

Equivariant free boundary minimal discs and annuli in ellipsoids

Mario B. Schulz

Abstract

We employ equivariant variational methods to construct new examples of nonplanar free boundary minimal discs in ellipsoids. We also prove that every ellipsoid contains at least three distinct embedded free boundary minimal annuli with dihedral symmetry.

1 Introduction

The classical Plateau problem asks for a minimal surface bounded by a given Jordan curve. This problem was famously resolved by Douglas [6] and Radó [39], who independently proved the existence of a solution with the topology of a disc. A few years later, Courant [4, Part II] addressed the “Plateau problem with free boundaries”, which concerns the existence of nontrivial area minimising surfaces whose boundaries are free to move on a given manifold. Given a compact, three-dimensional ambient manifold M with boundary ∂M , we call a compact, two-dimensional submanifold of M which is stationary (and not necessarily minimising) for the area functional among all surfaces $\Sigma \subset M$ with boundary $\partial \Sigma = \Sigma \cap \partial M$ a *free boundary minimal surface*. Equivalently, a free boundary minimal surface has vanishing mean curvature and meets the ambient boundary ∂M orthogonally along its own boundary.

The case where M is the Euclidean unit ball $\mathbb{B}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ has attracted considerable attention, partly due to its intriguing connection with the optimisation problem for the first Steklov eigenvalue on surfaces with boundary [11, 13, 16, 23]. Existence results have been obtained using gluing methods [2, 3, 7, 19–22], min-max methods [1, 9, 17, 18, 26, 30] and via Steklov eigenvalue optimisation [24, 38]. Equally interesting is the question whether a given free boundary minimal surface is unique in a given class of solutions. Nitsche [37] proved the uniqueness of the equatorial disc in the class of immersed free boundary minimal discs in \mathbb{B}^3 up to ambient isometries. This result has been generalised to higher codimensions by Fraser and Schoen [12]. A famous conjecture asserts the uniqueness of the critical catenoid in the class of embedded free boundary minimal annuli in \mathbb{B}^3 up to ambient isometries [10]. In [28, 36], the uniqueness of the critical catenoid has been proved under additional symmetry assumptions. In general however, embedded free boundary minimal surfaces in \mathbb{B}^3 are nonunique in the class of solutions with the same topology and symmetry group [3].

The construction of free boundary minimal surfaces in more general ambient manifolds M has been pioneered by Struwe [42], who constructed parametric minimal discs with free boundary constraint to surfaces $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ diffeomorphic to the sphere, and by Grüter and Jost [17] who proved the existence of an embedded free boundary minimal disc in any convex domain $M \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. This emphasis on solutions with the topology of a disc is reminiscent of the classical Plateau problem and their existence has been investigated by several authors [14, 29, 31, 33]. Haslhofer and Ketover [18] proved that any strictly convex ball M with nonnegative Ricci-curvature contains at least two embedded free boundary minimal discs. Moreover the area of their second solution is strictly less than twice the area of the Grüter–Jost solution. An interesting consequence of this result is [18, Corollary 1.5] stating that ellipsoids

$$M_\alpha := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (x_1/\alpha_1)^2 + (x_2/\alpha_2)^2 + (x_3/\alpha_3)^2 \leq 1\} \quad (1)$$

with $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in]0, \infty[^3$ satisfying $\alpha_3 \geq 2 \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ contain a *nonplanar*, embedded free boundary minimal disc, in addition to the three planar solutions

$$\mathcal{D}_\iota := M_\alpha \cap \{x_\iota = 0\}, \quad \iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}. \quad (2)$$

In the case $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, this statement recovers an independent result of Petrides [38] about nonplanar, embedded free boundary minimal discs in M_α which converge to the planar solution \mathcal{D}_3 with multiplicity 2 as $\alpha_3 \rightarrow \infty$. These discoveries are in stark contrast with Nitsche’s [37] aforementioned uniqueness result in \mathbb{B}^3 and solve a long-standing open problem originally raised by Smyth [41, p. 411] (see also [5, p. 335]). Petrides’ approach relies on the optimisation of combinations of first and second Steklov eigenvalues on the disc while Haslhofer and Ketover employed a two-parameter min-max construction in arbitrary convex balls with nonnegative Ricci-curvature. In this article, we prove several existence results demonstrating that a one-parameter equivariant min-max approach suffices to construct nonplanar free boundary minimal discs in Euclidean ellipsoids.

Notation. We equip \mathbb{R}^3 with standard Cartesian coordinates x_1, x_2, x_3 and denote the k -dimensional Hausdorff measure on \mathbb{R}^3 by \mathcal{H}^k . Given $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the intersection of the ellipsoid M_α defined in (1) with the x_j -axis is denoted by ξ_j and R_j denotes the rotation of angle π around the x_j -axis. By definition, $R_j M_\alpha = M_\alpha$ for every $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and any choice of $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$. Let \mathbb{D}_1 be the group of Euclidean isometries generated by R_1 and let \mathbb{D}_2 be the group of Euclidean isometries generated by $\{R_1, R_2\}$. Note that $\mathbb{D}_1 \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $\mathbb{R}_3 = R_2 \circ R_1 \in \mathbb{D}_2 \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$. Our convention is consistent with the notation in [1, 3, 9], where \mathbb{D}_n denotes the dihedral group of order $2n$ acting on \mathbb{R}^3 .

Theorem 1.1. *For any $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$ satisfying $\alpha_3 \geq 2 \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ the ellipsoid M_α contains an embedded, \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant free boundary minimal disc \mathcal{C} with the following properties.*

- (i) \mathcal{C} is nonplanar with area $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{C}) < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$.
- (ii) \mathcal{C} intersects the segment ξ_1 exactly once and the intersection is orthogonal.
- (iii) \mathcal{C} has equivariant index equal to 1.

It is reasonable to expect that \mathcal{C} coincides with the aforementioned solutions found in [18, 38], at least in the case where $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$. In slightly more elongated ellipsoids, we also obtain a new type of nonplanar free boundary minimal disc (see Figure 1):




Figure 1: \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant free boundary minimal discs $\mathcal{C} \subset M_{(3,2,6)}$ and $\mathcal{S} \subset M_{(3/2,2,6)}$.

Theorem 1.2. *For any $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$ satisfying $\alpha_3 \geq 3 \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ the ellipsoid M_α contains an embedded, \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant free boundary minimal disc \mathcal{S} with the following properties.*

- (i) \mathcal{S} is nonplanar with area strictly between $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ and $3\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$.
- (ii) \mathcal{S} contains the segment ξ_1 .
- (iii) \mathcal{S} has equivariant index equal to 1.

In [1], the authors introduced for all $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$ an effective \mathbb{D}_n -sweepout of the Euclidean unit ball \mathbb{B}^3 in order to construct embedded free boundary minimal surfaces in \mathbb{B}^3 with connected boundary and prescribed genus $n - 1$. The case $n = 1$ would have been vacuous in that setting, because a solution in \mathbb{B}^3 with connected boundary and genus zero is necessarily a flat disc [37]. The punchline of this article is that we can prove Theorem 1.2 by mimicking the sweepout construction in [1, §2] for $n = 1$ (i. e. genus $g = 0$) in M_α , where the resulting min-max free boundary minimal surface is not necessarily a flat disc. Similarly, Theorem 1.1 can be proved using a similar sweepout as in [9, §5] for $n = 1$ in M_α . We outline the construction of the sweepouts in section 2, establish the required min-max width estimate in section 3 and prove the main theorems in section 4. In general, the ellipsoid M_α is not equivariant with respect to any dihedral group \mathbb{D}_n with $n > 2$ but for $n = 2$, it is natural to expect that a \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant min-max approach could establish the existence of free boundary minimal surfaces in M_α with nontrivial topology. We investigate this idea in Theorem 1.3 below.

Maximo, Nunes and Smith [35, Theorem 1.1] showed that any compact, strictly convex domain $K \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ contains at least one embedded free boundary minimal annulus. In the case where the domain K is an arbitrary ellipsoid, we improve this result by proving the existence of at least three embedded, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal annuli:

Theorem 1.3. *For any $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$ the ellipsoid M_α contains three embedded, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal annuli $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3$ with the following properties for every $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

- (i) \mathcal{A}_ι has area $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{A}_\iota) < 2 \min_{\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_\ell)$.
- (ii) \mathcal{A}_ι is disjoint from the segment ξ_ι and intersects the other two segments orthogonally.
- (iii) \mathcal{A}_ι has equivariant index equal to 1.

Property (ii) ensures that the three solutions $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3$ are indeed distinct, and in fact noncongruent if the parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ are all different, because there is no ambient isometry interchanging segments ξ_ι of different length. (See Lemma 4.5 about the general structure of \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant annuli in M_α .) Simulations of the free boundary minimal annuli from Theorem 1.3 are visualised in Figure 2. In analogy with the existence result [1, Theorem 1.1 for $g = 1$] in \mathbb{B}^3 , we conjecture that every ellipsoid also contains an embedded, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal surface with genus one and connected boundary (see Figure 2, last image).

When employing min-max methods to construct solutions with nontrivial topology, it is essential to prove that the limit of the resulting min-max sequence is not just a topological disc. In [1, 9], this step relies on Nitsche's [37] uniqueness result for free boundary minimal discs in \mathbb{B}^3 . However, it is evident that this argument does not generalise to ellipsoids. In fact, Theorem 1.4 stated below provides a counterexample even in the class of \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant solutions, reaffirming the dramatic nonuniqueness of free boundary minimal discs in M_α . Instead, our proof of Theorem 1.3 must rely on a much weaker property of \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant discs in M_α (cf. Corollary 4.3).

Theorem 1.4. *For any $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$ satisfying $\alpha_3 < \alpha_1\alpha_2/(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)$ the ellipsoid M_α contains a \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal disc \mathcal{U} with the following properties.*

- (i) \mathcal{U} is nonplanar with area $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{U}) < \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$.
- (ii) \mathcal{U} contains the segments $\xi_1 \cup \xi_2$.
- (iii) \mathcal{U} is equivariantly stable.

Proof. Let $\xi_1^+ := M_\alpha \cap \{x_1 \geq 0 = x_2 = x_3\}$ and $\xi_2^+ := M_\alpha \cap \{x_2 \geq 0 = x_1 = x_3\}$. Then $\xi_1^+ \cup \xi_2^+$ is a Jordan curve in \mathbb{R}^3 with endpoints on ∂M_α . By [5, §4.6, Theorem 2] there exists an area-minimising disc Σ spanning $\xi_1^+ \cup \xi_2^+$ with partially free boundary on ∂M_α . The assumption on α implies that the competitor $\Gamma = (\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2) \cap \{x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0\}$ has area $\mathcal{H}^2(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{4}\pi(\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_1\alpha_3) < \frac{1}{4}\pi\alpha_1\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. Being minimising, $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(\Gamma)$. By the Schwarz reflection principle, the surface

$$\mathcal{U} = \Sigma \cup R_1\Sigma \cup R_2\Sigma \cup R_1R_2\Sigma$$

is a \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal disc with area $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{U}) = 4\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma) < \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ containing $\xi_1 \cup \xi_2$. In particular, \mathcal{U} must be nonplanar. Being equivariantly area-minimising, \mathcal{U} is equivariantly stable. \square




Figure 2: Three \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal annuli in M_α for $\alpha = (2, 4, 5)$ and a conjectural, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant solution with genus one and connected boundary.




Figure 3: A nonplanar, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant free boundary minimal disc \mathcal{U} in M_α for $\alpha = (6, 4, 2)$.

Remark 1.5. Lima and Menezes proved that free boundary minimal surfaces in the Euclidean unit ball \mathbb{B}^3 satisfy the *two-piece property* [32, Theorem 2], which states that the equatorial disc divides any compact, embedded free boundary minimal surface of \mathbb{B}^3 in exactly two connected components. A key step in their proof is based on [32, Lemma 2] stating that any immersed, stable, partially free boundary minimal surface in \mathbb{B}^3 with fixed boundary contained in the equatorial disc is necessarily totally geodesic. This property does not generalise to ellipsoids and the surface constructed in Theorem 1.4 is a counterexample.

Remark 1.6. The respective condition on α in Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4 is not expected to be sharp but it ensures relevant area estimates. It is an interesting problem to determine the set of all $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$ for which the respective existence result remain true (cf. [18, Remark 2.11]).

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Giada Franz and Alessandro Carlotto for helpful comments and discussions. This project has received funding from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044 – 390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics–Geometry–Structure, and the Collaborative Research Centre CRC 1442, Geometry: Deformations and Rigidity.

2 Sweepout construction

Let M_α be as in (1) and $\mathcal{D}_3 = M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 = 0\}$ as in (2). The notion of equivariant sweepout is defined e. g. in [9, Definition 1.1].

Lemma 2.1. *There exists a \mathbb{D}_1 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t^C\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ of M_α such that*

- $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_0^C) = \mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_1^C) = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t^C) < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ for all $t \in]0, 1[$,
- Σ_t^C is a topological disc intersecting the x_1 -axis orthogonally for all $t \in]0, 1[$.

Proof. We follow part (I) in the proof of [9, Theorem 5.1] and employ comparable notation. Let $B_\varepsilon(p_1)$ denote the open ball of radius $\varepsilon > 0$ around the point $p_1 = (\alpha_1, 0, 0) \in \partial M_\alpha$. Let $D_\varepsilon := \mathcal{D}_3 \setminus B_\varepsilon(p_1)$ and $D_{t,\varepsilon} := \sqrt{1-t^2}D_\varepsilon + (0, 0, \alpha_3 t)$ for any $t \in]-1, 1[$. Then $D_{t,\varepsilon} \subset M_\alpha$ and if $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, $D_{t,\varepsilon}$ is a topological disc. With $0 < t_0 < 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ to be chosen, let $\varepsilon: [t_0, 1[\rightarrow]0, \varepsilon_0]$ be a continuous function of t such that $\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 1$ and define

$$\Omega_t := \bigcup_{\tau \in [-t, t]} D_{\tau, \varepsilon(t)}, \quad \Sigma_t := \overline{\partial\Omega_t \setminus \partial M_\alpha} \quad (3)$$

as in [9, (25)] for all $t \in [t_0, 1[$, where $\partial\Omega_t$ refers to the topological boundary of the set $\Omega_t \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Then Σ_t is the union of $D_{\pm t, \varepsilon(t)}$ with a connecting ribbon. In particular, Σ_t is \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant. By the coarea formula, there exists a constant c_α depending only on α such that the area of the ribbon is bounded from above by $c_\alpha \varepsilon_0 t$ and we have

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t) \leq 2(1-t^2)\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) + c_\alpha \varepsilon_0 t < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) \quad (4)$$

for all $t \in [t_0, 1[$ by choosing $\varepsilon_0 = (t_0/c_\alpha)\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. As t decreases from t_0 to 0 we intend to deform Σ_t continuously and \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariantly into a neighbourhood of the point $-p_1 \in \partial M_\alpha$ without violating the area bound (4) and such that $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \searrow 0$. This is made possible by the so-called catenoid estimate [27, Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.4] if $t_0 > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small (see also [18, § 2.3]). The estimates can be carried out explicitly as detailed in [1, § 2] and [9, § 5]. \square

Lemma 2.2. *For each $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ there exists a \mathbb{D}_2 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t^\iota\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ of M_α such that*

- $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_0^\iota) = \mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_1^\iota) = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t^\iota) < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ for all $t \in]0, 1[$,
- Σ_t^ι is an annulus which is disjoint from the x_ι -axis for all $t \in]0, 1[$ and intersects the other two axes orthogonally.

Proof. For $\iota = 2$ it suffices to replace D_ε with $\mathcal{D}_3 \setminus (B_\varepsilon(p_1) \cup B_\varepsilon(-p_1))$ in the proof of Lemma 2.1. For $\iota = 1$ we additionally replace the point p_1 by $p_2 = (0, \alpha_2, 0)$ and then follow exactly the same approach. With these modifications, Σ_t defined as in (3) becomes \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant and resembles the union of the horizontal discs $D_{\pm t, \varepsilon(t)}$ with two connecting ribbons. Estimate (4) still holds for all $t \in [t_0, 1[$, possibly with a different constant c_α . As t decreases from t_0 to 0, the catenoid estimate allows us to \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariantly widen the two ribbons, deforming Σ_t continuously into a neighbourhood of the segment ξ_k .

For $\iota = 3$, we return to the proof of Lemma 2.1 and replace D_ε with $\mathcal{D}_3 \setminus B_\varepsilon(0)$. Then Σ_t defined as in (3) is the \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant union of the planar annuli $D_{\pm t, \varepsilon(t)}$ with a connecting central tube (instead of connecting ribbons with boundary). As t decreases from t_0 to 0 the catenoid estimate allows us to \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariantly widen the tube without violating the area estimate (4), deforming Σ_t continuously into a neighbourhood of the equator $\partial\mathcal{D}_3$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *There exists a \mathbb{D}_1 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t^S\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ of M_α such that*

- $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_0^S) = \mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_1^S) = \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ and $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t^S) < 3\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ for all $t \in]0, 1[$,
- Σ_t^S is a topological disc containing the segment ξ_1 for all $t \in]0, 1[$.

Proof. We closely follow the proof of [1, Lemma 2.2] but for genus $g = 0$ rather than $g \geq 1$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ and $p^\pm = (0, \pm\alpha_2, 0)$ consider the sets

$$D_\varepsilon^\pm := \mathcal{D}_3 \setminus B_\varepsilon(p^\pm), \quad D_\varepsilon^0 := D_\varepsilon^+ \cap D_\varepsilon^-, \quad D_{t,\varepsilon}^\pm := \sqrt{1-t^2} D_\varepsilon^\pm \pm (0, 0, \alpha_3 t)$$

for any $t \in [0, 1[$. With $0 < t_0 < 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ to be chosen, let $\varepsilon: [t_0, 1[\rightarrow]0, \varepsilon_0]$ be a continuous function of t such that $\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 1$ and define

$$\Omega_t^\pm := \bigcup_{\tau \in [0, t]} D_{\tau, \varepsilon(t)}^\pm, \quad S_t^\pm := \overline{\partial \Omega_t^\pm \setminus (\partial \mathbb{B}^3 \cup D_0^\pm)}, \quad \Sigma_t := S_t^+ \cup D_{\varepsilon(t)}^0 \cup S_t^-$$

as in [1, Eqn. (4)]. Then Σ_t is the union of the three parallel topological discs $D_{t, \varepsilon(t)}^\pm, D_{\varepsilon(t)}^0$ with two ribbons joining them. As in the proof of Lemma 2.1 there is a constant c_α such that the total area of the two ribbons is bounded from above by $c_\alpha \varepsilon_0 t$ and we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t) \leq (3 - 2t^2) \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) + c_\alpha \varepsilon_0 t < 3 \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) \quad (5)$$

for all $t \in [t_0, 1[$ by choosing $\varepsilon_0 = (t_0/c_\alpha) \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. If $t_0 > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, the catenoid estimate allows us to increase the width of the ribbons as t decreases from t_0 to 0 without violating the area bound (5) such that Σ_t is deformed smoothly and \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariantly into \mathcal{D}_3 as $t \searrow 0$. The corresponding estimates are detailed in [1, §2]. \square

Remark 2.4. By setting $p^\pm := (\alpha_1 \cos(\pm \frac{\pi}{4}), \alpha_2 \sin(\pm \frac{\pi}{4}), 0)$ and $D_\varepsilon^\pm := \mathcal{D}_3 \setminus (B_\varepsilon(p^\pm) \cup B_\varepsilon(-p^\pm))$ in the proof of Lemma 2.1 we can follow the same approach to construct a \mathbb{D}_2 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ of M_α such that

- $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_0) = \mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_1) = \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ and $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t) < 3 \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ for all $t \in]0, 1[$,
- Σ_t contains $\xi_1 \cup \xi_2$, and has genus one and connected boundary for all $t \in]0, 1[$.

3 Width estimate

We recall (e.g. from [9, Definition 1.3]) that the equivariant saturation Π of a given equivariant sweepout $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ of M_α is defined as the set of all $\{f(t, \Sigma_t)\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$, where $f: [0, 1] \times M_\alpha \rightarrow M_\alpha$ is smooth such that $f(t, \cdot)$ is an equivariant diffeomorphism for all $t \in [0, 1]$ which coincides with the identity if $t \in \{0, 1\}$. The corresponding min-max width of Π is

$$W_\Pi := \inf_{\{\Lambda_t\} \in \Pi} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} \mathcal{H}^2(\Lambda_t).$$

The min-max approach (cf. [9, Theorem 1.4] and references therein) requires the strict inequality $W_\Pi > \max\{\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_0), \mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_1)\}$. This estimate is typically proven by leveraging the (relative) isoperimetric inequality in the ambient space. We recall the notation $\mathcal{D}_3 := M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 = 0\}$.

Lemma 3.1 (Isoperimetric inequality in ellipsoids [40, Corollary 1]). *Let M_α be as in (1) such that $\alpha_3 \geq \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. Then any finite perimeter set $F \subset M_\alpha$ with Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{H}^3(F) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha)$ has relative perimeter $P(F; M_\alpha) \geq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$.*

Lemma 3.2 (Uniqueness of isoperimetric sets in ellipsoids). *Let M_α be as in (1) such that $\alpha_3 > \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. Suppose $F \subset M_\alpha$ has Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{H}^3(F) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha)$ and relative perimeter $P(F; M_\alpha) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. Then the relative boundary of F in M_α coincides with \mathcal{D}_3 .*

Proof. Towards a contradiction, assume that $\Sigma \neq \mathcal{D}_3$ is the relative boundary of F in M_α . The assumption $\mathcal{H}^3(F) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha)$ implies that Σ intersects \mathcal{D}_3 . In particular, x_3 is not constant on Σ . Let $\lambda = \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}/\alpha_3$ and $\tilde{F} := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : (x_1, x_2, x_3/\lambda) \in F\}$. Then, $\mathcal{H}^3(\tilde{F}) = \lambda\mathcal{H}^3(F) = \frac{\lambda}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_{\tilde{\alpha}})$, where $\tilde{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \lambda\alpha_3)$. On the one hand, Lemma 3.1 implies $P(\tilde{F}; M_{\tilde{\alpha}}) \geq \mathcal{H}^2(M_{\tilde{\alpha}} \cap \{x_3 = 0\}) = \mathcal{H}^2(M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 = 0\})$ because $\lambda\alpha_3 \geq \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. On the other hand, the area formula [34, Theorem 8.1] implies $P(\tilde{F}; M_{\tilde{\alpha}}) < P(F; M_\alpha) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 = 0\})$ because x_3 is nonconstant on Σ and $\lambda < 1$ by assumption. This contradiction proves the claim. \square

Lemma 3.3 (Stability of the isoperimetric inequality in ellipsoids). *Let M_α be as in (1) such that $\alpha_3 > \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that given $F \subset M_\alpha$ with Lebesgue measure $\mathcal{H}^3(F) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha)$ and relative perimeter $P(F; Z) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) + \delta$, we have either $\mathcal{H}^3(F \triangle (M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 \geq 0\})) \leq \varepsilon$ or $\mathcal{H}^3(F \triangle (M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 \leq 0\})) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof. We follow the proof of [1, Lemma 3.6]. Towards a contradiction, suppose that there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and a sequence $\{F_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of finite perimeter sets satisfying $\mathcal{H}^3(F_k) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha)$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^3(F_k \triangle (M_\alpha \cap \{\pm x_3 \geq 0\})) \geq \varepsilon, \quad P(F_k; M_\alpha) \leq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) + \delta_k$$

such that $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The compactness result [34, Theorem 12.26] for finite perimeter sets implies the existence of $F_\infty \subset M_\alpha$ with finite perimeter such that a subsequence of $\{F_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies $\mathcal{H}^3(F_\infty \triangle F_k) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}^3(F_\infty) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{H}^3(M_\alpha)$. Moreover,

$$P(F_\infty; M_\alpha) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} P(F_k; M_\alpha) = \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$$

since the perimeter is lower semicontinuous (cf. [34, Proposition 12.15]). Lemma 3.2 then implies that either $\mathcal{H}^3(F_\infty \triangle (M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 \geq 0\})) = 0$ or $\mathcal{H}^3(F_\infty \triangle (M_\alpha \cap \{x_3 \leq 0\})) = 0$ in contradiction with our choice of the sequence $\{F_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$. \square

Lemma 3.4 (Width estimate). *Let M_α be as in (1) such that $\alpha_3 > \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ and let $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ be any one of the equivariant sweepouts of M_α constructed in Lemmata 2.1–2.3. Then the min-max width W_Π of the corresponding equivariant saturation satisfies*

$$W_\Pi > \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) \geq \max\{\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_0), \mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_1)\}.$$

Proof. Given the stability of the isoperimetric inequality in M_α stated in Lemma 3.3, the proof is exactly the same as in [9, Theorem 5.1 (II)] (for the sweepouts from Lemmata 2.1 and 2.2) respectively [1, Proposition 3.7] (for the sweepout from Lemma 2.3). \square

4 Geometric and topological control

In this section we prove Theorems 1.1–1.3. We recall the fact that, since the ambient manifold M_α is simply connected, any properly embedded surface in M_α must be orientable. Moreover, as M_α is strictly convex, [10, Lemma 2.4] implies that every free boundary minimal surfaces in M_α is necessarily connected.

Let $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ be any one of the equivariant sweepouts of M_α constructed in Lemmata 2.1–2.3. The width estimate stated in Lemma 3.4 and the mean-convexity of ∂M_α ensure that the min-max theorem [9, Theorem 1.4] applies: In each case, we obtain a min-max sequence $\{\Sigma^j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging in the sense of varifolds to $m\Gamma$, where Γ is a compact, connected, embedded, equivariant free boundary minimal surface in M_α and where the multiplicity m is a positive integer. Moreover, the width W_Π coincides with $m\mathcal{H}^2(\Gamma)$. It remains to verify the desired properties of Γ . In particular, the topology of Γ must be determined, because topology is not necessarily preserved under varifold convergence.

We start with a classification of all planar free boundary minimal surfaces in M_α which will allow us to conclude that the solutions constructed in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are in fact nonplanar.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Σ be a free boundary minimal surface in M_α which is planar in the sense that $\Sigma = M_\alpha \cap P$ for some plane $P \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Then $\Sigma \in \{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3\}$ up to ambient isometries.*

Proof. Since M_α is strictly convex, [10, Lemma 2.4] implies that Σ intersects \mathcal{D}_1 . If $\Sigma = \mathcal{D}_1$ the proof concludes. Otherwise, the intersection $\xi = \Sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_1$ is a straight line segment since both Σ and \mathcal{D}_1 are planar. The free boundary property of Σ implies that ξ meets $\partial \mathcal{D}_1$ orthogonally in both its endpoints $\gamma(s_0)$ and $\gamma(t_0)$, where we have parametrised $\partial \mathcal{D}_1$ by $\gamma(s) = (0, \alpha_2 \cos s, \alpha_3 \sin s)$. It is elementary to show that (s_0, t_0) is necessarily a critical point of the function $f(s, t) = |\gamma(s) - \gamma(t)|^2$. By determining all critical points of f explicitly, we conclude that ξ coincides with either the major or the minor axis of the ellipse \mathcal{D}_1 , respectively with a diameter of \mathcal{D}_1 in the case $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3$. Up to a coordinate rotation in the x_2 - x_3 -plane we have $\xi = \mathcal{D}_1 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$. Repeating the argument with \mathcal{D}_3 in place of \mathcal{D}_1 we obtain necessarily $\Sigma \cap \mathcal{D}_3 = \mathcal{D}_3 \cap \mathcal{D}_2$. In particular, Σ contains both axis of the ellipse \mathcal{D}_2 . Since Σ is planar, $\Sigma = \mathcal{D}_2$ follows. \square

The next results pertain the general structure of properly embedded, equivariant discs which are not necessarily free boundary minimal surfaces in M_α . We recall that $\xi_1 = M_\alpha \cap \{x_2 = 0 = x_3\}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let M_α be as in (1) and let $\Sigma \subset M_\alpha$ be any smooth, properly embedded, \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant topological disc. Then either $\xi_1 \subset \Sigma$ or $\Sigma \cap \xi_1$ contains exactly one point and the intersection is orthogonal.*

Proof. We recall that the group \mathbb{D}_1 is generated by the rotation R_1 of angle π around ξ_1 . Let $p \in \Sigma \setminus \xi_1$. Then $p \neq R_1 p \in \Sigma$. Since Σ is connected, a curve $\gamma \subset \Sigma$ connects p and $R_1 p$. If γ is disjoint from ξ_1 then $\gamma \cup R_1 \gamma$ is a simple closed curve winding around ξ_1 . This curve is contractible in Σ because Σ is a topological disc. Therefore, $\Sigma \cap \xi_1$ must be nonempty.

By [25, Lemma 3.4 (2)] we have either $\xi_1 \subset \Sigma$ (which would complete the proof) or $\Sigma \cap \xi_1$ is finite and every intersection is orthogonal. Let $1 \leq j \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of points in $\Sigma \cap \xi_1$. The quotient $\Sigma' = \Sigma/\mathbb{D}_1$ is a connected topological surface with boundary and therefore has Euler-Characteristic $\chi(\Sigma') \leq 1$. A variant of the Riemann–Hurwitz formula (see e. g. [15, §IV.3]) and the fact that $\mathbb{D}_1 \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2$ implies $1 = \chi(\Sigma) = 2\chi(\Sigma') - j(2 - 1)$ and thus $j = 2\chi(\Sigma') - 1 \leq 1$. Therefore $j = 1$ as claimed. \square

Corollary 4.3. *Any smooth, properly embedded, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant topological disc $\Sigma \subset M_\alpha$ contains two of the three segments ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 .*

Proof. We recall that \mathbb{D}_2 contains the rotation R_ι of angle π around ξ_ι for any $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Hence, Lemma 4.2 implies that either $\xi_\iota \subset \Sigma$ or $\Sigma \cap \xi_\iota$ contains exactly one point. Being smooth and embedded, Σ cannot contain ξ_ι for all $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Therefore there exists $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $p \in \xi_k \cap \Sigma$ is unique. Since Σ is \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant, $R_\iota p \in \xi_k \cap \Sigma$ for every $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Hence, $p = (0, 0, 0)$. Lemma 4.2 then implies that Σ contains ξ_ι for all $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{k\}$ because Σ is orthogonal to ξ_k and thus tangent to ξ_ι at the origin. \square

Lemma 4.4. *Any smooth, compact, connected, properly embedded, \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant surface $\Sigma \subset M_\alpha$ which contains the segment ξ_1 divides M_α into two equal volumes.*

Proof. The surface Σ is connected by assumption and orientable because M_α is simply connected. Thus, $M_\alpha \setminus \Sigma$ has exactly two connected components $F_1, F_2 \subset M_\alpha$. Let ν_0 be a unit normal vector for Σ at $0 \in \xi_1 \subset \Sigma$ and recall that R_1 denotes the generator of \mathbb{D}_1 . Then, $R_1\nu_0 = -\nu_0$ and therefore $R_1F_1 = F_2$. Since R_1 is an isometry, the claim $\mathcal{H}^3(F_1) = \mathcal{H}^3(F_2)$ follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $m\mathcal{C}$ be the limit of the min-max sequence resulting from applying [9, Theorem 1.4] to the \mathbb{D}_1 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t^{\mathcal{C}}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ constructed in Lemma 2.1. Every surface along the min-max sequence is a topological disc, hence the lower semicontinuity result [9, Theorem 1.8] implies that the first Betti number of \mathcal{C} vanishes. Since $M_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ does not contain any closed minimal surfaces, we directly obtain that \mathcal{C} has genus zero and connected boundary (cf. [9, Prop. A.1]), i. e. \mathcal{C} is a free boundary minimal disc.

(i) We recall that $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t^{\mathcal{C}}) < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) < W_{\text{II}} = m\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{C}) < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3). \quad (6)$$

By assumption, $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_1) = \pi\alpha_2\alpha_3 \geq 2\pi\alpha_2\alpha_1 = 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ and similarly, $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_2) \geq 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. Therefore, (6) implies $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{C}) \neq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_\iota)$ for all $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and \mathcal{C} is nonplanar by Lemma 4.1.

(ii) By Lemma 4.2, the surface \mathcal{C} either intersects the segment ξ_1 exactly once and the intersection is orthogonal, or $\xi_1 \subset \mathcal{C}$. By Lemma 2.1, every surface along the min-max sequence intersects ξ_1 orthogonally. The \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariance then implies that if $\xi_1 \subset \mathcal{C}$, the multiplicity $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is even by [26, Theorem 3.2.iv] (see also [25, Theorem 1.3.f]); in particular, $m \geq 2$. Moreover, \mathcal{C} divides M_α into two equal volumes by Lemma 4.4. The isoperimetric inequality stated in Lemma 3.1 then yields $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{C}) \geq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ which contradicts inequality (6) for $m \geq 2$.

(iii) The min-max theorem [9, Theorem 1.4] (see also [8, Theorem 1.10]) states that the equivariant index is bounded from above by the number of parameters in the sweepout. Thus, the \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant index of \mathcal{C} is at most 1. Statement (ii) implies that the unit normal on \mathcal{C} is \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant. Hence any constant function on \mathcal{C} is \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant. Since the Jacobi quadratic form is negative on nonzero constant functions, the \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant index of \mathcal{C} is equal to 1. We refer to [8, § 8] for more details. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $m\mathcal{S}$ be the limit of the min-max sequence resulting from applying [9, Theorem 1.4] to the \mathbb{D}_1 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t^{\mathcal{S}}\}_{t \in [0,1]}$ constructed in Lemma 2.3. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1 we may apply [9, Theorem 1.8] to prove that \mathcal{S} is a topological disc. By construction, every surface along the min-max sequence contains the segment ξ_1 . Consequently, $\xi_1 \subset \mathcal{S}$ which proves Claim (ii) and implies that the multiplicity m is odd (see [26, § 7.3]). Moreover, being \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant and containing ξ_1 , the surface \mathcal{S} divides M_α into two equal volumes by Lemma 4.4. Therefore, the isoperimetric inequality stated in Lemma 3.1 implies $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{S}) \geq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. Since $\mathcal{H}^2(\Sigma_t^{\mathcal{S}}) < 3\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) < W_\Pi = m\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{S}) < 3\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3). \quad (7)$$

In particular, $m < 3$, and being odd, $m = 1$. By assumption, $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_1), \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_2) \geq 3\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$. Therefore, (6) implies $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{C}) \neq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_\iota)$ for all $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and we obtain that \mathcal{C} is nonplanar by applying Lemma 4.1. This completes the proof of (i).

As in the proof of Theorem 1.1 (iii), we obtain that the \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant index of \mathcal{S} is at most 1. Since \mathcal{S} is nonplanar containing ξ_1 , the function $u(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_3$ restricts to a nonzero, \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant negative direction for the Jacobi quadratic form on \mathcal{S} which proves that the \mathbb{D}_1 -equivariant index of \mathcal{S} is equal to 1 (cf. [8, § 8]). \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let M_α be as in (1) and let $\Sigma \subset M_\alpha$ be any smooth, properly embedded, \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant annulus. Then, Σ is disjoint from exactly one of the three segments ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 and it intersects each of the other two segments exactly twice and orthogonally.*

Proof. Let γ_1 and γ_2 denote the two boundary components of Σ . Let W_1 and W_2 be the two connected components of $\partial M_\alpha \setminus \gamma_1$ labelled such that $\gamma_2 \subset W_2$. Suppose there exist $p \in \gamma_1$ and $R \in \mathbb{D}_2 \setminus \{\text{id}\}$ such that $R(p) = p$. Then $R\gamma_1 = \gamma_1$ and $R\gamma_2 \subset RW_2 = W_1$ would be a third boundary component of Σ . This contradiction proves that γ_1 (and similarly γ_2) does not contain any fix points of the group action. In particular, Σ does not contain any of the three segments ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 , because their endpoints being fixed by \mathbb{D}_2 cannot be on $\partial\Sigma$.

Given any $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the set $\Sigma \cap \xi_k$ is finite (possibly empty) by [25, Lemma 3.4 (2)], and every occurring intersection is orthogonal. Let $j_k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be the cardinality of $\Sigma \cap \xi_k$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.2 we consider the connected topological surface Σ/R_k with Euler-Characteristic $\chi(\Sigma/R_k) \leq 1$ and apply the Riemann–Hurwitz formula [15, § IV.3] to obtain

$$0 = \chi(\Sigma) = 2\chi(\Sigma/R_k) - j_k \quad (8)$$

and thus $j_k \in \{0, 2\}$. If $j_1 = 2$ then $\chi(\Sigma/R_1) = 1$ implying that Σ/R_1 has connected boundary and thus $R_1\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$. If additionally $j_2 = 2$ then $R_2\gamma_2 = \gamma_1$ and $R_3\gamma_1 = R_2 \circ R_1\gamma_1 = \gamma_1$.

Consequently, Σ/R_3 has two boundary components, implying $\chi(\Sigma/R_3) = 0$ and $j_3 = 0$ by (8). We conclude that Σ is disjoint from at least one of the segments in question.

Towards a contradiction, suppose that Σ is disjoint from two of the segments – without loss of generality ξ_1 and ξ_2 . Then $j_1 = 0 = j_2$ and (arguing as above) $R_1\gamma_1 = \gamma_1 = R_2\gamma_1$. Since γ_1 does not contain any fix points of the group action, we have $R_k(p) \neq p$ for any $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and any given $p \in \gamma_1$. Hence, $\gamma_1 \setminus \{p, R_1(p)\}$ has two connected components c_1 and c_2 satisfying $R_1c_1 = c_2$; in particular, they are of equal length. Arguing similarly for $\gamma_1 \setminus \{p, R_2(p)\}$ we obtain $R_2(p) = R_1(p)$ and thus the contradiction $R_3(p) = R_2(R_1(p)) = p$. Therefore Σ is disjoint from exactly one of the three segments and the proof concludes. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $\alpha \in]0, \infty[^3$ be arbitrary. If $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3$, then $M_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a round ball and the claim follows by rescaling and rotating the critical catenoid in \mathbb{B}^3 suitably. Otherwise, we may assume $\alpha_3 > \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ up to a change of coordinates, such that $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) = \min_{\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_\ell)$. In particular, the width estimate stated in Lemma 3.4 applies.

(i) Given $\iota \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let $m\mathcal{A}_\iota$ be the limit of the min-max sequence $\{\Sigma^{\iota, j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ resulting from applying [9, Theorem 1.4] to the \mathbb{D}_2 -sweepout $\{\Sigma_t^\iota\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ of M_α constructed in Lemma 2.2. The corresponding area estimates imply

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3) < W_\Pi = m\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{A}_\iota) < 2\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3). \quad (9)$$

Since every surface along the min-max sequence is an annulus, the topological lower semicontinuity results [9, Theorems 1.8–9] imply that \mathcal{A}_ι has genus zero and at most two boundary components. Towards a contradiction, suppose that \mathcal{A}_ι is a topological disc. Since \mathcal{A}_ι is \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant, Corollary 4.3 implies that \mathcal{A}_ι contains two of the three segments ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 . However, by Lemma 2.2, every surface along the min-max sequence intersects two of the segments orthogonally. Therefore, the $\mathbb{D}_2 \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ -equivariance implies that the multiplicity m is even by [26, Theorem 3.2.iv]. Applying Lemmata 4.4 and 3.1 yields $\mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{A}_\iota) \geq \mathcal{H}^2(\mathcal{D}_3)$ which contradicts (9) for $m \geq 2$. Therefore, \mathcal{A}_ι is an annulus as claimed, satisfying (i).

(ii) It remains to prove that \mathcal{A}_ι is disjoint from the segment ξ_ι and intersects the other two segments orthogonally in order to distinguish the three free boundary minimal annuli in question. Towards a contradiction suppose that \mathcal{A}_ι intersects ξ_ι . By Lemma 4.5 the \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant annulus \mathcal{A}_ι must be disjoint from ξ_ℓ for some $\ell \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{\iota\}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small, such that the ε -neighbourhood $U_\varepsilon\mathcal{A}_\iota$ is still disjoint from ξ_ℓ and such that $U_\varepsilon\mathcal{A}_\iota \cap \partial M_\alpha$ has two connected components N_1 and N_2 , one around each boundary component of \mathcal{A}_ι . By [9, Theorem 4.11] we may apply a topological surgery procedure to all surfaces $\Sigma^{\iota, j}$ in the min-max sequence with sufficiently large $j \in \mathbb{N}$ to obtain \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant surfaces $\tilde{\Sigma}^{\iota, j} \subset U_\varepsilon\mathcal{A}_\iota$ such that the sequence $\{\tilde{\Sigma}^{\iota, j}\}_j$ still converges to $m\mathcal{A}_\iota$ in the sense of varifolds.

Since $\Sigma^{\iota, j}$ is an annulus, [9, Lemma 3.3 and 3.6] imply that at most one connected component of $\tilde{\Sigma}^{\iota, j}$ is an annulus and its remaining connected components are all topological discs or spheres. Indeed, employing [9, Definition 1.6], we have genus complexity $\mathfrak{g}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{\iota, j}) = \mathfrak{g}(\Sigma^{\iota, j}) = 0$ and boundary complexity $\mathfrak{b}(\tilde{\Sigma}^{\iota, j}) \leq \mathfrak{b}(\Sigma^{\iota, j}) = 1$ (recalling that $1 + \mathfrak{b}$ counts the number of boundary components of a connected surface). Since the limit \mathcal{A}_ι is also annulus, the topological lower semi-continuity stated in [9, Theorem 4.11] then implies that exactly one connected component

$\widehat{\Sigma}^{\iota,j}$ of $\widetilde{\Sigma}^{\iota,j}$ has annular topology, because $1 = \mathfrak{b}(\mathcal{A}_\iota) \leq \mathfrak{b}(\widetilde{\Sigma}^{\iota,j}) \leq 1$. In particular, $\widehat{\Sigma}^{\iota,j}$ is \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant and has two boundary components $\widehat{\gamma}_1, \widehat{\gamma}_2 \subset N_1 \cup N_2$. Since $R_\iota N_1 = N_2$ we have $R_\iota \widehat{\gamma}_1 = \widehat{\gamma}_2$. However, the boundary components γ_1, γ_2 of the original surface $\Sigma^{\iota,j}$, which is \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariantly isotopic to one of the surfaces Σ_t^ι in the sweepout constructed in Lemma 2.2, satisfy $R_\iota \gamma_k = \gamma_k$ for both $k \in \{1, 2\}$. We recall that $\widehat{\Sigma}^{\iota,j}$ is obtained from $\Sigma^{\iota,j}$ through surgery in the sense of [9, Definition 3.1 (c)], i. e. by

- (1) discarding connected components,
- (2) cutting away a neck,
- (3) cutting away a half-neck formed by a single boundary component,
- (4) cutting away a half-neck formed by two different boundary components,

and note that any \mathbb{D}_2 -equivariant surgery procedure involving only operations of type (1)–(3) preserve the property that $R_\iota \gamma_k = \gamma_k$ for both $k \in \{1, 2\}$. The first occurrence of operation (4) however irreparably reduces the boundary complexity $\mathfrak{b}(\widetilde{\Sigma}^{\iota,j})$ from 1 to 0. This contradiction proves the claim.

(iii) The computation of the equivariant index is analogous to the proof of Theorem 1.1 (iii). \square

References

- [1] A. Carlotto, G. Franz, and M. Schulz, *Free boundary minimal surfaces with connected boundary and arbitrary genus*, Camb. J. Math. **10** (2022), no. 4, 835–857.
- [2] A. Carlotto, M. B. Schulz, and D. Wiygul, *Disc stackings and their Morse index*, preprint, available at [arXiv:2308.07138](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07138).
- [3] ———, *Infinitely many pairs of free boundary minimal surfaces with the same topology and symmetry group*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear), available at [arXiv:2205.04861](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.04861).
- [4] R. Courant, *The existence of minimal surfaces of given topological structure under prescribed boundary conditions*, Acta Math. **72** (1940), 51–98.
- [5] U. Dierkes, S. Hildebrandt, A. Küster, and O. Wohlrab, *Minimal surfaces I*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 295, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. Boundary value problems.
- [6] J. Douglas, *Solution of the problem of Plateau*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **33** (1931), no. 1, 263–321.
- [7] A. Folha, F. Pacard, and T. Zolotareva, *Free boundary minimal surfaces in the unit 3-ball*, Manuscripta Math. **154** (2017), no. 3-4, 359–409.
- [8] G. Franz, *Equivariant index bound for min-max free boundary minimal surfaces*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **62** (2023), no. 7, Paper No. 201, 28.
- [9] G. Franz and M. B. Schulz, *Topological control for min-max free boundary minimal surfaces*, preprint, available at [arXiv:2307.00941](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.00941).
- [10] A. Fraser and M. M.-c. Li, *Compactness of the space of embedded minimal surfaces with free boundary in three-manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature and convex boundary*, J. Differential Geom. **96** (2014), no. 2, 183–200.
- [11] A. Fraser and R. Schoen, *The first Steklov eigenvalue, conformal geometry, and minimal surfaces*, Adv. Math. **226** (2011), no. 5, 4011–4030.
- [12] ———, *Uniqueness theorems for free boundary minimal disks in space forms*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **17** (2015), 8268–8274.
- [13] ———, *Sharp eigenvalue bounds and minimal surfaces in the ball*, Invent. Math. **203** (2016), no. 3, 823–890.
- [14] A. M. Fraser, *On the free boundary variational problem for minimal disks*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **53** (2000), no. 8, 931–971.

- [15] E. Freitag, *Complex Analysis 2*, Universitext, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [16] A. Girouard and J. Lagacé, *Large Steklov eigenvalues via homogenisation on manifolds*, *Invent. Math.* **226** (2021), no. 3, 1011–1056.
- [17] M. Grüter and J. Jost, *On embedded minimal disks in convex bodies*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **3** (1986), no. 5, 345–390.
- [18] R. Haslhofer and D. Ketover, *Free boundary minimal disks in convex balls*, preprint, available at [arXiv:2307.01828](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.01828).
- [19] N. Kapouleas and M. M.-c. Li, *Free boundary minimal surfaces in the unit three-ball via desingularization of the critical catenoid and the equatorial disc*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **776** (2021), 201–254.
- [20] N. Kapouleas and P. McGrath, *Generalizing the linearized doubling approach, I: General theory and new minimal surfaces and self-shrinkers*, *Camb. J. Math.* **11** (2023), no. 2, 299–439.
- [21] N. Kapouleas and D. Wiygul, *Free-boundary minimal surfaces with connected boundary in the 3-ball by tripling the equatorial disc*, *J. Differential Geom.* (to appear), available at [arXiv:1711.00818](https://arxiv.org/abs/1711.00818).
- [22] N. Kapouleas and J. Zou, *Free boundary minimal surfaces in the Euclidean three-ball close to the boundary*, preprint, available at [arXiv:2111.11308](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.11308).
- [23] M. Karpukhin, G. Kokarev, and I. Polterovich, *Multiplicity bounds for Steklov eigenvalues on Riemannian surfaces*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **64** (2014), no. 6, 2481–2502.
- [24] M. Karpukhin, R. Kusner, P. McGrath, and D. Stern, *Embedded minimal surfaces in \mathbb{S}^3 and \mathbb{B}^3 via equivariant eigenvalue optimization*, preprint, available at [arXiv:2402.13121](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.13121).
- [25] D. Ketover, *Equivariant min-max theory*, preprint, available at [arXiv:1612.08692](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.08692).
- [26] ———, *Free boundary minimal surfaces of unbounded genus*, preprint, available at [arXiv:1612.08691](https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.08691).
- [27] D. Ketover, F. C. Marques, and A. Neves, *The catenoid estimate and its geometric applications*, *J. Differential Geom.* **115** (2020), no. 1, 1–26.
- [28] R. Kusner and P. McGrath, *On Steklov Eigenspaces for free boundary minimal surfaces in the unit ball*, *Amer. J. Math.* (to appear), available at [arXiv:2011.06884](https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.06884).
- [29] P. Laurain and R. Petrides, *Existence of min-max free boundary disks realizing the width of a manifold*, *Adv. Math.* **352** (2019), 326–371.
- [30] M. M.-c. Li, *A general existence theorem for embedded minimal surfaces with free boundary*, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **68** (2015), no. 2, 286–331.
- [31] M. M.-C. Li and X. Zhou, *Min-max theory for free boundary minimal hypersurfaces I—Regularity theory*, *J. Differential Geom.* **118** (2021), no. 3, 487–553.
- [32] V. Lima and A. Menezes, *A two-piece property for free boundary minimal surfaces in the ball*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **374** (2021), no. 3, 1661–1686.
- [33] L. Lin, A. Sun, and X. Zhou, *Min-max minimal disks with free boundary in Riemannian manifolds*, *Geom. Topol.* **24** (2020), no. 1, 471–532.
- [34] F. Maggi, *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 135, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [35] D. Maximo, I. Nunes, and G. Smith, *Free boundary minimal annuli in convex three-manifolds*, *J. Differential Geom.* **106** (2017), no. 1, 139–186.
- [36] P. McGrath, *A characterization of the critical catenoid*, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **67** (2018), no. 2, 889–897.
- [37] J. C. C. Nitsche, *Stationary partitioning of convex bodies*, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **89** (1985), no. 1, 1–19.
- [38] R. Petrides, *Non planar free boundary minimal disks into ellipsoids*, preprint, available at [arXiv:2304.12111](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.12111).
- [39] T. Radó, *On Plateau’s problem*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **31** (1930), no. 3, 457–469.
- [40] A. Ros, *The isoperimetric problem*, *Global theory of minimal surfaces*, 2005, pp. 175–209.
- [41] B. Smyth, *Stationary minimal surfaces with boundary on a simplex*, *Invent. Math.* **76** (1984), no. 3, 411–420.
- [42] M. Struwe, *On a free boundary problem for minimal surfaces*, *Invent. Math.* **75** (1984), no. 3, 547–560.

June 2024

MARIO B. SCHULZ

University of Münster, Mathematisches Institut, Einsteinstrasse 62, 48149 Münster, Germany
E-mail address: mario.schulz@uni-muenster.de