

FOLIATION OF AREA MINIMIZING HYPERSURFACES IN ASYMPTOTICALLY FLAT MANIFOLDS AND SCHOEN'S CONJECTURE

SHIHANG HE, YUGUANG SHI, AND HAOBIN YU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we demonstrate that any asymptotically flat manifold (M^n, g) with $4 \leq n \leq 7$ can be foliated by a family of area-minimizing hypersurfaces, each of which is asymptotic to Cartesian coordinate hyperplanes defined at an end of (M^n, g) . As an application of this foliation, we show that for any asymptotically flat manifold (M^n, g) with $4 \leq n \leq 7$, nonnegative scalar curvature and positive mass, the solution of free boundary problem for area-minimizing hypersurface in coordinate cylinder C_{R_i} in (M^n, g) either does not exist or drifts to infinity of (M^n, g) as R_i tends to infinity. Additionally, we introduce a concept of globally minimizing hypersurface in (M^n, g) , and verify a version of the Schoen Conjecture.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminary	4
3.	Construction of foliations of the area minimizing hypersurfaces in AF manifolds	8
3.1.	Constructing area minimizing hypersurfaces	8
3.2.	Asymptotic behavior of Σ_t	12
3.3.	The foliation structure for AF manifold	20
4.	On the Schoen's conjecture	23
Appendix A. Some L^p estimate for solutions to elliptic equations		36
References		39

1. INTRODUCTION


A famous conjecture due to R.Schoen states that for a Riemannian manifold (M, g) of dimension $3 \leq n \leq 7$ and asymptotically flat (AF for short) of rate $\tau = n - 2$ with non-negative scalar curvature, if it contains a non-compact area minimizing boundary, then M is actually isometric to the flat \mathbb{R}^n . We say a hypersurface Σ in (M^n, g) is area-minimizing if for any hypersurface Σ' in (M^n, g) and a compact set $D \subset M$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma \cap D) \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma' \cap D),$$

provided the symmetric difference $\Sigma \Delta \Sigma'$ is contained in D . Here $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\cdot)$ denotes the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. The conjecture has been verified in dimension $n = 3$ in [CCE16], see also [Car16] for the case where $4 \leq n < 8$ with a volume growth condition on the minimal hypersurface and [AR89] for splitting results of area-minimizing surface in 3-dimensional manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature. Recently, a version of Schoen conjecture was verified in [EK23], and also in Theorem 5 in this paper, a family of properly and completely embedded area-minimizing boundaries, which serve as counterexamples to

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C21, secondary 53C24 .

S. He, Y. Shi are funded by the National Key R&D Program of China Grant 2020YFA0712800. H. Yu is funded by NSFC12001147.

FIGURE 1. Free boundary hypersurface in the class \mathcal{F}_R

the conjecture, was constructed in Schwarzschild manifolds for dimensions $4 \leq n \leq 7$. In other words, the usual area-minimizing condition is not strong enough to ensure the validation of Schoen conjecture. Inspired by this, we get the following more general result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (M^n, g) be an AF manifold with $4 \leq n \leq 7$ and asymptotic order $\tau > \frac{n-1}{2}$, then there is $t_0 > 0$, such that for all $t \geq t_0$, there exists an area minimizing hypersurface Σ_t , satisfying:*

(1) *Under the Cartesian coordinates of $M \setminus K$, Σ_t is the graph of a function u_t over coordinate z -hyperplane S_t ;*

(2) *There is a constant C depends only on k, n, τ and (M, g) , so that for any $k \geq 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, $|z - t|_{C^k}(x) \leq C|x|^{1-\tau-k+\epsilon}$ as $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$;*

(3) *Moreover, except for countable values $t_i, 1 = 1, 2, \dots$, each of those area minimizing hypersurfaces satisfying conditions above is unique. Furthermore, $\{(x, z) \in M : |z| \geq t_0\}$ for some fixed t_0 is smoothly foliated by these Σ_t .*

In conjunction with Theorem 1.6 in [CCE16], Theorem 1.1 illustrates tremendous difference from the phenomenon in dimension 3. For an AF manifold (M^n, g) , and let compact set $K \subset M$ be as defined in Definition 2.1, let C_R be the region bounded by the cylinder $\partial B_R^{n-1}(O) \times \mathbb{R}$ for $R > 1$, where $B_R^{n-1}(O)$ is coordinate ball in a coordinate hyperplane at an end of (M^n, g) . Then an application of Theorem 1.1 is given below, it may be of some interest to compare this result with Corollary 3 in [Car16]. Define

$$\mathcal{F}_R := \{\Sigma = \partial\Omega \cap \mathring{C}_R : \text{there is a Caccioppoli set } \Omega \subset M \text{ with locally finite perimeter} \\ \text{and } C_R \cap \{z \leq b\} \subset \Omega \text{ and } \Omega \cap \{z \geq a\} = \emptyset \text{ for some } -\infty < a \leq b < \infty, \}$$

then we have

Theorem 1.2. *Let (M^n, g) be an AF manifold as described in Theorem 1.1 with nonnegative scalar curvature and $\tau > \max\{\frac{n-1}{2}, n-3\}$. Suppose its ADM mass $m > 0$. Then one of the following happens*

- *There exists $R_0 > 0$, such that for all $R > R_0$, there exists no hypersurface Σ_i in C_R , which minimizes the volume in the \mathcal{F}_R ;*
- *For any sequence $\{R_i\}$ tending to infinity such that there exists a hypersurface Σ_{R_i} in C_{R_i} , which minimizes the volume in \mathcal{F}_{R_i} . Then Σ_{R_i} drifts to infinity, i.e. for any compact set $\Omega \subset M$, $\Sigma_{R_i} \cap \Omega = \emptyset$ for sufficiently large i .*

Due to Theorem 1.2, it seems to us that if there exists a hypersurface which minimizes the volume among all the hypersurfaces in some relative homology class represented by a given

hypersurface S_0 then M should be actually flat. With these issues in mind, we introduce the following notion of global minimizing.

Definition 1.3. *Let (M^n, g) be an AF manifold. We say a hypersurface Σ in M is globally minimizing, if there exists a sequence of number $R_i \rightarrow +\infty$, such that*

- (1) Σ intersects ∂C_{R_i} transversally.
- (2) As free boundary hypersurface in C_{R_i} , $\Sigma_{R_i} = \Sigma \cap C_{R_i}$ minimizes the volume in \mathcal{F}_{R_i} . Here and in the sequel, S_t denotes the coordinated hyperplane $\{z := x_n = t\}$ in M outside K .

It is worth noting that S_t is the only global minimizing hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n . With this conception, we are able to demonstrate the following version of Schoen conjecture is true.

Theorem 1.4. *Let (M, g) be an asymptotically flat Riemannian manifold of dimension $4 \leq n \leq 7$ with non-negative scalar curvature and asymptotic order $\tau > \max\{\frac{n-1}{2}, n-3\}$. If M contains a globally minimizing hypersurface, then M is isometric to the flat \mathbb{R}^n .*

To establish existence of Σ_t in Theorem 1.1, we first solve a Plateau problem in cylinder C_r with boundary $\partial C_r \cap S_t$, let $\Sigma_{r,t}$ denotes the solution, and we aim for $\Sigma_{r,t}$ to converge to Σ_t as r tends to the infinity. To achieve this, we need to demonstrate $\Sigma_{r,t}$ does not escape to infinity of M^n . We note that in the proof of positive mass theorem in [SY79], the assumption of negative ADM mass of the AF manifold ensures that the mean curvature of S_t with respect to outward normal vector is positive for large $|t|$. Consequently, S_t can be served as barrier hyperplane for large $|t|$. In our current case, we lack such condition, however, we observe that the volume growth of $\Sigma_{r,t}$ can be controlled and therefore, its second fundamental forms and higher derivatives can be controlled as well, for details, see Lemma 2.2 below. Once the second fundamental forms of interior part of $\Sigma_{r,t}$ are controlled, we are able to improve the Sobolev inequality on it, which can be used to deduced the estimate of $u := z(x) - t$ on $\Sigma_{r,t}$. Here, $z(x)$ is the restriction of coordinate function x_n on $\Sigma_{r,t}$, see Proposition 3.3 below. Therefore, we see that $\Sigma_{r,t}$ cannot slide off to infinity of M^n . Thus, by choosing a subsequence if necessary, we prove that $\Sigma_{r,t}$ converges to Σ_t as r approaches to infinity. By careful analysis of minimal surface equation that Σ_t satisfies, we obtain its asymptotic behavior at infinity. Additionally, we show that $\{(x, z) \in M : |z| \geq t_0\}$ for some large t_0 is smoothly foliated by these Σ_t . It may be of interest to compare this property with that of constant mean curvature surfaces near infinity of an AF manifold (c.f. Theorem 4.1 in [HY96]).

We observe that if there is a sequence $\{R_i\}$ tending to infinity and a solution Σ_{R_i} for the free boundary problem in each C_{R_i} in the sense of (2) in Definition 1.3 with $\Sigma_{R_i} \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$ for a fixed compact set $\Omega \subset M$, then by choosing a subsequence if necessary, we may assume $\{\Sigma_{R_i}\}$ converges locally smoothly to a complete area-minimizing hypersurface $\Sigma \subset M$. By the arguments in [EK23], it must be asymptotic to certain coordinate hyperplane S_t in a end E of M . Then by Theorem 1.1, in this Cartesian coordinates determined by S_t at the end E , there is an area-minimizing hypersurface foliation whose leaf is asymptotic to a coordinate hyperplane S_t for large $|t|$. Then again by the arguments in [EK23], for any $p \in M$ with $|z(p)|$ large enough, we can demonstrate that there is a complete area-minimizing hypersurface Σ' which is asymptotic to some coordinate hyperplane S_t and passes through p . Additionally, Σ' is stable under asymptotically constant variation. On account of Proposition 3.16, we see that Σ' is must be Σ_t . Thus, all of these minimal hypersurfaces Σ_t are indeed stable under asymptotically constant variation, and hence, in conjunction with a suitable conformal deformation and the positive mass theorem, each of them are flat, totally geodesic and the Ricci curvature of (M^n, g) with normal direction of Σ_t vanishes along these minimal hypersurfaces. Therefore, by Proposition A.3, (M^n, g) is flat in the part with $|z|$ large enough. Together with the condition $\tau > n - 3$, we obtain

the ADM mass $m = 0$ and reach the contradiction. Theorem 1.4 is a direct conclusion of Theorem 1.2, thereby confirming a version of Schoen conjecture.

The remainder of the paper is outlined as follows. In Section 2, we will introduce some notations and collect some facts on the properties of minimal surfaces. In Section 3, we will construct foliation of area minimizing hypersurfaces. In Section 4, we will verify a version of Schoen conjecture. In Appendix we will list some basic facts about L^p estimate for linear elliptic equations.

2. PRELIMINARY

In this section, we will introduce some notations and collect some facts on the properties of minimal surfaces.

Definition 2.1. *A n -dimensional Riemannian manifold (M, g) is said to be asymptotically flat of order τ for some $\tau > \frac{n-2}{2}$, if there is a compact set K in M , such that each component of $M \setminus K$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n(O)$, and the metric in $M \setminus K$ satisfies*

$$|g_{ij} - \delta_{ij}| + |x| |\partial g_{ij}| + |x|^2 |\partial^2 g_{ij}| = O(|x|^{-\tau}),$$

and $R \in L^1(M)$. Each component of $M \setminus K$ is called end of (M^n, g) .

For $\alpha > 0$, we use $O(|x|^{-\alpha})$ to denote the quantities which can be bounded by $C|x|^{-\alpha}$ for some C depending only on (M, g) throughout the paper. For a fixed number t with $|t| > 1$, denote S_t to be the coordinate hyperplane of height t , i.e. $S_t = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \{t\}$. In the end E of an AF manifold (M^n, g) , any point x has its coordinate $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. We always call x_n the z -component and denote $z(x) = x_n$ and use $D_{r,t}$ to denote the coordinate ball of radius r in S_t , centered at the intersection of S_t and the z -axis.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (M^n, g) be an asymptotically flat manifold of order τ ($n \geq 4$). Then there is a hypersurface $\Sigma_{r,t}$ contained in C_r minimizing the volume among all hypersurfaces S with $\partial S = \partial D_{r,t}$. Moreover, for any $p \in \Sigma_{r,t}$ we have*

- *There exists a constant Λ depending only on (M^n, g) such that for any $s > 1$ with $\partial \Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_s^n(p) = \emptyset$ and*

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_s^n(p)) \leq \Lambda s^{n-1}.$$

Here and in the sequel, $B_s^n(p)$ denotes the geodesic ball in (M^n, g) with centre p and radius s .

- *For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there is a constant $\beta > 0$ depends only on k, α, Λ and n so that*

$$(2.2) \quad |h|_{C^{k,\alpha}(\Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}^n(p))} \leq \frac{\beta}{\rho^{k+\alpha}},$$

provided $\partial \Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_{\rho}^n(p) = \emptyset$. Here and in the sequel $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\cdot)$ and h denote the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure and the second fundamental form of $\Sigma_{r,t}$ respectively.

Remark 2.3. *Indeed, by the proof of Lemma 2.2, we will know that $\Sigma_{r,t}$ is a part of a boundary of compact domain in M^n .*

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Let O_t be the intersection of $S_{r,t}$ and the z -axis, then $B_r^n(O_t)$ is a ball enclosing $D_{r,t}$. By asymptotic flatness of M we know that $\partial B_r^n(O_t)$ is mean convex with respect to outer normal vector for r sufficiently large, this enable us to find the solution $\Sigma_{r,t}$ of the Plateau problem of minimal boundary with $\partial \Sigma_{r,t} = \partial D_{r,t}$ (c.f. Theorem 1.20 in [Giu84]). Due to its minimality, we know that for all s with $\partial \Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_s^n(p) = \emptyset$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_s^n) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_s^n) \leq \Lambda s^{n-1}.$$

To verify (2.2) it suffices to show

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_{r,t} \cap B_{\rho}^n(p)} (\rho - d(x,p)) |h|(x) \leq \beta < \infty,$$

here $d(x,p)$ denotes the distance function of x and p in (M^n, g) . Indeed, this is direct conclusion of Corollary 1 in [SS81]. However, for the convenience of readers, we will utilize the standard point-picking arguments to verify this. Suppose the above inequality false, then there is a sequence $\{\Sigma_{r_i, t_i}\}$, $\{B_{\rho_i}^n(p_i)\}$ and $\{\beta_i\}$ which tends to infinity with

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_{r_i, t_i} \cap B_{\rho_i}^n(p_i)} (\rho_i - d(x, p_i)) |h|(x) = \beta_i,$$

and $\partial \Sigma_{r_i, t_i} \cap B_{\rho_i}^n(p_i) = \emptyset$, let us assume

$$(\rho_i - d(q_i, p_i)) |h|(q_i) = \sup_{x \in \Sigma_{r_i, t_i} \cap B_{\rho_i}^n(p_i)} (\rho_i - d(x, p_i)) |h|(x) = \beta_i,$$

and $2l_i := \rho_i - d(q_i, p_i)$. There are three cases we need to concern:

- Case 1:** $\{l_i\}$ is bounded while $\{|h|(q_i)\}$ tends to infinity;
- Case 2:** $\{l_i\}$ tends to infinity while $\{|h|(q_i)\}$ is bounded;
- Case 3:** Both $\{l_i\}$ and $\{|h|(q_i)\}$ tends to infinity.

It is enough to show Case 1, since Case 2 and Case 3 can be handled by the similar arguments. Let us consider $\Sigma_i := \Sigma_{r_i, t_i} \cap B_{l_i}^n(q_i)$, then for any $y \in \Sigma_i$ there holds

$$|h|(y) \leq 2|h|(q_i) := 2\lambda_i.$$


Note that (M^n, g) is AF, $\{\lambda_i\}$ tends to infinity, we know that $\{(M^n, \lambda_i^2 g, q_i)\}$ locally smoothly converges to \mathbf{R}^n in Gromov-Hausdorff sense, meanwhile, $\{\Sigma_i, \lambda_i^2 g|_{\Sigma_i}, q_i\}$ locally smoothly converges to a complete and properly embedding stable minimal hypersurface Σ in \mathbf{R}^n . Without loss of the generality, we may $\{q_i\}$ converges to $O \in \Sigma$, then the norm of the second fundamental forms of Σ at the point O is 1. On the other hand, by the definition, we know that Σ enjoys the Euclidean volume growth, then due to Theorem 1 in [Bel23], Σ must be totally geodesic, therefore, we get the contradiction. \square

In the rest of this subsection, we aim to establish suitable Sobolev type inequality on compact minimal hypersurface Σ in asymptotically flat manifold, which will be used in the next section.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume Σ is a compact minimal hypersurface in (M^n, g) satisfying (2.1), and there is a coordinate ball B_R of radius R , such that $\Sigma \subset B_R$, $\partial \Sigma \subset \partial B_R$. Given $\alpha > n - 1$ and $r_1 > 1$, then for any $r > 0$ and t with $|t| > 1$, there holds*

$$(2.3) \quad \int_{\Sigma \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |x|^{-\alpha} d\bar{\mu} \leq C r_1^{(n-1-\alpha)},$$

for some C depending only on (M^n, g) .

FIGURE 2. Region D in Σ

Proof. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $\frac{R}{2^{k+1}} < r_1 \leq \frac{R}{2^k}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Sigma_{r,t} \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |x|^{-\alpha} d\bar{\mu} &= \sum_{i=0}^k \int_{(\Sigma \cap (B_{\frac{R}{2^i}}^n \setminus B_{\frac{R}{2^{i+1}}}^n)) \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |x|^{-\alpha} d\bar{\mu} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\frac{R}{2^{i+1}}\right)^{-\alpha} \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma \cap B_{\frac{R}{2^i}}^n) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^k \Lambda \left(\frac{R}{2^{i+1}}\right)^{-\alpha} \left(\frac{R}{2^i}\right)^{n-1} \\
&= \Lambda \sum_{i=0}^k (2^{k-1-i} r_1)^{-\alpha} \cdot (2^{k+1-i} r_1)^{n-1} \\
&\leq 2^n \Lambda \sum_{i=0}^k 2^{(n-1-\alpha)(k-1-i)} r_1^{n-1-\alpha} \\
&< 2^{n+1} \Lambda r_1^{n-1-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows. \square

Throughout the paper, we use \bar{g} to denote the Euclidean metric on \mathbb{R}^n and a bar to indicate that a geometric quantity is computed with respect to \bar{g} . If we regard Σ as a hypersurface in (\mathbb{R}^n, \bar{g}) , then we have

Lemma 2.5. *Under the same assumption as in Lemma 2.4, given $r_1 > 0, \delta \in (0, 1)$, assume further there is a region $D \subset \Sigma$ satisfying $|h|_g \leq \frac{C}{\delta}$ on D for some C depending only on (M^n, g) . There holds*

$$(2.4) \quad \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{H}|^m d\bar{\mu} \leq C \delta^{-m} r_1^{m(1-\tau)}$$

Here $m = n - 1$ and C depends only on (M, g) .

Proof. As Σ is a minimal surface with $|h|_g \leq C\delta^{-1}$ on D , by

$$\bar{H} = H + O(|x|^{-1-\tau}) + O(|x|^{-\tau}|h|),$$

it follows that $|\bar{H}| = O(\delta^{-1}|x|^{-\tau})$ on D . Since $\tau > \frac{n-2}{2} \geq 1$, then by Lemma 2.4, the conclusion follows. \square

Next, we recall the following Sobolev-type inequality due to Michael and Simon [MS73] on hypersurfaces in Euclidean space.

Lemma 2.6. *Let \bar{H} be the mean curvature of a hypersurface Σ in $(\mathbb{R}^{m+1}, \bar{g})$. Then there exists c_m depending only on m such that for any positive Lipschitz function u with compact support on Σ , there holds*

$$(2.5) \quad \left(\int_{\Sigma} u^{\frac{m}{m-1}} d\bar{\mu} \right)^{\frac{m-1}{m}} \leq c_m \int_{\Sigma} (|\bar{\nabla} u| + |\bar{H}|u) d\bar{\mu}$$

Now we are ready to establish the following Sobolev inequality on Σ .

Lemma 2.7. *Let Σ be an embedding minimal hypersurface in (M^n, g) as in Lemma 2.4, given $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with $|h|_g \leq \frac{C}{\delta}$ on a region $D \subset \Sigma$ for some C depending only on (M^n, g) , then there exists some $r_1 \geq \delta^{\frac{-1}{\tau-1}}$ such that for any smooth function v with compact support on $D \setminus B_{r_1}^n$ there holds*

$$(2.6) \quad \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |v|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\nabla v|^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where C depends only on (M^n, g) .

Proof. We assume $v > 0$ first. Let $u = v^{\frac{2(m-1)}{m-2}}$ be a function on D supported outside $B_{r_1}^n$. Plugging this into (2.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-1}{m}} &\leq c_m \frac{2(m-1)}{m-2} \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{\nabla} v| \cdot v^{\frac{m}{m-2}} d\mu + \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} v^{\frac{2(m-1)}{m-2}} |\bar{H}| d\mu \\ &\leq c_m \frac{2(m-1)}{m-2} \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{\nabla} v| \cdot v^{\frac{m}{m-2}} d\mu + \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{H}|^m d\mu \right)^m \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-1}{m}} \end{aligned}$$

As $\tau > \frac{n-2}{2} \geq 1$, then by Lemma 2.5 we can choose some $r_1 \geq \delta^{\frac{-1}{\tau-1}}$ such that

$$\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{H}|^m d\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-1}{m}} &\leq c_m \frac{2(m-1)}{m-2} \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{\nabla} v| \cdot v^{\frac{m}{m-2}} d\mu \\ &\leq C_m \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\bar{\nabla} v|^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here C_m depends only on m . As (M^n, g) is asymptotically flat, then there exist some C depending on (M^n, g) such that

$$\frac{d\bar{\mu}}{C} \leq d\mu \leq C d\bar{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\bar{\nabla} v|}{C} \leq |\nabla v| \leq C |\bar{\nabla} v|$$

Hence,

$$\left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\nabla v|^2 d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

This shows the Sobolev inequality holds for positive C^1 -smooth function on $D \setminus B_{r_1}^n$. The same thing also holds true for positive function in $W^{1, \frac{2m}{m-2}}$ by approximating argument. For general smooth function v , this can be proved by verifying the inequality for positive and negative part of v respectively, and the conclusion follows. \square

3. CONSTRUCTION OF FOLIATIONS OF THE AREA MINIMIZING HYPERSURFACES IN AF MANIFOLDS

In this section we construct area minimizing foliation, discuss existence result in Theorem 1.1, uniqueness result in Proposition 3.16. Finally, we are able to show a smooth foliation structure for our AF manifold in Sec. 3.3.

3.1. Constructing area minimizing hypersurfaces. Denote $z(x)$ to be the n -th coordinate function in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n(O)$ and set $u = z(x) - t$ for some t . Let Σ be any embedded area minimizing minimal surface. We derive the equation of u over Σ as follows.

Lemma 3.1. *Let u and Σ be described as above, then*

$$(3.1) \quad \Delta_\Sigma u = f,$$

for smooth function f on $\Sigma \setminus B_1^n(O)$ with $|f| = O(|x|^{-\tau-1})$.

Proof. Denote ν to be the normal vector along Σ . By minimality of Σ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\Sigma u &= \Delta_{M^n} u - H \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} - \nabla_{M^n}^2 u(\nu, \nu) \\ &= g^{ij} (\partial_i \partial_j z - \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k z) - \nu^i \nu^j (\partial_i \partial_j z - \Gamma_{ij}^k \partial_k z) \\ &= O(|x|^{-\tau-1}). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Let Σ, D be as in Lemma 2.7 with $\partial D \subset S_t$ for some $t > 0$. Let u be a smooth function defined on Σ satisfying

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u = f & \text{in } D \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases}$$

for some $f = O(|x|^{-\tau-1})$. We start by establishing L^p ($p > 1$) estimate for u .

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $\tau > \frac{m}{2} := \frac{n-1}{2}$. Then for some $r_1 \geq \delta^{\frac{-1}{\tau-1}}$ we have*

$$\left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C r_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1),$$

for some C depending only on (M^n, g) . Furthermore, if $\Sigma \cap B_{r_1}^n = \emptyset$, then

$$\left(\int_D |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C r_1^{-\frac{2m(\tau+1)}{m+2} + m}.$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ be a cut off function on Σ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= 1 \text{ outside } B_{r_1}^n \\ \zeta &= 0 \text{ inside } B_{r_1/2}^n \\ |\nabla \zeta| &< \frac{4}{r_1} \end{aligned}$$

By integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.3) \quad \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\nabla(\zeta u)|^2 d\mu &\leq - \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} \zeta^2 u \Delta u d\mu + \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\nabla \zeta|^2 u^2 d\mu \\
&= - \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} \zeta^2 u f d\mu + \int_{D \setminus B_{r_1/2}^n} |\nabla \zeta|^2 u^2 d\mu \\
&\leq \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\zeta u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \left(\int_{D \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\zeta f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m+2}{2m}} \\
&\quad + \mathcal{H}^m(D \cap B_{r_1/2}^n) (t + r_1)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have utilized

$$|u| \leq (t + r_1) \text{ on } D \cap B_{r_1}^n.$$

Since

$$f = O(|x|^{-\tau-1}),$$

then by Lemma 2.4, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \int_{\Sigma \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |\zeta f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} d\mu = O(r_1^{-\frac{2m(\tau+1)}{m+2} + m})$$

which tends to zero as r_1 increases, provided $-\frac{2m(\tau+1)}{m+2} + m < 0$, *i.e.* $\tau > \frac{m}{2}$. Combining this with Lemma 2.7 and (3.3) we obtain the desired result.

If $\Sigma \cap B_{r_1}^n = \emptyset$, then by (3.2), Lemma 2.7 and integration by parts we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_D u^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} &\leq \int_D |\nabla u|^2 d\mu = \int_D -u f d\mu \\
&\leq \left(\int_D |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \left(\int_D |f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m+2}{2m}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from (3.4). \square

Now we use Lemma 3.2 and Moser iteration to establish the C^0 estimate for u .

Proposition 3.3. *There is some fixed $r_1 \geq 1$ such that for any $r, t > 0$ we have*

$$\|u\|_{C^0(\Sigma_{r,t} \setminus B_{r_1}^n)} \leq C r_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1),$$

for some C depending only on (M^n, g) . Moreover, if $\Sigma_{r,t}$ does not intersect $B_{r_1}^n$, then the C^0 norm of u is bounded by some uniform constant $C(t)$. In particular, if $\tau > \frac{m}{2}$, then $C(t)$ approaches to zero as $|t|$ tends to infinity.

Proof. We give an upper bound for u on $\Sigma_{r,t}$ and the lower bound can be derived in the same way. Note $u = 0$ on $\partial \Sigma_{r,t}$. Choose some $a \in [1, 2]$ such that $\Sigma_{r,t}^+ = \Sigma_{r,t} \cap \{z(x) \geq a + t\}$ is a regular hypersurface. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\Sigma_{r,t}^+ = \Sigma_{r,t} \cap \{z(x) \geq 1 + t\}$. Then for any $x \in \Sigma_{r,t}^+$ and $y \in \partial \Sigma_{r,t}$, we have

$$d_{\Sigma_{r,t}}(x, y) \geq d_{M^n}(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{2} |z(x) - z(y)| \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

The last second inequality is due to the asymptotic flatness of metric. By Lemma 2.2, for any $r, t > 0$, $\Sigma_{r,t}^+$ satisfies (2.1) and $|h| \leq C$ for some uniform C depending only on (M^n, g) . From this we see $\Sigma_{r,t}^+$ satisfies the conditions satisfied by D in previous lemmas. It suffices to consider $\Sigma_{r,t} \cap \{z(x) \geq 3 + t\} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise we immediately have $u \leq 3$. For any point




FIGURE 3. C^0 estimate of u : $\Sigma = \Sigma_{r,t}$, $D = \Sigma_{r,t}^+$

$q \in \Sigma_{r,t} \cap \{z(x) \geq 3 + t\}$, we have $\text{dist}_{\Sigma_{r,t}}(q, \partial \Sigma_{r,t}^+) \geq 1$. Set $v = u - a$ and Consider the equation

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta v = f & \text{in } \Sigma_{r,t}^+ \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Sigma_{r,t}^+. \end{cases}$$

Denote B_R to be the intrinsic geodesic ball of radius R centered at q throughout the proof. Let ζ be a compact supported function on B_R . For $p > 2$, multiply $\zeta^2 v^{2p-1}$ on (3.5) and integration by part, we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} - \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-1} f &= \int_{B_R} \nabla(\zeta^2 v^{2p-1}) \cdot \nabla v \\ &= (2p-1) \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-2} |\nabla v|^2 + 2 \int_{B_R} \zeta v^{2p-1} \nabla \zeta \cdot \nabla v \end{aligned}$$

By Schwartz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \int_{B_R} |\zeta v^{2p-1} \nabla \zeta \cdot \nabla v| \\ &\leq 2 \left(\int_{B_R} \zeta^2 |v|^{2p-2} |\nabla v|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_R} v^{2p} |\nabla \zeta|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{2p-1}{2} \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 |v|^{2p-2} |\nabla v|^2 + \frac{2}{2p-1} \int_{B_R} v^{2p} |\nabla \zeta|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (3.6) gives

$$\int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-2} |\nabla v|^2 \leq \frac{4}{(2p-1)^2} \left(\int_{B_R} v^{2p} |\nabla \zeta|^2 - \frac{2p-1}{2} \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-1} f \right)$$

Applying Sobolev inequality for ζv^p on B_R , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.7) \quad & \left(\int_{B_R} |\zeta v^p|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} \leq C \int_{B_R} |\nabla \zeta v^p|^2 \\
& \leq 2C \int_{B_R} |\nabla \zeta|^2 v^{2p} + 2Cp^2 \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-2} |\nabla v|^2 \\
& \leq 2C \int_{B_R} |\nabla \zeta|^2 v^{2p} + 10C \int_{B_R} v^{2p} |\nabla \zeta|^2 + 8Cp \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-1} |f| \\
& \leq 12C \int_{B_R} v^{2p} |\nabla \zeta|^2 + 8Cp \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-1} |f|.
\end{aligned}$$

By Holder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.8) \quad & \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p-1} |f| \leq \left(\int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p} \right)^{\frac{2p-1}{2p}} \left(\int_{B_R} \zeta^2 |f|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \\
& \leq \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p} + \frac{1}{2p} \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 |f|^{2p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (3.8) into (3.7) gives

$$(3.9) \quad \left(\int_{B_R} |\zeta v^p|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} \leq 12C \int_{B_R} v^{2p} |\nabla \zeta|^2 + 8Cp \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 v^{2p} + 4C \int_{B_R} \zeta^2 |f|^{2p}$$

Let ζ_k be the cut-off function supported on B_{R_k} with

$$\zeta_k = 1 \text{ on } B_{R_{k+1}} \text{ and } |\nabla \zeta_k| < \frac{2}{R_k - R_{k+1}} = 2^{k+2},$$

where $R_k = (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^k})$. Set

$$p_k = 2 \left(\frac{m}{m-2} \right)^k \text{ and } I_k = \int_{B_{R_k}} |v|^{p_k} + \int_{B_{R_k}} |f|^{2p_k}$$

As B_{R_0} lies outside $B_{r_1}^n$ and it's not hard to see $|f|_{C^0(B_{R_0})} \leq 1$. Then it follows from (3.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad & I_{k+1} \leq C_1 [4^k + \left(\frac{m}{m-2} \right)^k] I_k^{\frac{m}{m-2}} + C_1 \int_{B_{R_k}} |f|^{2p_{k+1}} \\
& \leq C_2 4^k I_k^{\frac{m}{m-2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

It's easy to show that

$$I_{k+1}^{p_{k+1}} \leq C_3 I_1^{\frac{m-2}{2m}}.$$

Sending k to ∞ , in conjunction with Lemma 3.2 gives

$$(3.11) \quad v(q) \leq C_4 \left[\left(\int_{B_R} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} + \left(\int_{B_R} f^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \right] \leq C_5 r_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1).$$

If $\Sigma_{r,t}$ does not intersect $B_{r_1}^n$, then by Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\left(\int_{B_R} v^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C r_1^{-\frac{2m(\tau+1)}{m+2} + m}.$$

As

$$\left(\int_{B_R} f^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C r_1^{-\frac{2m(\tau+1)}{m+2} + m},$$

then by (3.11), we obtain the uniform bound for the C^0 norm of u and this bound tends to zero as $|t| \rightarrow \infty$. \square

With Proposition 3.3 we're able to construct area minimizing hypersurfaces in (M, g) . For fixed t , by Lemma 3.3, $u_i(x) = z(x) - t_i$ is uniformly bounded on $\Sigma_{r_i, t}$, which shows $\Sigma_{r_i, t}$ intersects with fixed compact set. Hence, by taking a subsequence if necessary, $\Sigma_{r_i, t}$ converges to an area minimizing hypersurface Σ_t locally smoothly as $r_i \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, Σ_t is between two parallel hyperplanes. Note that a complete minimal hypersurface between two parallel hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^n must be an affine hyperplane, and an area minimizing hypersurface Σ in \mathbb{R}^n with $\partial\Sigma = S_0 \cap B_1^n(O)$ must be the unit disk in S_0 , in conjunction this with a blow-down argument we know that, outside a compact set, Σ_t must be a graph over S_t .

3.2. Asymptotic behavior of Σ_t . Let Σ_t be as above. Let u be the graph function of Σ_t over S_t outside a compact set. First, we prove the uniform gradient bound of the graph function u outside give compact set if Σ_t lies between two parallel hyperplanes. We use (x', x^n) to denote a point $x \in M^n \setminus B_1^n(O)$.

Notational Remark

Here and in the sequel, we may sometimes use abuse of notation. For $x \in \Sigma_t$, $u = z(x) - t$ denotes a function on Σ_t , as what was used in Lemma 3.3. When Σ_t can be locally written as a graph over S_t , we may use u to denote the graph function. Note that in two definitions u has the same value at corresponding points: $u(x)$ in the first definition equals $u(x')$ in the second definition, when $x = (x', x^n)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that Σ_t can be bounded by $S_{t \pm \lambda}$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$. Then there is a constant C depending only on (M^n, g) such that for $|x'| \gg 1$ we have*

$$|\nabla u(x')| \leq \frac{C\lambda}{|x'|}.$$

Proof. We first show $|\nabla u(x')| \rightarrow 0$ as $|x'| \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose not, then we can identify a constant $\delta_0 > 0$ and a sequence of points $p_i = (x'_i, x_i^n)$ with $|x'_i| \rightarrow \infty$ satisfying

$$(3.12) \quad |\nabla u|(x'_i) \geq \delta_0$$

By asymptotic flatness of (M^n, g) , we know that (M, g, p_i) converges locally smoothly to $(\mathbb{R}^n, \bar{g}, O)$ in the Gromov-Hausdorff's sense as $i \rightarrow +\infty$. Here \bar{g} denotes the standard Euclidean metric. Additionally, we get that (Σ_t, p_i) converge to an area minimizing graph Σ with graph function \bar{u} passing through the origin O in \mathbb{R}^n . Since $n \leq 7$, then Σ must be a hyperplane. Combining with that Σ_t is bounded by $S_{t \pm \lambda}$ we deduce that $\bar{u} = 0$. This is not compatible with (3.12).

Next, we use scaling down argument to improve the estimate. Take $p = (x', t) \in S_t$ with $|x'| = 2\sigma \gg 1$ and consider the region Ω_σ which is the part of the slab $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [t - \lambda, t + \lambda]$ within the cylinder $C_\sigma(x')$ centered around the line $\{(x', t) : |x'| = 2\sigma\}$. Rescale the asymptotically flat metric g_{ij} to the metric \tilde{g}_{ij} using the transformation Φ given by $x = p + \sigma\tilde{x}$, i.e.

$$\tilde{g} = \Phi^*g.$$

The rescaled minimal surface is denoted by $\tilde{\Sigma}_t$ and it can be bounded by $\tilde{S}_{\pm\lambda\sigma^{-1}}$. We choose σ large enough such that $\tilde{\Sigma}$ is a smooth minimal surface with \tilde{u} satisfying the uniform elliptic equation. Then by the interior estimate, we have

$$|\tilde{u}|_{C^{2,\alpha}(B_{\frac{1}{2}})} \leq C(|\tilde{u}|_{C^0(B_1)} + |\tilde{f}|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_1)}) \leq C\frac{\lambda}{\sigma},$$

where the norm is taken with respect to \tilde{g} . Rescale back and use the fact $|\nabla u|$ is rescale invariant we get the desired decay estimate for $|\nabla u|$. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Given Σ_t as above, there is some $C = C_t$ depending only on (M^n, g) and t such that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $|z(x) - t| \leq C_t|x'|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}$ as $|x'| \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. As Σ_t is bounded by $S_{\pm Ct}$ from above and below and we have the decay estimate for ∇u , then we can use Proposition 9 in [EK23] to show that Σ_t must asymptotic to some hyperplane $S_{t'}$, furthermore, we have

$$(3.13) \quad |z(x) - t'| \leq C_{t'} |x'|^{1-\tau+\epsilon} \quad \text{as } |x'| \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Here $C_{t'}$ is a positive constant depending only on (M, g) and t' .

Claim $t \leq t'$

Suppose not, then we can choose a sequence of $\{r_i\}$ with $\Sigma_{r_i, t}$ converge to the given Σ_t in the C_c^∞ sense as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Set

$$\delta = \frac{t' - t}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{i, t}^\delta = \Sigma_{r_i, t} \cap \{z(x) \geq t + 2\delta\}.$$

Then

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma_{i, t}^\delta \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |z(x) - (t + 2\delta)|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq Cr_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1).$$

Sending $i \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$\left(\int_{(\Sigma_t \cap \{z(x) \geq t + 2\delta\}) \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |z(x) - (t + 2\delta)|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq Cr_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1).$$

It follows from (3.13) that $z(x) = t + 4\delta + O(|x'|^{1-\tau+\epsilon})$. Hence, we get the desired contradiction. By a similar argument, we may show $t \geq t'$. Therefore, we get the conclusion. \square

For future reference, we introduce the following definition

Definition 3.6. *A complete noncompact area minimizing hypersurface Σ is called asymptotic to some hyperplane S_t if Σ is the graph over S_t outside some compact set and $|z(x) - t| \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.*

Remark 3.7. *If Σ is a complete noncompact area minimizing hypersurface as in Definition 3.6, then by the arguments of the proof of Lemma 2.2, its second fundamental form is uniformly bounded. Therefore, One can show the Sobolev inequality (2.6) holds on $\Sigma \setminus K$. Here K is a compact set of M . If Σ is asymptotic to some hyperplane S_t then we can use Proposition 9 in [EK23] again to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$ it holds $|z(x) - t| \leq C|x'|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}$ as $|x'| \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Lemma 3.5 implies that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_t . In the rest of this subsection, we aim to investigate more general property of area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_t , so we always assume that Σ is a complete noncompact area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to some hyperplane S_t . We will give the explicit analysis for the asymptotic behavior of Σ .

Lemma 3.8. *Let Σ be any complete area minimizing hypersurface that is asymptotic to S_t , suppose $\tau > \frac{m}{2} := \frac{n-1}{2}$. Then $u = z(x) - t$ is $L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}$ -integrable on $\Sigma \setminus B_{r_1}^n$. Moreover, there exists some constant C depending only on (M^n, g) such that*

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq Cr_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1).$$

Proof. It follows from Remark 3.7 that $u = z(x) - t$ is $L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}$ -integrable on $\Sigma \setminus B_{r_1}^n$. Given $\theta > 0$, Set $\Sigma_{t, \theta}^+ = \Sigma \cap \{z(x) - t \geq \theta\}$ and $\Sigma_{t, \theta}^- = \Sigma \cap \{z(x) - t \leq -\theta\}$. Then $\Sigma_{t, \theta}^+$ and $\Sigma_{t, \theta}^-$ are compact. By applying Lemma 3.2 in the case that $\Sigma = \Sigma_t \cap B_R^n$ for R sufficiently large and $D = \Sigma_{t, \theta}^+$, we obtain

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma_{t, \theta}^+ \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |u - \theta|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq Cr_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1),$$

Similarly,

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma_{t,\theta}^- \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |u + \theta|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq Cr_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1).$$

Thus

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma_{t,\theta}^+ \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |u - \theta|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} + \left(\int_{\Sigma_{t,\theta}^- \setminus B_{r_1}^n} |u + \theta|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq Cr_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t + r_1).$$

The assertion follows by sending $\theta \rightarrow 0$ and using Fatou Lemma. \square

Let $\{\Sigma_i\}$ be a sequence of area minimizing minimal surfaces asymptotic to $\{S_{t_i}\}$ with $t_i \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proposition 3.9. $\{\Sigma_i\}$ must drift off to the infinity as $i \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof. We take the contradiction argument. Suppose not, then after passing to a subsequence (we still denote by $\{\Sigma_i\}$) we have $\Sigma_i \cap K \neq \emptyset$ for some compact K . Then Σ_i converges locally smoothly to an area minimizing boundary Σ . Let $R > r_1$ be a constant to be fixed. By Lemma 3.8, for some uniform C_0 depending only on (M^n, g) , we have

$$(3.14) \quad \left(\int_{\Sigma_i \cap (B_R^n \setminus B_{r_1}^n)} |u_i|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C_0 r_1^{\frac{m}{2}} (t_i + r_1)$$

where u_i is defined by $u_i = z(x) - t_i$. Since $\Sigma_i \cap B_R^n$ converges smoothly to $\Sigma \cap B_R^n$, we have that for i large enough

$$(3.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\Sigma_i \cap (B_R^n \setminus B_{r_1}^n)} |u_i|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} &\geq (t_i - R) (\mathcal{H}^m(\Sigma_i \cap (B_R^n \setminus B_{r_1}^n)))^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} (t_i - R) (\mathcal{H}^m(\Sigma \cap (B_R^n \setminus B_{r_1}^n)))^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $|u_i| = |z(x) - t_i| \geq t_i - R$ in $\Sigma_i \cap (B_R^n \setminus B_{r_1}^n)$. Fix some $R \gg r_1^{2m}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^m(\Sigma \cap (B_R^n \setminus B_{r_1}^n)) \geq C_0 r_1^m$. Sending i to the infinity, we find 3.15 is not compatible with 3.14. Hence, we get the desired contradiction. \square

Now we are ready to show

Proposition 3.10. *There exists some t_0 such that for any area minimizing hypersurface Σ'_t asymptotic to S_t for some $t \geq t_0$ it holds*

$$(3.16) \quad \inf_{x \in \Sigma'_t} \langle \nu(x), \partial z \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

and Σ'_t must be the entire graph over S_t .

Proof. We take the contradiction argument. Suppose not, then we can choose a sequence of $t_i \rightarrow \infty$, a sequence of area minimizing hypersurfaces $\{\Sigma'_{t_i}\}$ asymptotic to $\{S_{t_i}\}$ and points $p_i \in \Sigma'_{t_i}$ such that $\langle \nu(p_i), \partial z \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Using the similar argument as in Lemma 3.4, (M, g, p_i) converges to $(\mathbb{R}^n, \bar{g}, O)$ and (Σ'_{t_i}, p_i) converges locally smoothly to an area minimizing hypersurface passing through the origin in \mathbb{R}^n as $i \rightarrow +\infty$. Since Σ'_{t_i} is asymptotic to S_{t_i} , then Σ must be a hyperplane vertical to ∂z . This is not compatible with the fact that $\langle \nu(O), \partial z \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

It suffices to show the projection map $\pi : \Sigma'_t \rightarrow S_t$ given by

$$\pi : (x', x^n) \rightarrow (x', t) \in S_t \text{ for } x = (x', x^n) \in M^n$$

is injective for $t \geq t_0$. It follows from (3.16) that projection map $\pi : \Sigma'_t \rightarrow S_t$ is the local diffeomorphism. Choose $R_t \gg 1$ and let C_{R_t} be the cylinder consisting of the points $x = (x', x^n)$ satisfying $|x'| \leq R_t$. Constraint on $\Sigma'_t \cap C_{R_t}$ and $S_t \cap C_{R_t}$, we have

$$\pi : \Sigma'_t \cap C_{R_t} \rightarrow S_t \cap C_{R_t}$$

is local diffeomorphism with $\pi : \partial(\Sigma'_t \cap C_{R_t}) \rightarrow \partial(S_t \cap C_{R_t})$ being diffeomorphism as Σ'_t being asymptotic to S_t . Since $\Sigma'_t \cap C_{R_t}$ is compact, $\pi|_{\Sigma'_t \cap C_{R_t}}$ is the covering map to $S_t \cap C_{R_t}$. As $S_t \cap C_{R_t}$ is simply connected, it follows that projection map $\pi : \Sigma'_t \rightarrow S_t$ is injective. \square

Let Σ'_t be any area minimizing surface asymptotic to S_t for some $t \geq t_0$. As (M^n, g) is asymptotically flat, we can take some fixed $t_0 \gg 1$ such that $\frac{1}{C_0} \delta_{ij} \leq g|_{\Sigma'_t} \leq C_0 \delta_{ij}$ for some uniform C_0 and $\Sigma'_t \cap B_{r_1}^n = \emptyset$ where r_1 is determined by Proposition 3.3. Next, we want to prove the following more precise decay estimate for higher order derivative of the graph function u over S_t when t is sufficiently large.

Lemma 3.11. *Let t_0 be taken as above and Σ'_t be any area minimizing surface asymptotic to S_t for some $t \geq t_0$. Then for $p > \frac{2m}{m-2}$ there exists a function $C(t)$ relying only on p and (M^n, g) with $C(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, such that*

$$(3.17) \quad \|u\|_{W^{2,p}} < C(t)$$

Here, the $W^{2,p}$ norm could be computed either on S_t or on Σ_t . More generally, let \mathcal{U} be an open set containing K , then there is a constant C depends only on $n, p, (M, g), \mathcal{U}$ and K with

$$(3.18) \quad \|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Sigma_t \setminus \mathcal{U})} < C,$$

and C tends to zero when \mathcal{U} exhausts M .

Proof. Note that Σ'_t could be written as an entire graph over S_t , u could be regarded as a function on both Σ'_t and S_t . In the following, we may not distinguish our notation for simplicity, and the domain of definition of u could be identified by context. By calculation in Lemma 3.1 we get

$$\Delta_{\Sigma'_t} u = f, \quad f = O(|x|^{-\tau-1})$$

Note that the Sobolev inequality holds on Σ'_t with some uniform Sobolev constant. By Proposition 9 in [EK23], for any $\varepsilon > 0$, it holds $|\nabla u| \leq C|x|^{-\tau+\varepsilon}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that $|\nabla u|^2 \in L^1(\Sigma'_t)$. Then integrating by parts gives

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma'_t} |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} \leq C_m \int_{\Sigma'_t} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu \leq C_m \left(\int_{\Sigma'_t} |f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m+2}{2m}} \left(\int_{\Sigma'_t} |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}}$$

Since Σ'_t drift off to the infinity as $t \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\int_{\Sigma'_t} |f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} d\mu \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence

$$\left(\int_{\Sigma'_t} |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \leq C(t) \quad \text{with } C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

Now we consider u as graph function defined on S_t . Note that the volume element $d\mu$ is uniformly C^0 equivalent to that on S_t , we get

$$\left(\int_{S_t} |u|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} dy \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} < C(t) \quad \text{with } C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

By Proposition 3.3, for $p > \frac{2m}{m-2}$ there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{S_t} |u|^p dy \right)^p &< C(t), \quad \text{with } C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \\ \left(\int_{\Sigma'_t} |u|^p d\mu \right)^p &< C(t), \quad \text{with } C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

Next, we derive the $W^{2,p}$ estimate of u over Σ_t . We cover $S_t \cong \mathbb{R}^m$ by a collection of balls B_α of radius 1, centered at each interger point on S_t . Then by covering S_t by concentric balls \tilde{B}_α of radius 2, the multiplicity of each point is no greater than 4^m . Consequently, Σ_t could be covered by $\pi^{-1}(B_\alpha)$ with multiplicity no greater than 4^m . By uniform gradient estimate Lemma 3.10, there is a uniform constant L_0 bounding the diameter of each $\pi^{-1}(B_\alpha)$ and $\pi^{-1}(\tilde{B}_\alpha)$. By L^p interior estimate, we have for each α that

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\pi^{-1}(B_\alpha))} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^p(\pi^{-1}(\tilde{B}_\alpha))} + \|f\|_{L^p(\pi^{-1}(\tilde{B}_\alpha))})$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{W^{2,p}} &\leq \sum_{\alpha} \|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\pi^{-1}(B_\alpha))} \\ &\leq \sum_{\alpha} C(\|u\|_{L^p(\pi^{-1}(\tilde{B}_\alpha))} + \|f\|_{L^p(\pi^{-1}(\tilde{B}_\alpha))}) \\ &\leq 4^m C(\|u\|_{L^p} + \|f\|_{L^p}) < C(t), \quad C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by uniform gradient estimate, the same thing also holds true when considering u as the function defining on S_t . This concludes the proof of Lemma 3.11. \square

Once $W^{2,p}$ -norm of u is obtained, we get $C^{1,\alpha}$ -estimate of u by choosing p large enough, and then by Schauder estimate we finally have $C^{k,\alpha}$ -estimate of u for all $k \geq 1$. With these facts, we establish the following lemma in terms of constant C independent on t , hence, improve Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 3.12. *Let t_0 be as in Lemma 3.11 and Σ'_t be any area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_t for some $t > t_0$. Then there is a constant C depends only on n and τ , so that for any $\epsilon > 0$, $|z - t|_{C^0}(x) \leq C|x|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}$ as $|x| \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. By the paragraph after the proof of Proposition 3.10, $(\Sigma'_t, g|_{\Sigma'_t})$ can be regarded as (\mathbf{R}^{n-1}, ds^2) with ds^2 satisfying

$$\frac{1}{C_0} \delta_{ij} \leq ds^2 \leq C_0 \delta_{ij}$$

for some uniform C_0 . Thus, (3.1) can be written as

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta_G u = f & \text{in } \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \\ u(x) \rightarrow 0 & \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty \end{cases}$$

Here Δ_G denotes the Laplacian operator on (\mathbf{R}^{n-1}, ds^2) and (G_{ij}) is uniformly elliptic on \mathbf{R}^{n-1} . To demonstrate that $|z - t|$ decay to zero at the rate specified in the Lemma, we still let $u = z(x) - t$ as before. Since the smallest and the largest eigenvalue of (G_{ij}) are uniformly bounded, then By [LSW63] (c.f. (7.9), p.67), we know that the Green function $G(x, y)$ for $-\Delta_G$ satisfies

$$(3.20) \quad C_1|x - y|^{3-n} \leq G(x, y) \leq C_2|x - y|^{3-n}, \quad \text{for any } x, y \text{ in } \mathbf{R}^{n-1},$$

here C_1 and C_2 are two constants depends only on n and C_0 . Now, we have

$$u(x) = - \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n-1}} G(x, y) f(y) dy,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.21) \quad |u(x)| &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n-1}} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy \\
&\leq C \left(\int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy + \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n-1} \setminus (B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o) \cup B_{3r}(x))} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int_{B_{3r}(x) \setminus B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $r = \frac{|x|}{2}$ and we have used the fact

$$|f|(y) \leq C(1+|y|)^{-\tau-1}$$

in the first inequality in (3.21), here and in the sequel C denotes a constant depends only on n and its meaning is different from line to line .

For the case that $\tau < n-2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.22) \quad \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy &\leq Cr^{3-n} \int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy \\
&\leq Cr^{3-n} \int_0^{\frac{r}{2}} (1+\rho)^{-\tau-1} \rho^{n-2} d\rho \\
&\leq Cr^{1-\tau},
\end{aligned}$$

and if $\tau = n-2$ we have

$$\int_{B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy \leq Cr^{3-n} \log r.$$

Note that for any $y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \setminus (B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o) \cup B_{3r}(x))$ there holds

$$|x| \leq \frac{|y|}{2},$$

and hence

$$|x-y| \geq \frac{1}{2}|y|,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.23) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n-1} \setminus (B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o) \cup B_{3r}(x))} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{R}^{n-1} \setminus B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} |y|^{2-n-\tau} dy \\
&\leq Cr^{1-\tau},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.24) \quad \int_{B_{3r}(x) \setminus B_{\frac{r}{2}}(o)} |x-y|^{3-n} (1+|y|)^{-\tau-1} dy &\leq Cr^{-\tau-1} \int_{B_{3r}(x)} |x-y|^{3-n} \\
&\leq Cr^{1-\tau}
\end{aligned}$$

Plug (3.22), (3.23) and (3.24) into (3.21) we finally obtain that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $|y|$ large enough there holds

$$|u|(y) \leq |y|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}.$$

Thus we get the conclusion. □

Given an area minimizing hypersurface Σ'_t asymptotic to S_t for some $t \geq t_0$, Σ'_t can be represented as the entire graph on S_t by $\Sigma'_t = \{(y, u), y \in S_t\}$, here and in the following, u is a smooth function defined on S_t . To obtain uniform decay for higher order derivative of u , we need the following minimal graph equation([CM11] P236).

Lemma 3.13. *Let $\Sigma_t = \{(y, u), y \in S_t\}$ be the area minimizing surface as above. Then*

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} F(y, u(y), D_i u(y), D_{ij}^2 u(y)) &:= h^{ij}(D_{ij} u + \Gamma_{ij}^n + D_i u \Gamma_{nj}^n + D_j u \Gamma_{ni}^n + D_i u D_j u \Gamma_{nn}^n) \\ &\quad - D_k u h^{ij}(\Gamma_{ij}^k + D_i u \Gamma_{nj}^k + D_j u \Gamma_{in}^k + D_i u D_j u \Gamma_{nn}^k) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (h^{ij}) is the inverse matrix to (h_{ij}) and

$$(3.26) \quad h_{ij}(y, u, p_i) = g_{ij}(y, u) + p_i g_{jn}(y, u) + p_j g_{in}(y, u) + p_i p_j g_{nn}(y, u)$$

and each Christoffel symbol is evaluated at (y, u) with $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n-1$.

Lemma 3.14. *There is a constant C depends only on k, α and (M^n, g) so that for any $k \geq 1, \epsilon > 0, |u - t|_{C^{k, \alpha}}(y) \leq C|y|^{1-\tau-k+\epsilon}$ as $|y| \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. for which we could write as $h^{ij} D_{ij} u = f_1$. For $x \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, denote $r = \frac{|x|}{4}$. By uniform Schauder estimate from the remark behind Lemma 3.11, we have $|h_{ij}|_\alpha$ and $|D_i u|_\alpha$ uniformly bounded. It follows that $f_1 = O(|x|^{-\tau-1})$. Moreover, we have

$$(3.27) \quad \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ij}^k(x, u(x))}{\partial x_l} = \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ij}^k}{\partial x_l} + \frac{\partial \Gamma_{ij}^k}{\partial x_n} D_l u = O(|x|^{-2-\tau}).$$

This yields

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} |\Gamma_{ij}^k|_{C^\alpha(B_r(x))} &\leq r^{1-\alpha} |D \Gamma_{ij}^k| = O(|x|^{\alpha-\tau-1}) \\ |f_1|_{0, \alpha; B_r(x)} &= O(|x|^{\alpha-\tau-1}) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain $|h_{ij}|_{C^\alpha(B_r(x))} + r^2 |f_1|_{C^\alpha(B_r(x))} < \Lambda$ for a uniform constant Λ when x is sufficiently large. By [GT83] Theorem 6.2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &r |Du(x)| + r^2 |D^2 u(x)| \\ &\leq |u|_{2, \alpha; B_r(x)}^* \leq C(|u|_{0, B_r(x)} + r^2 |f_1|_{0, \alpha; B_r(x)}) \\ &= O(|x|^{-\tau+1+\epsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

Here C relies only on $\alpha, (M^n, g)$ and Λ . This gives the desired estimate for $|Du|$ and $|D^2 u|$. By taking derivative on two sides of (3.25) and iterating the argument above, we get the desired decay estimate for higher order derivative of u . \square

In the last of this subsection, we show the uniqueness result for area minimizing surface asymptotic to same hyperplane S_t .

Consider two area minimizing hypersurfaces asymptotic to same hyperplane S_t for some $t \geq t_0$. Denote the graph function to be u, v respectively. Then we have

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} F(y, u(y), D_i u(y), D_{ij}^2 u(y)) &= 0 \\ F(y, v(y), D_i v(y), D_{ij}^2 v(y)) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Denote $w = v - u$. Then following P237 of [CM11] we subtract the two equations (3.29) and get

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(\int_0^1 F_{p_{ij}} ds \right) D_{ij} w + \left(\int_0^1 F_{p_i} ds \right) D_i w + \left(\int_0^1 F_u ds \right) w \\ &=: a_{ij} D_{ij} w + b_i D_i w + c w = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where each derivative of F is evaluated at $(y, u + sw, D_i u + sD_i w, D_{ij} u + sD_{ij} w)$. Since $F_{p_{ij}} = h^{ij}$, by the remark after Proposition 3.10, we have a_{ij} is uniformly elliptic for $t \geq t_0$:

$$\lambda|\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij}\xi^i\xi^j$$

The next lemma presents decay estimate of coefficients in (3.30)

Lemma 3.15. *On S_t , evaluating at $(y, u(y), Du(y), D^2u(y))$, there holds*

$$|Dh^{ij}| + |F_{p_i}| + |F_u| = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$$

and

$$\|Dh^{ij}\|_{L^m} + \|F_{p_i}\|_{L^m} + \|F_u\|_{L^{\frac{m}{2}}} \rightarrow 0 (t \rightarrow \infty)$$

Proof. We first establish the decay estimate. We calculate

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} D_\theta h^{ij} &= -h^{ik}h^{lj}D_\theta h_{kl} \\ &= -h^{ik}h^{lj}D_\theta(g_{kl} + D_k u g_{ln} + D_l u g_{kn} + D_k u D_l u g_{nn}) \end{aligned}$$

For the next two terms, we use D_{p_θ} and D_u to denote partial derivative calculated with respect to F . Rewrite (3.25) as $F = h^{ij}W_{ij} = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F_{p_\theta} &= (D_{p_\theta} h^{ij})W_{ij} + h^{ij}D_{p_\theta} W_{ij} \\ &= -h^{ik}h^{lj}D_{p_\theta} h_{kl}W_{ij} + h^{ij}D_{p_\theta} W_{ij} \\ &= -h^{ik}h^{lj}(\delta_{k\theta}g_{ln} + \delta_{l\theta}g_{kn} + \delta_{k\theta}p_l g_{nn} + \delta_{l\theta}p_k g_{nn})W_{ij} + h^{ij}D_{p_\theta} W_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} F_u &= (D_u h^{ij})W_{ij} + h^{ij}D_u W_{ij} \\ &= -h^{ik}h^{lj}D_u h_{kl}W_{ij} + h^{ij}D_u W_{ij} \\ &= -h^{ik}h^{lj}(p_k \frac{\partial g_{ln}}{\partial x_n} + p_l \frac{\partial g_{kn}}{\partial x_n} + p_k p_l \frac{\partial g_{nn}}{\partial x_n})W_{ij} + h^{ij}D_u W_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Then by the asymptotic flatness of M and Lemma 4.6,

$$|\partial g| + |Du||g_{kn}| + |D^2u| = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$$

Thus, we have $|Dh^{ij}| = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$. Similarly, $D_{ij}u = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$ and any other term in $W_{ij}u$ consists the factors Christoffel symbol Γ , it follows $W_{ij} = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$. It's easy to show that $D_{p_\theta} W_{ij}$ and $D_u W_{ij}$ decays fast in order $-\tau - 1$. Thus, we get the desired decay estimate.

To derive the integral estimate, we observe

$$(3.32) \quad \begin{aligned} |Dh^{ij}| &= O(|\partial g| + |\partial g||Du| + |\partial g||Du|^2 + |g_{kn}||D^2u| + |Du||D^2u|) \\ |W_{ij}| &= O(|Du|^2 + |\partial g||Du| + |\partial g||Du|^2) \\ |D_{p_\theta} W_{ij}| &= O(|\partial g| + |\partial g||Du|) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.11 and the remark after it, we have for some uniform C

$$(3.33) \quad |Du| + |D^2u| \leq C.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |Dh^{ij}| + |F_{p_\theta}| &= O(|\partial g| + |Du|^2 + |g_{kn}||D^2u| + |Du||D^2u|) \\ &\leq C(|\partial g| + |g_{kn}|^2 + |Du|^2 + |D^2u|^2) \end{aligned}$$

Note for $q > m + 1$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} \frac{1}{(|y| + t)^q} dy \leq C \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{\rho^{m-1}}{(\rho + t)^q} d\rho \leq C t^{m-q} \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{s^m}{(1 + s)^q} ds \leq C_q t^{m-q}.$$

Since $|\partial g| \leq C(|y| + t)^{-1-\tau}$ and $m(1 + \tau) \geq \frac{m}{2}(m + 1) > m + 1$, we get

$$(3.34) \quad \int_{S_t} |\partial g|^m d\mu \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} \frac{1}{(|y| + t)^{m+m\tau}} dy \leq Ct^{-m\tau}.$$

Similarly, $|g_{kn}| \leq C(|y| + t)^{-\tau}$ and $2m\tau \geq m(m - 1) > m + 1$, then we have

$$\int_{S_t} |g_{kn}|^{2m} d\mu \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} \frac{1}{(|y| + t)^{2m\tau}} dy \leq Ct^{m-2m\tau}.$$

For $p \geq \frac{2m}{m-2}$, by Lemma 3.11, we have

$$\|u - t\|_{W^{2,p}} \leq C(t) \quad \text{with} \quad C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

As $2m \geq \frac{2m}{m-2}$, then

$$(3.35) \quad \int_{S_t} (|Du|^m + |D^2u|^m) d\mu \leq C(t) \quad \text{with} \quad C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

Thus,

$$(3.36) \quad \int_{S_t} (|Dh^{ij}|^m + |F_{p\theta}|^m) d\mu \leq C(t) \quad \text{with} \quad C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

Similarly, we have

$$|D_u W_{ij}| = O(|\partial^2 g| + |\partial^2 g| |Du| + |\partial^2 g| |Du|^2) \quad \text{and} \quad |F_u| = O(|\partial g| |W_{ij}| + |\partial g|^2 + |\partial^2 g|)$$

It follows

$$(3.37) \quad \begin{aligned} |F_u|^{\frac{m}{2}} &\leq C(|\partial g|^{\frac{m}{2}} |W_{ij}|^{\frac{m}{2}} + |\partial g|^m + |\partial^2 g|^{\frac{m}{2}}) \\ &\leq C(|\partial g|^m + |W_{ij}|^m + |\partial^2 g|^{\frac{m}{2}}) \\ &\leq C(|\partial g|^m + |Du|^{2m} + |\partial^2 g|^{\frac{m}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.32) and (3.33) in the last inequality. Using $|\partial^2 g| \leq C(|y| + t)^{-2-\tau}$ and $\frac{m}{2}(2 + \tau) \geq \frac{m}{4}(m + 3) > m + 1$, we get

$$(3.38) \quad \int_{S_t} |\partial^2 g|^{\frac{m}{2}} d\mu \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} \frac{1}{(|y| + t)^{\frac{m}{2}(2+\tau)}} dy \leq Ct^{-\frac{m}{4}(m-1)}.$$

Plugging (3.34), (3.35) and (3.38) into (3.37) yields

$$(3.39) \quad \int_{S_t} |F_u|^{\frac{m}{2}} d\mu \leq C(t) \quad \text{with} \quad C(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

Combining (3.36) and (3.39) gives the desired integral estimate. \square

Since S_t enjoys very nice properties for $t \gg 1$, we can use Corollary A.2 to conclude that (3.30) has only trivial solution $w = 0$. Hence, we obtain

Proposition 3.16. *There exists some t_0 such that any two area minimizing surfaces asymptotic to the same hyperplane S_t for some $t \geq t_0$ must coincide.*

3.3. The foliation structure for AF manifold. For $t > t_0$, we denote the unique area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_t in Proposition 3.16 by Σ_t . The first thing we will do is to show that $\{\Sigma_t\}$ actually form a C^0 foliation for $t > t_0$

Proposition 3.17. *The region in M beyond Σ_{t_0} can be C^0 foliated by $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t>t_0}$.*

First, we prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.18. *For a sequence of $\{t_i\}$ with $t_i \rightarrow t > t_0$, we have $\Sigma_{t_i} \rightarrow \Sigma_t$.*

Proof. Since the second fundamental form of Σ_{t_i} is uniformly bounded and Σ_{t_i} is asymptotic to S_{t_i} , then by Proposition 3.3, we have C^0 estimate on Σ_{t_i} , therefore it converges to an area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_t . By uniqueness result in Proposition 3.16 this hypersurface must coincide with Σ_t . \square

Lemma 3.19. *For $t_1 > t_2$, let $\Sigma_i = \Sigma_{t_i}$ be the area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_{t_i} for $i = 1, 2$. Then Σ_1 lies strictly beyond Σ_2 .*

Proof. By asymptotic property (Proposition 9 in [EK23]) Σ_1 lies strictly beyond Σ_2 outside a compact set. If these two minimal hypersurface intersect, then they must intersect transversally. Let D_i be the compact region on Σ_i bounded by the transversal intersection of Σ_1 and Σ_2 . Consider $(\Sigma_1 \setminus D_1) \cup D_2$, which turns out to be another area minimizing boundary. This violates the regularity theory of area minimizing hypersurface for dimension less than 7. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.17. Denote U to be the region beyond Σ_{t_0} . It suffices to show for any point p in U , there exists a hypersurface Σ_t passing through p for some $t > t_0$. Let l be the portion of line passing through p in U , paralleling to z -axis under Euclidean metric. Denote

$$\mathcal{S} = \{q \in l \mid \exists \Sigma_t, \Sigma_t \cap l = q\}$$

By Lemma 3.18 \mathcal{S} must be close. If p is not in l , then we can find $p_1, p_2 \in l$, such that

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{aligned} z(p_1) &= \inf_{q \in l, z(q) > z(p)} z(q) \\ z(p_2) &= \sup_{q \in l, z(q) < z(p)} z(q) \end{aligned}$$

Let $p_i \in \Sigma_{t_i}$. By graph property we have $t_1 \geq t_2$. If $t_1 > t_2$, then for some $t_3 \in (t_1, t_2)$, $p_3 = \Sigma_{t_3} \cap l$ lies between p_1 and p_2 , this contradicts with (3.40). Hence $t_1 = t_2$, and this contradicts with uniqueness Proposition 3.16. \square

Next, we improve the foliation $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t > t_0}$ into a C^1 foliation.

Proposition 3.20. *The foliation $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t > t_0}$ is C^1 in t .*

Proof. Let u_t and $u_{t+\delta}$ be the graph function of Σ_t and $\Sigma_{t+\delta}$ over S_t respectively. Then

$$(3.41) \quad \begin{aligned} F(y, u_t(y), D_i u_t(y), D_{ij}^2 u_t(y)) &= 0 \\ F(y, u_{t+\delta}(y), D_i u_{t+\delta}(y), D_{ij}^2 u_{t+\delta}(y)) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |u_t - t| + |y| |Du_t| + |y|^2 |D^2 u_t| &= O(|y|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}) \\ |u_{t+\delta} - (t + \delta)| + |y| |Du_{t+\delta}| + |y|^2 |D^2 u_{t+\delta}| &= O(|y|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

Denote $w_\delta = \frac{u_{t+\delta} - u_t}{\delta} - 1$. By subtracting two equations in (3.41), we obtain

$$\left(\int_0^1 F_{p_{ij}} ds \right) D_{ij} w_\delta + \left(\int_0^1 F_{p_i} ds \right) D_i w_\delta + \left(\int_0^1 F_u ds \right) w_\delta = - \left(\int_0^1 F_u ds \right) w_\delta$$

where each derivative of F is evaluated at $(y, u_\delta + s w_\delta, D_i u_\delta + s D_i w_\delta, D_{ij} u_\delta + s D_{ij} w_\delta)$. We rewrite the above equation as

$$(3.42) \quad L_\delta w_\delta = a_{ij}^\delta D_{ij} w_\delta + b_i^\delta D_i w_\delta + c^\delta w_\delta = -c^\delta$$

The following estimate follows easily from the argument of Lemma 3.15:

$$(3.43) \quad |Da_{ij}^\delta| + |b_i^\delta| + |c^\delta| = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$$

$$(3.44) \quad \|Da_{ij}^\delta\|_{L^m} + \|b_i^\delta\|_{L^m} + \|c^\delta\|_{L^{\frac{m}{2}}} \rightarrow 0 (t \rightarrow \infty)$$

By Lemma 3.12, we see $|w_\delta| \leq \frac{C}{\delta}(|x|^{-\tau+1+\epsilon})$, hence $L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}$ integrable. Combining the L^p estimate for coefficients (3.43) with (A.2) in Appendix we obtain uniform $L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}$ estimate for w_δ . By Moser iteration w_δ is uniformly bounded ([GT83], Theorem 8.17), so L^p norm of w_δ is uniformly bounded for all $p > \frac{2m}{m-2}$. Combining with $W^{2,p}$ estimate and Schauder estimate, we know the $C^{k,\alpha}$ norm of w_δ is uniformly bounded. Consequently, there exists a subsequence w_{δ_i} converging to a function w with respect to $C^{k,\alpha}$ norm with w satisfying the following equation:

$$(3.45) \quad h^{ij}D_{ij}w + F_{p_i}D_iw + F_uw = -F_u$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.43) and the uniform $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimate of w_δ that if we write

$$D_i(a_{ij}^\delta D_j w_\delta) = f_\delta$$

then $f_\delta = O(|y|^{-\tau-1})$. Similar to the argument of Lemma 3.12, we get the following inequality holds for a constant C independent of the choice of δ :

$$|w_\delta| + |y||Dw_\delta| + |y|^2|D^2w_\delta| \leq C|y|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}$$

Therefore, the same thing also holds for w :

$$(3.46) \quad |w| + |y||Dw| + |y|^2|D^2w| \leq C|y|^{1-\tau+\epsilon}$$

By Lemma A.1, the solution of (3.45) satisfying (3.46) is unique. Combining with uniform Schauder estimate for w_δ we conclude that the limit of w_δ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ exists and equals w . By uniform boundness of w_δ we see u is Lipschitz in t .

To see u is C^1 in t , we denote $u_t^{(1)} = w + 1$ above with respect to Σ_t . (3.45) then interprets as

$$h_t^{ij}D_{ij}u_t^{(1)} + F_{p_i}^t D_i u_t^{(1)} + F_u^t u_t^{(1)} = 0$$

By subtracting the equations respect to t and $t + \delta$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & h_t^{ij}D_{ij}(u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} - u_t^{(1)}) + F_{p_i}^t D_i(u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} - u_t^{(1)}) + F_u^t(u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} - u_t^{(1)}) \\ &= (h_t^{ij} - h_{t+\delta}^{ij})D_{ij}u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} + (F_{p_i}^t - F_{p_i}^{t+\delta})D_i u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} + (F_u^t - F_u^{t+\delta})u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} \end{aligned}$$


By (3.43)(3.46), the coefficients in the above equation has fast decay, so we can apply Lemma A.1 to obtain a $L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}$ estimate for $|u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} - u_t^{(1)}|$. Standard iteration improves this to a C^0 bound. Consequently, $|u_{t+\delta}^{(1)} - u_t^{(1)}|$ tends to zero as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.20. \square

By the similar arguments, we can demonstrate that the foliation $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t>t_0}$ is C^k in t for all $k \geq 1$. Similarly, the same thing also holds when t is sufficiently negative. As a result, we can find $T_0 > 0$, such that the regions in M beyond Σ_{T_0} and below Σ_{-T_0} coincide with the smooth foliation $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t>T_0}$ and $\{\Sigma_t\}_{t<-T_0}$. Next we're interested in the characterization of the region between Σ_{-T_0} and Σ_{T_0} .

For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we define \mathcal{A}_t to be the collection of area minimizing boundaries Σ asymptotic to S_t at infinity. Pick a sequence $t_i \rightarrow t^+$. By Lemma 3.12, there exists $\Sigma_i \in \mathcal{A}_{t_i}$. For a fixed element $\Sigma \in \mathcal{A}_t$, we have Σ strictly below Σ_i for each i according to Lemma 3.19. Let $i \rightarrow \infty$, by uniform C^0 decay estimate of Lemma 3.12 Σ_i must converge to an element in \mathcal{A}_t , denoted by Σ^+ . Then Σ either coincide with Σ^+ , or lies strictly below Σ^+ . By exactly the same procedure we are able to construct an element Σ_- in \mathcal{A}_t . The discussion above summarizes to the following lemma:

Lemma 3.21. *For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, one of the following two cases happens:*

- (1) $|\mathcal{A}_t| = 1$. In this case area minimizing boundary asymptotic to S_t is unique.


 FIGURE 4. The foliation structure of M

(2) $|\mathcal{A}_t| > 1$. In this case there exist $\Sigma_t^+, \Sigma_t^- \in \mathcal{A}_t$ which bound a region Ω_t , such that all other element in \mathcal{A}_t lies in Ω_t .

Here, $|\mathcal{A}_t|$ denotes the number of elements of \mathcal{A}_t (not necessarily finite).

Summarizing the results above, we obtain the following structure theorem for asymptotic manifold of dimension $4 \leq n \leq 7$

Proposition 3.22. *For any asymptotic flat manifold (M^n, g) satisfying $4 \leq n \leq 7, \tau > \frac{n-1}{2}$, there exists $T_0 > 0$, such that*

(1) *For $|t| > T_0$, the area minimizing boundary in M asymptotic to S_t is unique. Moreover, the region outside $\Sigma_{\pm T_0}$ is smooth foliation by $\{\Sigma_t\}_{|t|>T_0}$.*

(2) *For $|t| \leq T_0$, denote*

$$I = \{t, \quad |\mathcal{A}_t| > 1\}$$

Then I is countable, and the region between $\Sigma_{\pm T_0}$ could be represented as

$$\left(\bigsqcup_{\alpha \in I} \Omega_\alpha \right) \cup \left(\bigsqcup_{\beta \in [-T_0, T_0] \setminus I} \Sigma_\beta \right)$$

Proof. By our definition, the area minimizing hypersurface asymptotic to S_t is unique if and only if $t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus I$. For the remaining it suffice to show I is countable. This follows immediately from the 1-1 correspondence between element $t \in I$ and the open set $\Omega_t \subset M$, and that these Ω_t 's are mutually disjoint. \square

4. ON THE SCHOEN'S CONJECTURE

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.2. Let (M^n, g) be the asymptotically flat manifold and C_{R_i} the cylinder as stated in Theorem 1.2, each of which contains a hypersurface Σ_i minimizing the volume in \mathcal{F}_{R_i} . Assume the statement of the theorem is not true, then we are able to find a compact set Ω_0 with $\Sigma_i \cap \Omega_0 \neq \emptyset$ for each i . By passing to a subsequence, Σ_i converges locally smoothly to an area minimizing boundary Σ . To investigate the basic properties for Σ , we introduce the *height* of a subset $A \subset M$ as follows:

the height of A is defined to be

$$(4.1) \quad Z(A) = Z_+(A) - Z_-(A)$$

with

$$Z_+(A) = \begin{cases} \sup\{z(p), p \in A \setminus K\}, & A \setminus K \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & A \setminus K = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

$$Z_-(A) = \begin{cases} \inf\{z(p), p \in A \setminus K\}, & A \setminus K \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & A \setminus K = \emptyset \end{cases}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Let Σ be described as above, then Σ is a graph over S_0 outside a compact set, and the graph function u satisfies*

$$|y|_{\bar{g}}^{-1}|u(y) - a| + |\bar{\nabla}u(y)|_{\bar{g}} + |y|_{\bar{g}}|\bar{\nabla}^2u(y)| = O(|y|^{-\tau+\epsilon})$$

Proof. We claim the following holds

$$(4.2) \quad Z(\Sigma_i) = o(R_i)$$

In fact, let $\tilde{C}_{R_i} = \frac{1}{R_i}(C_{R_i} \setminus K)$ be the rescaled cylinder with radius 1, then \tilde{C}_{R_i} converges to $(C_1 \setminus \{O\}, g_{Euc})$ in Gromov-Hausdorff sense, with C_1 denoting the Euclidean cylinder with radius 1. Since Σ_i intersects with a compact set, we have $\frac{1}{R_i}\Sigma_i$ converge to a stable hypercone Σ' in $C_1 \setminus O$ with Euclidean metric, and $\partial\Sigma' \subset C_1$. From our assumption that $n \leq 7$, it follows from the classification of stable minimal cone by J.Simons [Sim68] that Σ' is actually a hyperplane. Moreover, as each Σ_i minimizes the volume in C_{R_i} , we see $\Sigma' \cup O$ minimizes the volume in C_1 . Hence, Σ' coincides with the standard disk $\{z = 0\} \cap C_1$, and (4.2) immediately follows.

Furthermore, by the minimizing property of each Σ_i and Σ' , we see the convergence from $\frac{1}{R_i}\Sigma_i$ to Σ' is of multiplicity one. From this it is not hard to see Σ , the limit of Σ_i , has exactly one end.

Let us return to the proof of Lemma 4.1. By Proposition 9 in [EK23], Σ is asymptotic to a hyperplane Π at infinity, with desired decay estimate for derivatives. (4.2) implies Π must be parallel to S_0 , and the conclusion follows. \square

For convenience of later discussion, we introduce the following conception of slope

Definition 4.2. *For a piecewise smooth hypersurface V in $M \setminus K$, we define the slope of a regular point $p \in V$ to be the dihedral angle of the tangent hyperplane of V at p and S_0 , with respect to Euclidean metric.*

Obviously, if we view V as a local graph over S_0 with graph function u , then the slope at p coincides with $\arctan |\bar{\nabla}u|$.

Clearly, Σ separates M into two parts: the upper part M_+ and the lower part M_- . By Theorem 1.1, there exists a positive number t_0 , such that the region in M beyond Σ_{t_0} is smoothly foliated by $\Sigma_t (t \geq t_0)$. The key step in proving is to establish Lemma 4.12, which claims the existence of $t_1 > t_0$, such that for $t > t_1$, Σ_t is stable under asymptotic constant variation. We would achieve this by picking a suitable point $p \in \Sigma_t$ and constructing a minimal hypersurface Σ_p with desired property, and showing that Σ_t coincides with Σ_p .

For $t > t_0$, we can pick a point $p \in \Sigma_t$ with sufficiently large x_1 -coordinate, such that the minimizing geodesic γ joining p and Σ is very far from the compact set K defined in Definition 2.1, and γ is almost perpendicular

$$(4.3) \quad \inf\{x_1(q), q \in \gamma\} > 100$$

$$\langle \gamma', \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \rangle > 1 - \frac{1}{10000}$$

This is always possible due to the asymptotic flatness of M and Lemma 4.1.

We present the following metric deformation lemma, which is a slight modification of Lemma 31 from [EK23].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p \in M_+$ be stated as above, then for any $r_0 > 0$, there exists $0 < r < r_0$, an open set $W \subset M$ with compact closure, satisfying $W \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset$, and a family of Riemannian metrics $\{g(s)\}_{s \in [0,1]}$, such that the following holds*

- (1) $g(s) \rightarrow g$ smoothly as $t \rightarrow 0$
- (2) $g(s) = g$ in $M \setminus W$
- (3) $g(s) < g$ in W
- (4) $R(g(s)) > 0$ in $\{x \in W : \text{dist}(x, p) > r\}$
- (5) For i sufficiently large, Σ_i is weakly mean convex and strictly mean convex at one interior point under $g(s)$ with respect to the normal vector pointing into M_- .

Moreover, W satisfies following properties:

- (I) ∂W is piecewise smooth.
- (II) If there exists a smooth hypersurface V touching ∂W from the outside at q , then q lies in the regular part in ∂W .
- (III) There exists a constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$, if $q \in W \cap M_+$ has slope smaller than ϵ_0 , then $\text{dist}(q, p) < 6r$.

Proof. We follow the main strategy of Lemma 31 in [EK23]. See also [CCE16] and [Li24].

By the calculation of [Li24], if we can find $v \in C^\infty(M)$ and the set W , such that

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} v &= 0 \text{ in } M \setminus W \\ v &< 0 \text{ in } W \\ \Delta v &< 0 \text{ in } \{x \in W : \text{dist}(x, p) > r\} \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu_i} &> 0 \text{ on } \Sigma_i \end{aligned}$$

Then $g_s = (1 + sv)^{\frac{4}{n-2}}g$ satisfies the desired property.

As in [Li24] we can find a nonpositive function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &> 0 \text{ on } (0, 6) \\ (4n-1)f'(x) + xf''(x) &< 0 \text{ on } (1, 6) \\ f(x) &= 0 \text{ for } x \geq 6 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by choosing $0 < r_0 < \text{inj}(M)$ sufficiently small, we can guarantee $\Delta_g d(x, q)^2 < 8n$ on any geodesic ball $B_{6r}(q)$ for $r < r_0$. Define $v_{r,q} = r_0^2 f(\frac{d(x,q)}{r_0})$, so the calculation in [Li24] yields


$$\begin{aligned} v_{r,q} &= 0 \text{ in } M \setminus B_{6r}(q) \\ v_{r,q} &< 0 \text{ in } B_{6r}(q) \\ \Delta v_{r,q} &< 0 \text{ in } B_{6r}(q) \setminus B_r(q) \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, If $B_{6r}(q) \cap V \neq \emptyset$ for some hypersurface V , then there holds

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{\partial v_{r,q}}{\partial \nu} = r_0 f'(\frac{d(x,q)}{r_0}) \langle \nabla d(x, q), \nu \rangle \text{ on } V$$

with ν denoting the unit normal of V .

Let γ be the minimizing geodesic joining p and Σ , with endpoints p and $p_0 \in \Sigma$. By our assumption γ lies far from the compact set K , the geometry around γ is very similar to that of the Euclidean space. Let N be a large interger with $r = \frac{L(\gamma)}{4N} < r_0$. Choose $p_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, N)$ along γ such that $\text{dist}(p_i, p_{i+1}) = 4r (i = 0, 1, \dots, N-1)$ with $p_N = p$.

FIGURE 5. The construction of W

Then p_i coincides with the image of exponential map determined by p_0 , by evaluating at $4ir$.

It is readily to check that, the p_i 's chosen above satisfies

$$B_r(p_i) \subset B_{5r}(p_{i+1}) \setminus B_{3r}(p_{i+1}), \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1$$

$$B_{6r}(p_i) \cap \Sigma = \emptyset, i = 2, \dots, N; B_{6r}(p_1) \cap \Sigma \neq \emptyset.$$

Following [EK23], we define a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N recursively by $a_1 = 1$ and set a_2, \dots, a_N by

$$a_i = 1 + \frac{\sup\{\Delta v_{r, q_{i-1}}(x), x \in B_r(q_{i-1})\}}{\inf\{\Delta v_{r, q_i}(x), x \in B_{5r}(q_i) \setminus B_{3r}(q_i)\}} a_{i-1}$$

Let

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i v_{r, p_i}$$

$$W = \bigcup_{i=1}^N B_{6r}(p_i)$$

then the first three equations in (4.4) could be satisfied.

For the last equation in (4.4), if we choose r sufficiently small, then $\Sigma \cap B_{6r}(p_1)$ could be regarded as a hyperplane. It is not hard to see from Figure 5 that

$$(4.6) \quad \langle \nabla d(x, q), \nu \rangle > \frac{2}{3} - \epsilon'$$

for any $q \in \Sigma \cap B_{6r}(p_1)$, with ν denoting the outer normal of Σ pointing inward M_- , and ϵ' can be arranged arbitrarily small by possibly choosing p with larger $x_1(p)$. Since Σ_i converges to Σ , (4.6) also holds for Σ_i when i is sufficiently large. The last equation of (4.4) then follows immediately (4.5). This shows the metric $g(s)$ has desired properties.

Next, we investigate properties (I)(II)(III) in describing the shape of W . (I) follows immediately from the construction. (II) follows from Figure 5 as the outer dihedral angle β of tangent hyperplanes of $\partial B_{6r}(p_i)$ and $\partial B_{6r}(p_{i+1})$ on $\partial B_{6r}(p_i) \cap \partial B_{6r}(p_{i+1})$ is less than π . (III) also follows from Figure 5, since for any $q \in \partial W \cap M_+$ the slope of q with respect to ∂W is bounded from below by $\cot \alpha > 2\sqrt{2} - \epsilon'$ for ϵ' arbitrarily small, provided that q is not in the upper hemisphere of $\partial B_{6r}(p)$, so the conclusion follows. \square

Under this perturbed metric, we next aim to find a free boundary minimal surface in \mathcal{F}_R . We need the following existence result for free boundary minimal hypersurface.

Lemma 4.4. *Let N be a n -Riemannian manifold with piecewise smooth boundary ($n \leq 7$), $\partial N = \partial_{\text{eff}} N \cup \partial_{\text{side}} N$, with $\partial_{\text{eff}} N = \partial_+ N \sqcup \partial_- N$, such that each of $\partial_+ N, \partial_- N$ and $\partial_{\text{side}} N$ is smooth. Assume the mean curvature on $\partial_{\pm} N$ with respect to outer normal is everywhere nonnegative, and strictly positive somewhere on both $\partial_{\pm} N$. Furthermore, assume the dihedral angle of $\partial_+ N$ with $\partial_{\text{side}} N$ is acute, and the dihedral angle of $\partial_- N$ with $\partial_{\text{side}} N$ equals $\frac{\pi}{2}$.*

Let

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ \Sigma = \partial \Omega \cap \mathring{N}, \Omega \text{ is a Caccioppoli set in } N, \partial_- N \subset \Omega, \partial_+ N \cap \Omega = \emptyset \}$$

Then one can find a hypersurface $\hat{\Sigma}$ minimizing the volume in the class \mathcal{C} . Further more, $\hat{\Sigma}$ is smooth away from ∂N , and is disjoint with $\partial_{\pm} N$.

Proof. The lemma follows from Theorem 3.1 in [Li24]. The acute angle part follows from Lemma 2.14 in [CCZ23], by letting $\mu = 0$ in Lemma 2.14 in [CCZ23]. \square

We need the following monotonicity formula for free boundary minimal hypersurface

Lemma 4.5 (Theorem 3.4 in [GLZ20]). *Let $(N, \partial N)$ be a Riemannian manifold with $|\text{sec}| < k$, injective radius bounded from below by i_0 and the square of the second fundamental form $|A|^2$ of ∂N bounded from above by Λ . Let $(\Sigma, \partial \Sigma) \subset (N, \partial N)$ be a free boundary minimal hypersurface in N . Then there exists L_0, Λ_0 depending only on k, i_0, Λ such that the following holds:*


$$(4.7) \quad e^{\Lambda_0 \sigma} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_\sigma(p))}{\sigma^{n-1}} \leq e^{\Lambda_0 \rho} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_\rho(p))}{\rho^{n-1}}$$

for $0 < \sigma < \rho < L_0$, when $p \in \partial N$.

Next, we study the existence of the area minimizing free boundary hypersurface in $(C_R, g(s))$. First, we need some notations: For t_1, t_2 with $|t_i| > 1$ ($i = 1, 2$), $t_1 < t_2$, we denote $S_{[t_1, t_2]}$ to be the region in M between t_1 and t_2 . For a point $p \in M \setminus K$, we define $z(p)$ to be the z -coordinate of p .

We begin by showing the following result concerning height estimate of the free boundary hypersurface in cylinder.

Lemma 4.6. *There exists constants $R_0 > 0, \eta = \eta(k, i_0, \Lambda) > 0$, with k, i_0 representing the curvature upper bound and injective radius lower bound of the asymptotically flat manifold*

FIGURE 6. Covering V by small geodesic balls

$(M, g(s))$, Λ representing the upper bound of second fundamental form of C_R , such that for $R > R_0$, there holds

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(V_0 \cap (C_R \cap S_{[-h,h]})) \geq \eta(Z(V_0 \cap (C_R \cap S_{[-h,h]})) - 2)$$

with Z given by (4.1). Here, V_0 is an embedded hypersurface in C_R with $\partial V_0 \subset \partial C_R$, such that the portion of V_0 inside $(C_R \cap S_{[-h,h]})$ is minimal in free boundary sense, with respect to the boundary portion of ∂C_R between the coordinate hyperplanes $S_{\pm h}$.

Proof. By the asymptotic flatness of $(M, g(s))$, we can choose $R_0 > 1$, such that for $R > R_0$, for any two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus C_{R-1}$, the following inequality holds

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{1}{2}d_{\mathbb{R}^n}(p, q) < d_{g(s)}(p, q) < 2d_{\mathbb{R}^n}(p, q)$$

Furthermore, it is clear that k, i_0 and Λ exists as positive number, owing to the asymptotic flatness. By Lemma 4.5 and the monotonicity formula for minimal surface without boundary ([CM11] P234), there exists $L_0, \Lambda_0 > 0$ depending only on k, i_0, Λ , such that for $p \in V \cap (C_R \cap S_{[-h+L_0, h-L_0]})$, the monotonicity formula

$$e^{\Lambda_0 \sigma} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(V_0 \cap B_\sigma(p))}{\sigma^{n-1}} \leq e^{\Lambda_0 \rho} \frac{\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(V_0 \cap B_\rho(p))}{\rho^{n-1}}$$

holds, provided one of the following holds:

- (1) $p \in \partial M$, $0 < \sigma < \rho < L_0$.
- (2) $p \in \text{Int } M$, $B_\tau(p) \cap \partial V = \emptyset$, $0 < \sigma < \rho < \tau < L_0$.

Here we require $p \in C_R \cap S_{[-h+L_0, h-L_0]}$ to ensure that $B_\sigma(p)$ and $B_\rho(p)$ lie between $S_{\pm h}$, so the intersection of $B_\sigma(p)$ and $B_\rho(p)$ with V_0 lies in the minimal part of V_0 .

In the following, for simplicity of the notation, we set $V = V_0 \cap (C_R \cap S_{[-h,h]})$ to be the minimal portion on V_0 . Fix $d < \min\{\frac{L_0}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$. Let us assume that either $|Z_+(V)|$ or $|Z_-(V)|$ is greater than 1, or else (4.8) automatically holds. Without loss of generality we assume $Z_+(V) > 1$.

Case 1: $Z_-(V) < -1$.

In this case, we can pick $Z_-(V) < a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_k = -1$, $1 = a_{k+1} < a_{k+2} < \dots < a_l < Z_+(V)$, such that $a_{i+1} - a_i > 5d$. Then for sufficiently large $Z(V)$, we can always find a_i 's such that

$$\begin{aligned} l &> \lceil \frac{Z_+(V) - 1}{5d} \rceil + \lceil \frac{-1 - Z_-(V)}{5d} \rceil \\ &\geq \frac{Z(V) - 2}{5d} \end{aligned}$$

Here $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the minimal integer greater than or equal to x .

Case 2: $Z_-(V) \geq -1$.

In this case, we can pick $\max\{Z_-(V), 1\} < a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_l < Z_+(V)$, such that $a_{i+1} - a_i > 5d$, and

$$l > \lceil \frac{Z_+(V) - \max\{Z_-(V), 1\}}{5d} \rceil > \frac{Z(V) - 2}{5d}$$

where in the second inequality we have used $\max\{Z_-(V), 1\} \leq Z_-(V) + 2$.

Denote

$$b_i = a_i + d, c_i = a_i + 2d, d_i = a_i + 3d, e_i = a_i + 4d$$

We aim to pick a point p_i in $S_{[b_i, e_i]}$ for each i , and obtain a uniform lower bound estimate of $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_d(p_i) \cap V)$.

If $\Omega_i \cap \partial V \neq \emptyset$, then we simply pick $p_i \in \partial V \cap \Omega_i$. According to the choice of R_0 in (4.9), the geodesic ball $B_{\frac{d}{2}}(p_i)$ always lies in $S_{[a_i, a_{i+1}]}$. By (4.7) we have

$$(4.10) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_d(p_i) \cap V) \geq \Theta^{n-1}(V, p_i) \omega_{n-1} \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{n-1} = \frac{1}{2^n} \omega_{n-1} d^{n-1}.$$

If $\Omega_i \cap \partial V = \emptyset$, we discuss the following two cases:

Case 1: There exists a point p_i with $\text{dist}(p_i, \partial V) > d$. Then $\partial V \cap B_d(p_i) = \emptyset$. By the monotonicity formula we have

$$(4.11) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_d(p_i) \cap V) \geq \Theta^{n-1}(V, p_i) \omega_{n-1} d^{n-1} = \omega d^{n-1}.$$

Case 2: $V \cap S_{[b_i, e_i]}$ lies entirely in a d -neighbourhood of ∂C_R . We pick a point $p_i \in S_{[c_i, d_i]}$. By the choice of R_0 in (4.9) we know the geodesic ball $B_{\frac{d}{2}}(p_i)$ lies in $S_{[b_i, e_i]}$. Furthermore, since there is no boundary point of V in $S_{[b_i, e_i]}$, we have $B_{\frac{d}{2}}(p_i) \cap \partial V = \emptyset$. Consequently, the monotonicity formula applies:

$$(4.12) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(B_{\frac{1}{2}d}(p_i) \cap V) \geq \Theta^{n-1}(V, p_i) \omega_{n-1} \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^{n-1} = \frac{\omega_{n-1}}{2^{n-1}} d^{n-1}.$$

Since $B_{\frac{d}{2}}(p_i) \subset S_{a_i, a_{i+1}}$, it is straightforward to see the ball we construct are disjoint with each other. Combining (4.10)(4.11)(4.12) we conclude that


$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(V) > \frac{\omega_{n-1}}{2^n} d^{n-1} l > \frac{\omega_{n-1}}{10 \cdot 2^n} d^{n-2} (Z(V) - 2).$$

□

Let $C_{R_i}^+$ be the region in C_{R_i} beyond Σ_i . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{R_i} &= \{\Sigma = \partial\Omega \cap \dot{C}_{R_i}^+, \Omega \text{ is a Caccioppoli set in } C_{R_i}^+, \\ &\quad \Sigma_i \subset \Omega, \quad \Omega \cap \{z \geq h\} = \emptyset \text{ for some } h\} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.7. *For the cylinder $(C_{R_i}, g(s))$, there exists an free boundary minimal hypersurface $\Sigma_i(s)$ which minimizes the volume in \mathcal{G}_{R_i} . Moreover, $\Sigma_i(s)$ intersects W .*

FIGURE 7. A diagram for $C_{R_i, h}$

Proof. Without particularly indicated, the Hausdorff measure throughout this proof is considered with respect to metric $g(s)$. For h sufficiently large, denote $C_{R_i, h}$ to be the region in C_{R_i} between the coordinate hyperplane S_h and Σ_i . By a C^0 -small ϵ -perturbation of the metric in a δ_0 -neighbourhood of $S_{\pm h}$, we obtain a metric $g^\epsilon(s)$ on $C_{R_i, h}$, such that the mean curvature on S_h with respect to outer normal is positive, and the dihedral angle of S_h with ∂C_{R_i} is acute inside $C_{R_i, h}$. Here a C^0 -small ϵ -perturbation means that

$$(1 - \epsilon)g^\epsilon(t)(v, v) < g(s)(v, v) < (1 + \epsilon)g^\epsilon(t)(v, v)$$

for all $v \in TC_{R_i, h}$. $C_{R_i, h}$ then satisfies the condition in Lemma 4.4 satisfied by N , with $\partial_+ N = C_{R_i} \cap S_h$, $\partial_- N = \Sigma_i$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{R_i, h} = & \{ \Sigma = \partial\Omega \cap \mathring{C}_{R_i, h}, \Omega \text{ is a Caccioppoli set in } C_{R_i, h}, \\ & \Sigma_i \subset \Omega, \quad (C_{R_i} \cap S_h) \cap \Omega = \emptyset \} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.4, there exists a volume minimizing free boundary minimal hypersurface $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ in the class $\mathcal{G}_{R_i, h}$.

We claim for ϵ sufficiently small, $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ must intersect with W . Or else, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s)) &= \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s)) \\ &< (1 + \epsilon)\mathcal{H}_{g^\epsilon(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s)) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\mathcal{H}_{g^\epsilon(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) \\ &< \frac{1 + \epsilon}{1 - \epsilon}\mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) = \mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) - (\mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) - \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i)) + \frac{2\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon}\mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) \\ &\leq \mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s)) - (\mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) - \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i)) + \frac{2\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon}\mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality in line 2 we have used the volume minimizing property of $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ under the metric $g^\epsilon(t)$ and for the last inequality we have used the volume minimizing

property of Σ_i under the metric g . This implies

$$0 < \mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) - \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) < \frac{2\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i)$$

A contradiction then follows by letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Next, we show for h sufficiently large, $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ does not touch the small neighbourhood of S_h where the metric has been changed to $g^\epsilon(s)$. We argue by contradiction. Pick a component $\hat{\Sigma}$ of $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ which intersects the δ_0 neighbourhood of S_h . We show that $\hat{\Sigma}$ must intersect $K \cup W$. If not, then $\hat{\Sigma}$ lies entirely in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n(O)$. Denote $\Gamma = \partial\hat{\Sigma}$, and assume that $\Sigma_i^h(s) = \partial\Omega \cap C_{R_i, h}^\circ$. We discuss following cases respectively

(1) $\Gamma = \emptyset$, then $\hat{\Sigma}$ is a closed hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1^n(O)$. By Jordan-Brouwer separation Theorem, we find an open set $U \subset M$ with compact closure satisfying $\partial U = \hat{\Sigma}$. Replacing Ω by $\Omega \cup U$ eliminates the component $\hat{\Sigma}$, and the volume of $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ decreases. A contradiction.

(2) Γ bounds a compact region P on $\partial C_{R_i} \cong S^{n-2} \times \mathbb{R}$. In this case, $P \cup \hat{\Sigma}$ is a closed hypersurface, and the argument for (1) carries through.

(3) Γ does not bound compact region in ∂C_{R_i} . In this case, by applying Jordan-Brouwer Theorem to two point compactification of $S^{n-2} \times \mathbb{R}$ diffeomorphic to S^{n-1} , we see Γ separates ∂C_{R_i} into two noncompact regions, P_- and P_+ . Again by Jordan-Brouwer Theorem, $\hat{\Sigma} \cup P_-$ bounds a noncompact region Ω' , so we have $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathcal{G}_{R_i, h}$, and it must intersect with W .

Therefore, we have found a component $\hat{\Sigma}$ of $\Sigma_i^h(s)$, intersecting both $S_{h-\delta_0}$ and $K \cup W$. The portion of $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ inside $C_{R_i, h-\delta_0}$ is minimal in free boundary sense. By Lemma 4.6 we deduce

$$(4.13) \quad \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s) \cap C_{R_i, h-\delta_0}) \geq \eta Z(\Sigma_i^h(s) \cap C_{R_i, h-\delta_0})$$

Note that

$$(4.14) \quad \begin{aligned} Z_+(\Sigma_i^h(s) \cap C_{R_i, h-\delta_0}) &= h - \delta_0 \\ Z_-(\Sigma_i^h(s) \cap C_{R_i, h-\delta_0}) &\leq \max\{1, Z_+(K \cup W)\} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we note that

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s) \cap C_{R_i, h-\delta_0}) &\leq \mathcal{H}_{g(s)}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) < \mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(\Sigma_i) \\ &\leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}_g^{n-1}(C_{R_i} \cap S_t) = \omega_{n-1} R_i^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

By Letting $h \rightarrow \infty$, (4.15) contradicts with (4.13)(4.14).

Consequently, there exists $h_0 > 0$, for $h > h_0$, $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ does not touch the region where $g(s)$ has been changed. This shows $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ is entirely minimal under the metric $g(s)$. Therefore

$$(4.16) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s)) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^{h_0}(s)) \text{ for all } h > h_0$$

since $\Sigma_i^{h_0}(s)$ lies entirely in C_{R_i, h_0} .

Finally, it remains to show $\Sigma_i^h(s)$ minimizes the volume globally in \mathcal{G}_{R_i} for $h > h_0$. If not, there exists $\Sigma' \subset \mathcal{G}_{R_i}$ with $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma') < \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^h(s)) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i^{h_0}(s))$. Then by taking h sufficiently large such that $\Sigma' \subset C_{R_i, h}$, we obtain a contradiction with the minimizing property of $\Sigma_i^h(s)$! Set $\Sigma_i(s) = \Sigma_i^h(s)$ for any $h > h_0$. Though the choice of $\Sigma_i(s)$ may not be unique, each choice has the same volume due to (4.16), and it turns out $\Sigma_i(s)$ minimizes the volume in \mathcal{G}_{R_i} . This completes the proof of Lemma 4.7. \square

By letting $R_i \rightarrow \infty$, We obtain a sequence of free boundary volume minimizing surface $\Sigma_i(s)$ under the metric $g(s)$, each of which intersects with the compact set W . Since $\Sigma_i(s)$ is a minimizing boundary it is standard to obtain the following volume estimate

$$(4.17) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\Sigma_i(s) \cap B_R) \leq \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_R) \leq \omega_{n-1} R^{n-1}.$$

Here B_R is the coordinate ball in the asymptotically flat end. It then follows from standard results in geometric measure theory that $\Sigma_i(s)$ converges subsequentially to a complete and noncompact properly embedded hypersurface $\Sigma(s)$ in $(M, g(s))$, satisfying the same volume estimate as (4.17).

Lemma 4.8. *There exists $r_1 > 0$, such that $\Sigma(s)$ is a graph over $S_0 \setminus B_{r_1}^n$, and for any $\epsilon > 0$ the graph function u satisfies*

$$(4.18) \quad |y|_{\bar{g}}^{-1} |u(y) - a| + |\bar{\nabla} u(y)|_{\bar{g}} + |y|_{\bar{g}} |\bar{\nabla}^2 u(y)| = O(|y|^{-\tau+\epsilon})$$

Consequently, $\Sigma(s)$ is an asymptotically flat manifold with mass zero.

Proof. Arguing as in Lemma 4.1, we see $\Sigma(s)$ has exactly one end. By Proposition 9 in [EK23], $\Sigma(s)$ is a graph with desired decay estimate as (4.18) over a hyperplane S' . If S' is not parallel to S_0 , then $\Sigma(s)$ would pass through Σ by Lemma 4.1. This contradicts with the fact that $\Sigma(s)$ lies in M^+ . The fact that $\Sigma(s)$ is an asymptotically flat manifold with mass zero follows immediately from (4.18) and the assumption that $\tau > n - 3$ \square

Lemma 4.9. *$\Sigma(s)$ is stable under asymptotically constant variation.*

Proof. Let X be a vector field on $\Sigma(s)$ which equals $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ outside a compact set and let $F_t : M \rightarrow M$ be the one parameter transformation group of X . For an embedded hypersurface V and a point $p \in V$, denote $a(p)$ to be the second derivative of the volume element of $F_t(V)$ with respect to t , evaluated at $t = 0$. It follows from [Sim83] that

$$\begin{aligned} a &= - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} R(X, e_i, X, e_i) + \operatorname{div}_V Z + (\operatorname{div}_V X)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |(D_{e_i} X)^\perp|^2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \langle e_i, D_{e_j} X \rangle \langle e_j, D_{e_i} X \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n-1}$ forms an locally orthonormal basis on V . $Z = D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} X$ is used to denote the acceleration vector field of the transformation F_t , and D denotes the covariant differentiation in M with respect to $g(s)$. Since $\Sigma_i(s)$ has least volume in the free boundary class in C_{R_i} , we have

$$(4.19) \quad \int_{\Sigma_i(s)} a d\mu \geq 0$$

for R_i sufficiently large.

By the asymptotic flatness, we have the following hold along each $\Sigma_i(s)$ and $\Sigma(s)$ outside a compact set:

$$(4.20) \quad \begin{aligned} Z &= D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = O(|x|^{-\tau-1}) \\ \operatorname{div}_{\Sigma_i(s)} Z &= O(|x|^{-\tau-2}), \operatorname{div}_{\Sigma(s)} Z = O(|x|^{-\tau-2}) \\ D_{e_i} X &= D_{e_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = O(|x|^{-\tau-1}) \\ R(X, e_i, X, e_i) &= O(|x|^{-\tau-2}) \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $a = O(|x|^{-\tau-2})$ along each $\Sigma_i(s)$ and $\Sigma(s)$. As $\tau + 2 > n - 3 + 2 = n - 1$, a must integrable over $\Sigma(s)$. Combining with (4.19) and the dominated convergence theorem we conclude that

$$\int_{\Sigma(s)} a d\mu \geq 0$$

We write $X = \hat{X} + \varphi\nu$, $Z = \hat{Z} + \psi\nu$, with \hat{X}, \hat{Z} tangent to $\Sigma(s)$ and ν the unit normal, $\hat{X} := \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \hat{X}_i e_i$, $\hat{X}_{i,j} := \langle D_{e_i} \hat{X}, e_j \rangle$. By the calculation of [Sch89] we have

$$\begin{aligned} G &= -2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \varphi \langle R(\hat{X}, e_i) \nu, e_i \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \langle R(\hat{X}, e_i) \hat{X}, e_i \rangle \\ &\quad + \operatorname{div} \hat{Z} + (\operatorname{div} \hat{X})^2 - 2A(\nabla \varphi, \hat{X}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} A(e_i, \hat{X})^2 \\ &\quad - 2\varphi \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} A(e_i, e_j) \hat{X}_{i,j} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \hat{X}_{i,j} \hat{X}_{j,i} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from the integration by part in [Sch89] that, for a bounded domain $D \subset \Sigma(s)$, there holds

$$(4.21) \quad \int_D G d\mu = \int_{\partial D} (\operatorname{div} \hat{X}) \langle \hat{X}, \eta \rangle - \sum_{i,j} \hat{X}_{i,j} \hat{X}_j \eta_i$$

$$(4.22) \quad -2\varphi \sum_{i,j} A(e_i, e_j) \hat{X}_i \eta_j + \langle \hat{Z}, \eta \rangle d\sigma$$

Here η denotes the outer normal of ∂D on $\Sigma(s)$ and $d\sigma$ denotes the volume element on ∂D .

By (4.18) we have

$$|A| = O(|y|^{-\tau-1+\epsilon})$$

Moreover, from (4.20) we see that outside a compact set the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{X}_{i,j} &= \langle \nabla_{e_i} \hat{X}, e_j \rangle = \langle \nabla_{e_i} X - \varphi\nu, e_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla_{e_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, e_j \rangle - \varphi A(e_i, e_j) \\ &= O(|y|^{-\tau-1}) \\ \langle \hat{Z}, \eta \rangle &= \langle Z, \eta \rangle = O(|y|^{-\tau-1+\epsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

Here, y is as in Lemma 4.8 to describe $\Sigma(s)$ as a graph outside a compact set. By choosing ϵ sufficiently small we have

$$G = O(|y|^{2-n-\epsilon})$$

Let $D = B_d$ be the d -geodesic ball on $\Sigma(s)$ and let $d \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$(4.23) \quad \int_{\Sigma(s)} |\nabla \varphi|^2 d\mu \geq \int_{\Sigma(s)} (\operatorname{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \varphi^2 d\mu$$

which holds for all the test function φ coinciding with $\varphi_0 = \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \nu \rangle$ outside a compact set.

From $\nu = \bar{\nu} + O(|y|^{-\tau})$ we obtain

$$\varphi_0 = \left\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial t}, \bar{\nu} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{(1 + |\bar{\nabla} u|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + O(|y|^{-\tau}) = 1 + O(|y|^{-\tau+\epsilon})$$

It follows that $\varphi_0 - 1$ is L^2 -integrable outside a compact set. Let ϕ be a C^1 function which equals to 1 outside a compact set and φ as above. Let ζ_d be a cut off function which equals 1 inside the geodesic ball B_d in $\Sigma(s)$ and 0 outside B_{2d} . Define

$$\phi_d = \zeta_d \phi + (1 - \zeta_d) \varphi$$

Note that $\operatorname{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 = O(|y|^{-\tau-2})$, and $\phi_d \rightarrow \phi$ in $W^{1,2}$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. It follows that (4.23) also holds for ϕ . This completes the proof of Lemma 4.9. \square

Remark 4.10. *By the same argument, we see that the conclusion remains true, provided that $\phi - 1$ has finite $W^{1,2}$ norm and ϕ is asymptotic to a constant at infinity. See also Remark 29 in [EK23].*

The following infinitesimal rigidity lemma is a consequence of Lemma 4.9, which follows from the argument in [Car16] and [EK23], and originates from the proof of the positive mass theorem [SY79] and [Sch89].

Lemma 4.11. *Suppose the ambient scalar curvature is nonnegative along $\Sigma(s)$, then $\Sigma(s)$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^n and totally geodesic. Moreover, we have $R = Ric(\nu, \nu) = 0$ along $\Sigma(s)$.*

Proof. Since the argument is well known to the experts we only give a sketch of the proof, and for a detailed treatment the readers may refer to P.14, P.15 in [Car16]. Let ϕ be the solution of the conformal Laplacian equation on $\Sigma(s)$ which equals to 1 at infinity. It follows that $(\Sigma(s), \phi^{\frac{4}{n-3}}g(s))|_{\Sigma(s)}$ is an asymptotically flat manifold with zero scalar curvature. The stability of $\Sigma(s)$ under asymptotically constant variation implies that the mass of $\Sigma(s)$ is non-increasing under the conformal deformation. Thus, the mass of $\Sigma(s)$ is nonpositive due to Lemma 4.8. By the positive mass theorem we see $(\Sigma(s), \phi^{\frac{4}{n-3}}g(s))|_{\Sigma(s)}$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . Again by Lemma 4.9, one deduces ϕ is a constant, so $\Sigma(s)$ is isometric to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . By letting $\phi = 1$ in (4.18) and using the rearrange formula

$$Ric(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2 = \frac{1}{2}(|A|^2 + R)$$

we see $\Sigma(s)$ is totally geodesic, which $R = Ric(\nu, \nu)$ along $\Sigma(s)$. \square

Lemma 4.12. *There exists $t_1 > t_0$ with the following property: If p is chosen in Σ_t with $t \geq t_1$, then by letting $r \rightarrow 0$, $s \rightarrow 0$, $\Sigma(s)$ subconverges locally smoothly to an area minimizing hypersurface Σ_p passing through p . Moreover, $\Sigma_p = \Sigma_t$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.7 we know $\Sigma_i(s) \cap W \neq \emptyset$ for each i . By letting $i \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\Sigma(s) \cap \bar{W} \neq \emptyset$. We discuss the following two situations:

Case 1: $\Sigma(s) \cap W \neq \emptyset$.

In this case, $\Sigma(s)$ must intersect $B_r(p)$. Or else, the ambient scalar curvature turns out to be nonnegative along $\Sigma(s)$, and strictly positive somewhere on $\Sigma(s)$, due to Lemma 4.3, which violates Lemma 4.11. Consequently, by letting $r \rightarrow 0$, $s \rightarrow 0$, $\Sigma(s)$ must subconverge locally smoothly to an area minimizing hypersurface Σ_p passing through p , with respect to metric g .

To see Σ_p coincides with Σ_t , recall that each $\Sigma(s)$ is asymptotic to certain hyperplane parallel to S_0 from Lemma 4.8. It follows that Σ_p is also asymptotic to a hypersurface $S_{t'}$ for some t' . If $t' > t_0$, by uniqueness statement Proposition 3.16 we see that Σ_p coincides with $\Sigma_{t'}$. As $p \in \Sigma_t$, we obtain $t' = t$. If $t' < t_0$, By increasing ζ we see Σ_p must touch Σ_ζ for some $\zeta > t_0$, so Σ_p coincides with Σ_ζ . Given the fact that $p \in \Sigma_t$ we see $\Sigma_\zeta = \Sigma_t$ and the conclusion follows.

Case 2: $\Sigma(s) \cap W = \emptyset$.

In this case, $\Sigma(s)$ must touch ∂W somewhere. For any point $p \in M \setminus K$ we introduce following notations. Denote


$$l_p^+ = \{q \in M_+, x_j(q) = x_j(p), j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1; z(q) \geq z(p)\}$$

$$l_p^- = \{q \in M_+, x_j(q) = x_j(p), j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1; z(q) \leq z(p)\}$$

We hope to verify the following topological claim

Claim $\Sigma(s)$ intersects l_p^+ .

Proof of the Claim. Assume $\Sigma(s)$ is asymptotic to $S_{s'}$. We pick a sufficiently large such that both W and $\Sigma(s)$ lie below S_a . Moreover, we pick $b < -1$ such that both Σ and K lie


 FIGURE 8. The case that $\Sigma(s)$ touches ∂W in M

beyond S_b . Let Ω be the region between S_a and S_b , so Ω is homeomorphic to $\Omega_0 \cup_{S^{n-1}} K$, with $\Omega_0 = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [a, b] \setminus B_1^n(0)$.

Let

$$l = (l_p^+ \cup \gamma \cup l_{p_0}^-) \cap \bar{\Omega}$$

be a curve joining S_a and S_b . From the long exact sequence of relative homology group and the fact $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [a, b] \setminus l \cong (\mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \setminus \{0\} \times [a, b]$ we know that

$$(4.24) \quad H_{n-1}(\Omega_0 \setminus l) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$$

By Lemma 4.8 $\Sigma(s)$ is asymptotic to $S_{s'}$, so $\Sigma(s)$ is a graph over $S_{s'}$ outside a compact set. Consider a disk $D_\rho \subset S_{s'}$. By choosing ρ sufficiently large, ∂D_ρ represents the generator α of the first \mathbb{Z} summand in (4.24). The generator β of the second \mathbb{Z} summand is represented by the inner boundary of Ω_0 : $\partial B_1^n(0) \cong S^{n-1}$. By the Mayer-Vietoris sequence for Ω_0 and K we see that

$$0 \longrightarrow H_{n-1}(S^{n-1}) \xrightarrow{i_1 \oplus i_2} H_{n-1}(\Omega_0) \oplus H_{n-1}(K) \xrightarrow{j} H_{n-1}(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0$$

Since i_1 maps the generator of $H_{n-1}(S^{n-1}) = \mathbb{Z}$ to β , the first summand in (4.24) is mapped injectively by j into $H_{n-1}(\Omega)$. This shows ∂D_ρ is not homologous to zero in $H_{n-1}(\Omega)$, and the same thing holds for $\{(x, u_s(x)), x \in \partial D_\rho\}$, where u_s denotes the graph function of $\Sigma(s)$ outside a compact set due to Lemma 4.8.

On the other hand, by Lemma 4.8, we know $\{(x, u_s(x)), x \in \partial D_\rho\}$ is the boundary of a compact region in $\Sigma(s)$. This shows $\Sigma(s)$ intersects with l . However, $\Sigma(s) \cap W = \emptyset$, and $\Sigma(s)$ lies beyond Σ . This shows $\Sigma(s) \cap l_p^+ \neq \emptyset$. \square

Since $\Sigma(s) \cap W = \emptyset$, $\Sigma(s)$ turns out to be an area minimizing hypersurface with respect to the original metric g . By the same argument as in Case 1, we see that $\Sigma(s)$ coincide with $\Sigma_{t'}$ for $t' > t > t_1$. Let ϵ_0 be as in Lemma 4.3. When t_1 is sufficiently large, the slope of $\Sigma_{t'}$ is smaller than ϵ_0 . Assume $\Sigma_{t'}$ touches ∂W at q , then the slope of q with respect to ∂W is

also smaller than ϵ_0 . It follows from Lemma 4.3 that $\text{dist}(q, p) < 6r$. By Letting $r \rightarrow 0$, we see that $\Sigma(s)$ subconverge to an area minimizing hypersurface Σ_p passing through p , which in turn coincides with Σ_t . \square

Lemma 4.13. *For $t \geq t_1$, Σ_t is stable under asymptotically constant variation.*

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C^\infty(\Sigma_t)$ which equals to 1 outside a compact set on Σ_t . We can extend φ to a smooth function ϕ defined on M , such that ϕ equals to 1 outside a compact set. By the previous Lemma, there exists $s_j \rightarrow 0$, such that $\Sigma(s_j)$ converge to Σ_t locally smoothly. Therefore, on each ball $B_R \subset M$, there holds

$$(4.25) \quad \int_{\Sigma(s_j) \cap B_R} (\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \phi^2 d\mu \rightarrow \int_{\Sigma_t \cap B_R} |(\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \phi^2 d\mu$$

Moreover, by uniform decay estimate in Lemma 3.14, we have

$$(4.26) \quad \int_{\Sigma(s_j) \setminus B_R} (\text{Ric}(\nu, \nu) + |A|^2) \phi^2 d\mu = o(1)$$

where the $o(1)$ is independent of R . By letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, in conjunction with Lemma 4.9, (4.25)(4.26), we see Σ_t is stable under variation which equals 1 outside a compact set. Remark 4.10 implies the same thing holds true when φ is only required to be asymptotic to 1 in $W^{1,2}$ sense. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Lemma 4.8, Lemma 4.12 and Lemma 4.13, we see that for $t \geq t_1$, Σ_t is an area minimizing hypersurface which is asymptotically flat under induced metric, with zero mass and stable under asymptotic constant variation. It follows from Lemma 4.11 that Σ_t is isometric to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , totally geodesic and has normal Ricci curvature vanishing. By Proposition A.3, we deduce that the region beyond Σ_{t_1} is isometric to \mathbb{R}_+^n . Similarly, there exists $t_2 < 0$ such that the region below Σ_{t_2} is isometric to \mathbb{R}_-^n . By the definition of ADM mass we have

$$(4.27) \quad m = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2(n-1)\omega_{n-1}} \int_{\partial B_r(O)} (g_{ij,i} - g_{ii,j}) \nu^j d\bar{\mu}$$

with $\partial B_r(O)$ denoting the centered coordinate sphere of radius r . Since $\tau > n-3$, the term $(g_{ij,i} - g_{ii,j})$ decays faster than $|x|^{2-n}$. Let us denote the region between Σ_{t_2} and Σ_{t_1} by Ω_{t_2, t_1} , then it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\partial B_r(O) \cap \Omega_{t_2, t_1}) = O(r^{n-2})$$

where the Hausdorff measure is associated with Euclidean metric in \mathbb{R}^n . In conjunction with (4.27), we see $m = 0$. This is a contradiction. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let Σ be the globally minimizing hypersurface as in Definition 1.3, then for each R_i , $\Sigma_i = \Sigma \cap C_{R_i}$ serves as the free boundary minimizing hypersurface in Theorem 1.2. Furthermore, these Σ_i does not drift to infinity as each of them contains Σ_1 . It follows from Theorem 1.2 that $m = 0$, and M is isometric to \mathbb{R}^n . \square

APPENDIX A. SOME L^p ESTIMATE FOR SOLUTIONS TO ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

Let (\mathbf{R}^m, g) be a complete Riemannian manifold with g equivalent to the Euclidean metric. Then we have the following Sobolev inequality

$$\left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |w|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} dy \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} \leq C_m \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |Dw|^2 dy.$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^m)$.

Lemma A.1. Let $w \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^m) \cap W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^m) \cap L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}(\mathbf{R}^m)$ be the solution of the equation

$$(A.1) \quad a_{ij}D_{ij}w + b_iD_iw + cw = f$$

on \mathbf{R}^m with uniform elliptic condition

$$\lambda|\xi|^2 \leq a_{ij}\xi^i\xi^j$$

Then

$$(A.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |w|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} dy \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \\ & \leq \frac{C_m}{\lambda^2} \left(\left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |(D_j a_{ij} - b_i)^2 + 2\lambda c|^{\frac{m}{2}} dy \right)^{\frac{2}{m}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} w^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} + \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} \right)^{\frac{m+2}{2m}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. (A.1) can be rewritten as

$$(A.3) \quad D_i(a_{ij}D_jw) + (b_i - D_j a_{ij})D_iw + cw = f$$

Multiply w on two sides on (A.3) and integration by parts, we get

$$(A.4) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} a_{ij}D_iwD_jw dy = \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} (b_i - D_j a_{ij})wD_iw + cw^2 - fwdx$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |Dw|^2 dy \leq \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} (b_i - D_j a_{ij})wD_iw + cw^2 - fwdx \\ & \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |D_iw|^2 dy + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} (D_j a_{ij} - b_i)^2 w^2 dy + \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} cw^2 - fwdx \end{aligned}$$

By Sobolev inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |w|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} dy \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} \leq C_m \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |Dw|^2 dy \\ & \leq \frac{C_m}{\lambda^2} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} [(D_j a_{ij} - b_i)^2 + 2\lambda c] w^2 dy - \int_{\mathbf{R}^m} 2\lambda fwdx \right) \\ & \leq \frac{C_m}{\lambda^2} \left(\left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |(D_j a_{ij} - b_i)^2 + 2\lambda c|^{\frac{m}{2}} dy \right)^{\frac{2}{m}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} w^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{m}} + \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} \right)^{\frac{m+2}{2m}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |w|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Assume $w \neq 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |w|^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} dy \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} \\ & \leq \frac{C_m}{\lambda^2} \left(\left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |(D_j a_{ij} - b_i)^2 + 2\lambda c|^{\frac{m}{2}} dy \right)^{\frac{2}{m}} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} w^{\frac{2m}{m-2}} \right)^{\frac{m-2}{2m}} + \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |f|^{\frac{2m}{m+2}} \right)^{\frac{m+2}{2m}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary, we have

Corollary A.2. Let $w \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^m) \cap W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^m) \cap L^{\frac{2m}{m-2}}(\mathbf{R}^m)$ be the solution of the equation

$$(A.5) \quad a_{ij}D_{ij}w + b_iD_iw + cw = 0$$

Then there exists some ε_0 depending only on C_m and the uniform elliptic coefficient λ such that if

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^m} |(D_j a_{ij} - b_i)^2 + 2\lambda c|^{\frac{m}{2}} dy \leq \varepsilon_0$$

Then equation (A.5) only has the trivial solution $w = 0$.

Finally, we show the following proposition which is from [Liu13]:

Proposition A.3. *Suppose (M^n, g) and Σ_t , t_0 as those in Theorem 1.1. Moreover, Σ_t satisfies the following conditions:*

- Σ_t is isometric to \mathbb{R}^{n-1} and totally geodesic;
- $Ric(\nu, \nu) = 0$ along Σ_t , here ν is the outward unit normal vector of Σ_t .

Then $\{(x, z) \in M : |z| \geq t_0\}$ is flat.

Proof. Let's fix any Σ_t in $\{(x, z) \in M : |z| > t_0\}$ and denote it by Σ for simplicity, then we may write

$$g = d\rho^2 + g_{ij}(\rho, \theta)d\theta^i d\theta^j,$$

in a tubular neighborhood \mathcal{U} of Σ . Here ρ is the distance function to Σ in (M^n, g) , $\theta = (\theta^1, \dots, \theta^{n-1})$ is a local coordinates in Σ , hence, (ρ, θ) is a local coordinates in \mathcal{U} . Then by the first assumption of Σ in Proposition A.3, we see that for any tangential vectors X, Y, Z, W of Σ , we have $R(X, Y, Z, W) = 0$ along Σ , and by Codazzi equations, we know that $R(X, Y, Z, \nu) = 0$ along Σ as well. Hence, it suffices to show $R(\nu, Y, Z, \nu) = 0$ along Σ . To this end, Let $\Sigma_t \subset \mathcal{U}$ be another leaf in the foliation of these minimal hypersurfaces mentioned in Theorem 1.1 so that it can be written as graph over Σ by a smooth positive function u , i.e.

$$\Sigma_t := \{(u(\theta), \theta) : \theta \in \Sigma\},$$

let

$$f(\rho, \theta) = \rho - u(\theta),$$

then $f|_{\Sigma_t} = 0$. Let X, Y be any tangential vectors of Σ_t , then

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 f(X, Y) &= \nabla_{\Sigma_t}^2 f(X, Y) - \langle \nabla_X Y, \nu \rangle \nu(f) \\ &= \nabla_{\Sigma_t}^2 f(X, Y) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\nabla^2, \nabla_{\Sigma_t}^2$ denote the Hessian operator on (M, g) and Σ_t with the induced metric respectively, and we have utilized the fact that Σ_t is totally geodesic, hence on Σ_t we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\Sigma_t}^2 u(X, Y) &= \nabla^2 u(X, Y) \\ (A.6) \quad &= \nabla^2 \rho(X, Y) \\ &= -R(\nu, X, Y, \nu)u + O(|u|^3), \end{aligned}$$

where we have utilized the Riccati equation of $\nabla^2 \rho(X, Y)$ and the fact that Σ is totally geodesic. Finally, let θ_0 be any fixed point in Σ , then $u(\theta_0) > 0$ for each t , and denote $w(\theta) = u^{-1}(\theta_0)u(\theta)$, then by previous estimate, we know that w is uniformly bounded on Σ_t . Plug these issues into (A.6), and let Σ_t approaches to Σ , then we get

$$\nabla_{\Sigma}^2 w = -R(\nu, X, Y, \nu)w,$$

on Σ . Taking trace in the above equation and noting that $Ric(\nu, \nu) = 0$, we observe that w is a bounded harmonic function on Σ , hence it must be a positive constant. This implies for any tangential vectors X, Y on Σ ,

$$R(\nu, X, Y, \nu) = 0.$$

Therefore, the curvature tensor Rm of (M^n, g) vanishes along Σ , and Σ is arbitrary, we see that $\{(x, z) \in M : |z| \geq t_0\}$ is flat. □

REFERENCES

- [AR89] Michael T. Anderson and Lucio Rodríguez. Minimal surfaces and 3-manifolds of nonnegative Ricci curvature. *Math. Ann.*, 284(3):461–475, 1989.
- [Bel23] Costante Bellettini. Extensions of schoen–simon–yau and schoen–simon theorems via iteration à la de giorgi, 2023.
- [Car16] Alessandro Carlotto. Rigidity of stable minimal hypersurfaces in asymptotically flat spaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 55(3):Art. 54, 20, 2016.
- [CCE16] Alessandro Carlotto, Otis Chodosh, and Michael Eichmair. Effective versions of the positive mass theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 206(3):975–1016, 2016.
- [CCZ23] Shuli Chen, Jianchun Chu, and Jintian Zhu. Positive scalar curvature metrics and aspherical summands, 2023.
- [CM11] Tobias Holck Colding and William P. Minicozzi, II. *A course in minimal surfaces*, volume 121 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
- [EK23] Michael Eichmair and Thomas Koerber. Schoen's conjecture for limits of isoperimetric surfaces, 2023.
- [Giu84] Enrico Giusti. *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, volume 80 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984.
- [GLZ20] Qiang Guang, Martin Man-chun Li, and Xin Zhou. Curvature estimates for stable free boundary minimal hypersurfaces. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 759:245–264, 2020.
- [GT83] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, volume 224 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1983.
- [HY96] Gerhard Huisken and Shing-Tung Yau. Definition of center of mass for isolated physical systems and unique foliations by stable spheres with constant mean curvature. *Invent. Math.*, 124(1-3):281–311, 1996.
- [Li24] Chao Li. The dihedral rigidity conjecture for n-prisms. *J. Differential Geom.*, 126(1):329–361, 2024.
- [Liu13] Gang Liu. 3-manifolds with nonnegative ricci curvature. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 193(2):367–375, 2013.
- [LSW63] W. Littman, G. Stampacchia, and H. F. Weinberger. Regular points for elliptic equations with discontinuous coefficients. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (3)*, 17:43–77, 1963.
- [Sch89] Richard M. Schoen. Variational theory for the total scalar curvature functional for Riemannian metrics and related topics. 1365:120–154, 1989.
- [Sim68] James Simons. Minimal varieties in riemannian manifolds. *Ann. of Math.*, 88(2):62–105, 1968.
- [Sim83] Leon Simon. *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, volume 3 of *Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University*. Australian National University, Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983.
- [SS81] Richard Schoen and Leon Simon. Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 34(6):741–797, 1981.
- [SY79] Richard Schoen and Shing Tung Yau. On the proof of the positive mass conjecture in general relativity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 65(1):45–76, 1979.

KEY LABORATORY OF PURE AND APPLIED MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PEKING UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100871, P. R. CHINA

Email address: hsh0119@pku.edu.cn

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

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, HANGZHOU NORMAL UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU, 311121, P. R. CHINA

Email address: yhbmath@hznu.edu.cn