

WILLMORE-TYPE INEQUALITY IN UNBOUNDED CONVEX SETS

XIAOHAN JIA, GUOFANG WANG, CHAO XIA, AND XUWEN ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper we prove the following Willmore-type inequality: On an unbounded closed convex set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ($n \geq 2$), for any embedded hypersurface $\Sigma \subset K$ with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial K$ satisfying certain contact angle condition, there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} |H|^n \, dA \geq \text{AVR}(K) |\mathbb{B}^{n+1}|.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if Σ is a part of a sphere and $K \setminus \Omega$ is a part of the solid cone determined by Σ . Here Ω is the bounded domain enclosed by Σ and ∂K , H is the normalized mean curvature of Σ , and $\text{AVR}(K)$ is the asymptotic volume ratio of K . We also prove an anisotropic version of this Willmore-type inequality. As a special case, we obtain a Willmore-type inequality for anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces in a half-space.

MSC 2020: 53C42, 53C20 .

Keywords: Willmore inequality, free boundary hypersurface, capillary hypersurface, anisotropic mean curvature, asymptotic volume ratio

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	5
Notations	5
2.1. Minkowski norm and anisotropic geometry	5
2.2. Anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces in a half-space	7
3. Willmore inequality in unbounded convex sets	9
4. Willmore inequalities in a half-space	17
4.1. An alternative approach in the half-space case	17
4.2. Capillary hypersurfaces in a half-space	18
Appendix A. Properties of unbounded convex sets	20
References	21

XJ is supported by the NSFC (Grant No. 12401249) and Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province, China (Grant No. BK20241258).

CX is supported by the NSFC (Grant No. 12271449, 12126102).

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Willmore inequality [2, 16] states that for a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with smooth boundary, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\partial\Omega} |H|^n \, dA \geq |\mathbb{B}^{n+1}|, \quad (1.1)$$

where H is the normalized mean curvature of $\partial\Omega$ and $|\mathbb{B}^{n+1}|$ is the volume of unit ball \mathbb{B}^{n+1} . Moreover, equality in (1.1) holds if and only if Ω is a round ball.

Recently, Agostiniani-Fogagnolo-Mazzeri [1] proved the following Willmore-type inequality in Riemannian manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature.

Theorem A ([1, Theorem 1.1]). *Let (M^{n+1}, g) ($n \geq 2$) be a complete Riemannian manifold with nonnegative Ricci curvature and $\Omega \subset M$ a bounded open set with smooth boundary. Then*

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\partial\Omega} |H|^n \, dA \geq \text{AVR}(g) |\mathbb{B}^{n+1}|,$$

where $\text{AVR}(g)$ is the asymptotic volume ratio of M . Moreover, if $\text{AVR}(g) > 0$, equality holds if and only if $M \setminus \Omega$ is isometric to $([r_0, \infty) \times \partial\Omega, dr^2 + \left(\frac{r}{r_0} g_{\partial\Omega}\right)^2)$ with

$$r_0 = \left(\frac{|\partial\Omega|}{\text{AVR}(g) |\mathbb{S}^n|} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

Soon after Wang [15] gave a short proof of Theorem A, which is based on Heintze-Karcher's comparison theorem in Riemannian geometry.

In this paper, we study a similar problem in *Euclidean unbounded closed convex sets*. Let us first introduce some terminologies and properties of unbounded closed convex sets, which are needed to state our main result. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ ($n \geq 2$) be an unbounded closed convex set. We denote by $\text{Reg}(\partial K)$ the regular part of ∂K , that is, the set of points near which ∂K can be locally written as a C^1 -hypersurface, and $\text{Sing}(\partial K) = \partial K \setminus \text{Reg}(\partial K)$ the singular part of ∂K . For $x \in \text{Reg}(\partial K)$, we denote by $\bar{N}(x)$ the outward unit normal to ∂K at x . Let $B_R(x)$ denote the open ball of radius R centered at x .

We define

$$\text{AVR}(K) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|B_R(0) \cap K|}{|\mathbb{B}^{n+1}| R^{n+1}}.$$

For the well-definedness of $\text{AVR}(K)$ and its generalization see Appendix A below. Moreover, It is not difficult to check that

$$\text{AVR}(K) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|B_R(p) \cap K|}{|\mathbb{B}^{n+1}| R^{n+1}},$$

for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Our main result in this paper is the following Willmore-type inequality in unbounded convex sets.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be an unbounded closed convex set. Let $\Sigma \subset K$ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \text{Reg}(\partial K)$ intersecting ∂K transversally such that*

$$\langle \nu(x), \bar{N}(x) \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Here ν denotes the outward unit normal to Σ with respect to Ω , the bounded domain enclosed by Σ and ∂K . Then there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} |H|^n dA \geq \text{AVR}(K) |\mathbb{B}^{n+1}|. \quad (1.2)$$

Moreover, equality in (1.2) holds if and only if Σ is a part of a sphere and $K \setminus \Omega$ is a part of the solid cone determined by Σ .

Our theorem can be viewed as an extrinsic counterpart of Theorem A. The approach to this theorem is inspired by Wang's short proof [15] of Theorem A based on Heintze-Karcher's comparison [7], and also inspired by our recent works on Heintze-Karcher-type inequalities in various circumstances, see [8–10]. We refer the interested reader to [9, Theorem 1.2] for the Heintze-Karcher-type inequality in arbitrary convex sets, which could be viewed as a "dual" version of the above Willmore inequality in unbounded convex sets.

We would like to call attention to a result by Choe-Ghomi-Ritore [3], which says that for a compact free boundary hypersurface $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ outside a convex set, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} |H|^n dA \geq \frac{1}{2} |\mathbb{B}^{n+1}|$$

with equality holds if and only if Σ is a hemisphere lying in a half-space. This inequality leads to an optimal relative isoperimetric inequality in [4]. See also [12]. In contrast all our results in this paper hold for compact hypersurfaces *in a convex set*.

In view of our previous work [9], it is not surprising that we could in fact establish the following Willmore-type inequality in unbounded convex sets, with anisotropy taken into account. Here anisotropy means a smooth positive function $F : \mathbb{S}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ on the unit sphere (\mathbb{S}^n, σ) such that $(\nabla^2 F + F\sigma)$ is positive definite. In literature F is usually called a Minkowski norm. (F induces a norm if F is even, i.e. $F(-x) = F(x)$. In the paper we do not require the evenness.) With respect to a Minkowski norm F , one can define (unit) Wulff ball \mathcal{W}^F , asymptotic volume ratio AVR_F for unbounded convex sets, the anisotropic unit normal ν_F and the normalized anisotropic mean curvature H^F for a hypersurface. For more definitions and notation see Section 2 and also Appendix A below.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be an unbounded closed convex set. Let $\Sigma \subset K$ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \text{Reg}(\partial K)$ intersecting ∂K transversally such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), \bar{N}(x) \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma. \quad (1.3)$$

Then there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA \geq \text{AVR}_F(K) |\mathcal{W}^F|. \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover, equality in (1.4) holds if and only if Σ is a part of a Wulff shape and $K \setminus \Omega$ is a part of the solid cone determined by Σ .

Note that Theorem 1.1 is a special case of Theorem 1.2 with $F(\xi) = |\xi|$.

The Willmore-type inequality (1.4) may be applied to prove relative isoperimetric inequality in unbounded convex sets, as Choe-Ghomi-Ritore [4] did outside convex sets. We remark that the relative isoperimetric-type inequality in unbounded convex sets in the isotropic case, i.e. $F(\xi) = |\xi|$, has been proved by Leonardi-Ritoré-Vernadakis [11].

When $K = \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$, the upper half-space, by choosing $F(\xi) = |\xi| - \cos \theta_0 \langle \xi, E_{n+1} \rangle$ for some $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$, we get from Theorem 1.2 the following Willmore-type inequality for capillary hypersurfaces.

Theorem 1.3. *Given $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ intersecting $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally such that*

$$\langle \nu, -E_{n+1} \rangle \geq -\cos \theta_0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} (1 - \cos \theta_0 \langle \nu, E_{n+1} \rangle) |H|^n dA \geq |B_{1, \theta_0}|, \quad (1.5)$$

where $B_{1, \theta_0} = B_1(-\cos \theta_0 E_{n+1}) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$. Moreover, equality in (1.5) holds if and only if Σ is a θ_0 -capillary spherical cap in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$.

More generally, by choosing $F(\xi)$ in Theorem 1.2 to be $F(\xi) + \omega_0 \langle \xi, E_{n+1}^F \rangle$ for some ω_0 , we get the following Willmore-type inequality for anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces.

Theorem 1.4. *Given $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$. Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ intersecting $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle = \omega(x) \geq \omega_0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} \left(F(\nu) + \omega_0 \langle \nu, E_{n+1}^F \rangle \right) |H^F|^n dA \geq |\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F|, \quad (1.6)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F = \mathcal{W}_1^F(\omega_0 E_{n+1}^F) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$. Moreover, equality in (1.6) holds if and only if Σ is an anisotropic ω_0 -capillary Wulff shape in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$.

In fact, as already observed in De Phillipis-Maggi's work [6], anisotropic capillary problems with respect to F can be regarded as anisotropic free boundary problems with respect to another Minkowski norm \tilde{F} in the half-space. Hypersurfaces with the aforementioned special boundary conditions naturally arise from

Calculus of Variations and are nowadays of particular interest. We refer the readers to [10] and the references therein for a short historical introduction.

For the specialty of the half-space, we could in fact prove Theorem 1.2 in the half-space case in an alternative way. This is done by a geometric observation on the Gauss image of Σ , stated in Proposition 4.2. Once this is established, the rest of the proof of the Willmore inequality in the half-space then follows from the classical argument based on an area formula.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we collect basic knowledges on Minkowski norm, anisotropic geometry, and anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 4, we give an alternative proof for Theorem 1.1 in the half-space case and then apply it to anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Notations. The Euclidean metric, scalar product, and Levi-Civita connection of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^{n+1} are denoted respectively by g_{euc} , $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, and D . When considering the topology of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , we adopt the following notations: for a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we denote by \bar{E} the topological closure of E , by $\text{int}(E)$ the topological interior of E , and by ∂E the topological boundary of E in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Regarding the use of the symbol $|\cdot|$, if we plug in a vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then $|e|$ denotes the Euclidean length of e . If we plug in a k -dimensional submanifold $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then we write

$$|M| := \mathcal{H}^k(M),$$

where \mathcal{H}^k is the k -dimensional Hausdorff measure in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . In particular, if we plug in an open set Ω of \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , then we mean

$$|\Omega| := \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\Omega).$$

To avoid ambiguity, we also use $\text{Vol}(\cdot)$ to denote the \mathcal{L}^{n+1} -measure of certain sets in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , see for example (3.5).

2.1. Minkowski norm and anisotropic geometry. Let $F : \mathbb{S}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a smooth positive function on the standard sphere (\mathbb{S}^n, σ) such that

$$A_F := \nabla^2 F + F\sigma > 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where ∇ denote the Levi-Civita connection corresponding to σ . A *Minkowski norm* is the one homogeneous extension of any such F to the whole \mathbb{R}^{n+1} , namely, $F(\xi) = |\xi|F(\frac{\xi}{|\xi|})$ for $\xi \neq 0$ and $F(0) = 0$. Note that condition (2.1) is equivalent to saying that $\frac{1}{2}F^2$ is uniformly convex, in the sense that

$$D^2\left(\frac{1}{2}F^2\right)(\xi) > 0, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

Let Φ be the *Cahn-Hoffman map* associated to F , which is given by

$$\Phi(z) = DF(z) = \nabla F(z) + F(z)z, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

The image $\Phi(\mathbb{S}^n)$ of Φ is called (unit) Wulff shape. The *dual Minkowski norm* of F , denoted by F° , is given by

$$F^\circ(x) = \sup \left\{ \frac{\langle x, z \rangle}{F(z)} \mid z \in \mathbb{S}^n \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

We collect some well-known facts on F , F° , and Φ , see e.g., [10, Proposition 2.1].

Proposition 2.1. *For any $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$ the following statements hold for an Minkowski norm.*

- (i) $F^\circ(tz) = tF^\circ(z)$, for any $t > 0$.
- (ii) $F^\circ(x + y) \leq F^\circ(x) + F^\circ(y)$, for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.
- (iii) $\langle \Phi(z), z \rangle = F(z)$.
- (iv) $F^\circ(\Phi(z)) = 1$.
- (v) *The following Cauchy-Schwarz inequality holds:*

$$\langle z, \xi \rangle \leq F^\circ(z)F(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

- (vi) *The Wulff shape $\Phi(\mathbb{S}^n) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid F^\circ(x) = 1\}$.*

We denote the Wulff ball of radius r and centered at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by

$$\mathcal{W}_r^F(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid F^\circ(x - x_0) < r\},$$

and the corresponding Wulff shape $\partial\mathcal{W}_r^F(x_0)$ is given by

$$\partial\mathcal{W}_r^F(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid F^\circ(x - x_0) = r\}.$$

We also use \mathcal{W}^F and \mathcal{W}_R^F to abbreviate $\mathcal{W}_1^F(0)$ and $\mathcal{W}_R^F(0)$.

Let $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a C^2 -hypersurface and ν a unit normal field of Σ . The *anisotropic normal* of Σ with respect to ν and F is given by

$$\nu_F = \Phi(\nu) = \nabla F(\nu) + F(\nu)\nu,$$

and the *anisotropic principal curvatures* $\{\kappa_i^F\}_{i=1}^n$ of Σ with respect to ν and F are given by the eigenvalues of the *anisotropic Weingarten map*

$$d\nu_F = A_F(\nu) \circ d\nu : T_p\Sigma \rightarrow T_p\Sigma.$$

The eigenvalues are real since A_F is positive definite and symmetric. Let

$$H^F = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \kappa_i^F \quad \text{and} \quad H_n^F = \prod_{i=1}^n \kappa_i^F$$

denote the normalized *anisotropic mean curvature* and the *anisotropic Gauss-Kronecker curvature* of Σ respectively. It is easy to check that the anisotropic principal curvatures of $\partial\mathcal{W}_r^F(x_0)$ are $\frac{1}{r}$, since

$$\nu_F(x) = \frac{x - x_0}{r}, \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{W}_r^F(x_0).$$

We record the following very useful anisotropic angle comparison principle.

Proposition 2.2 ([10, Proposition 3.1]). *Let $x, z \in \mathbb{S}^n$ be two distinct points and $y \in \mathbb{S}^n$ lie in a length-minimizing geodesic joining x and z in \mathbb{S}^n , then we have*

$$\langle \Phi(x), z \rangle \leq \langle \Phi(y), z \rangle.$$

Equality holds if and only if $x = y$.

2.2. Anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces in a half-space. Let us first recall the definition of anisotropic capillary hypersurface in the half-space.

Definition 2.3. Given $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$, any hypersurface $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ is said to be *anisotropic ω_0 -capillary* in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} if it intersects $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally with

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle \equiv \omega_0, \forall x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

In particular, Σ is said to be *anisotropic free boundary* if it is anisotropic ω_0 -capillary with $\omega_0 = 0$.

Here we record some facts concerning anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces in the half-space.

Proposition 2.4 ([10, Remark 2.1]). *Let Σ be a hypersurface in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ which meets $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally and define a function on $\partial\Sigma$ by $\omega(x) := \langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle$. Then for any $x \in \partial\Sigma$,*

$$\omega(x) \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1})).$$

Define a constant vector $E_{n+1}^F \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ as in [10],

$$E_{n+1}^F = \begin{cases} -\frac{\Phi(-E_{n+1})}{F(-E_{n+1})}, & \text{if } \omega_0 > 0, \\ \frac{\Phi(E_{n+1})}{F(E_{n+1})}, & \text{if } \omega_0 < 0, \\ E_{n+1}, & \text{if } \omega_0 = 0, \end{cases}$$

whose definition is strongly related to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. When $\omega_0 = 0$, one can also define E_{n+1}^F as $\frac{\Phi(E_{n+1})}{F(E_{n+1})}$ or $-\frac{\Phi(-E_{n+1})}{F(-E_{n+1})}$. Note that $\langle E_{n+1}^F, E_{n+1} \rangle = 1$, and when F is the Euclidean norm, E_{n+1}^F is indeed E_{n+1} .

Proposition 2.5 ([10, Proposition 3.2]). *For $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$, there holds*

$$F(z) + \omega_0 \langle z, E_{n+1}^F \rangle > 0, \quad \text{for any } z \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

We have the following integral formula.

Lemma 2.6. *Let Σ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ which intersects $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally. Denote by Ω the bounded domain enclosed by Σ and $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$. Then there holds*

$$\int_{\Sigma} \langle \nu, E_{n+1}^F \rangle dA = \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} dA.$$

Proof. Notice that $\operatorname{div}(E_{n+1}^F) = 0$. Integrating this over Ω , using integration by parts, then invoking the fact that $\langle E_{n+1}, E_{n+1}^F \rangle = 1$, we obtain the assertion. \square

As mentioned in the introduction, we shall interpret the anisotropic capillary problem as an anisotropic free boundary problem. This is done by introducing the following Minkowski norm.

Proposition 2.7. *Given $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$. Let Σ be a compact, embedded C^2 ω_0 -capillary hypersurface in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} . Then Σ is an anisotropic free boundary hypersurface in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} with respect to the Minkowski norm \tilde{F} , defined by*

$$\tilde{F}(\xi) := F(\xi) + \omega_0 \langle \xi, E_{n+1}^F \rangle, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover,

- $A_F = A_{\tilde{F}}$ on Σ , and hence the anisotropic curvatures of Σ w.r.t. to F and \tilde{F} are the same.
- The unit Wulff shapes of associated to F and \tilde{F} are the same up to a translation, precisely,

$$\partial \mathcal{W}^{\tilde{F}} = \partial \mathcal{W}_1^F(\omega_0 E_{n+1}^F).$$

Proof. By direct computation, we see that

$$D\tilde{F}(\xi) = DF(\xi) + \omega_0 E_{n+1}^F. \quad (2.4)$$

It follows that for every $p \in \partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, there holds

$$\langle \nu_{\tilde{F}}(p), -E_{n+1} \rangle = \langle \nu_F(p) + \omega_0 E_{n+1}^F, -E_{n+1} \rangle = \omega_0 - \omega_0 = 0,$$

where we have used the fact that $\langle E_{n+1}, E_{n+1}^F \rangle = 1$. This proves the first part of the assertion.

It is direct to see that $A_F(p) = A_{\tilde{F}}(p)$ for any $p \in \Sigma$, since we have

$$D^2\tilde{F}(\xi) = D^2F(\xi).$$

The last part of the assertion follows from (2.4), and the fact that the unit Wulff shape with origin as its center could be characterized by $\partial \mathcal{W}^{\tilde{F}} = D\tilde{F}(\mathbb{S}^n)$. \square

Since F is in general not an even function on \mathbb{S}^n , for later purpose, we need the following Minkowski norm. Define F_* by

$$F_*(z) = F(-z), \quad z \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

Geometrically speaking, F_* is induced by the convex body which is centrally symmetric to \mathcal{W}^F . It is clear that F_* also induces a smooth Minkowski norm, still denote by F_* , and we denote by Φ_* and F_*^o the Cahn-Hoffman map and the dual Minkowski norm associated to F_* .

Proposition 2.8. *There hold that*

(1)

$$F_*^o(x) = F^o(-x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}. \quad (2.5)$$

(2)

$$\Phi_*(z) = -\Phi(-z), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{S}^n. \quad (2.6)$$

(3) For any $x \in \Sigma$, let $\{\kappa_i^F(x)\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the anisotropic principal curvatures of Σ at x with respect to ν and F . Then $\{-\kappa_i^F(x)\}_{i=1}^n$ are the anisotropic principal curvatures of Σ at x with respect to the unit inner normal $-\nu$ and F_* , which we denote by $\{\kappa_i^{F_*}(x)\}_{i=1}^n$.

Proof. To prove (2.5), we verify by definition. Precisely, thanks to (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^o(x) &= \sup \left\{ \frac{\langle x, z \rangle}{F_*(z)} \mid z \in \mathbb{S}^n \right\} = \sup \left\{ \frac{\langle x, z \rangle}{F(-z)} \mid z \in \mathbb{S}^n \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \frac{\langle -x, -z \rangle}{F(-z)} \mid -z \in \mathbb{S}^n \right\} = F^o(-x). \end{aligned}$$

(2.6) follows directly by differentiating both sides of the equality $F_*(z) = F(-z)$.

To prove (3), we fix any $x \in \Sigma$ and let $\{e_i(x)\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the anisotropic principal vector at $x \in \Sigma$ corresponding to κ_i^F , that is,

$$D_{e_i(x)} \Phi(\nu(x)) = \kappa_i^F(x) e_i(x).$$

Letting $z = -\nu(x)$ in (2.6) then differentiating with respect to $e_i(x)$, we obtain

$$D_{e_i(x)} \Phi_*(-\nu(x)) = -D_{e_i(x)} \Phi(\nu(x)) = -\kappa_i^F(x) e_i(x),$$

thereby showing that $\{e_i(x)\}_{i=1}^n$ are also the anisotropic principal vectors at $x \in \Sigma$, corresponding to $\{\kappa_i^{F_*}(x)\}_{i=1}^n$, with

$$\kappa_i^{F_*}(x) = -\kappa_i^F(x), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We close this subsection by stating the following geometric result, which follows simply by using integration by parts for the divergence of the position vector field.

Lemma 2.9. *We have*

$$\int_{\partial \mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} F(\nu) dA = (n+1) |\mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}| \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} \left(F(\nu) + \omega_0 \langle \nu, E_{n+1}^F \rangle \right) dA = (n+1) |\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F|, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F = \mathcal{W}_1^F(\omega_0 E_{n+1}^F) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$.

Proof. (2.7) follows from integration by parts of the divergence of the position vector field. (2.8) follows from plugging \tilde{F} given by (2.3) into (2.7). \square

3. WILLMORE INEQUALITY IN UNBOUNDED CONVEX SETS

As in [10], we introduce the following flow which generates *parallel hypersurfaces* in the anisotropic free boundary sense, defined by

$$\zeta_F(x, t) = x + t \Phi(\nu(x)), \quad (x, t) \in \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_+ =: Z.$$

In the rest of the section, we write $\mathcal{W}_{r, K}^F = \mathcal{W}_r^F(0) \cap K$ for any $r > 0$.

Proposition 3.1. *Given an unbounded, closed convex sets K in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Let $\Sigma \subset K$ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \text{Reg}(\partial K)$ such that (1.3) holds. Denote by Ω the bounded domain delimited by Σ and ∂K . Assume that $0 \in \text{int}(\partial\Omega \cap \partial K)$. Define a distance function on K by*

$$d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\Omega}) = \inf_{r>0} \left\{ r \mid \overline{\mathcal{W}_r^{F_*}(y)} \cap \overline{\Omega} \neq \emptyset \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Then we have following statements.

(1) For any $R > 0$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ y \in K \setminus \overline{\Omega} : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\Omega}) \leq R \right\} \\ & \subset \{ \zeta_F(x, t) \mid x \in \Sigma, t \in (0, \min(R, \tau(x))) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where τ is a function defined on Σ by

$$\tau(x) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } \kappa_i^{F_*}(x) \leq 0 \text{ for any } i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \frac{1}{\max_i \kappa_i^{F_*}(x)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

(2) For any $R > 0$, there holds

$$\left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}) \leq R \right\} = \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r+R,K}^F}. \quad (3.4)$$

(3)

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\text{Vol} \left(\left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\Omega}) \leq R \right\} \right)}{|\mathcal{W}^F| R^{n+1}} = \text{AVR}_F(K), \quad (3.5)$$

where $\text{AVR}_F(K)$ is defined and discussed in Appendix A below.

Proof. (1) For any $y \in K \setminus \overline{\Omega}$ satisfying $d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\Omega}) \leq R$, we use a family of closed Wulff balls $\{\mathcal{W}_r^{F_*}(y)\}_{r>0}$ to touch $\overline{\Omega}$. Clearly there must exist $x \in \partial\Omega$ and $0 < r_0 \leq R$, such that $\mathcal{W}_{r_0}^{F_*}(y)$ touches $\overline{\Omega}$ for the first time at a point x . Let $\nu^*(x)$ be the outer unit normal of $\mathcal{W}_{r_0}^{F_*}(y)$ at x , and $\Phi_*(\nu^*(x))$ the anisotropic normal at x satisfying

$$\Phi_*(\nu^*(x)) = \frac{x - y}{r_0}.$$

By convexity of K and strictly convexity of $\mathcal{W}_{r_0}^{F_*}(y)$, x cannot be obtained at $\partial\Omega \setminus \Sigma$, thus only the following two cases are possible:

Case 1. $x \in \partial\Sigma$.

Since $\mathcal{W}_{r_0}^{F_*}(y)$ touches $\overline{\Omega}$ from outside at x , $\nu^*(x)$, $-\nu(x)$ and $-\bar{N}(x)$ lie on the same 2-plane and moreover, ν^* lies in a length-minimizing geodesic on \mathbb{S}^1 joining $-\nu$ and $-\bar{N}(x)$. Thanks to Proposition 2.2, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi_*(\nu^*(x)), -\bar{N}(x) \rangle & \geq \langle \Phi_*(-\nu(x)), -\bar{N}(x) \rangle \\ & = \langle -\Phi(\nu(x)), -\bar{N}(x) \rangle = \langle \nu_F(x), \bar{N}(x) \rangle \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since K is convex and $y \in K$, we must have

$$0 \geq \langle y - x, \bar{N}(x) \rangle = \langle -r_0 \Phi_*(\nu^*(x)), \bar{N}(x) \rangle = r_0 \langle \Phi_*(\nu^*(x)), -\bar{N}(x) \rangle.$$

Hence, the above two inequalities must hold as equalities simultaneously; that is to say, x must belong to $\{x \in \partial\Sigma \mid \langle \nu_F(x), \bar{N}(x) \rangle = 0\}$, while $\nu^*(x) = -\nu(x)$, then there hold that

$$y = x - r_0\Phi_*(-\nu) = x + r_0\Phi(\nu) = \zeta_F(x, r_0),$$

and that $\bar{\Omega}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{r_0}^{F^*}}(y)$ are mutually tangent at x . Recall that $\kappa_i^{F^*}(x)$ denotes the anisotropic principal curvatures of Σ at x , with respect to $-\nu$ and F_* , we therefore find $\max_i \kappa_i^{F^*}(x) \leq \frac{1}{r_0}$. Taking the definition of $\tau(x)$ into account, this readily implies $r_0 \leq \tau(x)$.

Case 2. $x \in \text{int}(\Sigma)$.

In this case, it is easy to see that $\nu^*(x) = -\nu(x)$ from the first touching property. We may conduct a similar argument as above to find that y can be written as $y = \zeta_F(x, r_0)$, with $r_0 \leq \tau(x)$.

Therefore, for any $y \in K \setminus \bar{\Omega}$, if $d_{F_*}(y, \bar{\Omega}) \leq R$, we can find $x \in \Sigma$ and $r_0 \in (0, \min(R, \tau(x))]$, such that $y = \zeta_F(x, r_0)$, which implies (3.2).

(2) Now we show (3.4). Recall that we have set $\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F = \mathcal{W}_r^F(0) \cap K$.

Our first observation is that, if $y \in \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$, it is easy to see that $d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}) = 0$. Since it is trivial to see that $\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F \subset \mathcal{W}_{r+R,K}^F$, to prove (3.4), it suffices to show that

$$\left\{ y \in K \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F} : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}) \leq R \right\} = \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r+R,K}^F} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}, \quad \forall R > 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Claim. For any $y \in K \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$, let $\tilde{R} = d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F})$, then $F^o(y) = r + \tilde{R}$.

To prove the claim, we consider the family of closed Wulff balls $\{\overline{\mathcal{W}_r^{F^*}}(y)\}_{r>0}$, as r increases, by the definition of d_{F_*} , we have that $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y)$ touches $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$ for the first time.

Suppose that $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y)$ touches $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$ at x , then

$$x \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y) \cap \partial\overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}.$$

Since $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y)$ is strictly convex, and K is convex, we deduce that

$$x \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y) \cap \partial\overline{\mathcal{W}_r^F}(0) \cap K.$$

Let $\nu(x)$, $\tilde{\nu}(x)$ denote respectively the unit outer normals of $\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{W}_r^F}(0)$ at x . It follows that

$$x - y = \tilde{R}\Phi_*(\nu(x)), \quad x = r\Phi(\tilde{\nu}(x)). \quad (3.7)$$

If $x \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F^*}}(y) \cap \partial\overline{\mathcal{W}_r^F}(0) \cap \partial K$, we have $-\nu(x)$ lies in a length-minimizing geodesic joining $\tilde{\nu}(x)$ and $\bar{N}(x)$ in \mathbb{S}^n . By Proposition 2.2, it holds that

$$\langle \Phi(\tilde{\nu}(x)), \bar{N}(x) \rangle \leq \langle \Phi(-\nu(x)), \bar{N}(x) \rangle = -\langle \Phi_*(\nu(x)), \bar{N}(x) \rangle.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (3.7) and convexity of K that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Phi(\tilde{\nu}(x)), \bar{N}(x) \rangle &= \left\langle \frac{x}{r}, \bar{N}(x) \right\rangle \geq 0, \\ -\langle \Phi_*(\nu(x)), \bar{N}(x) \rangle &= -\left\langle \frac{x-y}{\tilde{R}}, \bar{N}(x) \right\rangle \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Combining all above, we thus obtain $\nu(x) = -\tilde{\nu}(x)$ and $\langle x, \bar{N}(x) \rangle = \langle y, \bar{N}(x) \rangle = 0$.

If $x \in \partial \mathcal{W}_{\tilde{R}}^{F_*}(y) \cap \partial \mathcal{W}_r^F(0) \cap \text{int}(K)$, it is easy to see that $\nu(x) = -\tilde{\nu}(x)$.

Summarizing, in either case, we always have $\nu(x) = -\tilde{\nu}(x)$, thus

$$\Phi_*(\nu) = -\Phi(-\nu) = -\Phi(\tilde{\nu}).$$

Using (3.7) again, we get

$$\begin{aligned}F^o(y) &= F^o(y - x + x) \\ &= F^o(-\tilde{R}\Phi_*(\nu(x)) + r\Phi(\tilde{\nu}(x))) \\ &= F^o((r + \tilde{R})\Phi(\tilde{\nu}(x))) = r + \tilde{R},\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. Now we prove (3.6).

" \subset ": For any $y \in K \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$ satisfying $\tilde{R} = d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}) \leq R$, we deduce immediately from the above estimate that

$$F^o(y) = r + \tilde{R} \leq r + R,$$

thus $y \in \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r+R,K}^F} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$.

" \supset ": For any $y \in \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r+R,K}^F} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}$, suppose that $\tilde{R} = d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}) > R$, then it holds that

$$F^o(y) = r + \tilde{R} > r + R,$$

which contradicts to $y \in \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r+R,K}^F}$. Hence $d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r,K}^F}) \leq R$, and the proof is completed.

(3) Since Ω is bounded, we could find r_1 and r_2 such that $\mathcal{W}_{r_1,K}^F \subset \Omega \subset \mathcal{W}_{r_2,K}^F$. From the definition of d_{F_*} (3.1), we find

$$d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r_2,K}^F}) \leq d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\Omega}) \leq d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r_1,K}^F}), \quad \forall y \in K,$$

and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}& \left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r_1,K}^F}) \leq R \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\Omega}) \leq R \right\} \\ & \subset \left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*}(y, \overline{\mathcal{W}_{r_2,K}^F}) \leq R \right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Dividing (3.8) by $|\mathcal{W}^F|R^{n+1}$, we get (3.5) by using (3.4) and Proposition A.1. \square

We have now all the requisites to prove the Willmore inequality.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We first prove the Willmore inequality. Our starting point is, thanks to (3.2), we may use the area formula to estimate the volume as follows: for any $R > 0$,

$$\text{Vol} \left(\left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*} \left(y, \overline{\Omega} \right) \leq R \right\} \right) \leq |\Omega| + \int_{\Sigma} \int_0^{\min(R, \tau(x))} \mathbf{J}^Z \zeta_F(x, t) dt dA. \quad (3.9)$$

By a simple computation, we see, the tangential Jacobian of ζ_F along $Z = \Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_+$ at (x, t) is just

$$\mathbf{J}^Z \zeta_F(x, t) = F(\nu(x)) \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + t \kappa_i^F(x)).$$

Recall the definition of τ (3.3), and taking also Proposition 2.8(3) into account, we may rewrite τ as

$$\tau(x) = \begin{cases} +\infty, & \text{if } \kappa_i^F(x) \geq 0 \text{ for any } i = 1, \dots, n, \\ -\frac{1}{\min_i \kappa_i^F(x)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that for any $x \in \Sigma$, there hold $1 + t \kappa_i^F(x) > 0$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, and for any $t \in (0, \tau(x))$. By the AM-GM inequality, we have

$$\mathbf{J}^Z \zeta_F(x, t) \leq F(\nu) \left(1 + H^F(x)t \right)^n. \quad (3.10)$$

To have a closer look at (3.9), we divide Σ into two parts $\Sigma_+ = \{x \in \Sigma : H^F(x) > 0\}$ and $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_+$. On $\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_+$, we have

$$0 \leq \left(1 + H^F t \right)^n \leq 1, \forall t \in [0, \tau(x)],$$

which, in conjunction with (3.10), gives

$$\int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_+} \int_0^{\min(R, \tau(x))} \mathbf{J}^Z \zeta_F(x, t) dt dA \leq O(R).$$

Thus (3.9) can be further estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Vol} \left(\left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*} \left(y, \overline{\Omega} \right) \leq R \right\} \right) \\ & \leq |\Omega| + \int_{\Sigma_+} \int_0^{\min(R, \tau(x))} \mathbf{J}^Z \zeta_F dt dA + \int_{\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_+} \int_0^{\min(R, \tau(x))} \mathbf{J}^Z \zeta_F dt dA \\ & \leq \int_{\Sigma_+} \int_0^R F(\nu) \left(1 + H^F(x)t \right)^n dt dA + O(R) \\ & = \frac{R^{n+1}}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma_+} F(\nu) \left(H^F(x) \right)^n dA + O(R^n) \\ & \leq \frac{R^{n+1}}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA + O(R^n), \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

where the third inequality holds due to (3.10).

Dividing both sides of (3.11) by R^{n+1} and letting $R \rightarrow +\infty$, we deduce from (3.5) that

$$\text{AVR}_F(K)|\mathcal{W}^F| \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma_+} F(\nu) (H^F)^n dA \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA. \quad (3.12)$$

which finishes the proof of the inequality (1.4).

Now we start to prove the rigidity. First we claim

Claim 1. If the equality in (1.4) holds, then $H^F \geq 0$ on Σ , $\tau(x) = +\infty$ on Σ_+ , and equality in (3.10) holds on Σ_+ .

To prove the first assertion of the claim, we deduce from (3.12) and the equality case of (1.4) that

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA = \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma_+} F(\nu) (H^F)^n dA,$$

which implies $H^F \geq 0$ on Σ .

To prove $\tau(x) = +\infty$ on Σ_+ , we argue by contradiction and assume that there exists a point $x_0 \in \Sigma_+$ satisfying $\tau(x_0) < +\infty$. Since $\Sigma \in C^2$, we can find a neighborhood of x_0 in Σ_+ , denoted by $U(x_0)$, such that $\tau(x) \leq 2\tau(x_0) < +\infty$ on $U(x_0)$. For any $R > 2\tau(x_0)$, we obtain from (3.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Vol} \left(\left\{ y \in K : d_{F_*} \left(y, \overline{\Omega} \right) \leq R \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \int_{\Sigma_+} \int_0^{\min(R, \tau(x))} F(\nu) \left(1 + H^F(x)t \right)^n dt dA + O(R) \\ & \leq \int_{\Sigma_+ \setminus U(x_0)} \int_0^R F(\nu) \left(1 + H^F(x)t \right)^n dt dA \\ & \quad + \int_{U(x_0)} \int_0^{\tau(x)} F(\nu) \left(1 + H^F(x)t \right)^n dt dA + O(R) \\ & \leq \int_{\Sigma_+ \setminus U(x_0)} \int_0^R F(\nu) \left(1 + H^F(x)t \right)^n dt dA + O(R) \\ & = \frac{R^{n+1}}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma_+ \setminus U(x_0)} F(\nu) (H^F)^n dA + O(R^n). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by R^{n+1} and letting $R \rightarrow +\infty$, it follows that

$$\text{AVR}_F(K)|\mathcal{W}^F| \leq \frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma_+ \setminus U(x_0)} F(\nu) (H^F)^n dA,$$

which is a contradiction to the assumption that equality in (1.4) holds.

By a similar contradiction argument, we also get that equality in (3.10) holds on Σ_+ , and we omit the proof here for brevity. In particular, this proves **Claim 1**.

In virtue of this claim, we see that $\Sigma = \Sigma_+$ must be an anisotropic umbilical hypersurface, and hence a part of a Wulff shape. Write $\Sigma = \partial \mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \cap K$ for some $R_0 > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Clearly, Σ determines an solid cone with vertex at x_0 ,

given by

$$C_{x_0} = \left\{ x_0 + t \frac{x - x_0}{R_0} : x \in \text{int}(\Sigma), t \in (0, +\infty) \right\}.$$

Consider now the modified convex set

$$\tilde{K} = (K \setminus \Omega) \cup \left(C_{x_0} \cap \mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \right).$$

Due to convexity of K and the boundary condition (1.3), for any $x \in \partial\Sigma$, there exists at least one supporting hyperplane passing through x , hence \tilde{K} is also convex.

Claim 2. $\frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R^{n+1}}$ is non-increasing on $R \in [0, +\infty)$.

This can be proved similarly as Proposition A.1 below. Indeed, by using the co-area formula, we have

$$\frac{d}{dR} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R^{n+1}} = \frac{\int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}} \frac{1}{|DF^o(x-x_0)|} dA - (n+1) \frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R}}{R^{n+1}}.$$

On the other hand, by the divergence theorem, we have for $R \geq R_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1)|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}| &= \int_{\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}} \text{div}(x - x_0) dx \\ &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}} \frac{R}{|DF^o(x-x_0)|} dA \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \partial K \setminus \Omega} \langle x - x_0, \bar{N}(x) \rangle dA \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial C_{x_0} \cap \mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0)} \langle x - x_0, \bar{N}(x) \rangle dA. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\langle x - x_0, \bar{N}(x) \rangle = 0$ on $\partial C_{x_0} \cap \mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0)$ since it is part of the boundary of a cone, and $\langle x - x_0, \bar{N}(x) \rangle \geq 0$ on $\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \partial K \setminus \Omega$ since \tilde{K} is convex. It follows that

$$(n+1)|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}| \geq R \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}} \frac{1}{|DF^o(x-x_0)|} dA,$$

and in turn

$$\frac{d}{dR} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R^{n+1}} \leq 0,$$

which proves the claim.

From the second claim, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AVR}_F(K) |\mathcal{W}^F| &= \lim_{R \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R^{n+1}} \\ &\leq \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R_0^{n+1}} = \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \cap C_{x_0}|}{R_0^{n+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using equality in (1.4) and the fact that Σ is anisotropic umbilical, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AVR}_F(K)|\mathcal{W}^F| &= \frac{1}{n+1} \frac{1}{R_0^n} \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \cap K} F(\nu) dA \\ &= \frac{1}{n+1} \frac{1}{R_0^n} \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \cap C_{x_0}} F(\nu) dA \\ &= \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{R_0}^F(x_0) \cap C_{x_0}|}{R_0^{n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F(x_0) \cap \tilde{K}|}{R^{n+1}}$ is a constant for $R \in [R_0, +\infty)$.




FIGURE 1. \tilde{K} and C_{x_0} .

See Fig. 1 for an illustration when F is the Euclidean norm, where the red part denotes the boundary of the modified set \tilde{K} and the blue part denotes the boundary of the cone C_{x_0} . Because of the boundary condition (1.3), we point out that Fig. 1 is what we could expect so far. Next, we are going to show by virtue of the claim that \tilde{K} is in fact C_{x_0} , namely, the blue portion and the red portion in Fig. 1 actually coincide. In fact, from the proof of the claim, we see that

$$\langle x - x_0, \bar{N}(x) \rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial K \setminus \Omega,$$

which implies that $\partial K \setminus \Omega$ is a part of boundary of the cone centered at x_0 . Finally from the information that Σ is a part of Wulff shape centered at x_0 and $\partial K \setminus \Omega$ is part of boundary of the cone centered at x_0 , we see that Σ is indeed an anisotropic free boundary Wulff shape in K , i.e., $\langle \nu_F, \bar{N} \rangle = 0$ along $\partial\Sigma$. This completes the proof. \square

4. WILLMORE INEQUALITIES IN A HALF-SPACE

4.1. An alternative approach in the half-space case. In this section, we use an alternative approach to prove Theorem 1.2 in the half-space case. We restate it here.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded, C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then we have

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA \geq |\mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}|. \quad (4.1)$$

Equality in (4.1) holds if and only if Σ is an anisotropic free boundary Wulff shape.

The alternative approach is based on the following geometric observation for the Gauss image of Σ .

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded, C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then the anisotropic Gauss map $\nu_F : \Sigma \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{W}^F$ satisfies

$$(\partial\mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}) \subset \nu_F(\widetilde{\Sigma}_+).$$

where $\widetilde{\Sigma}_+$ is the subset of Σ where the anisotropic Weingarten map $d\nu_F$ is positive-semi definite.

Proof. For any $y \in \partial\mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, denote by $N(y)$ the outer unit normal to $\partial\mathcal{W}^F$ at y . Then $\Phi(N(y)) = y$. Let \mathbf{H}_y be a closed half-space whose inward unit normal is given by $N(y)$, such that $\Sigma \cap \mathbf{H}_y = \emptyset$, and let $\mathbf{\Pi}_y$ be the boundary of \mathbf{H}_y , which is a hyperplane in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} . Parallel translating $\mathbf{\Pi}_y$ towards Σ and denote by Π_y the hyperplane that touches Σ for the first time at some $p \in \Sigma$. If $p \in \partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, then by the first touching property, we have

$$\langle \nu(p), -E_{n+1} \rangle \leq \langle N(y), -E_{n+1} \rangle.$$

Thanks to the first touching property, $\nu(p)$, $N(y)$, and $-E_{n+1}$ are on the same 2-plane and from the above relation we know, $N(y)$ lies in the length-minimizing geodesic on \mathbb{S}^n joining $\nu(p)$ and $-E_{n+1}$. Therefore using the anisotropic angle comparison principle (Proposition 2.2), we obtain

$$\langle \nu_F(p), -E_{n+1} \rangle \leq \langle \Phi(N(y)), -E_{n+1} \rangle = \langle y, -E_{n+1} \rangle.$$

On the other hand, by assumption,

$$\langle \nu_F(p), -E_{n+1} \rangle \geq 0 > \langle y, -E_{n+1} \rangle,$$

which gives a contradiction. Hence the first touching point $p \in \text{int}(\Sigma)$ and Σ is again tangent to Π_y at p . Thus $\nu(p) = N(y)$ and $\nu_F(p) = \Phi(\nu(p)) = y$. Note that the touching of Σ with Π_y is from the interior, therefore at the touching point p ,

$dv(p) \geq 0$ and in turn, $d\nu_F(p) \geq 0$. Thus we have $p \in \widetilde{\Sigma}_+$ and $\nu_F(p) = y$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Our starting point is Proposition 4.2. To proceed, note that the Jacobian of the Gauss map with respect to Σ is just $J^\Sigma d\nu_F = H_n^F$, where H_n^F is the anisotropic Gauss-Kronecker curvature. By using (2.7), the area formula and AM-GM inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1)|\mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}| &= \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} F(\nu(y)) dA(y) \leq \int_{\widetilde{\Sigma}_+} F(\nu(p)) H_n^F(p) dA(p) \\ &\leq \int_{\widetilde{\Sigma}_+} F(\nu) (H^F)^n dA \leq \int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA, \end{aligned}$$

which is (4.1).

If equality in (4.1) holds, then all the inequalities in the above argument are actually equalities, so we readily infer that Σ agrees with $\widetilde{\Sigma}_+$ and is in fact an anisotropic umbilical hypersurface, thanks to the AM-GM inequality. It is not hard to deduce that $\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle = 0$. Hence Σ is an anisotropic free boundary Wulff shape in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} . \square

4.2. Capillary hypersurfaces in a half-space. As corollaries of Theorem 4.1, we may deduce various Willmore-type inequalities for anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces in a half-space.

First, through the new Minkowski norm \tilde{F} in (2.3) (see Proposition 2.7), the anisotropic capillary problem can be rephrased as an anisotropic free boundary problem. Second, a special Minkowski norm to our interest is defined as

$$F(\xi) = |\xi| - \cos \theta_0 \langle \xi, E_{n+1} \rangle,$$

for some angle constant $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$, by virtue of which the capillary problem in a half-space could be interpreted in terms of anisotropic terminology (see e.g., [5, 13]). Plugging these Minkowski norms into Theorem 4.1, we thereby obtain the following Willmore inequalities as claimed in the introduction, which we state for readers' convenience.

Theorem 4.3. *Given $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$. Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded, C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ intersecting $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle = \omega(x) \geq \omega_0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} \left(F(\nu) + \omega_0 \langle \nu, E_{n+1}^F \rangle \right) |H^F|^n dA \geq |\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F|, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F = \mathcal{W}_1^F(\omega_0 E_{n+1}^F) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$. Moreover, equality in (4.2) holds if and only if Σ is an anisotropic ω_0 -capillary Wulff shape in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Given $\theta_0 \in (0, \pi)$. Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ intersecting $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally, such that*

$$\langle \nu, -E_{n+1} \rangle \geq -\cos \theta_0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then there holds

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \int_{\Sigma} (1 - \cos \theta_0 \langle \nu, E_{n+1} \rangle) |H|^n dA \geq |B_{1, \theta_0}|, \quad (4.3)$$

where $B_{1, \theta_0} = B_1(-\cos \theta_0 E_{n+1}) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$. Moreover, equality in (4.3) holds if and only if Σ is a θ_0 -capillary spherical cap in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$.

On the other hand, by revisiting the geometric property concerning Gauss map in the (anisotropic) capillary settings, we could prove a variant of Theorem 4.3 as follows.

Theorem 4.5. *Given $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$. Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded, C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ intersecting $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ transversally such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle = \omega(x) \geq \omega_0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then there holds

$$\int_{\Sigma} F(\nu) |H^F|^n dA \geq \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} F(\nu) dA. \quad (4.4)$$

Moreover, equality in (4.4) holds if and only if Σ is an anisotropic ω_0 -capillary Wulff shape in $\overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$.

The revisited variant of Proposition 4.2 reads as follows.

Proposition 4.6. *Given $\omega_0 \in (-F(E_{n+1}), F(-E_{n+1}))$. Let $\Sigma \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}}$ be a compact, embedded, C^2 -hypersurface with boundary $\partial\Sigma \subset \partial\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ such that*

$$\langle \nu_F(x), -E_{n+1} \rangle = \omega(x) \geq \omega_0, \quad \text{for any } x \in \partial\Sigma.$$

Then the anisotropic Gauss map $\nu_F : \Sigma \rightarrow \partial\mathcal{W}^F$ satisfies

$$\{y \in \partial\mathcal{W}^F : \langle y, -E_{n+1} \rangle \leq \omega_0\} \subset \nu_F(\widetilde{\Sigma}_+).$$

Proposition 4.6 follows from Proposition 4.2 by introducing \tilde{F} in (2.3) and using Proposition 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. We note that

$$\{y \in \partial\mathcal{W}^F : \langle y, -E_{n+1} \rangle \leq \omega_0\} + \omega_0 E_{n+1}^F = \partial\mathcal{W}_1^F(\omega_0 E_{n+1}^F) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1},$$

and hence

$$\int_{\{y \in \partial\mathcal{W}^F : \langle y, -E_{n+1} \rangle \leq \omega_0\}} F(\nu(y)) dA(y) = \int_{\partial\mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} F(\nu(y)) dA(y).$$

By virtue of Proposition 4.6, we use the area formula in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_{1, \omega_0}^F \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}} F(v(y)) dA(y) &\leq \int_{\Sigma_+} F(v(p)) H_n^F(p) dA(p) \\ &\leq \int_{\Sigma_+} F(v) (H^F)^n dA \leq \int_{\Sigma} F(v) |H^F|^n dA, \end{aligned}$$

which is (4.4).

The proof of rigidity follows similarly as that in the proof of Theorems 4.1. \square

Remark 4.7. In view of (2.8), it is clear that the two Willmore-type inequalities (4.2) and (4.4) are different unless $\omega_0 = 0$.

APPENDIX A. PROPERTIES OF UNBOUNDED CONVEX SETS

The following two Propositions may be familiar to experts, especially in the case $F(\xi) = |\xi|$.

Proposition A.1. *Let K be an unbounded, closed convex set with boundary ∂K which contains the origin. Fix $0 \leq r < +\infty$, then $\frac{|\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K|}{R^{n+1}}$ is non-increasing. In particular, $\frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F \cap K|}{R^{n+1}}$ is a constant if and only if K is a cone with vertex at the origin.*

Proof of Proposition A.1. By using the co-area formula, for any $0 \leq r$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dR} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K|}{R^{n+1}} = R^{-(n+1)} \left(\int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K} \frac{1}{|DF^o|} dA - (n+1) \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K|}{R} \right).$$

On the other hand, by the divergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1) |\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K| &= \int_{\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K} \operatorname{div}(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K} \left\langle x, \frac{DF^o(x)}{|DF^o(x)|} \right\rangle dA + \int_{\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap \partial K} \langle x, \bar{N}(x) \rangle dA \\ &\geq \int_{\partial \mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K} \frac{R}{|DF^o|} dA. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we have used $\langle x, \bar{N}(x) \rangle \geq 0$ thanks to the convexity of K .

It is then direct to see that

$$\frac{d}{dR} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{r+R}^F \cap K|}{R^{n+1}} \leq 0.$$

If $\frac{d}{dR} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F \cap K|}{R^{n+1}} = 0$, then $\langle x, \bar{N}(x) \rangle = 0$ for \mathcal{H}^n -a.e. $x \in \partial K$, it follows that K is a cone with vertex at the origin, see e.g., [14, Proposition 28.8]. \square

A direct consequence is that one can define the *asymptotic volume ratio with respect to F* for K as

$$\operatorname{AVR}_F(K) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_R^F \cap K|}{|\mathcal{W}^F| R^{n+1}}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Similarly, we show the following asymptotic volume ratio for any F .

Proposition A.2. *Let K be an unbounded, closed convex set with boundary ∂K which contains the origin. There is a unique tangent cone at infinity of K , say K_∞ . Moreover, one has*

$$\text{AVR}_F(K) = \frac{|\mathcal{W}^F \cap K_\infty|}{|\mathcal{W}^F|}.$$

Proof of Proposition A.2. Denote by $K_R = \frac{1}{R}K$. From the compactness result, see e.g., [14, Corollary 12.27], we know that, up to a subsequence, say $\{R_h\}_{h \in \mathbb{N}}$,

$$K_{R_h} \xrightarrow{\text{loc}} K_\infty$$

for some sets of locally finite perimeter C , with convergence in the sense that, for every compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} |E \cap (K_\infty \Delta K_{R_h})| = 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

By the monotonicity, one can prove that K_∞ must be a cone. In fact, for each $s > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{W}_s^F \cap K_{R_h}| = \lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\mathcal{W}_{sR_h}^F \cap K|}{R_h^{n+1}} \stackrel{(\text{A.1})}{=} s^{n+1} \text{AVR}_F(K) |\mathcal{W}^F|.$$

On the other hand, from (A.2) we deduce

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{W}_s^F \cap K_{R_h}| = |\mathcal{W}_s^F \cap K_\infty|.$$

It follows that, regardless of the choice of convergence subsequence, there always holds

$$\frac{|\mathcal{W}_s^F \cap K_\infty|}{s^{n+1}} = \text{AVR}_F(K) |\mathcal{W}^F|.$$

As the LHS is a constant about s , it follows from Proposition A.1 that C is a cone, revealing the fact that

$$\text{AVR}_F(K) = \frac{|\mathcal{W}^F \cap K_\infty|}{|\mathcal{W}^F|}.$$

In other words, we have proved that for any such non-compact convex set K , there exists a unique *tangent cone at infinity*, denoted by K_∞ . This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Virginia Agostiniani, Mattia Fogagnolo, and Lorenzo Mazzieri, *Sharp geometric inequalities for closed hypersurfaces in manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature*, Invent. Math. **222** (2020), no. 3, 1033–1101. MR4169055
- [2] Bang-yen Chen, *On a theorem of Fenchel-Borsuk-Willmore-Chern-Lashof*, Math. Ann. **194** (1971), 19–26. MR291994
- [3] Jaigyoung Choe, Mohammad Ghomi, and Manuel Ritoré, *Total positive curvature of hypersurfaces with convex boundary*, J. Differential Geom. **72** (2006), no. 1, 129–147. MR2215458
- [4] ———, *The relative isoperimetric inequality outside convex domains in \mathbf{R}^n* , Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **29** (2007), no. 4, 421–429. MR2329803

- [5] Luigi De Masi, *Existence and properties of minimal surfaces and varifolds with contact angle conditions*, 2022. Thesis (Ph.D.)—SISSA, [url](#).
- [6] G. De Philippis and F. Maggi, *Regularity of free boundaries in anisotropic capillarity problems and the validity of Young's law*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **216** (2015), no. 2, 473–568. MR3317808
- [7] Ernst Heintze and Hermann Karcher, *A general comparison theorem with applications to volume estimates for submanifolds*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **11** (1978), no. 4, 451–470. MR533065
- [8] Xiaohan Jia, Guofang Wang, Chao Xia, and Xuwen Zhang, *"Heintze-Karcher inequality and capillary hypersurfaces in a wedge"*, 2022. to appear in **Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.** doi: [10.2422/2036-2145.202212_001](#), [arXiv:2209.13839](#).
- [9] ———, *"Heintze-Karcher inequality for anisotropic free boundary hypersurfaces in convex domains"*, 2023. to appear in **J. Math. Study**, Special Issue for the 100th Anniversary of Mathematics of XMU, [arXiv:2311.01162](#).
- [10] Xiaohan Jia, Guofang Wang, Chao Xia, and Xuwen Zhang, *Alexandrov's theorem for anisotropic capillary hypersurfaces in the half-space*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **247** (2023), no. 2, Paper No. 25, 19. MR4562813
- [11] Gian Paolo Leonardi, Manuel Ritoré, and Efstratios Vernadakis, *Isoperimetric inequalities in unbounded convex bodies*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **276** (2022), no. 1354, 1–86. MR4387775
- [12] Lei Liu, Guofang Wang, and Liangjun Weng, *The relative isoperimetric inequality for minimal submanifolds with free boundary in the Euclidean space*, J. Funct. Anal. **285** (2023), no. 2, Paper No. 109945, 22. MR4571870
- [13] Zheng Lu, Chao Xia, and Xuwen Zhang, *Capillary Schwarz symmetrization in the half-space*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **23** (2023), no. 1, Paper No. 20220078, 14. MR4604661
- [14] Francesco Maggi, *Sets of finite perimeter and geometric variational problems*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 135, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. An introduction to geometric measure theory. MR2976521
- [15] Xiaodong Wang, *Remark on an inequality for closed hypersurfaces in complete manifolds with nonnegative Ricci curvature*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **32** (2023), no. 1, 173–178. MR4574743
- [16] T. J. Willmore, *Mean curvature of immersed surfaces*, An. Şti. Univ. "Al. I. Cuza" Iaşi Sect. I a Mat. (N.S.) **14** (1968), 99–103. MR238220

(X.J) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SOUTHEAST UNIVERSITY, 211189, NANJING, P.R. CHINA
 Email address: xhjia@seu.edu.cn

(G.W) MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG, ERNST-ZERMELO-STR.1, 79104,
 FREIBURG, GERMANY
 Email address: guofang.wang@math.uni-freiburg.de

(C.X) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, XIAMEN UNIVERSITY, 361005, XIAMEN, P.R. CHINA
 Email address: chaoxia@xmu.edu.cn

(X.Z) MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG, ERNST-ZERMELO-STR.1, 79104,
 FREIBURG, GERMANY
 Email address: xuwen.zhang@math.uni-freiburg.de