \frown \dots \frown \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M)$$

does not lie in the image of the Hurewicz map $\pi_2(M) \rightarrow H_2(M)$. Such a class τ is called *spherical*.

To introduce the notion of SYS for open manifolds, a treatment for ends at infinity is essential. Let X be a manifold equipped with an exhaustion

$$K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_i \subseteq \dots$$

¹If not specified otherwise, all homology groups are with integral coefficients.

by compact sets of X . Then an *end* of X means a decreasing sequence

$$U_1 \supseteq U_2 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq U_i \supseteq \cdots$$

where U_i is a connected component of $X \setminus K_i$.

Define $\mathcal{B}(X)$ as the collection of subsets V of X with compact boundaries. For any subset $V \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ we denote $\partial_\infty V$ to be the collection of ends, denoted by $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, satisfying $U_i \subset V$ for i sufficiently large. We remark that V can be compact and in this case $\partial_\infty V$ is empty.

Notice that if X has a decomposition $X = A \cup B$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ and $A \cap B$ is compact, then we have the corresponding enomds decomposition

$$\partial_\infty X = \partial_\infty A \sqcup \partial_\infty B.$$

For any subset $V \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ we can define the chain complex

$$C_*(X, \partial_\infty V) := \varprojlim_i C_*(X, V \setminus K_i)$$

and denote $H_*(X, \partial_\infty V)$ to be the corresponding homology groups. Moreover, the cohomology groups $H^*(X, \partial_\infty V)$ can be defined by the same approach, via the direct limit, instead of the inverse limit.

The non-compact version of the Poincaré duality (For more details, one can see [Mas78, section 11] or [Hat05, Theorem 3.43] if X is the interior of a compact manifold with boundary) states that if X has an ends-decomposition $\partial_\infty X = \partial_\infty A \sqcup \partial_\infty B$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, then the cap product with the fundamental class $[X]$ in $H_n(X, \partial_\infty X)$ gives the isomorphism of Poincaré dual

$$D_X : H^k(X, \partial_\infty A) \rightarrow H_{n-k}(X, \partial_\infty B), \quad \alpha \mapsto [X] \frown \alpha.$$

Throughout this paper, V is always denoted to be a set in $\mathcal{B}(X)$ and use these notions


$$\partial_s X := \partial_\infty V \text{ and } \partial_b X := \partial_\infty V^c.$$

where V^c is denoted to be the complement of V in X . This gives rise to an ends-decomposition $\partial_\infty X = \partial_s X \sqcup \partial_b X$ induced by V . Notice that if $\overline{V_1 \Delta V_2}$ is compact, then they induce the same ends-decomposition, and this condition is equivalent to $\partial_\infty V_1 = \partial_\infty V_2$.

With above preparation we introduce the notion of aspherical classes.

Definition 1.1. Given an ends-decomposition $\partial_\infty X = \partial_s X \sqcup \partial_b X$ induced by $V \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, a homology class $\tau \in H_2(X, \partial_s X)$ is called *spherical* if for any closed subset Ω of X with $\overline{\Omega \Delta V^c}$ is compact, the restricted class $\tau|_\Omega \in H_2(X, X \setminus \Omega)$ is a class in the image of the Hurewicz map $\pi_2(X, X \setminus \Omega) \rightarrow H_2(X, X \setminus \Omega)$. Otherwise, we say that τ is *aspherical*.

Remark 1.2. The class τ at infinity is supported in $\partial_s X$, instead of $\partial_b X$. Since $\partial_s X$ serves like a side-face in the picture, we use $\partial_s X$ to mean the side-ends of X and $\partial_b X$ to mean the botton-ends of X .



When considering finer structures of ends, it is necessary and crucial to use the relative homology $H_2(X, \partial_s X)$ instead of $H_2(X, \partial_\infty X)$, because some surface is non-trivial in $H_2(X, \partial_s X)$, but vanishes in $H_2(X, \partial_\infty X)$.

Now we define the generalized SYS manifolds under our consideration as follows.

Definition 1.3. An orientable manifold M^n (possibly open) is said to be *SYS* if there is a $V \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ and a decomposition $\partial_\infty X = \partial_s X \sqcup \partial_b X$ such that there is a cohomology class β_1 in $H^1(M, \partial_b X)$ and some cohomology classes $\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{n-2}$ in $H^1(M)$ such that the class

$$[M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M, \partial_s X)$$

is aspherical.

Remark 1.4. If M is closed, this definition coincides the original one, and it is well-defined without any confusion.

Our main result is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *For $3 \leq n \leq 7$, there is no complete metric with positive scalar curvature on a open SYS n -manifold.*

Let us provide several concrete examples for open SYS manifolds, where the verification will be postponed to Section 4. For convenience, we assume that all manifolds are orientable and open unless otherwise stated.

Example 1.6. *If M is an open SYS manifold, then $M \# X$ is an open SYS manifold for arbitrary manifold X .*

More generally, if M is a domination of an open SYS manifold, then M is open SYS, where a domination of \underline{M} on M means that there exists a quasi-proper² map $f : M \rightarrow \underline{M}$ with $\deg f = \pm 1$.

Example 1.7. *If M is a closed SYS manifold, then $M \times \mathbb{R}$ is an open SYS manifold.*

Example 1.8. *Let M^n be a closed SYS manifold and Γ be a submanifold. If Γ satisfies one of the following:*

²A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called quasi-proper ([Gro23, section 1.5]) if for all proper maps $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow X$, the composed map $f \circ \phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow Y$ is either proper or converges to a point in Y for $t \rightarrow \infty$.

- (i) $\dim(\Gamma) \leq 1$;
(ii) The first betti number $b_1(\Gamma) \leq n - 3$,
then $M \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold.

We use Theorem 1.5 to partially answer a conjecture of Schoen mentioned in [LM19].

Corollary 1.9. *Let M^n , $3 \leq n \leq 7$ be a closed manifold and Γ be a closed subset of M . If $M \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold and g is a metric in $L^\infty(M) \cap C^\infty(M \setminus \Gamma)$ with nonnegative scalar curvature on $M \setminus \Gamma$, then g is Ricci-flat on $M \setminus \Gamma$.*

The original conjecture of Schoen [LM19] supposes that Γ is co-dimensional 3 and the Yamabe invariant of M is non-positive, instead of the open SYS property of M . Mantoulidis-Li [LM19] and Kazaras [Kaz19] resolved the conjecture for 3-dimension and 4-dimension respectively.

1.2. Uniformly Positive Scalar Curvature. PSC and UPSC obstructions exhibit differing behaviors in non-compact manifolds. For example, \mathbb{R}^2 admits a complete PSC metric, but there is no complete UPSC metric. Hence, Definitions 1.1 and 1.3 fall short in determining which types of open manifolds admit a complete UPSC metric.

We modify the previous definition slightly and introduce the so-called “strongly spherical” class.

Definition 1.10. Given an ends-decomposition $\partial_\infty X = \partial_s X \sqcup \partial_b X$ induced by $V \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, a homology class $\tau \in H_2(X, \partial_s X)$ is called *strongly spherical* if for any closed subset Ω of X satisfying that $\overline{\Omega \Delta V^c}$ is compact, the restricted class $\tau|_\Omega \in H_2(X, X \setminus \Omega)$ is a class in the image of the Hurewicz map $\pi_2(X) \rightarrow H_2(X, X \setminus \Omega)$. Otherwise, we say that τ is *weakly aspherical*.

Likewise, we define weak SYS manifolds.

Definition 1.11. An orientable manifold M^n (possibly open) is said to be *weakly SYS* if there is an ends-decomposition $\partial_\infty X = \partial_s X \sqcup \partial_b X$ induced by V satisfying the following property: there are a cohomology class β_1 in $H^1(M, \partial_b X)$ and cohomology classes $\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{n-2}$ in $H^1(M)$ such that the class

$$[M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M, \partial_s X)$$

is weakly aspherical.

Example 1.12. $\mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ is weakly SYS but not SYS as it admits a complete PSC metric.

Similarly to Theorem 1.5, we can prove the following:

Theorem 1.13. *For $3 \leq n \leq 7$, there is no complete metrics with uniformly positive scalar curvature on a weakly SYS n -manifold.*

We will give a class of weak SYS manifolds obtained by deleting certain submanifold from closed SYS manifolds.

Corollary 1.14. *Let M be a closed SYS manifold with the aspherical class $\tau = [M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M)$ and $\Gamma \subset M$ be an embedded submanifold. If τ is not in the subgroup generated by the image of $H_2(\Gamma)$ and $\pi_2(M)$, then M is weakly SYS.*

Remark 1.15. If the Hurewicz map $\pi_2(\Gamma) \rightarrow H_2(\Gamma)$ is surjective, then the aspherical class τ automatically satisfies the condition of the above theorem.

1.3. Idea of the proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.13. Similar to the compact case, we apply the Schoen-Yau descent argument to find a suitable surface representation of the aspherical class τ defined in Section 1.1. It will be seen later that both the proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.13 follow the same strategy: determining the topological characterization of this surface under the condition of PSC or UPSC. The proof of Theorem 1.13 is much simpler than Theorem 1.5 itself, due to the UPSC assumption. Thus, we will only focus on the proof of Theorem 1.5 here.

As the non-compactness of manifolds leads to the lack of the existence of global stable minimal surfaces, we will find a “minimal” surface in a sufficiently large closed subset Ω (as chosen in Definition 1.1) with a possible use of Gromov’s μ -bubble. Precisely, we construct a stable weighted slicing with free boundary

$$(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2, w_2) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (\Sigma_{n-1}, \partial\Sigma_{n-1}, w_{n-1}) \rightarrow (\Sigma_n, \partial\Sigma_n, w_n) = (\Omega, \partial\Omega, 1),$$

where Σ_k is a k -dimensional submanifold in Ω , w_k is a smooth positive function on Σ_k which will be served as a weight later.

The main difficulty lies in obtaining a topological description of $(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2)$ under the positive scalar curvature assumption. Specifically, we can give a localized topological characterization (see Proposition 3.2) asserting that

$$(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2) \text{ must be a disk far away from } \partial\Sigma_2. \quad (ltc)$$

The reason is as follows: We first apply the warping product trick consecutively and get that Σ_2 (actually $\Sigma_2 \times \mathbb{T}^{n-2}$) can be viewed as a surface with a PSC metric.

Choose a compact set $K \subset \Sigma_2$ such that $\partial\Sigma_2$ is sufficiently far from K . If there is a non-trivial closed curve $\gamma \subset K$ in $H_1(\Sigma_2)$, we lift it to a certain covering space and assume that

- the curve γ separates two ends of $\partial\Sigma_2$;
- it is sufficiently far from $\partial\Sigma_2$.

The distance between such a curve and $\partial\Sigma_2$ is bounded by a definite constant, which is a contradiction with the first fact.

We can conclude that each component ∂K is contractible in $H_2(\Sigma_2)$. Namely, Σ is a disc far away from $\partial\Sigma_2$


Remark that the the bound follows from the width estimate in Lemma 2.8, which is a quantitative improvement of the fact that a Riemannian surface with complete PSC metrics cannot have two ends.

We use the localized topological characterization (see *(ltc)*) and see that the class τ is spherical, as $(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2)$ represents the class $\tau|_\Omega$ as in Definition 1.1. However, τ is aspherical from the SYS assumption.

We now explain the construction of the co-dimensional one hypersurfaces.

For the case $\partial_b M = \emptyset$, the closed subset Ω is compact. By the standard theorems of geometric measure theory, the minimal surface exists with singularities of codimension 7.

For the case $\partial_b M \neq \emptyset$, Ω may be non-compact, so we try to find a μ -bubble Σ_{n-1} at the first step. An essential advantage of μ -bubbles over minimal hypersurfaces is that the former are easier to “trap” them and prevent from fully sliding away to infinity than the minimal hypersurfaces. By lifting to a covering space, we can assume that Ω is a non-compact manifold with boundary ∂_s and a nontrivial ends decomposition $\partial_\infty \Omega = \partial_+ \sqcup \partial_-$. The existence of μ -bubble is guaranteed by the non-trivial ends decomposition.



1.4. Arrangement of this paper. The rest of this paper is organized as follows:

- In Section 2, we provide some preliminary content on topology and analysis.
- In section 3, we prove Theorem 1.5.
- In section 4, we give some examples of open SYS manifolds, including those mentioned in the introduction.
- In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.13 and discuss the obstruction for UPSC.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Prof. Chao Li for several helpful conversations about non-compact minimal surfaces. We are grateful to Prof. Xin Zhou and Dr. Zhichao Wang for discussion on minimal surfaces with free boundary. Finally, during the workshop “Recent Advances in Comparison Geometry

(24w5226)” held in Hangzhou, Prof. Pengzi Miao highlighted a potential link between Theorem 1.5 and the Schoen conjecture, for which we are grateful. Additionally, we would like to thank the Banff International Research Station and the Institute of Advanced Studies in Mathematics for providing us with this enriching opportunity.

2. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we introduce some notions and some useful lemmas.

2.1. Topological Preliminaries.

Lemma 2.1. *Let M^n be a connected and oriented smooth manifold, possibly open, $0 \neq \alpha \in H_{n-1}(M^n)$ be a non-zero homology class, then α can be represented by closed embedded oriented hypersurface Σ^{n-1} in M^n ; Moreover, there is a smooth map $f: M^n \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ and Σ^{n-1} is regular level set of f .*

Proof. Let $\eta \in H_c^1(M)$ be the Poincaré dual of $\alpha \in H_1(M)$. One has that

$$H_c^1(M) := \varinjlim_{K \subseteq M} H^1(M, M \setminus K),$$

We can find a compact set $K \subset M$ such that $\eta \in H^1(M, M - K)$. Without loss of the generality, we may assume ∂K is smooth.

From Brown’s representability theorem(see Page 448 ,Theorem [Hat05]), one has that

$$H^1(M, M \setminus K) \cong H^1(M/(M \setminus K)) = [M/(M \setminus K), \mathbb{S}^1],$$

where $[M/(M \setminus K), \mathbb{S}^1]$ is the homotopic class from $M/(M \setminus K)$ to \mathbb{S}^1 .

Thus we can find a smooth map

$$f: (M, M \setminus K) \rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^1, \{-1\}),$$

i.e. $f(M) \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ and $f(M \setminus K) = -1$. Moreover the induced map

$$f^*: H^1(\mathbb{S}^1, \{-1\}) \rightarrow H^1(M, M \setminus K) \rightarrow H_c^1(M)$$

satisfies that $f^*(d\theta) = \eta$. By Sard’s theorem we can take the pre-image Σ of a regular value as a representative of α . \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let M^n be an oriented smooth Riemannian manifold and $\alpha \in H_{n-1}(M^n)$ be a non-zero class. Then there exist a covering space \tilde{M} of M associated with a smooth function*

$$\rho: \tilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

satisfying

- (1) $\tilde{\Sigma} = \rho^{-1}(0)$ is a smooth embedded hypersurface.
- (2) $p_*[\tilde{\Sigma}] = \alpha \in H_{n-1}(M)$ where $p: \tilde{M} \rightarrow M$ is the projection map.
- (3) $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$ and ρ is surjective.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in H_{n-1}(M^n)$ be the non-zero class. From Lemma 2.1, there is a smooth map $f: M^n \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^1$ satisfying that

- the regular level set $\Sigma := f^{-1}(1)$ is a closed hypersurface;
- $[\Sigma] = \alpha$

We consider the pull back

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \times_f \mathbb{R} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \mathbb{R} \\ \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow p_2 \\ M & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{S}^1 \end{array} \quad (2.1)$$

where $M \times_f \mathbb{R} := \{(x, t) \in M \times \mathbb{R} : f(x) = p_2(t)\}$ is a covering space of M .

The hypersurface $\tilde{\Sigma} := \tilde{f}^{-1}(0)$ is the lifting of Σ (i.e. $(p_1)_*([\tilde{\Sigma}]) = [\Sigma]$), and we take \tilde{M} to be all connected components of $M \times_f \mathbb{R}$ that contain $\tilde{\Sigma}$.

We denote $\tilde{M}^\pm := \tilde{f}^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^\pm) \cap \tilde{M}$, both of which are smooth manifolds with boundary $\tilde{\Sigma}$. Since $[\tilde{\Sigma}] \neq 0$ in $H_{n-1}(\tilde{M})$, both \tilde{M}^\pm are non-compact. Then we define a signed distance function

$$d(x) := \begin{cases} \text{dist}(x, \tilde{\Sigma}) & x \in \tilde{M}^+ \\ -\text{dist}(x, \tilde{\Sigma}) & x \in \tilde{M}^- \end{cases}$$

By modifying the signed distance function $d(x)$, we can construct a proper map $\rho: \tilde{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$. Furthermore, ρ is surjective by construction. □

2.2. μ -bubbles.

Definition 2.3. Given a Riemannian band $(M, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$, a function μ is said to satisfy the *barrier condition* if either $\mu \in C^\infty(\overset{\circ}{M})$ with $\mu \rightarrow \pm\infty$ on ∂_\mp , or $\mu \in C^\infty(M)$ with

$$\mu|_{\partial_-} > H_{\partial_-}, \quad \mu|_{\partial_+} < H_{\partial_+} \quad (2.2)$$

where H_{∂_-} is the mean curvature of ∂_- with respect to the inward normal and H_{∂_+} is the mean curvature of ∂_+ with respect to the outward normal.

Choose a Caccioppoli set Ω_0 with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega_0 \subset \overset{\circ}{M}$ and $\partial_+ \subset \Omega_0$. Consider the following functional

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega) := \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial^*\Omega) - \int_M (\chi_\Omega - \chi_{\Omega_0}) \mu \, d\mathcal{H}^n \quad (2.3)$$

where Ω is any Caccioppoli set of M with reduced boundary $\partial^*\Omega$ such that $\Omega \Delta \Omega_0 \Subset \overset{\circ}{M}$.

The existence and regularity of a minimizer \mathcal{A}^μ among all Caccioppoli sets was claimed by Gromov in [Gro23, Section 5.2], and was rigorously carried out by the fourth-named author in [Zhu21, Proposition 2.1].

Lemma 2.4. (Cf. [Zhu21, Proposition 2.1]) *Let $(M^n, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$ be a Riemannian band with $n \leq 7$, and let Ω_0 be a reference set. If μ satisfies the barrier condition, then there exists an $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}$ with smooth boundary such that*

$$\mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega) = \inf_{\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}_{\Omega_0}} \mathcal{A}_{\Omega_0}^\mu(\Omega').$$

Remark 2.5. In Lemma 2.4 the smooth hypersurface $\Sigma := \partial\Omega \setminus \partial_-$ is homologous to ∂_+ .

We next discuss the first and second variation of μ -bubble.

Lemma 2.6. (Cf. [CL20, lemma 13]) *If Ω_t is a smooth 1-parameter family of regions with $\Omega_0 = \Omega$ and normal speed ψ at $t = 0$, then*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{A}^\mu(\Omega_t) = \int_{\Sigma_t} (H - \mu) \psi \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$$

where H is the scalar mean curvature of $\partial\Omega_t$. In particular, a μ -bubble Ω satisfies

$$H = \mu$$

along $\partial\Omega$.

Lemma 2.7. (Cf. [CL20, lemma 14]) *Consider a μ -bubble Ω with $\partial\Omega = \Sigma$. Assume that Ω_t is a smooth 1-parameter family of regions with $\Omega_0 = \Omega$ and normal speed ψ at $t = 0$, then $\mathcal{Q}(\psi) := \left. \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \right|_{t=0} (\mathcal{A}(\Omega_t)) \geq 0$ where $\mathcal{Q}(\psi)$ satisfies*

$$\mathcal{Q}(\psi) = \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} R_{\Sigma} \psi^2 - \frac{1}{2} (|\Pi_{\Sigma}|^2 + R_M + \mu^2 - 2\langle \nabla_M \mu, \nu \rangle) \psi^2 \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$$

where ν is the outwards pointing unit normal.

It is well-known that if the scalar curvature of a torical band M is bounded below by $\text{Sc}(\mathbb{S}^n) = n(n-1)$, then

$$\text{width}(M) = \text{dist}(\partial_-, \partial_+) \leq \frac{2\pi}{n}.$$

However, if the scalar curvature only bounded below by σ on a neighborhood of a separating hypersurface and $\text{Sc}(M) > 0$ (actually, not too negative), then the distance from this hypersurface to the boundary ∂M can not be too large.

The following lemma also appears in [CRZ22, HSS23].

Lemma 2.8. *Let $(M^n, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$ be a compact Riemannian band with $n \leq 7$ associated with a smooth function*

$$\rho : (M, \partial_{\pm}) \rightarrow ([-D, D], \pm D)$$

satisfying

$$(1) \text{Lip}(\rho) < 1;$$

- (2) The scalar curvature $\text{Sc}(M) \geq \sigma > 0$ in $\rho^{-1}([-1, 1])$ and $\text{Sc}(M) > 0$ everywhere in M .
- (3) Any closed hypersurface Σ in M which separates ∂_- from ∂_+ admits no metric with positive scalar curvature.

Then we have $D \leq D_0$ where $D_0 = D_0(\sigma) > 1$ is a positive constant depend only on σ .

Proof. Suppose the contrary that $D > 2(1 - 2h_0^{-1}(1))$, where $h_0(x) = -\sqrt{\sigma} \tan(\frac{\sqrt{\sigma}}{2}x)$. We first construct a function μ satisfies the barrier condition. Then use it to find the μ -bubble Σ admitting a metric with positive scalar curvature and separating M , which leads to a contradiction.

Consider the piecewise smoothly function

$$h(x) := \begin{cases} -\infty & x \geq 1 - 2h_0^{-1}(1) \\ \frac{2}{x-1+2h_0^{-1}(1)} & 1 \leq x \leq 1 - 2h_0^{-1}(1) \\ -\sqrt{\sigma} \tan(\frac{\sqrt{\sigma}}{2}x) & -1 \leq x \leq 1 \\ \frac{2}{x+1+2h_0^{-1}(-1)} & -1 - h_0^{-1}(-1) \leq x \leq -1 \\ +\infty & x \leq -1 - h_0^{-1}(-1) \end{cases}$$

Ignore the smoothness of h and choose $\mu := h \circ \rho$. We directly calculate that

$$\text{Sc}(M) + \mu^2 - 2|\nabla_M \mu| > 0.$$

From the hypothesis, μ satisfies the barrier condition. By the Lemma 2.4, the μ -bubble Σ exists and separates M .

We now show that Σ admits a positive scalar curvature metric. Combining with the second variation formula in Lemma 2.7, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma} \psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \text{Sc}(\Sigma) \psi^2 > 0.$$

for any smooth function ψ on Σ . We have that the operator

$$-\Delta_{\Sigma} + \frac{1}{2} \text{Sc}(\Sigma) > 0.$$

Hence if $n \geq 3$, the conformal Laplacian $L = -4\frac{n-1}{n-2}\Delta_{\Sigma} + \text{Sc}(\Sigma)$ has positive first eigenvalue. As a conclusion, Σ admits a PSC metric. If $n = 2$, it is obtained directly by Gauss-Bonnet theorem.

Let $\phi : [-D, D] \rightarrow [-D, D]$ be a monotonically increasing smooth function such that $\phi \equiv \pm 1$ near the neighborhood of ± 1 and $\text{Lip}(\phi) \leq 1 + \varepsilon$. The composition $\tilde{h} = h \circ \phi$ is smooth and we use $\tilde{\mu} = \tilde{h} \circ \rho$, instead of μ and the same argument to complete the proof. \square

Definition 2.9. Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold. Given any function $\sigma : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we say that (M, g) has its T^* -stabilized scalar curvature bounded below by σ if there are finitely many smooth positive functions u_1, \dots, u_k

such that the warped metric

$$g_{warp} = g + \sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 d\theta_i^2 \text{ on } M \times \mathbb{T}^k$$

satisfies $\text{Sc}(g_{warp}) \geq \sigma \circ \pi_M$, where $\pi_M : M \times \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow M$ is denoted to be the canonical projection map.

Remark 2.10. From [GL83], \mathbb{T}^n does not admit a metric of positive scalar curvature for any $n \geq 2$. We could conclude that any circle \mathbb{S}^1 has no metric with positive T^* -stabilized scalar curvature. If not, we use Definition 2.9 to find a wrapped metric on \mathbb{T}^{n+1} with positive scalar curvature, which leads to a contradiction with the last paragraph.

We generalize the Lemma 2.8 to T^* -stabilized scalar curvature.

Lemma 2.11. *Let $(M^n, g; \partial_-, \partial_+)$ be a compact Riemannian band with $n \leq 7$ associated with a smooth function*

$$\rho : (M, \partial_{\pm}) \rightarrow ([-D, D], \pm D)$$

satisfying

- (1) $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$;
- (2) (M, g) has its T^* -stabilized scalar curvature bound below by σ , where $\sigma : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function such that $\text{Sc}(g) \geq c$ in $\rho^{-1}([-1, 1])$ and $\text{Sc}(g) \geq 0$ everywhere in M
- (3) Any closed hypersurface Σ in M which separates ∂_- from ∂_+ admits no metric with positive T^* -stabilized scalar curvature.

Then we have $D \leq D_0$ where $D_0 = D_0(c) > 1$ is a positive constant depend only on c .

Proof. For a constant $c > 0$, one can construct a smooth function $h_c : (-D_0, D_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the proof of Lemma 2.8 satisfying that

- $h'_c \leq 0$ and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \pm D_0} h_c(t) = \mp \infty;$$

- $2h'_c + h_c^2 + c\chi_{[-1, 1]} > 0$, where $\chi_{[-1, 1]}$ is the characteristic function of the interval $[-1, 1]$.

In the following we are going to deduce a contradiction when $D \geq D_0$. By Definition 2.9, there are finitely many smooth positive functions u_1, \dots, u_k on M such that the warped metric

$$g_{warp} = g_M + \sum_{i=1}^k u_i^2 d\theta_i^2 \text{ on } M \times \mathbb{T}^k$$

satisfies $\text{Sc}(g_{warp}) \geq \sigma \circ \pi_M$, where $\pi_M : M \times \mathbb{T}^k \rightarrow M$ is denoted to be the canonical projection map. Suppose that

$$M_{D_0} := \rho^{-1}([-D_0, D_0]) \times \mathbb{T}^k$$

and consider the functional

$$\mathcal{A}^{h_c}(\Sigma \times \mathbb{T}^k) := \mathcal{H}^{k+1}(\Sigma \times \mathbb{T}^k) - \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{T}^k} h_c \circ \rho \, d\mathcal{H}^{k+2},$$

where Σ is any closed hypersurface separating two boundaries $\rho^{-1}(\pm D_0)$ and bounds a region Ω with $\rho^{-1}(-D_0)$. From geometric measure theory we can find a smooth minimizer $\Sigma_{min} \times \mathbb{T}^k$ of the functional \mathcal{A}^{h_c} . Using the stability and applying the warping product trick by Fischer-Colbrie-Schoen [FCS80], we can find a warped metric

$$\hat{g}_{warp} = g_{\Sigma_{min}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} u_i^2 d\theta_i^2 \text{ on } \Sigma_{min} \times \mathbb{T}^{k+1}$$

with positive scalar curvature, which contradicts our assumptions. \square

Corollary 2.12. *Assume that (Σ^2, g_Σ) is a complete and orientable surface having its T^* -stabilized scalar curvature bounded below by a positive function σ . Then Σ^2 is conformally equivalent a plane or a sphere.*

Proof. The proof is divided into two steps:

Step 1. Σ is topologically a plane or a sphere.

From the uniformization theorem it is sufficient to prove that the simply-connectedness of Σ .

We first note that $H_1(\Sigma) = 0$. If not, according to Lemma 2.2, we can find a covering of Σ with a map $\rho : \tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$. For simplicity of notation, we also denote this covering space by Σ . Both conditions in Lemma 2.11 hold for the map $\rho : \rho^{-1}([-D, +D]) \rightarrow [-D, +D]$ where D is arbitrarily large. This contradicts with Lemma 2.11.

We have two cases: (1) Σ is closed; (2) Σ is open.

(I) If Σ is closed, then it is \mathbb{S}^2 .

(II) If Σ is open, then $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ is torsion-free as Σ is aspherical. We have that $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ is trivial. If not, we can find a covering space $\tilde{\Sigma}$ such that $H_1(\tilde{\Sigma}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, and use the same argument as above to lead to a contradiction with Lemma 2.11.

Step 2. Σ is conformally equivalent to a plane or a sphere.

It is sufficient to study the non-compact case. Suppose by contradiction that Σ is not conformally equivalent to the plane but to the disk \mathbb{D} . Then we can write the metric g_Σ as

$$g_\Sigma = \mu(z)|dz|^2 \text{ with } z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Choose $v = \mu^{-1/2}$ and the Gaussian curvature K of (Σ, g_Σ) can be expressed as follows:

$$K = \frac{\Delta_\Sigma v}{v} - \frac{|\nabla_\Sigma v|^2}{v^2}. \quad (2.4)$$

In the following, we use the uniform positivity of T^* -stability scalar curvature to study the positivity of the operator $-\Delta_\Sigma + \beta_k K$ where $\beta_k = \frac{k+1}{2k}$ and then use it to get a contradiction.

Claim: For any non-zero $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Sigma)$, one has that

$$\int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma \phi|^2 + \beta_k K \phi^2 \, d\text{vol}_\Sigma > 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Proof of the claim: Let $u = \prod_{i=1}^k u_i$. Then, we have that

$$\text{Sc}(g_{\text{warp}}) = 2K - 2 \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\Delta_\Sigma u_i}{u_i} - 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \langle \nabla_\Sigma \log u_i, \nabla_\Sigma \log u_j \rangle > 0$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\Sigma \log u &= \frac{\Delta_\Sigma u}{u} - |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\Delta_\Sigma u_i}{u_i} + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \langle \nabla_\Sigma \log u_i, \nabla_\Sigma \log u_j \rangle - |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2 \\ &< K + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \langle \nabla_\Sigma \log u_i, \nabla_\Sigma \log u_j \rangle - |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for $k \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k |\nabla_\Sigma \log u_i|^2 + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \langle \nabla_\Sigma \log u_i, \nabla_\Sigma \log u_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \frac{1}{k-1} (|\nabla_\Sigma \log u_i|^2 + |\nabla_\Sigma \log u_j|^2) + 2 \langle \nabla_\Sigma \log u_i, \nabla_\Sigma \log u_j \rangle \\ &\geq \frac{2k}{k-1} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \langle \nabla_\Sigma \log u_i, \nabla_\Sigma \log u_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

we combine them together to get that

$$\Delta_\Sigma \log u < K - \frac{k+1}{2k} |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2 = K - \beta_k |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2.$$

Let ϕ be any non-zero function in $C_c^\infty(\Sigma)$. Multiplying ϕ^2 from both sides and integrating by parts, we see

$$- \int_\Sigma 2\phi \langle \nabla_\Sigma \phi, \nabla_\Sigma \log u \rangle \, d\sigma_\Sigma < \int_\Sigma K \phi^2 \, d\sigma_\Sigma - \beta_k \int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2 \phi^2 \, d\sigma_\Sigma.$$

The left hand side is bounded below by

$$-\beta_k^{-1} \int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma \phi|^2 \, d\sigma_\Sigma - \beta_k \int_\Sigma |\nabla_\Sigma \log u|^2 \phi^2 \, d\sigma_\Sigma$$

Then, we get (2.5) and complete the proof of the claim.

We now use (2.5) to get a contradiction. We have that

$$\int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma}(\phi v)|^2 + \beta_k K \phi^2 v^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} > 0 \text{ for any non-zero } \phi \in C_c^{\infty}(\Sigma).$$

In addition, from (2.4), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma}(\phi v)|^2 &= \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma}\phi|^2 v^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} + 2 \int_{\Sigma} \phi v \langle \nabla_{\Sigma}\phi, \nabla_{\Sigma}v \rangle d\sigma_{\Sigma} + \int_{\Sigma} \phi^2 |\nabla_{\Sigma}v|^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} \\ \int_{\Sigma} \beta_k K \phi^2 v^2 &= -2\beta_k \int_{\Sigma} \phi v \langle \nabla_{\Sigma}\phi, \nabla_{\Sigma}v \rangle - 2\beta_k \int_{\Sigma} \phi^2 |\nabla_{\Sigma}v|^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 2(1 - \beta_k) \int_{\Sigma} \phi v \langle \nabla_{\Sigma}\phi, \nabla_{\Sigma}v \rangle d\sigma_{\Sigma} \\ \leq \frac{2(1 - \beta_k)^2}{2\beta_k - 1} \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma}\phi|^2 v^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} + \frac{2\beta_k - 1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} \phi^2 |\nabla_{\Sigma}v|^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$$

we arrive at

$$\int_{\Sigma} \phi^2 |\nabla_{\Sigma}v|^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} \leq C(\beta_k) \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\Sigma}\phi|^2 v^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma},$$

where

$$C(\beta_k) = \frac{2}{2\beta_k - 1} \left(\frac{2(1 - \beta_k)^2}{2\beta_k - 1} + 1 \right).$$

Fix a point p in Σ . By taking ϕ to be a test function such that $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ in Σ , $\phi \equiv 1$ in $B_R(p)$, $\phi \equiv 0$ outside $B_{2R}(p)$ and $|\nabla_{\Sigma}\phi| \leq 10R^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\int_{B_R(p)} |\nabla_{\Sigma}v|^2 d\sigma_{\Sigma} \leq 10\pi C(\beta_k) R^{-2}.$$

Sending $R \rightarrow +\infty$ we conclude that v turns out to be a constant function, which contradicts to the fact that g_{Σ} is a complete metric. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma, g_{\Sigma})$ is a compact orientable surface having its T^* -stabilized scalar curvature bounded below by a positive function σ . Let $\Omega \subset \Sigma$ be a compact connected domain, and let s be a number such that*

- (1) $\Omega(s)$ does not meet $\partial\Sigma$.
- (2) $\text{Image}[H_1(\Omega) \rightarrow H_1(\Omega(s))] \neq 0$

where $\Omega(s) := \{x \in \Sigma : \text{dist}_{\Sigma}(x, \Omega) \leq s\}$. Then

$$s \leq D_0 \left(\inf_{\Omega(1)} \sigma \right)$$

where D_0 is the function coming from Lemma 2.11.

Proof. Suppose the contrary that $s > D_0$. Then, we find a curve γ in Ω which is non-trivial in $H_1(\Omega(s))$. Similar as Lemma 2.2, by lifting to a covering space, we can assume γ separates two boundaries, $\partial^+\Omega(s)$ and $\partial^-\Omega(s)$, of the domain $\Omega(s)$.

Let $\rho : \Omega(s) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smoothing of the signed distance function to γ . By rescaling, we can assume $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$ and $\rho : (\Omega(s), \partial^+, \partial^-) \rightarrow ([-D_0 - \epsilon_1, D_0 + \epsilon_2], -D_0 - \epsilon_1, D_0 + \epsilon_2)$, where ϵ_i is some positive constant. We combine Lemma 2.11 with Remark 2.10 to have that

$$D_0 + \frac{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2}{2} \leq D_0$$

which is a contradiction. \square


Proposition 3.2. *For any function $L : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$ and a constant $s_0 > 0$, there is a positive constant $T_0 = T_0(L, s_0) > s_0$ such that if $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma, g_\Sigma)$ is a compact oriented surface with boundary such that*

- *there is a smooth function $\rho : (\Sigma, \partial\Sigma) \rightarrow ([0, T], T)$ with $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$;*
- *$T > T_0$ and T is the regular value of ρ ;*
- *(Σ, g_Σ) has its T^* -stabilized scalar curvature bound below by σ , where $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is some function satisfying that*

$$\inf_{\rho^{-1}([0, s])} \sigma \geq L(s) \text{ for all } s \in [0, T],$$

then for any regular value $s \in (0, s_0]$ of ρ , there are finitely many pairwise disjoint embedded disks D_1^s, \dots, D_l^s in $\rho^{-1}([0, T_0])$ such that

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^l \partial D_i^s \subset \rho^{-1}(s) \text{ and } \rho^{-1}([0, s]) \subset \bigsqcup_{i=1}^l \bar{D}_i^s.$$



Proof. We first use Lemma 2.11 to find an expression of T_0 and then use the choice of T_0 to show that it is the desired one.

Step 1: Find T_0 and set up the proof.

We use the function $D_0(c)$ defined in Lemma 2.11 to introduce the following constants:

- $C_1 = D_0(L(s_0 + 2))$;
- $s_1 = s_0 + 1 + C_1$;
- $C_2 = D_0(L(s_1 + 3))$;
- $T_0 = s_1 + 2 + D_2$.

In the following, we assume that $(\Sigma, \partial\Sigma, g_\Sigma)$ σ and ρ are defined as in the assumption. For our convenience, we fix a regular value s_1^* of with $s_1 \leq s_1^* \leq s_1 + 1$.

Step 2: Every component of $\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])$ is homeomorphic to a 2-sphere with finitely many disks removed.

If not, there is a compact component $\Omega \subset \rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])$ with $g(\Omega) > 0$. Using long exact sequence for relatively homology groups (see Page in [Hat05]), we have that

$$0 < g(\Omega) \leq g(\Omega(C_2)) \text{ and } \text{Image}[H_1(\Omega) \rightarrow H_1(\Omega(C_2))] \neq 0,$$

which contradicts lemma 3.1. Notice that $C_2 > D_0(s_1^*)$.

Step 3: For any $s \in (0, s_0]$, each component of $\rho^{-1}(s)$ bounds a disk in $\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])$.

It is sufficient to show that $\pi_1(\rho^{-1}(s)) \rightarrow \pi_1(\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*]))$ is trivial.

Suppose the contrary that there is a closed curve γ which is non-contractible in $\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])$. For our convenience, we may assume that $\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])$ is connected. From Step 2, it is a 2-sphere with finitely many discs removed.

We conclude that γ must be separable (i.e. γ separates two non-empty parts ∂^+ and ∂^- of the boundary $\partial[\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])]$). If not, γ is bounded by a disc, which is a contradiction with the choice of γ .

We now apply Lemma 2.11 to $(\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*]), \partial^+, \partial^-)$ and get a contradiction as follows.

Notice that we have

- $\gamma \subset \rho^{-1}(s)$,
- $\partial[\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])] = \partial^+ \amalg \partial^- \subset \rho^{-1}(s_1^*)$
- $\text{Lip}(\rho) < 1$
- $\text{dist}_g(\gamma, \partial^+) > C_1 > D_0(L(s_0+2))$ and $\text{dist}_g(\gamma, \partial^-) > C_1 > D_0(L(s_0+2))$

Through a modification of the signed distance function of γ we can construct a smooth function

$$\tilde{\rho} : ((\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*]), \partial^+, \partial^-)) \rightarrow ([-C_1, C_1], C_1, -C_1)$$

with $\text{Lip}\tilde{\rho} < 1$ and $\tilde{\rho}^{-1}([-1, 1]) \subset \gamma(2) \subset \rho^{-1}([0, s_0 + 2])$. Moreover, the scalar curvature is bounded below by $\sigma \geq L(s_0 + 2)$ in $\tilde{\rho}^{-1}([-1, 1])$ and is non-negative ($\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*])$).

From Remark 2.9, any circle has no metric with positive T^* -stabilized scalar curvature. We apply Lemma 2.11 to $(\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*]), \partial^+, \partial^-)$ and have that that $C_1 < D_0(L_{s_0+2})$, which is a contradiction with the choice of C_1 .

Step 4: Show that for $s \in (0, s_0]$, there are finitely many pairwise disjoint embedded disks D_1^s, \dots, D_l^s in Σ such that

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^l \partial D_i^s \subset \rho^{-1}(s) \text{ and } \rho^{-1}([0, s]) \subset \bigsqcup_{i=1}^l \bar{D}_i^s.$$

For any $s \in (0, s_0]$, assume that $\rho^{-1}(s)$ is a disjoint union of closed curves, $\{\gamma_i^s\}_{i=1}^m$. From Step 3, each γ_i^s bounds a disc $D_i^s \subset (\rho^{-1}([0, s_1^*]))$.

Claim: For any i_1, i_2 , one of the following relations holds: (1) $D_{i_1}^s \cap D_{i_2}^s = \emptyset$; (2) $D_{i_1}^s \subset D_{i_2}^s$; (3) $D_{i_2}^s \subset D_{i_1}^s$.

Proof of the claim: Suppose that $D_{i_1}^s \setminus D_{i_2}^s \neq \emptyset$ and $D_{i_2}^s \setminus D_{i_1}^s \neq \emptyset$. Then, we have that $\gamma_{i_1}^s \cap D_{i_2}^s \neq \emptyset$ and $\gamma_{i_2}^s \cap D_{i_1}^s \neq \emptyset$.

Since $\gamma_{i_1}^s$ and $\gamma_{i_2}^s$ are disjoint, we get that $\gamma_{i_1}^s \subset D_{i_2}^s$ and $\gamma_{i_2}^s \subset D_{i_1}^s$. Namely, the set $D_{i_1}^s \cup D_{i_2}^s \subset M$ is a 2-sphere. It is an open and closed set, which is a contradiction with the fact that M is connected.

Use the claim to have that $(\{D_i^s\}_{i=1}^m, \subset)$ is a partially ordered set. Consider the collection $\{D_{i_k}^s\}_{k=1}^l$ of maximal elements. Then, $\{D_{i_k}^s\}_{k=1}^l$ are disjoint and $\Pi_{k=1}^l D_{i=k}^s = \cup_{i=1}^m D_i^s$.

It remains to show that $\rho^{-1}([0, s]) \subset \Pi_{k=1}^l D_{i=k}^s$.

Suppose by contradiction that there is a component $\mathcal{C} \subset \rho^{-1}([0, s])$ with $\text{Int} \mathcal{C} \cap (\Pi_{k=1}^l D_{i=k}^s) = \emptyset$. The boundary $\partial \mathcal{C} = \cup_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \gamma_i^s$ is a subset of $\cup_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^s$.

We have that for $i, i' \in \mathcal{C}$, $D_i^s \cap D_{i'}^s = \emptyset$. If not, use the claim that $D_i^s \subset D_{i'}^s$ or $D_{i'}^s \subset D_i^s$. Without the loss of generalization, we assume that $D_{i'}^s \subset D_i^s$. Since $\text{Int} \mathcal{C} \cap (\Pi_{k=1}^l D_{i=k}^s) = \emptyset$, we get that $d(D_{i'}^s, \mathcal{C}) > 0$, which is a contradiction with $\gamma_{i'}^s \subset \partial \mathcal{C}$.

Consider a closed 2-submanifold as follows:

$$\mathcal{C} \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (\cup_{\gamma_i^s} D_i^s) \subset M$$

It is an open and closed set, which is a contradiction with the connectedness of M . We complete the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.5.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Denote

$$\tau := [M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M, \partial_s M),$$

where $\beta_1 \in H^1(M, \partial_b M)$ and $\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{n-2} \in H^1(M)$.

Suppose by contradiction that (M, g) is a complete manifold with positive scalar curvature. It is sufficient to show that τ is spherical.

The proof is divided into two cases.

Case A : If $\partial_b M = \emptyset$, $\beta_1 \in H^1(M)$ and $\tau \in H_2(M, \partial_\infty M)$.

Fix any compact subset Ω of M , we can construct a proper smooth function via modifying certain distance function

$$\rho : M \rightarrow [0, +\infty) \text{ with } \rho|_\Omega \equiv 0 \text{ and } \text{Lip}(\rho) < 1.$$

$$\Omega_s := \rho^{-1}([0, s]) \text{ for any } s \geq 0.$$

Clearly, if s is a regular value of ρ , then Ω_s is a compact region in M with smooth boundary.

In the following, we will show that $\tau|_{\Omega}$ is a spherical class, (i.e. it is in the image of the Hurewicz map

$$\pi_2(M, M \setminus \Omega) \rightarrow H_2(M, M \setminus \Omega).$$

Our approach is to find suitable surface representing the class $\tau|_{\Omega}$. For our purpose we take

$$L(s) = \min_{\Omega_s} R(g).$$

Fix a positive constant s_0 and denote $T_0 = T_0(L, s_0)$ to be the constant coming from Proposition 3.2. Take a regular value T of ρ with $T > T_0$ and consider the restricted class

$$\tau|_{\Omega_T} = [\Omega_T, \partial\Omega_T] \frown (e^*\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile e^*\beta_{n-2}),$$

where $e : \Omega_T \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion map. Remark that if $\tau|_{\Omega_T}$ is the zero class, so is $\tau|_{\Omega}$ and this yields that $\tau|_{\Omega}$ is spherical.

It remains to study the case when $\tau|_{\Omega_T}$ is non-zero.

Using the non-vanishing property of $\tau|_{\Omega_T}$, we can construct a stable weighted slicing with free boundary

$$(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2, w_2) \rightarrow (\Sigma_3, \partial\Sigma_3, w_3) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (\Sigma_n, \partial\Sigma_n, w_n) = (\Omega_T, \partial\Omega_T, 1),$$

where

- each $(\Sigma_j, \partial\Sigma_j, w_j)$ is a compact manifold $(\Sigma_j, \partial\Sigma_j)$ with boundary associated with a positive smooth function $w_j : \Sigma_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$[\Sigma_j, \partial\Sigma_j] = [\Omega_T, \partial\Omega_T] \frown (e^*\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile e^*\beta_{n-j})$$

- for each $3 \leq j \leq n$, Σ_{j-1} is an embedded two-sided hypersurface with free boundary in Σ_j with integer multiplicity, which is a stable critical point of the w_j -weighted area given by

$$\mathcal{A}_j(\Sigma) = \int_{\Sigma} w_j d\mathcal{H}_g^{j-1};$$

- for each $3 \leq j \leq n$, the quotient function

$$q_{j-1} := \frac{w_{j-1}}{w_j|_{\Sigma_{j-1}}}$$

is a first eigenfunction of the stability operator on Σ_{j-1} with the Neumann boundary condition associated with the w_j -weighted area.

Existence and regularity results for minimal surfaces with free boundary can be found in [Grü87a, Grü87b, LZ17].

Using the stability of all Σ_j and the warping trick consecutively (The detail can be found in [Gro23, Section 2.4]), we actually have the inequality

$$\text{Sc} \left(g_{\Sigma_2} + \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} q_j^2 d\theta_j^2 \right) \geq \text{Sc}(g)|_{\Sigma_2} > 0.$$

Now we analyze each component \mathcal{C} of Σ_2 . In the following, we assume that \mathcal{C} has boundary and it touches Ω . (If \mathcal{C} is closed (and so it is a 2-sphere by Corollary 2.12) or \mathcal{C} has boundary without touching Ω , then $[\mathcal{C}]|_\Omega$ is automatically spherical.)

Consider the surface $(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2)$ associated with the smooth function $\rho|_{\Sigma_2}$. Let s be a common regular value of ρ and $\rho|_{\Sigma_2}$ with $s < s_0$. It follows from Proposition 3.2 that there are finitely many pairwise disjoint embedded disks D_1, \dots, D_l in Σ_2 such that

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^l \partial D_i \subset \mathcal{C} \cap \partial\Omega_s \text{ and } \mathcal{C} \cap \Omega_s \subset \bigsqcup_{i=1}^l D_i.$$

In particular, $[\mathcal{C}]|_{\Omega_s}$ is spherical and so is $[\mathcal{C}]|_\Omega$.

Case B: If $\partial_b M \neq \emptyset$, the only difference from the previous proof is that we find the first slicing Σ_{n-1} via the μ -bubble technique. Since

$$H^1(M, \partial_b M) = \varinjlim_{Z \subset M} H^1(M, M \setminus Z)$$

where Z takes all closed subsets in M satisfying $Z \Delta \partial_s M \Subset M$. As in lemma 2.1, choosing a large enough closed subset Z , we can find a class $\tilde{\beta}_1 \in H^1(M, M \setminus Z)$ represents the class $\beta_1 \in H^1(M, \partial_b M)$ and a map $f : (M, M \setminus Z) \rightarrow (\mathbb{S}^1, *)$. Moreover the induced map

$$f^* : H^1(\mathbb{S}^1, *) \rightarrow H^1(M, M - Z) \rightarrow H^1(M, \partial_b M)$$

satisfies $f^*(d\theta) = \beta_1$, where $d\theta$ is the generator of $H^1(\mathbb{S}^1, *)$

Consider the covering pull-back

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{M} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & \mathbb{R} \\ \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow p_2 \\ M & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{S}^1 \end{array}$$

where \tilde{M} is the connected component containing $\tilde{\Sigma} = \tilde{f}^{-1}(0)$. Moreover, $(p_1)_*([\tilde{\Sigma}]) = D_M(\beta_1) \in H_{n-1}(M, \partial_s M)$. Lifting to the covering \tilde{M} , we can assume $\partial_b M = \partial_- \cup \partial_+$ consist of two ends and there is a hypersurface Σ with $[\Sigma] = [M] \frown \beta_1$ separating ∂_- and ∂_+ . Therefore for any closed subset Ω with $\Omega \Delta \partial_b M$ is compact, we can construct a stable μ -bubble $(\Sigma_{n-1}, \partial\Sigma_{n-1})$ such that

$$[\Sigma_{n-1}, \partial\Sigma_{n-1}] = [\Omega_T, \partial\Omega_T] \frown e^* \beta_1.$$

As we get the first slicing, the rest is exactly the same as before. \square

4. EXAMPLES OF OPEN SYS MANIFOLDS

Proposition 4.1. *If M is a domination of an open SYS manifold, then M is also SYS, where we say M is a domination of \underline{M} if there exists a quasi-proper map $f : M \rightarrow \underline{M}$ with $\deg f = \pm 1$.*

Proof. Due to the quasi-properness of the map f we can find a set of points $\{\underline{p}_i \in \underline{M}\}$ such that for any proper map $\phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \underline{M}$ the composed map $f \circ \phi$ is either proper or converges to a point \underline{p}_i as $t \rightarrow +\infty$. By definition of SYS there exists $\underline{V} \in \mathcal{B}(\underline{M})$ such that we can find $\underline{\beta}_1 \in H^1(\underline{M}, \partial_\infty \underline{V}^c)$ and $\underline{\beta}_2, \dots, \underline{\beta}_{n-2}$ in $H^1(\underline{M})$ such that the class

$$\underline{\tau} := [\underline{M}] \smile (\underline{\beta}_1 \frown \underline{\beta}_2 \frown \dots \frown \underline{\beta}_{n-2}) \in H_2(\underline{M}, \partial_\infty \underline{V})$$

is aspherical. Perturb the boundary of \underline{V} , we assume $\underline{p}_i \notin \partial \underline{V}$. Now we can take $V := f^{-1}(\underline{V})$ which appears to be an element in $\mathcal{B}(M)$. Since $\underline{\beta}_1$ is a cohomology class of dimension 1, its restriction near points \underline{p}_i is zero. Through pull-back we have

$$\beta_1 := f^*(\underline{\beta}_1) \in H^1(M, \partial_\infty V^c)$$

and

$$\beta_i := f^*(\underline{\beta}_i) \in H^1(M) \text{ when } i \neq 1.$$

We claim that the class

$$\tau := [M] \smile (\beta_1 \frown \beta_2 \frown \dots \frown \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M, \partial_\infty V)$$

is aspherical. Otherwise, there is a subset Ω of M such that $\overline{\Omega \Delta V}$ is compact and that the class $\tau|_\Omega$ is in the image of the Hurewicz map $\pi_2(M, M \setminus \Omega) \rightarrow H_2(M, M \setminus \Omega)$. Since f has degree ± 1 , by push-forward we obtain

$$\underline{\tau}|_{f(\Omega)} = \pm f_*(\tau|_\Omega)$$

and in particular $\underline{\tau}|_{f(\Omega)}$ lies in the image of the composed map

$$\pi_2(\underline{M}, f(M \setminus \Omega)) \rightarrow \pi_2(\underline{M}, \underline{M} \setminus f(\Omega)) \rightarrow H_2(\underline{M}, \underline{M} \setminus f(\Omega)).$$

This means that $\underline{\tau}$ is aspherical, which leads to a contradiction. \square

Proposition 4.2 (i.e. Example 1.7). *If M is a closed SYS manifold, then $M \times \mathbb{R}$ is an open SYS manifold.*

Proof. Let $[M] \frown \beta_1 \frown \dots \frown \beta_{n-2}$ be the aspherical homology class in the definition of closed SYS manifold. Take $V = \emptyset$, where V is the set required in Definition 1.3. Denote $\gamma \in H_c^1(M \times \mathbb{R}) = H^1(M \times \mathbb{R}, \partial_\infty V^c)$ to be the Poincaré dual of $[M]$ in $M \times \mathbb{R}$. Then the class

$$[M \times \mathbb{R}] \frown \gamma \frown \beta_1 \frown \dots \frown \beta_{n-2} \text{ in } H_2(M \times \mathbb{R})$$

is aspherical. We already show that $M \times \mathbb{R}$ is an open SYS manifold. \square

Proposition 4.3 (i.e. Example 1.8 Case (ii)). *Let M^n be a closed SYS manifold, Γ be a embedding submanifold of M with the first Betti number $b_1 \leq n - 3$, then $M^n \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold.*

Proof. Let $[M] \frown \beta_1 \frown \dots \frown \beta_{n-2}$ be the aspherical homology class in the definition of closed SYS manifold. Since $H^1(\Gamma)$ is torsion-free (see universal coefficient theorem in [Hat05]) and $\text{rank } H^1(\Gamma) = b_1 \leq n - 3$, we

conclude that $\beta_1|_\Gamma, \dots, \beta_{n-2}|_\Gamma$ are \mathbb{Z} -linearly dependent in $H^1(\Gamma)$, i.e. there are integers a_1, \dots, a_{n-2} such that

$$a_1 \cdot \beta_1|_\Gamma + a_2 \cdot \beta_2|_\Gamma + \dots + a_{n-2} \cdot \beta_{n-2}|_\Gamma = 0 \text{ in } H^1(\Gamma).$$

Since $H^1(\Gamma)$ is free, we can assume $(a_1, \dots, a_{n-2}) = 1$. That is to say, there are integers μ_i such that $\sum \mu_i a_i = 1$.

We define a new cohomology class

$$\gamma = a_1 \cdot \beta_1 + a_2 \cdot \beta_2 + \dots + a_{n-2} \cdot \beta_{n-2} \text{ in } H^1(M).$$

Notice that $\gamma|_\Gamma = 0$. Since we have the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2} &= (\sum \mu_i a_i) \cdot \beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2} \\ &= \mu_1 \cdot \gamma \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2} + \dots + \mu_{n-2} \cdot \beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

we have that at least one component should be aspherical.

Without loss of generality, we may just assume $[M] \frown (\gamma \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2})$ be an aspherical class in $H_2(M)$. Consider the long exact sequence of cohomology with compact support

$$\dots \rightarrow H_c^i(M \setminus \Gamma) \xrightarrow{j_*} H_c^i(M) \xrightarrow{i^*} H_c^i(\Gamma) \rightarrow H_c^{i+1}(M \setminus \Gamma) \rightarrow \dots,$$

then we have

$$0 \rightarrow H_c^1(M \setminus \Gamma) \xrightarrow{j_*} H^1(M) \xrightarrow{i^*} H^1(\Gamma).$$

Therefore, γ can be regarded as a class in $H_c^1(M \setminus \Gamma) = H^1(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty V^c)$ for $V = \emptyset$, where V is the set required in Definition 1.3, and so $M \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold. \square

Consider a tubular neighborhood $N(\Gamma)$ of a closed k -submanifold Γ in a closed manifold M^n , where $k < n$. The exact sequence for the relative homology (see [Hat05]) can be expressed as follows:

$$H_2(N(\Gamma)) \xrightarrow{i_*} H_2(M) \xrightarrow{j_*} H_2(M, N(\Gamma)) \xrightarrow{\partial} H_1(N(\Gamma)).$$

For Borel-Moore homology there is a long exact localization sequence

$$H_i^{BM}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{i_*} H_i^{BM}(M) \xrightarrow{j_*} H_i^{BM}(M/\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\partial} H_{i-1}^{BM}(\Gamma).$$

Since Γ and M are both closed, we have $H_*^{BM}(\Gamma) = H_*(\Gamma)$ and $H_*^{BM}(M) = H_*(M)$. Denote $\partial_\infty = \partial_\infty(M \setminus \Gamma)$, then we see $H_*^{BM}(M/\Gamma) = H_*(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty)$. Moreover, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} H_i(\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & H_i(M) & \xrightarrow{j_*} & H_i(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_{i-1}(\Gamma) \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \parallel & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ H_i(N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & H_i(M) & \xrightarrow{j_*} & H_i(M, N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_{i-1}(N(\Gamma)), \end{array}$$

where the first and fourth isomorphisms hold since Γ is the deformation retract of $N(\Gamma)$ and the third isomorphism comes from the five lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Let M be a closed n -manifold and Γ be a closed k -submanifold of M satisfying*

- $H_1(\Gamma) \cong \pi_1(\Gamma)$,
- and $H_2(\Gamma) \cong \pi_2(\Gamma)$.

If τ is an element in $H_2(M)$ such that $j_*(\tau)$ is spherical in $H_2(M, N(\Gamma))$, then τ is also spherical in $H_2(M)$.

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
H_2(N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & H_2(M) & \xrightarrow{j_*} & H_2(M, N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_1(N(\Gamma)) \\
f_1 \uparrow & & f_2 \uparrow & & f_3 \uparrow & & f_4 \uparrow \\
\pi_2(N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{i'_*} & \pi_2(M) & \xrightarrow{j'_*} & \pi_2(M, N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{\partial'} & \pi_1(N(\Gamma))
\end{array}$$

where each f_i is the corresponding Hurewicz map. From our assumption both f_1 and f_4 are isomorphisms. The proof depends on the diagram-chasing argument.

Since $j_*(\tau)$ is spherical in $H_2(M, N(\Gamma))$, by definition we can find an element $u \in \pi_2(M, N(\Gamma))$ satisfying $j_*(\tau) = f_3(u)$. In particular, we obtain

$$f_4 \circ \partial'(u) = \partial \circ f_3(u) = \partial \circ j_*(\tau) = 0.$$

Because f_4 is an isomorphism, we have $\partial'(u) = 0$. Due to the exact sequence in the second line, there is an element $v_1 \in \pi_2(M)$ such that $u = j'_*(v_1)$. Clearly we have

$$j_* \circ f_2(v_1) = f_3 \circ j'_*(v_1) = f_3(u) = j_*(\tau),$$

and so $j_*(\tau - f_2(v_1)) = 0$. Now we use the exact sequence in the first line to find $v_2 \in H_2(N(\Gamma))$ satisfying $\tau - f_2(v_1) = i_*(v_2)$. Recall that the map $f_1 : \pi_2(N(\Gamma)) \rightarrow H_2(N(\Gamma))$ is an isomorphism, then there is an element $v'_2 \in \pi_2(N(\Gamma))$ satisfying $v_2 = f_1(v'_2)$. And we arrive at

$$f_2 \circ i'_*(v'_2) = i_* \circ f_1(v'_2) = i_*(v_2) = \tau - f_2(v_1).$$

Therefore, we obtain $\tau = f_2(v_1 + i'_*(v'_2))$, which means that τ is spherical in $H_2(M)$. \square

Corollary 4.5. *Let M and Γ be assumed as above and $\tau \in H_2(M)$. If τ is aspherical in $H_2(M)$, then $j_*(\tau)$ is aspherical in $H_2(M, N(K))$.*

In the following, let M be a closed SYS manifold. By definition there are cohomology classes $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-2} \in H^1(M)$ such that

$$\tau := [M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M) \text{ is an aspherical class.}$$

Consider a closed k -submanifold Γ satisfying

- $\pi_1(\Gamma) \cong H_1(\Gamma)$,
- and $\pi_2(\Gamma) \cong H_2(\Gamma)$.

Notice that we have the following commutative diagram involving cup and cap operations:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
H_n(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty) & \times & (H^1(M \setminus \Gamma))^{n-2} & \xrightarrow{\quad \frown \quad} & H_2(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty) \\
\downarrow \simeq & & \uparrow i^* & & \downarrow \simeq \\
H_n(M, N(\Gamma)) & \times & (H^1(M))^{n-2} & \xrightarrow{\quad \frown \quad} & H_2(M, N(\Gamma)) \\
\uparrow j_* & & \parallel & & \uparrow j_* \\
H_n(M) & \times & (H^1(M))^{n-2} & \xrightarrow{\quad \frown \quad} & H_2(M).
\end{array}$$

As a consequence of Corollary 4.5, we conclude that

$$j_*(\tau) = [M, N(\Gamma)] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2})$$

is aspherical.

Proposition 4.6. *Let M be a closed SYS n -manifold and Γ be a closed embedded k -submanifold satisfying*

- $\pi_1(\Gamma) \cong H_1(\Gamma)$,
- and $\pi_2(\Gamma) \cong H_2(\Gamma)$,

where $k < n$. Then $M \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold.

Proof. Let $N(\Gamma)$ be the same as above. We shall show that

$$u = [M \setminus \Gamma] \frown (i^*(\beta_1) \smile \dots \smile i^*(\beta_{n-2})) \in H_2(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty)$$

is aspherical. By the commutative diagram above, the map $H_2(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty) \rightarrow H_2(M, N(\Gamma))$ maps u to $j_*(\tau)$. Take $V = M \setminus \Gamma$, where V is the set required in Definition 1.3.

We are going to show that for any compact subset Ω the class $u|_\Omega$ does not lie in the image of the Hurewicz map $\pi_2(M, M \setminus \Omega) \rightarrow H_2(M, M \setminus \Omega)$.

With the tubular neighborhood $N(\Gamma)$ taken to be small enough we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_2(M, M \setminus \Omega) & \longrightarrow & \pi_2(M, N(\Gamma)) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
H_2(M, M \setminus \Omega) & \longrightarrow & H_2(M, N(\Gamma)).
\end{array}$$

Since $j_*(\tau)$ is aspherical, $u|_\Omega$ is aspherical as well, which yields that $M \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold. \square

Remark 4.7. If Γ is simply-connected or Γ is a curve, then Γ satisfies the topological conditions $\pi_1(\Gamma) \cong H_1(\Gamma)$ and $\pi_2(\Gamma) \cong H_2(\Gamma)$.

Corollary 4.8 (i.e. Example 1.8 Case (i)). *Let M^n be a closed SYS manifold, Γ be a embedding submanifold of M with $\dim \Gamma \leq 1$, then $M^n \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold.*

5. UNIFORMLY POSITIVE SCALAR CURVATURE

In this section, we study the UPSC obstructions on an open manifold. Similar to Theorem 1.5, we prove that a weak SYS manifold does not admit a complete UPSC metric.

Theorem 5.1. *For $3 \leq n \leq 7$ if M^n is weakly SYS, then it admits no complete metrics with uniformly positive scalar curvature.*

Proof. The proof is almost the same as the proof of theorem 1.5. Denote

$$\tau := [M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M, \partial_s M),$$

where $\beta_1 \in H^1(M, \partial_b M)$ and $\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{n-2} \in H^1(M)$.

Assume M admits a complete metric with $Sc \geq \sigma > 0$. For any closed subset Ω of M satisfies $\Omega \Delta V^c$ is precompact, we can choose a compact region $K \subset \Omega$ such that $\beta_1|_{\Omega \setminus K} = 0$.

Then consider the the stable weighted slicing for $T > \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\sigma}}$ as above:

$$(\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2, w_2) \rightarrow (\Sigma_3, \partial\Sigma_3, w_3) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (\Sigma_n, \partial\Sigma_n, w_n) = (K_T, \partial K_T, 1).$$

And the restricted class

$$\tau|_{K_T} = [K_T, \partial K_T] \frown (e^* \beta_1 \smile \dots \smile e^* \beta_{n-2}) = [\Sigma_2, \partial\Sigma_2],$$

where $e : \Omega_T \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion map.

By the diameter estimate, each component \mathcal{C} of Σ_2 which intersects with K is a sphere with $\text{diam}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\sigma}}$. As $\beta_1|_{\Omega \setminus K} = 0$, the components lying outside of K are trivial in homology. Consequently,

$$\tau|_{\Omega} = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \cap K \neq \emptyset} [\mathcal{C}]$$

is in the image of $\pi_2(M)$ which implies that τ is spherical. The proof is completed. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Let M be a closed SYS manifold with the aspherical class $\tau = [M] \frown (\beta_1 \smile \dots \smile \beta_{n-2}) \in H_2(M)$ and $\Gamma \subset M$ be a embedded submanifold. If τ is not in the subgroup generated by the image of $H_2(\Gamma)$ and $\pi_2(M)$, then M is weakly SYS.*

Proof. We shall show that

$$u = [M \setminus \Gamma] \frown (i^*(\beta_1) \smile \dots \smile i^*(\beta_{n-2})) \in H_2(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty)$$

is weakly aspherical by contradiction. Where $i : M \setminus \Gamma \rightarrow M$ is the natural injection.

Let $N(\Gamma)$ be a tubular neighborhood of Γ and $K = M \setminus N(\Gamma)$. If u is strongly spherical, by Definition 1.10, $u|_K = \tau|_K$ is in the image of the Hurewicz map

$$\pi_2(M) \rightarrow H_2(M) \rightarrow H_2(M, M \setminus K).$$

Hence there exists a spherical class $s \in H_2(M)$ such that $\tau|_K - s|_K = 0$ in $H_2(M, M \setminus K)$.

Combining with the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 H_2(\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & H_2(M) & \longrightarrow & H_2(M \setminus \Gamma, \partial_\infty) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_1(\Gamma) \\
 \downarrow \simeq & & \parallel & & \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\
 H_2(N(\Gamma)) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & H_2(M) & \longrightarrow & H_2(M, M \setminus K) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_1(N(\Gamma)),
 \end{array}$$

$\tau - s$ is in the image of $H_2(\Gamma)$, so τ lies in the group generated by $H_2(\Gamma)$ and $\pi_2(M)$. Thus we have arrived at a contradiction. \square

Remark 5.3. Moreover, if we assume that Γ is incompressible, i.e., $\pi_1(\Gamma) \rightarrow \pi_1(M)$ is injective, then using the same diagram chasing, we can prove that $M \setminus \Gamma$ is an open SYS manifold.

REFERENCES

- [CCZ23] Shuli Chen, Jianchun Chu, and Jintian Zhu. Positive scalar curvature metric and aspherical summands. 2023.
- [Che22] Shuli Chen. A generalization of the geroch conjecture with arbitrary ends. *Mathematische Annalen*, 2022.
- [CL20] O. Chodosh and C. Li. Generalized soap bubbles and the topology of manifolds with positive scalar curvature. *arXiv:2008.11888v3*, 2020.
- [CRZ22] Simone Cecchini, Daniel Rade, and Rudolf Zeidler. Nonnegative scalar curvature on manifolds with at least two ends. 2022.
- [CRZ23] Simone Cecchini, Daniel Råde, and Rudolf Zeidler. Nonnegative scalar curvature on manifolds with at least two ends. *Journal of Topology*, 16(3):855–876, June 2023.
- [FCS80] Doris Fischer-Colbrie and Richard Schoen. The structure of complete stable minimal surfaces in 3-manifolds of non-negative scalar curvature. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 33(2):199–211, 1980.
- [GL83] Mikhael Gromov and H. Blaine Lawson. Positive scalar curvature and the dirac operator on complete riemannian manifolds. *Publications Mathématiques de l’Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques*, 58:83–196, 1983.
- [Gro23] Misha Gromov. Four lectures on scalar curvature. In *Perspectives in scalar curvature. Vol. 1*, pages 1–514. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, [2023] ©2023.
- [Grü87a] Michael Grüter. Optimal regularity for codimension one minimal surfaces with a free boundary. *manuscripta mathematica*, 58:295–343, 1987.
- [Grü87b] Michael Grüter. Regularity results for minimizing currents with a free boundary. 1987.
- [Hat05] Allen Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Tsinghua university press, 2005.
- [HSS23] Tianze Hao, Yuguang Shi, and Yukai Sun. Llarull type theorems on complete manifolds with positive scalar curvature, 2023.
- [Kaz19] Demetre Kazaras. Desingularizing positive scalar curvature 4-manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.05306*, 2019.
- [LM19] Chao Li and Christos Mantoulidis. Positive scalar curvature with skeleton singularities. *Math. Ann.*, 374(1-2):99–131, 2019.
- [LUY20] Martin Lesourd, Ryan Unger, and Shing-Tung Yau. Positive scalar curvature on noncompact manifolds and the liouville theorem, 2020.
- [LZ17] Martin Li and Xin Zhou. Min-max theory for free boundary minimal hypersurfaces i - regularity theory, 2017.

- [Mas78] W.S. Massey. *Homology and Cohomology Theory: An Approach Based on Alexander-Spanier Cochains*. Monographs and textbooks in pure and applied mathematics. M. Dekker, 1978.
- [Sch98] Thomas Schick. A counterexample to the (unstable) gromov–lawson–rosenberg conjecture. *Topology*, 37(6):1165–1168, 1998.
- [SY79] Richard Schoen and Shing-Tung Yau. On the structure of manifolds with positive scalar curvature. *Manuscripta Math.*, 28(1-3), 1979.
- [WZ22] Xiangsheng Wang and Weiping Zhang. On the generalized Geroch conjecture for complete spin manifolds. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B*, 43(6):1143–1146, 2022.
- [Zhu21] Jintian Zhu. Width estimate and doubly warped product. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 374(2):1497–1511, 2021.

(Yuguang Shi) KEY LABORATORY OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, P. R. CHINA
Email address: ygshi@math.pku.edu.cn

(Jian Wang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY, 100 NICOLLS ROAD, STONY BROOK, NY 11794, USA
Email address: jian.wang.4@stonybrook.edu

(Runzhang Wu) KEY LABORATORY OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, P. R. CHINA
Email address: wrz0415@stu.pku.edu.cn

(Jintian Zhu) INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL SCIENCES, WESTLAKE UNIVERSITY, 600 DUNYU ROAD, 310030, HANGZHOU, ZHEJIANG, PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Email address: zhujintian@westlake.edu.cn