

MINIMAL SUBMANIFOLDS WITH MULTIPLE ISOLATED SINGULARITIES

BRYAN DIMLER

ABSTRACT. We extend Smale’s singular bridge principle (see [26]) for n -dimensional strictly stable minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} ($n \geq 7$) to arbitrary codimension when $n \geq 4$. We then apply the procedure to copies of the Lawson-Osserman cone to produce a four dimensional minimal graph in \mathbb{R}^7 with any finite number of isolated singularities.

1. INTRODUCTION

The bridge principle, introduced by Lévy in 1948 ([13]), is the idea that it should be possible to glue minimal submanifolds by a thin bridge to produce an “approximately minimal” submanifold, and apply a small perturbation so that it becomes minimal. Lévy’s theorem was quite general, but offered more of a heuristic argument than a rigorous proof. It was not until the 1980’s that the first proofs of the bridge principle strong enough to justify Lévy’s result were published ([9, 16]).

In 1987, Smale proved a bridge principle for (possibly unstable)¹ minimal submanifolds of arbitrary dimension and codimension by solving a fixed point problem for the stability operator L (see (2.11)) on the approximately minimal submanifold ([25]). They then adapted their bridge principle in 1989 to strictly stable (i.e. first eigenvalue for L positive) minimal hypercones giving a process that allows one to construct many examples of strictly stable minimal hypersurfaces with boundary in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} ($n \geq 7$) having any finite number of isolated singularities ([26]). Their constructions were the first published examples of the bridge principle for unstable and singular minimal submanifolds. Shortly after, White proved bridge principles for strictly stable, unstable, and singular minimal submanifolds in Euclidean space with arbitrary dimension and codimension using geometric measure theory ([27, 28]).

The results of White are more general than Smale in the stable and unstable cases in the sense that the bridges do not have to be tailored to the surface and, in the singular case, the singularities need not be isolated. On the other hand, in the singular case White required the additional hypothesis that the minimal submanifolds to be glued are uniquely area-minimizing as opposed to just being strictly stable. Since the cone over $\mathbb{S}^1(\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}) \times \mathbb{S}^5(\sqrt{\frac{5}{6}})$ is strictly stable ([2, 14, 21]) but not area-minimizing ([8, 23]), Smale’s bridge principle is more general when viewed from this lens. Following the publication of Smale’s and White’s work, the bridge principle has been extended to other scenarios, such as harmonic maps and harmonic diffeomorphisms between manifolds ([11, 12]).

¹Here, stability means that the second variation of area is non-negative (i.e. Morse index zero). It is equivalent to the stability operator having non-negative spectrum.

In this paper, we first generalize the singular bridge principle of Smale ([26]) to arbitrary codimension for dimensions $n \geq 4$ (Theorem 2.4). The submanifolds constructed from the glueing process allow for prescribed rate of decay to their tangent cones near their singularities. The main difficulties to overcome in the generalization of the bridge principle are as follows: (1) The usual Schauder estimates are not immediately at one's disposal since, in the high codimension case, the stability operator L produces an elliptic system; (2) Existence and regularity of solutions to the Dirichlet problem for L need to be treated with care; (3) In dimensions $n = 4, 5$ (arbitrary codimension), the mean curvature of the bridges joining the cones must be updated so that their L^p mean curvature is $O(\epsilon^{\frac{n}{p}})$ instead of $O(\epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{p}})$, where $\epsilon > 0$ is the width of the bridges. This is done via foliation by spheres. The improved mean curvature bound enables one to obtain the estimates needed to ensure a solution to the fixed point problem using the Schauder fixed point theorem.

After generalizing Smale's singular bridge principle, we apply it to copies of the Lawson-Osserman cone (see (2.15), (2.16)) to construct a four dimensional graphical strictly stable minimal submanifold M in \mathbb{R}^7 with many isolated singularities (Theorem 2.5). This is done by showing that, if the cones to be glued are graphical and the approximately minimal submanifold is constructed so as to remain graphical, then the submanifold obtained from the glueing process is also graphical. Since the Lawson-Osserman cone is strictly stable ([3]), the result is immediate. Note that if $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is the defining function for M , then u solves the minimal surface system (2.33). We thereby obtain a Lipschitz solution to the minimal surface system with multiple isolated singularities. To the author's knowledge this is the first example of a minimal graph with multiple isolated singularities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express their sincere gratitude to Connor Mooney and Rick Schoen for bringing this problem to their attention and for many enlightening discussions on the subject of this paper. The author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2143668, Sloan Fellowship, and UCI Chancellor's Fellowship.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. Let (M, g) be an n -dimensional smooth embedded Riemannian submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} , with or without boundary. When M has boundary ∂M , we identify M with its interior. We will denote the normal bundle and tangent bundles of M by NM and TM , respectively, and will denote the fibers at $x \in M$ for each bundle by $N_x M$ and $T_x M$. As a Riemannian submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} , the induced metrics on NM and TM are the Euclidean dot product restricted to each bundle when they are viewed as elements of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} .

We will denote the connections on NM and TM by ∇ and ∇^M , respectively. Precisely, if X, Y are C^1 sections of TM and U is a C^1 section of NM , then

$$\nabla_X U = (D_X U)^\perp \text{ and } \nabla'_X Y = (D_X Y)^\top,$$

where D is the directional derivative on Euclidean space. In local coordinates x^1, \dots, x_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}} U &:= \frac{\partial U}{\partial x^i} = U_{x^i} \\ \nabla_i U &:= \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}} U. \end{aligned}$$

Let U be a C^2 section of NM and let e_1, \dots, e_n be a smooth local orthonormal frame in a neighborhood of $x \in M$. Then

$$(2.1) \quad \Delta^\perp U = \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_{e_i} \nabla_{e_i} U - \nabla_{\nabla'_{e_i} e_i} U.$$

The operator Δ^\perp is called the *normal Laplacian on NM* .

2.1.1. *Function Spaces.* For each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, we will write ∇^k for the k -th order covariant derivative

$$\nabla^k : C^\infty(NM) \xrightarrow{\nabla} C^\infty(T^*M \otimes NM) \xrightarrow{\nabla} \dots \xrightarrow{\nabla} C^\infty(T^*M^{\otimes k} \otimes NM),$$

where $C^\infty(T^*M^{\otimes k} \otimes NM)$ is the space of smooth sections of $T^*M^{\otimes k} \otimes NM$. Then for each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, we define the space $C^k(NM)$ to be the space of sections of NM whose components relative to any smooth local orthonormal frame for NM are C^k and the quantity

$$(2.2) \quad \|U\|_{C^k(NM)} := \sum_{j=0}^k \sup_{x \in M} |\nabla^j U(x)|$$

is finite. The spaces $C^k(NM)$ are Banach spaces with norm defined by (2.2). When M is compact with non-empty boundary, we will denote by $C_0^k(NM) \subset C^k(NM)$ the space of C^k normal sections that vanish on ∂M . For each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, the Hölder space $C^{k,\alpha}(NM)$ is the space of sections U of NM whose components relative to any smooth local orthonormal frame are $C^{k,\alpha}$, and the quantity

$$(2.3) \quad \|U\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(NM)} := \|U\|_{C^k(NM)} + |U|_{k,\alpha,M}$$

is finite. Here, the Hölder semi-norm $|\cdot|_{k,\alpha,M}$ is defined in the usual way (see [1, 19]). The spaces $C^{k,\alpha}(NM)$ are Banach spaces when given the norm (2.3). We define $C_0^{k,\alpha}(NM)$ similarly to the C^k case.

Let \mathcal{H}^n represent the n -dimensional Hausdorff measure on M . For $1 \leq p < \infty$, the space $L^p(NM)$ will denote the class of Borel measurable sections of NM such that

$$\|U\|_{L^p} := \left(\int_M |U|^p d\mathcal{H}^n \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

For each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, let $\mathcal{C}_k^2(NM)$ be the subset of $C^\infty(NM)$ for which the norm

$$(2.4) \quad \|U\|_{H^k} := \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\int_M |\nabla^j U|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

is finite. The Sobolev space $H^k(NM)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{C}_k^2(NM)$ in L^2 for $\|\cdot\|_{H^k}$. It is a Hilbert space when given the inner product

$$(2.5) \quad \langle U, V \rangle_{H^k} := \sum_{j=0}^k \int_M \langle \nabla^j U, \nabla^j V \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

If M is compact with boundary ∂M , then the subspace $H_0^k(NM) \subset H^k(NM)$ is the closure of $C_0^\infty(NM)$ in $H^k(NM)$. When there is no confusion, we will drop the $d\mathcal{H}^n$ term in the integral expressions and will write $C^k(M)$, $L^p(M)$, etc., for the spaces $C^k(NM)$, $L^p(NM)$, and so on.

2.1.2. Coordinate Expressions. Fix $x \in M$, let x^1, \dots, x^n be local coordinates near x , and let n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} be a smooth local orthonormal frame near x . Let $U \in C^2(M)$ and write $U = u^k n_k$ for C^2 functions u^k ($k = 1, \dots, m+1$). For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and each $t, k = 1, \dots, m+1$, let B_{li}^k be the connection terms

$$B_{li}^k := (\nabla_i n_l) \cdot n_k = (n_l)_{x^i} \cdot n_k$$

By standard tensor calculus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla U &= u_{;j}^k dx^j \otimes n_k \text{ and} \\ \nabla^2 U &= u_{;ij}^k dx^i \otimes dx^j \otimes n_k, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Einstein summation and

$$(2.6) \quad u_{;j}^k := u_{x^j}^k + u^l B_{lj}^k$$

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} u_{;ij}^k &:= u_{x^i x^j}^k + u_{x^j}^l B_{li}^k + u_{x^i}^l B_{lj}^k - \Gamma_{ij}^l u_{x^l}^k \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{\partial B_{li}^k}{\partial x^j} + B_{lj}^t B_{ti}^k - \Gamma_{ij}^t B_{li}^k \right) u^l \end{aligned}$$

and the Γ_{ij}^l are the Christoffel symbols for ∇' in the given coordinates. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla U|^2 &:= g^{ij} u_{;i}^k u_{;j}^k \\ |\nabla^2 U|^2 &:= g^{il} g^{jt} u_{;ij}^k u_{;lt}^k, \end{aligned}$$

where $g_{ij} := \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}$, $g := (g_{ij})$, and $g^{-1} := (g^{ij})$. Since the normal Laplacian on NM is the trace of ∇^2 taken with respect to the metric, we have the coordinate expression:

$$(2.8) \quad \Delta^\perp = g^{ij} \nabla_i \nabla_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} (\sqrt{g} g^{ij}) \nabla_j.$$

2.2. Stability. Here, we define stability of a minimal submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} and provide a brief discussion of strictly stable minimal cones.

2.2.1. Definitions. Let M be an n -dimensional smooth compact minimal submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with the induced metric and boundary ∂M . For a normal section $U \in H_0^1(M)$, the second variation of area if we vary in the direction U is

$$(2.9) \quad Q(U, U) := \int_M (|\nabla U|^2 - \langle U, \tilde{A}(U) \rangle)$$

where \tilde{A} is the *Simons' operator* on M . If e_1, \dots, e_n is a smooth local orthonormal frame for TM , then

$$\tilde{A}(U) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \langle A(e_i, e_j), U \rangle A(e_i, e_j)$$

where A is the second fundamental form for M defined on $X, Y \in TM$ by the formula

$$A(X, Y) := (D_X Y)^\perp.$$

The mean curvature vector is defined as the trace of the second fundamental form, and is given by

$$H := \sum_{i=1}^n A(e_i, e_i)$$

in a local orthonormal frame for TM .

If $U \in C^2$, we may integrate by parts in (2.9) to get

$$(2.10) \quad Q(U, U) = - \int_M \langle U, \Delta^\perp U + \tilde{A}(U) \rangle.$$

Set

$$(2.11) \quad L := \Delta^\perp + \tilde{A}.$$

Then (2.10) can be written in the simplified form

$$Q(U, U) = - \int_M \langle U, LU \rangle.$$

The operator L is called the *stability operator* and is defined on C^2 normal sections of M . It is a (formally) L^2 self-adjoint uniformly elliptic operator on normal sections in $C_0^2(M)$; thus, extends weakly to a self-adjoint uniformly elliptic operator on $H_0^1(M)$. M is said to be *stable* if $Q_M(U, U) \geq 0$ for all $U \in H_0^1(M)$.

We will need to write the stability operator in local coordinates. Fix $x \in M$, let (Ω, ψ) be a coordinate chart near x , and let n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} be a smooth local orthonormal frame for $NM|_\Omega$. If $U \in C^2(M)$, we can write $U = u^k n_k$ on Ω . In these coordinates, the Simons' operator is

$$(2.12) \quad \tilde{A}(U) = (g^{sj} g^{it} A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k u^l) n_k,$$

where $A_{ij}^k := \psi_{x^i x^j} \cdot n_k$ and we have summed over repeated indices. Using (2.8) and (2.12), for any normal section $U \in C^2(M)$ we can write

$$(2.13) \quad LU = (g^{ij} u_{x^i x^j}^k + b_l^{ik} u_{x^i}^l + c_l^k u^l) n_k$$

in local coordinates with respect to any local orthonormal frame n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} .

2.2.2. Stable Minimal Cones. We will work with cones over smooth compact embedded minimal submanifolds of $\mathbb{S}^{n+m}(p)$, where $\mathbb{S}^{n+m}(p)$ is the unit $n+m$ sphere in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with center at p . For more on stable minimal cones, we refer the reader to [2, 24, 26] for the codimension one case and [3] for the high codimension case.

Let Σ be a smooth compact embedded $(n-1)$ -dimensional minimal submanifold of \mathbb{S}^{n+m} , $n \geq 3$. Let C be the cone over Σ with vertex at p intersected with the unit ball $B_1(p)$ in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} . In other words,

$$C := \{(1-t)p + t\theta : \theta \in \Sigma, t \in (0, 1]\}.$$

Then C is an n -dimensional minimal submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} , $\partial C = \Sigma$, and C has an isolated singularity at p , unless Σ is the totally geodesic $(n-1)$ -sphere², in

²One dimensional minimal submanifolds of a sphere are great circles, so it is appropriate to assume $n \geq 3$.

which case C is a piece of an n -plane in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} . We will sometimes work in polar coordinates on C :

$$\begin{aligned} x &= r\omega \text{ for } x \in C \\ \omega &= \theta - p \text{ for } \theta \in \Sigma \\ r &= |x - p|. \end{aligned}$$

That is, C is identified with $C \setminus \{p\}$.

Fix $\omega \in \Sigma$ and let e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} be an orthonormal basis for $T_\omega \Sigma$. Extend the e_i to a local orthonormal frame on Σ so that they are covariant constant at ω with respect to the connection on $T\Sigma$. Let $e_r := \frac{\partial}{\partial r}$ be the unit radial vector in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} and choose smooth normal sections n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} such that n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} is a local orthonormal frame for $N\Sigma$ near ω . Extend $e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}, n_1, \dots, n_{m+1}$ to TC and NC by parallel translation along the radial paths from points on Σ through p . In the chosen coordinates,

$$A_C(e_i, e_j) = r^{-1} A_\Sigma(e_i, e_j) \text{ for each } i, j = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

where A_C and A_Σ are the second fundamental forms for C and Σ , respectively. Using that Σ is minimal in \mathbb{S}^{n+m} and the definition of the e_i via parallel transport, we obtain the polar coordinate expression

$$(2.14) \quad L_C = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{n-1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} L_\Sigma,$$

where $L_\Sigma := \Delta_\Sigma^\perp + \tilde{A}_\Sigma$. The operator on the link, L_Σ , is a self-adjoint elliptic operator so the eigenvalues of L_Σ are real, countable, and form an increasing sequence

$$\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_3 \leq \dots$$

with $\mu_i \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. By Proposition 2.2 in [3] (see [2, 24] also), we can define stability of a cone in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} as follows:

Definition 2.1. *An n -dimensional minimal cone C in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} is said to be stable (strictly stable) if*

$$\frac{(n-2)^2}{4} + \mu_1 \geq 0 \text{ (likewise, } > 0 \text{)}.$$

In this paper, we will be interested in strictly stable minimal cones. In codimension one, Simons' cones are strictly stable when $n \geq 7$ ([2, 24]). More recently, Dimler and Lee showed that special Langrangian cones in \mathbb{R}^{2n} are strictly stable when $n \geq 5$ and when $n = 4$ under the additional assumption that the link is simply connected (Theorem 5.4). They also proved that all coassociative cones in \mathbb{R}^7 are strictly stable (Theorem 6.4).

Of particular interest to the present paper is the Lawson-Osserman cone. Let $\eta : \mathbb{S}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ denote the Hopf map:

$$(2.15) \quad \eta(z_1, z_2) = (2\bar{z}_1 z_2, |z_1|^2 - |z_2|^2)$$

for $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ with $|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 = 1$. Making the identifications $\mathbb{C}^2 \simeq \mathbb{R}^4$ and $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$, we see that the graph of $\frac{\sqrt{5}}{2} \eta\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)$ is a four dimensional minimal cone in \mathbb{R}^7 (see [10]) with an isolated singularity, called the *Lawson-Osserman cone*. The link Σ is given by

$$(2.16) \quad \Sigma := \left\{ \left(\frac{2}{3}x, \frac{\sqrt{5}}{3}\eta(x) \right) : |x| = 1 \right\},$$

and is a closed three dimensional minimal submanifold of \mathbb{S}^6 . In [7], it was shown that the Lawson-Osserman cone is coassociative; hence, strictly stable by the discussion above. In particular, the Lawson-Osserman cone is an example of a graphical, strictly stable minimal cone with an isolated singularity.

2.3. Approximate Solutions. As in [26], strictly stable cones will be the building blocks for our approximate solutions M^ϵ .³ Before we rigorously define the submanifolds M^ϵ we must specify what is meant by an ϵ -bridge. Let C_1 and C_2 be cones over Σ_1 and Σ_2 constructed as above and let $q_i \in \Sigma_i = \partial C_i$ for each $i = 1, 2$.

Definition 2.2. *An ϵ -bridge $\Gamma_{q_1, q_2}(\epsilon)$ from q_1 to q_2 is a one-parameter family (defined for small $\epsilon > 0$) of embedded n -dimensional strips (i.e. a diffeomorphic copy of $B^{n-1} \times [0, 1]$) whose ends are smoothly attached to C_1 and C_2 at the geodesic balls of radius 5ϵ , $D_{5\epsilon}(q_1)$ and $D_{5\epsilon}(q_2)$, in Σ_1 and Σ_2 respectively.*

When $n \geq 6$, we assume

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{cases} c_0^{-1}\epsilon \leq \text{diam } \Gamma_{q_1, q_2}(\epsilon) \leq c_0\epsilon \\ \max_{x \in \Gamma} |A_\Gamma(x)| + \max_{x \in \Gamma} |\nabla A_\Gamma(x)| \leq c_0 \\ \max_{x \in \partial\Gamma} |A_{\partial\Gamma}(x)| \leq c_0\epsilon^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

where c_0 is a constant independent of ϵ and ∇ is the covariant derivative relative to the induced metric, while A_Γ and $A_{\partial\Gamma}$ are the second fundamental forms of $\Gamma := \Gamma_{q_1, q_2}(\epsilon)$ and $\partial\Gamma$ respectively. When $n = 4, 5$, we can only assume

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{cases} c_0^{-1}\epsilon \leq \text{diam } \Gamma_{q_1, q_2}(\epsilon) \leq c_0\epsilon \\ \max_{x \in \Gamma} |A_\Gamma(x)| \leq c_0 \\ \max_{x \in \Gamma} |\nabla A_\Gamma(x)| \leq c_0\epsilon^{-1} \\ \max_{x \in \partial\Gamma} |A_{\partial\Gamma}(x)| \leq c_0\epsilon^{-1}. \end{cases}$$

Such a Γ can be constructed inside any tubular neighborhood of any path γ in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} from q_1 to q_2 due to the constructions in Section 8.1 (see (8.1) and (8.4)).

We now let C_1, \dots, C_N ($N \geq 2$) be a collection of strictly stable cones as above with vertices at p_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$); that is

$$C_i := \{(1-t)p_i + t\theta : \theta \in \Sigma_i, t \in (0, 1]\},$$

where Σ_i is a smooth minimal submanifold of $\mathbb{S}^{n+m}(p_i)$ with $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, N$. Let $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_I$ be a collection of ϵ -bridges, where $\Gamma_i := \Gamma_i(\epsilon)$ is an ϵ -bridge from q_{2i-1} to q_{2i} , $i = 1, \dots, I$, and each q_j is in some $\Sigma_i = \partial C_i$, such that resulting configuration is connected. Then $I \geq N - 1$ and the configuration is a smooth submanifold with boundary in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with isolated singularities at the p_i . Denote this submanifold by M^ϵ . Then

$$\partial M^\epsilon := \bigcup_{j=1}^I \partial\Gamma_j \bigcup_{i=1}^N \Sigma_i \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{2I} D_{5\epsilon}(q_k).$$

Note that the parts of Σ_i where the bridges are attached are in the interior of M^ϵ . Furthermore, due to the bridge constructions in Section 8.1, we may assume that M^ϵ satisfies the following L^p mean curvature estimates for each $p \geq 1$ and ϵ small:

$$(2.19) \quad \left(\int_{M^\epsilon} |H|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq c\epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{p}} \text{ when } n \geq 6$$

³See Section 8.1 in the appendix for the construction of the approximate solutions M^ϵ .

and

$$(2.20) \quad \left(\int_{M^\epsilon} |H|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq c\epsilon^{\frac{n}{p}} \text{ when } n = 4, 5,$$

where the constant c is independent of ϵ in each case. The submanifold M^ϵ is “approximately minimal” in the sense that its mean curvature is small in any L^p norm.

We will write M_δ^ϵ to denote the submanifold constructed the same as M^ϵ , but with the cones C_i replaced by the truncated cones $C_{i,\delta}$, where

$$(2.21) \quad C_{i,\delta} := \{(1-t)p_i + t\theta : \theta \in \Sigma_i, t \in [\delta, 1]\}.$$

The submanifolds M_δ^ϵ are compact smooth submanifolds with boundary. For $0 < r_1 < r_2 < 1$ and each $i = 1, \dots, N$, we set

$$(2.22) \quad S_{r_1, r_2}^i := \{x \in C_i : r_1 \leq |x - p_i| \leq r_2\} \text{ and } S := \bigcup_{i=1}^N S_{r_1, r_2}^i.$$

The submanifolds above will be helpful tools for making the necessary Schauder estimates to complete the gluing procedure.

2.4. Main Results. Our first goal is to extend the gluing methods in [26] to higher codimension minimal submanifolds in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} . After doing so, we show that Smale’s gluing method can be used to construct a minimal graph with multiple isolated singularities by joining Lawson-Osserman cones.

We will write $C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon})$ to represent the $C^{2,\alpha}$ sections of NM^ϵ that vanish on a compact subset of M^ϵ away from the p_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$). We define $C_0^\infty(\overline{M^\epsilon})$ similarly. Note that if $U \in C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon})$ and $\|U\|_{C^1}$ is sufficiently small, then U induces a $C^{2,\alpha}$ submanifold M_U^ϵ that is a small normal perturbation of M^ϵ . When $U = 0$ on ∂M^ϵ , we have $\partial M_U^\epsilon = \partial M^\epsilon$. If $(\Omega, \psi) \in \mathcal{U}$, then $\psi + U : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ is a local parameterization (i.e. an immersion) of M_U^ϵ .

Let ϵ_0 be small enough depending only on c_0 in (2.17),(2.18) so that $\|U\|_{C^1} \leq \epsilon_0$ implies $\psi + U$ is an immersion and set

$$(2.23) \quad \mathcal{H}(\epsilon) := \{U \in C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon}) : \|U\|_{C^1} \leq \epsilon < \epsilon_0\}.$$

For $U \in \mathcal{H}(\epsilon)$, define $H(U) : \Omega \rightarrow C_0^{0,\alpha}(\overline{M_U^\epsilon})$ by $H(U)(x) := \Delta_U(\psi(x) + U(x))$; that is, $H(U)$ is the mean curvature for M_U^ϵ . Here, Δ_U is the Laplace-Beltrami operator relative to the induced metric on M_U^ϵ acting component-wise on $\psi(x) + U(x)$ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} . In coordinates, $H(U)$ is given by the formula

$$(2.24) \quad H(U) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det g(U)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \left(\sqrt{\det g(U)} g^{ij}(U) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} (\psi + U) \right),$$

where $g(U) := (g_{ij}(U))$ is the metric tensor for M_U^ϵ . We have

$$(2.25) \quad g_{ij}(U) := (\psi + U)_{x^i} \cdot (\psi + U)_{x^j}$$

and

$$(2.26) \quad g(U)^{-1} := (g^{ij}(U)).$$

We would like to solve the equation $H(U) = 0$ for some $U \in \mathcal{H}(\epsilon)$ and show that U is sufficiently small as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The issue is that H is not an operator on NM^ϵ . The reason why is that, if U is a normal section of M^ϵ , then $H(U)$ may not be normal to M^ϵ as a vector in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} (however, it is normal to M_U^ϵ). Fortunately,

this is no problem since we may project $H(U)$ onto NM^ϵ . For $x \in M^\epsilon$, let $\Pi_x : \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} \rightarrow N_x M^\epsilon$ denote the orthogonal projection. The following proposition is standard:

Proposition 2.3. *If $U \in \mathcal{K}(\epsilon)$ for ϵ sufficiently small depending on c_0 , then for $x \in M^\epsilon$ and $V \in N_{U(x)} M_U^\epsilon$ we have*

$$\Pi_x V(x) = 0 \text{ if and only if } V(x) = 0.$$

Define a map $H^\perp : \mathcal{K}(\epsilon) \times M^\epsilon \rightarrow N_x M^\epsilon$ by $H^\perp(U)(x) := \Pi_x H(U(x))$. By Proposition 2.3, we may take ϵ_0 small to conclude that $H^\perp(U) = 0$ if and only if $H(U) = 0$ for $U \in \mathcal{K}(\epsilon)$. Using the coordinate expression for H , we see that $H^\perp : \mathcal{K}(\epsilon) \subset C^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) \rightarrow C^{0,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ and is an analytic mapping of Banach spaces.

Based on the discussion above, we need to solve the boundary value problem

$$H^\perp(U) = 0 \text{ for } U \in \mathcal{K}(\epsilon)$$

and show that $U \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ sufficiently rapidly. However, this is a nonlinear system and is therefore difficult to analyze. To circumvent this issue, we linearize the mean curvature operator about the approximate solution M^ϵ as in [2, 25, 26]. Precisely, for any $U \in C^2(M^\epsilon)$ such that $H^\perp(U)$ is defined, we can expand $H^\perp(U)$ in a Taylor polynomial as

$$H^\perp(U)(x) = H(x) + \left. \frac{dH^\perp(tU(x))}{dt} \right|_{t=0} + \int_0^1 (1-t) \frac{d^2 H^\perp(tU(x))}{dt^2} dt,$$

where H is the mean curvature of M^ϵ . It is well known that

$$LU = \left. \frac{dH^\perp(tU)}{dt} \right|_{t=0}.$$

Thus, if we set $H_0 := -H$ and

$$(2.27) \quad E(U) := - \int_0^1 (1-t) \frac{d^2 H^\perp(tU(x))}{dt^2} dt,$$

the condition that M_U^ϵ is a minimal submanifold is equivalent to

$$(2.28) \quad LU = H_0 + E(U).$$

As in [26], the idea is to invert L in (2.28) for U in a suitable space of normal sections and appropriate boundary data $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{M^\epsilon})$, then solve (2.28) as a fixed point problem using the Schauder fixed point theorem⁴:

$$(2.29) \quad \begin{cases} U = L^{-1}(H_0 + E(U)) \text{ in } M^\epsilon \\ U = \Psi \text{ on } \partial M^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Thus, we need to study the existence and regularity of the Dirichlet problem

$$(2.30) \quad \begin{cases} LU = H_0 + E(U) \text{ in } M^\epsilon \\ U = \Psi \text{ on } \partial M^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

We can now state the main theorems. Let C_1, \dots, C_N be strictly stable minimal cones as above with links Σ_i , set

$$(2.31) \quad L_{\Sigma_i} := \Delta_{\Sigma_i}^\perp + \tilde{A}_{\Sigma_i},$$

⁴The Schauder fixed point theorem says that, if K is a non-empty convex compact subset of a Banach space \mathcal{B} and if $T : K \rightarrow K$ is a continuous map, then T has a fixed point (see [5]).

and let μ_1^i be the first eigenvalue for L_{Σ_i} ($i = 1, \dots, N$). Set

$$(2.32) \quad \gamma_1^i := \frac{(2-n) + \sqrt{(n-2)^2 + 4\mu_1^i}}{2}$$

for each i .

Theorem 2.4. *Let $n \geq 4$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and let ν_1, \dots, ν_N be any set of N numbers such that $\nu_i \geq 2$ and $\nu_i > \gamma_1^i$ for each i . Then there is an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a constant $c > 0$ each depending only on $n, m, \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N, c_0, \alpha, \nu_i$, and $\text{Vol}(M^\epsilon)$ such that, for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, there exists a unique smooth solution to (2.30) satisfying*

$$|U(x)| \leq c|x - p_i|^{\nu_i} \text{ for each } x \in C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N$$

for appropriate $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{M^\epsilon})$. The resulting submanifold M_U^ϵ is smooth away from N isolated singularities at the points p_i . Furthermore, it is close to M^ϵ , strictly stable, and is embedded provided ϵ_0 is sufficiently small. If M^ϵ is constructed from graphical cones so as to remain graphical, then we may choose ϵ_0 so that M_U^ϵ remains graphical as well.

Applying Theorem 2.4 to copies of the Lawson-Osserman cone, we will obtain a 4-dimensional strictly stable minimal graph M in \mathbb{R}^7 that is smooth away from its isolated singularities. If $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ is the defining function for M , then the graph map $\psi(x) := (x, u(x))$ is a weak (integral) solution to the minimal surface system

$$(2.33) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} (\sqrt{g} g^{ij}) = 0, & j = 1, \dots, n \\ \sum_{i,j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} (\sqrt{g} g^{ij} u_{x^j}^k) = 0, & k = 1, \dots, m, \end{cases}$$

where g is the usual metric on the graph of u defined component-wise by

$$g_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^m u_{x^i}^k u_{x^j}^k.$$

This leads to our most interesting result:

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there is a compact smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and a strictly stable stationary solution $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ to the minimal surface system which is smooth away from N isolated singularities.*

Since the proof of Theorem 2.4 is similar to [26] when $n \geq 6$, we focus on the cases $n = 4$ and $n = 5$ in the body of the paper. However, a sketch of the case $n \geq 6$ has been included in Section 8.3 for reference and comparison to the lower dimensional cases. The main difficulty in lower dimensions is that the estimates used when $n \geq 6$ deteriorate when $n = 4, 5$ since the L^2 mean curvature bound becomes too large. To circumvent this issue, we update the L^p mean curvature estimates for M^ϵ when $n = 4, 5$ by building an improved bridge via foliation by $(n-1)$ -spheres. This construction is sketched in Section 8.1 of the appendix, and is inspired by Smale's construction in [25] when $n = 2$.

3. EXISTENCE AND REGULARITY FOR THE STABILITY OPERATOR

In this section, we extend the results of Section 3 in [26] to the high codimension case. We first derive Schauder estimates for the equation $LU = F$ for $U \in C^{2,\alpha}$ and $F \in C^{0,\alpha}$ analogous to those found in [26]. Using the Schauder estimates, we prove existence and regularity to the Dirichlet problem for L on M^ϵ . Combining

these results and arguing by separation of variables as in [26] leads to an asymptotic formula for solutions to the Dirichlet problem which will be essential in the proof of Theorem 2.4.

3.1. Schauder Estimates. Let Δ be the Laplace-Beltrami operator on functions. Then the stability operator on functions is given by

$$L_0 := \Delta + |A|^2.$$

To obtain C^0 bounds, we show that $|U|$ is a subsolution to an elliptic equation and apply the standard regularity theory. Going forward, we will say a constant $c > 0$ is universal if it depends on $n, m, \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N, c_0, \alpha, \nu$, and $\text{Vol}(M^\epsilon)$ and is independent of ϵ .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\Omega \subset M^\epsilon$ be an open region in M^ϵ . Suppose $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(\Omega)$ and that $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega)$ satisfies $LU = F$. Then $|U| \in H^1(\Omega)$ (viewed as a space of functions) and*

$$L_0|U| \geq -|F| \text{ on } \Omega$$

in the (integral) weak sense.

Proof. The fact that $|U| \in H^1(\Omega)$ is well known. When $x_0 \in \{|U| > 0\}$, then $|U|$ is C^2 near x_0 so we may compute $\Delta U(x_0)$ directly. Let e_1, \dots, e_n be an orthonormal frame for TM^ϵ near x_0 . Then

$$\Delta|U| = \frac{(\Delta^\perp U \cdot U)}{|U|} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|\nabla_{e_i} U|^2}{|U|} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\nabla_{e_i} U \cdot U)^2}{|U|^3}.$$

In particular,

$$-\Delta|U| \leq |\Delta^\perp U| \leq |A|^2|U| + |F| \text{ at } x_0$$

implying

$$\Delta|U| + |A|^2|U| \geq -|F| \text{ at } x_0.$$

Hence, $|U|$ is a C^2 subsolution to $L_0 w = -|F|$ on $\{|U| > 0\}$. For each $\gamma > 0$, set

$$\phi_\gamma(s) := \max\{0, s - \gamma\}.$$

By writing

$$\phi_\gamma(s) = \frac{s - \gamma + |s - \gamma|}{2},$$

we see that $\phi'_\gamma(s) = 0$ almost everywhere on $\{s \leq \gamma\}$ and $\phi'_\gamma(s) = 1$ on $\{s > \gamma\}$. Let $v \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ be such that $v \geq 0$ and set $\phi_{\gamma,\beta} := \eta_\beta * \phi_\gamma$ where η_β is the standard mollifier. Using that $\phi_{\gamma,\beta}$ is C^2 and convex and that $|U|$ is a subsolution on $\{|U| > 0\}$, we may argue as in Lemma 4.6 in [6] to conclude

$$\int_\Omega \langle \nabla' \phi_{\gamma,\beta}(|U|), \nabla' v \rangle \leq \int_\Omega |F| \phi'_{\gamma,\beta}(|U|) v + \int_\Omega |A|^2 |U| \phi'_{\gamma,\beta}(|U|) v$$

for β small enough. Letting $\beta \rightarrow 0^+$, we see that

$$\int_\Omega \langle \nabla' \phi_\gamma(|U|), \nabla' v \rangle \leq \int_\Omega |F| \phi'_\gamma(|U|) v + \int_\Omega |A|^2 |U| \phi'_\gamma(|U|) v$$

Note that $|\nabla' \phi_\gamma(|U|)| = |\phi'_\gamma(|U|)| |\nabla' |U|| \leq |\nabla' |U||$ and $\phi'_\gamma(|U|)$ increases to the characteristic function $\chi_{\{|U| > 0\}}$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$. Letting $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and applying the dominated convergence theorem shows

$$\int_\Omega \langle \nabla' |U|, \nabla' v \rangle \leq \int_\Omega |F| v + \int_\Omega |A|^2 |U| v,$$

so that $|U|$ is a subsolution. \square

As a consequence of Lemma 3.1, we easily obtain both local and global C^0 bounds for L . Using (8.1)-(8.6), we see that the coefficients of L_0 are uniformly bounded in L^∞ on M_δ^ϵ for each $n \geq 4$. Combining this with Lemma 3.1 leads to a global C^0 bound for L on M_δ^ϵ .

Corollary 3.2 (Global C^0 Bound). *Suppose $LU = F$ on M_δ^ϵ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $U \in C^2(NM_\delta^\epsilon)$. Then for any $\tau > 0$ there is a universal constant $c := c(\tau, \delta)$ such that*

$$\|U\|_{C^0(M_\delta^\epsilon)} \leq c(\|F\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_\delta^\epsilon)} + \|U\|_{C^0(\partial M_\delta^\epsilon)} + \|U\|_{L^2(M_\delta^\epsilon)}).$$

Proof. Since the coefficients of L_0 are uniformly bounded in C^0 independent of ϵ for each $n \geq 4$, M_δ^ϵ is compact, and M_δ^ϵ satisfies a uniform Sobolev inequality (see [17]), we may apply Lemma 3.1 and argue as in Proposition 3.2 in [26]. \square

Corollary 3.3 (Local C^0 Bound). *Let $K \subset M^\epsilon$ be a compact region and let $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(K)$. Suppose $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(K)$ satisfies $LU = F$ on K . Let $B_{2r} \subset K$ be a geodesic ball in M^ϵ of radius $2r$. Then there is a universal constant $c := c(K)$ such that*

$$\|U\|_{C^0(B_r)} \leq c(r^{-\frac{n}{2}}\|U\|_{L^2(B_{2r})} + r\|F\|_{L^n(B_{2r})}),$$

Proof. This follows immediately from the Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 8.17 in [5], as well as the uniform boundedness, independent of ϵ , of the coefficients of L_0 on K for $n \geq 4$. \square

We will need local and global Schauder estimates on M_δ^ϵ . The global Schauder estimates below are proved in Section 3 of [25].

Proposition 3.4 (Global Schauder Estimates). *Suppose $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ and suppose U solves the Dirichlet problem*

$$\begin{cases} LU = F \text{ in } M_\delta^\epsilon \\ U = 0 \text{ on } \partial M_\delta^\epsilon \end{cases}$$

Then there is an $\epsilon_0 := \epsilon_0(\alpha)$ and a universal constant $c(\delta)$ such that, if $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, then

- (a) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(M_\delta^\epsilon)} \leq c(\delta)(\epsilon^{-k}\|U\|_{C^0(M_\delta^\epsilon)} + \epsilon^{2-k}\|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)})$ for $k = 1, 2$ and
- (b) $|\nabla^k U|_{(\alpha), M_\delta^\epsilon} \leq c(\delta)(\epsilon^{-k-\alpha}\|U\|_{C^0(M_\delta^\epsilon)} + \epsilon^{2-k-\alpha}\|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)})$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$.

Using the local Schauder estimates in Section 8.2 for linear elliptic systems, we can prove local Schauder estimates for the stability operator on M^ϵ . To do so, we need some interpolation inequalities for $C^{2,\alpha}$ functions on an n -ball B_r^n in Euclidean space:

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i,j} \|u_{x^i x^j}\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} \leq r^\alpha \sum_{i,j} |u_{x^i x^j}|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + cr^{-2}\|u\|_{C^0(B_r^n)},$$

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_i |u_{x^i}|_{(\alpha), B_r^n} \leq r \sum_{i,j} |u_{x^i x^j}|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + cr^{-1-\alpha}\|u\|_{C^0(B_r^n)},$$

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_i \|u_{x^i}\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} \leq r^{1+\alpha} \sum_{i,j} |u_{x^i x^j}|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + cr^{-1}\|u\|_{C^0(B_r^n)},$$

$$(3.4) \quad |u|_{\alpha, B_r^n} \leq r^2 \sum_{i,j} |u_{x^i x^j}|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + cr^{-\alpha}\|u\|_{C^0(B_r^n)}.$$

For the details, see [5].

When $n = 4, 5$, the coefficients of (2.13) are bounded in C^3 independent of ϵ on any compact subset of M^ϵ away from the patching region P_ϵ^5 , and they are uniformly bounded in C^3 on any compact subset of M^ϵ when $n \geq 6$. Using this and the Schauder estimates in the appendix, we obtain local interior Schauder estimates for $LU = F$ on M^ϵ .

Proposition 3.5 (Local Schauder Estimates). *Let K be a compact region contained in the interior of M^ϵ , let $B_{2r} \subset K$ be a geodesic ball with $r \in (0, 1]$, and let $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(K)$. Suppose $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(K)$ satisfies $LU = F$ on K and $n \geq 6$. Then there is a universal constant $c := c(K)$ such that*

- (a) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(B_r)} \leq c(r^{-k}\|U\|_{C^0(B_{2r})} + r^{2-k}\|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2r})})$ for $k = 1, 2$, and
- (b) $|U|_{k,\alpha,B_r} \leq c(r^{-k-\alpha}\|U\|_{C^0(B_{2r})} + r^{2-k-\alpha}\|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2r})})$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$.

When $n = 4, 5$, the same estimates hold if we also require $K \cap P_\epsilon = \emptyset$.

Proof. Let n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} be a local orthonormal frame for B_{2r} and write $U = u^k n_k$. The constant c_1, c_2, \dots will denote universal constants.

- (a) Using (2.6), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{B_r} |\nabla U| &\leq c_1 \sum_{i,k,t} \|u_{x^i}^k + u^t B_{ti}^k\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} \\ &\leq c_2 \left(\sum_{i,k} \|u_{x^i}^k\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} + \sum_k \|u^k\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Applying the interpolation inequality (3.3) to the first term above and using that $r \leq 1$ in the second, we get

$$(3.5) \quad \max_{B_r} |\nabla U| \leq c_3 \left(r^{1+\alpha} \sum_{i,j,k} |u_{x^i x^j}^k|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + r^{-1} \|U\|_{C^0(B_r)} \right).$$

Similarly, we can use (2.7) to find

$$(3.6) \quad \max_{B_r} |\nabla^2 U| \leq c_4 \left(r^\alpha \sum_{i,j,k} |u_{x^i x^j}^k|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + r^{-2} \|U\|_{C^0(B_r)} \right).$$

By the coordinate formula (2.13), we can apply Corollary 8.2 in (3.5) and (3.6) to conclude (a).

- (b) We have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla^2 U|_{\alpha, B_r} &\leq c_5 \sum_{i,j,k} \left(\|u_{x^i x^j}^k\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} + |u_{x^i x^j}^k|_{(\alpha), B_r^n} + \|u_{x^i}^k\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |u_{x^i}^k|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + |u_{x^j}^k|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + \|u^k\|_{C^0(B_r^n)} + |u^k|_{\alpha, B_r^n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying the interpolation inequalities (3.1)-(3.4) on the right-hand side above and using that $r \leq 1$ yields

$$(3.7) \quad |\nabla^2 U|_{\alpha, B_r} \leq c_6 \left(\sum_{i,j,k} |u_{x^i x^j}^k|_{\alpha, B_r^n} + r^{-2-\alpha} \|U\|_{C^0(B_{2r})} \right)$$

⁵When $n = 4, 5$, the patching region where the bridges are adjoined to the cones defining M^ϵ is denoted by P_ϵ . See Section 8.1 for the details.

By the coordinate expression (2.13), we can apply Corollary 8.2 to the first term in (3.7) to find

$$\|U\|_{2,\alpha,B_r} \leq c_7 \left(r^{-\alpha} \|F\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2r})} + r^{-2-\alpha} \|U\|_{C^0(B_{2r})} \right),$$

proving the desired inequality when $k = 2$. The other cases are similar and follow by interpolation.

Combining parts (a) and (b) completes the proof. \square

We remark that, when $n = 4, 5$, the constant c will not be universal on the entirety of M_δ^ϵ since it will depend on ϵ if $K \cap P_\epsilon \neq \emptyset$ and will blow up as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. However, this is no issue since we will only apply the local Schauder estimates on the cones C_i away from P_ϵ .

3.2. Existence and Regularity for the Dirichlet Problem. In order to solve the Dirichlet problem for the stability operator L on M^ϵ , we need to get a positive lower bound on the spectrum of L . This is done using the strict stability of each C_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$). Set

$$(3.8) \quad h(x) := \begin{cases} |x - p_i| & \text{for } x \in C_i \\ 1 & \text{for } x \in \cup_j \Gamma_j(\epsilon). \end{cases}$$

Then $h^2 L$ is elliptic and self-adjoint on the space of normal sections

$$H_{0,h}^1(M_\delta^\epsilon) := H_0^1(NM_\delta^\epsilon; h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n).$$

By (8.4), (8.5), (8.6), and the polar coordinate expression for L , $h^2 L$ has bounded smooth coefficients for each $n \geq 4$. Hence, $h^2 L$ has a discrete set of eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots \quad (\lambda_i := \lambda_i(\epsilon, \delta))$$

with $\lambda_i \rightarrow \infty$ and a corresponding orthonormal basis of smooth eigensections for

$$L_{h,-}^2(M_\delta^\epsilon) := L^2(NM_\delta^\epsilon; h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n)$$

given by

$$\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3, \dots$$

where Φ_i vanishes on $\partial M_\delta^\epsilon$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\delta \in (0, 1)$. It will be helpful to also define

$$L_{h,+}^2(M_\delta^\epsilon) := L^2(M_\delta^\epsilon; h^2 d\mathcal{H}^n).$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, N$, let $d_0(C_i)$ denote the first eigenvalue for the stability operator on C_i . The main results in this section are as follows:

Lemma 3.6. *Let $d_1 := \min_{1, \dots, N} d_0(C_i) > 0$. There are universal constants \bar{d} and ϵ_0 (depending only on d_1) such that for all positive $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, all $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and all $U \in H_{0,h}^1(M_\delta^\epsilon)$,*

$$\lambda_1(\delta, \epsilon) \geq \bar{d} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} |\nabla U|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} |U|^2 h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \frac{1}{\bar{d}^2} \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} |LU|^2 h^2 d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

Lemma 3.7. *Let $F \in C_{loc}^{0,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) \cap L_{h,+}^2(M^\epsilon)$, $\Psi \in C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon})$, $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists a unique solution $U \in C_{loc}^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) \cap L_{h,-}^2(M^\epsilon)$ to the Dirichlet problem*

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{cases} LU = F & \text{on } M^\epsilon, \\ U = \Psi & \text{and } \partial M^\epsilon, \end{cases}$$

satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M^\epsilon} |U|^2 h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla U|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n &\leq \frac{1}{d^2} \left(\int_{M^\epsilon} |F|^2 h^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{M^\epsilon} |\Psi|^2 h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{M^\epsilon} |L\Psi|^2 h^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla\Psi|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \right). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing L_0 with $L_0 + \lambda_1 h^{-2}$ in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we see that the Lemma 3.1 holds for this operator as well, along with Corollary 3.2. Combining this with the local Schauder estimates in the previous section, and noting that Corollary 3.5 is only applied on the cones C_i defining M^ϵ away from P_ϵ , we may argue precisely as in Lemma 3.1 in [26] to prove Lemma 3.6. In order to prove Lemma 3.7 via the argument in Lemma 3.2 in [26], we need to study existence and regularity of the Dirichlet problem for L on M_δ^ϵ . Note that it is enough to prove Lemma 3.7 for $\Psi = 0$ since we can solve the general case by setting $U = V + \Psi$, where V satisfies

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} LV = F - L\Psi \text{ on } M_\delta^\epsilon \\ V = 0 \text{ on } \partial M_\delta^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Hence, we only consider the case of zero boundary data.

Lemma 3.8. *Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and let $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$. Suppose $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, where ϵ_0 is as in Lemma 3.6. Then the Dirichlet problem*

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} LV = F \text{ on } M_\delta^\epsilon \\ V = 0 \text{ on } \partial M_\delta^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$. Furthermore, U satisfies

$$(3.12) \quad \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} |\nabla U|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} |U|^2 h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \frac{1}{d^2} \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} |F|^2 h^2 d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of an $H_{0,h}^1(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ solution U to (3.11) with L replaced by $h^2 L$ and F replaced by $h^2 F$ is immediate from the Fredholm alternative together with Lemma 3.6. Such a solution satisfies $LU = F$ in the weak sense on $H_0^1(M_\delta^\epsilon)$, along with the inequality (3.12) by Lemma 3.6. We show $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ by approximation with smooth normal sections.

Fix any positive $\beta < \alpha$ and let $\{F_j\}_1^\infty$ be a sequence in $C^\infty(M^\epsilon)$ such that $F_j \rightarrow F$ in $C^{0,\beta}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$. Let $\{U_j\}_1^\infty$ be the corresponding sequence of unique $H_{0,h}^1(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ weak solutions to the problem $LV = F_j$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the F_j are smooth, the compactness of M_δ^ϵ , L^2 elliptic regularity, and the Sobolev embedding theorem together show the U_j are in $C^k(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ for each k and each j . Since $C^{0,\beta}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ convergence implies convergence in $L^p(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ for any $p \geq 1$, Corollary 3.2 implies that the U_j are uniformly bounded in the L^∞ norm on M_δ^ϵ for fixed ϵ giving a uniform C^0 bound for the U_j . Proposition 3.4 applied to the U_j then gives a uniform $C^{2,\beta}$ bound so by the Arzelá-Ascoli theorem there is a subsequence of the U_j (which we do not relabel) converging to some $\tilde{U} \in C^{2,\beta}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ in the $C^{2,\frac{\beta}{2}}$ norm. By construction, we must have $L\tilde{U} = F$ in the weak sense so $U = \tilde{U}$ by uniqueness. Applying Proposition 3.4 to U and using that $F \in C^{0,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ shows $U \in C^{2,\alpha}(M_\delta^\epsilon)$. \square

The proof of Lemma 3.7 now follows by the arguments in Lemma 3.2 in [26].

3.3. An Asymptotic Formula. We now consider the behavior of solutions to (3.9) given by Lemma 3.7 near the singularities p_1, \dots, p_N . To do so, we will need to narrow the class of functions that F can lie in. For a full discussion of the content in this section, we refer the reader to [2] and [26]. See [20] also.

For an N -vector $\nu := (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_N)$, ($\nu_i > 0$), set

$$C_\nu^{k,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) := \left\{ U \in C_{\text{loc}}^{k,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) : \max_{r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]} \sum_{j=0}^k \|\nabla^j U\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} r^{j-\nu_i} < \infty \text{ and} \right. \\ \left. \max_{r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]} \sum_{j=0}^k |U|_{j,\alpha,S_{r,2r}^i} r^{j+\alpha-\nu_i} < \infty, i = 1, \dots, N \right\}$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $k = 0, 1, 2$. In other words, on each cone C_i , $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ decays like $|x - p_i|^{\nu_i}$ near p_i . The spaces $C_\nu^{k,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ are Banach spaces with the norm

$$\|U\|_{\nu,k,\alpha} := \max_{r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}], i=1, \dots, N} \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \|\nabla^j U\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} r^{j-\nu_i} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j=0}^k |U|_{j,\alpha,S_{r,2r}^i} r^{j+\alpha-\nu_i} \right) + |U|_{k,\alpha,M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon}.$$

We look for a solution $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ of $H^\perp(U) = 0$.

Let

$$\bar{\nu} := \nu - \left(\frac{3}{2}, \dots, \frac{3}{2} \right)$$

where the second vector has N components. Let $F \in C_{\bar{\nu}}^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$, let $\Psi \in C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon})$, and let U be the solution to the Dirichlet problem (3.9) given by Lemma 3.7. Fix a cone C_i and recall that in polar coordinates $x = r\omega$ on C_i :

$$(3.13) \quad LU(x) = \frac{\partial^2 U(r\omega)}{\partial r^2} + \frac{n-1}{r} \frac{\partial U(r\omega)}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2} L_{\Sigma_i} U(r\omega)$$

where $L_{\Sigma_i} := \Delta_{\Sigma_i}^\perp + \tilde{A}_{\Sigma_i}$.

As before, L_{Σ_i} is a self-adjoint elliptic operator on $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ so L_i has a discrete set of eigenvalues for each i

$$\mu_1^i \leq \mu_2^i \leq \mu_3^i \leq \dots$$

with $\mu_j^i \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and a corresponding smooth orthonormal basis of eigensections

$$\eta_1^i, \eta_2^i, \eta_3^i, \dots,$$

for $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots$. That is,

$$\Delta_{\Sigma_i}^\perp \eta_j^i + \tilde{A}_{\Sigma_i}(\eta_j^i) + \mu_j^i \eta_j^i = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } j = 1, 2, \dots$$

with

$$\int_{\Sigma_i} |\eta_j^i(\omega)|^2 d\omega = 1 \text{ for each } i, j.$$

For $r > 0$, we can expand U in a Fourier series (see [2, 3, 24]) as

$$U(r\omega) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^i(r) \eta_j^i(\omega)$$

for functions $a_j^i(r)$, where $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Furthermore, the $a_j^i(r)$ are square summable since $U(r \cdot) \in L^2(\Sigma_i)$. Substituting the above expression for U into (3.13), we see that the a_j^i satisfy the ordinary differential equations

$$(3.14) \quad r^2 w_j'' + (n-1) r w_j' - \mu_j^i w_j = r^2 f_j^i \text{ for each } j = 1, 2, \dots$$

where

$$f_j^i(r) := \int_{\Sigma_i} \langle F(r\omega), \eta_j^i(\omega) \rangle d\omega.$$

Note that $(n-2)^2 + 4\mu_j^i > 0$ by Definition 2.1 and the strict stability of C_i , so we may define the real numbers

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j^i(+)&:= \frac{(2-n) + \sqrt{(n-2)^2 + 4\mu_j^i}}{2}, \\ \gamma_j^i(-)&:= \frac{(2-n) - \sqrt{(n-2)^2 + 4\mu_j^i}}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

By direct computation, it is easy to see that the functions $r^{\gamma_j^i(+)}$ and $r^{\gamma_j^i(-)}$ are two linearly independent solutions of the homogeneous version of the ODE (3.14) (i.e. $f_j^i \equiv 0$). Now, let J_i be a positive integer such that

$$\gamma_{J_i}^i(+) < \nu_i \leq \gamma_{J_i+1}^i(+) \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N.$$

This can be done since we have assumed $\gamma_1^i(+) < \nu_i$ for each i and $\gamma_j^i(+) \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, we let

$$(3.15) \quad F_j^i(F)(r) := \begin{cases} r^{\gamma_j^i(+)} \int_0^r \tau^{1-n-2\gamma_j^i(+)} \int_0^\tau s^{n-1+\gamma_j^i(+)} f_j^i(s) ds d\tau & \text{for } j \leq J_i \\ r^{\gamma_{J_i}^i(+)} \int_1^r \tau^{1-n-2\gamma_{J_i}^i(+)} \int_0^\tau s^{n-1+\gamma_{J_i}^i(+)} f_{J_i}^i(s) ds d\tau & \text{for } j > J_i. \end{cases}$$

Then $F_j^i(F)$ is a particular solution of (3.14). Solving the ODE (3.14), we find

$$a_j^i(r) = \alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i(+)} + \beta_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i(-)} + F_j^i(F)(r)$$

for $r \in (0, 1]$ and some numbers α_j^i, β_j^i where $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Since the proof of Lemma 3.3 in [26] only relies on the estimates proved in Section 3.1, we have:

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $F \in C_{\overline{V}}^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$, $\Psi \in C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon})$, and let U be the solution of the Dirichlet problem (3.9) guaranteed by Lemma 3.7. Then on each C_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, U has the eigensection expansion*

$$(3.16) \quad U(r\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i(+)} + F_j^i(F)(r)) \eta_j^i(\omega) \text{ for } r \in (0, 1],$$

convergent in $L^2(\Sigma)$, for unique α_j^i satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\alpha_j^i|^2 < \infty$. In addition, there is a universal constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j>J_i} (\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i(+)} + F_j^i(F)(r)) \eta_j^i \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 &\leq c \left(\int_0^1 s^{3-2\nu_i} \|F(s)\|_{L^2(\Sigma)}^2 ds \right) r^{2\nu_i} \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{j>J_i} |\alpha_j^i|^2 \right) r^{2\nu_i}. \end{aligned}$$

With Lemma 3.9 in hand, we can begin making progress toward the proof of Theorem 2.4.

4. THE FIXED POINT PROBLEM

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem 2.4, excluding strict stability of the solution and the graphical case. Since the proof of Theorem 2.4 when $n \geq 6$ is the same as the codimension one case in [26] with only slight modifications, we will only consider the cases $n = 4, 5$ in the main body of the paper. For comparison and ease of reference, an outline of the case $n \geq 6$ is included in Section 8.3 of the appendix. The main difference between the cases $n \geq 6$ and $n = 4, 5$ is that one needs a better L^p estimate for the mean curvature vector on M^ϵ when $n = 4, 5$ in order to obtain the required estimates to solve (4.1) below as a fixed point problem.

4.1. Dirichlet Problem. For $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ and $\Psi \in C_0^\infty(\overline{M^\epsilon})$, consider the Dirichlet problem

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} LV = H_0 + E(U) \text{ in } M^\epsilon, \\ V = \Psi \text{ on } \partial M^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

We need an appropriate class of Ψ for which a solution V of (4.1) will be in $C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ if $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ also. It can be seen from Lemma 3.9 that the obstruction to V being in $C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ is the set of numbers α_j^i for $j \leq J_i$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$ in the asymptotic expansion for V given by the lemma. That is, $V \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ if and only if $\alpha_j^i = 0$ when $j \leq J_i$. Thus, we need boundary conditions for which the $\alpha_j^i = 0$.

Choose δ_0 small as in Section 4 in [26] so that $D_{5\delta_0}(q_i) \cap D_{5\delta_0}(q_j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, 2I$)⁶ and choose ϵ small depending on δ_0 (e.g. $\epsilon < \frac{\delta_0}{10}$ will do). By making only minor adjustments in the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [26], we obtain:

Proposition 4.1. *For any $p > 0$, any integer $K \geq 1$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$, there exists a K -parameter family $\{\Psi_\lambda\} \subset C^\infty(\Sigma)$ ($\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K)$) satisfying the following properties:*

- (a) Ψ_λ is supported in $\Sigma_i \setminus \bigcup_{q_j \in \Sigma_i} D_{5\delta_0}(q_j)$;
- (b) $\Psi_\lambda = \lambda_1 \eta_1^i + \dots + \lambda_K \eta_K^i + \Psi_\lambda^\perp$, where $-\epsilon^p \leq \lambda_j \leq \epsilon^p$ and $\Psi_\lambda^\perp \in \text{span}\{\eta_1^i, \dots, \eta_K^i\}^\perp$;
- (c) $\|\Psi_\lambda\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma)} \leq c\epsilon^p$ where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$;
- (d) $\max_{\lambda_i \in [-\epsilon^p, \epsilon^p]} \left\| \frac{\partial \Psi_\lambda}{\partial \lambda_i} \right\|_{C^3(\Sigma)} \leq c$ for $i = 1, \dots, K$, where c is independent of ϵ . Thus, the parameter space is $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon := [-\epsilon^p, \epsilon^p]^K$.

To obtain a suitable family of boundary conditions, we apply Proposition 4.1 to each Σ_i . For each Σ_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$), let $\Psi_{\lambda^i}^i$ with $\lambda^i := (\lambda_1^i, \dots, \lambda_{J_i}^i)$ be a J_i parameter family of C^3 normal sections on Σ_i as in Proposition 4.1. Suppose also that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} p = n - 3 - \frac{3}{n^4} \text{ when } n \geq 6 \\ p = \frac{n}{2} + \frac{3}{2n^8} \text{ when } n = 4, 5. \end{cases}$$

Set $J_0 := \sum_{j=1}^N J_j$, let

$$\lambda := (\lambda_1^1, \dots, \lambda_{J_1}^1, \lambda_1^2, \dots, \lambda_{J_2}^2, \dots, \lambda_1^N, \dots, \lambda_{J_N}^N) \text{ for } \lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon,$$

⁶Recall that, for each i , q_{2i} is where the bridge Γ_i is attached to one of the cones C_i .

and let Ψ_λ be the J_0 -parameter family of functions on ∂M^ϵ given by:

$$(4.3) \quad \Psi_\lambda(x) := \begin{cases} \Psi_{\lambda_i}^i(x), & x \in \Sigma_i \text{ and } i = 1, \dots, N \\ 0, & x \in \partial M^\epsilon \setminus \cup_{i=1}^N \Sigma_i. \end{cases}$$

We now let $\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth function which is zero on $[0, \frac{3}{4}]$, increases from 0 to 1 on $[\frac{3}{4}, 1]$, and whose derivative tends to zero from the left as $r \rightarrow 1^-$ and from the right as $r \rightarrow \frac{3}{4}^+$. Then Ψ_λ can be extended to all of M^ϵ as follows: In polar coordinates $x = r\omega$ on C_i , let

$$(4.4) \quad \hat{\Psi}_\lambda(r\omega) := \phi(r)\Psi_\lambda(\omega)$$

and set $\hat{\Psi}_\lambda(x) = 0$ on $\cup_{i=1}^I \Gamma_i(\epsilon)$. Then $\hat{\Psi}_\lambda \in C_0^\infty(\overline{M^\epsilon}) \subset C_0^{2,\alpha}(\overline{M^\epsilon})$ and satisfies properties (c) and (d) in Proposition 4.1 with M^ϵ replacing Σ_i . The normal sections $\hat{\Psi}_\lambda$ are the desired boundary data for the Dirichlet problem. Going forward, we will denote the normal sections $\hat{\Psi}_\lambda$ by Ψ_λ .

We can now solve the Dirichlet problem (4.1) with Ψ_λ replacing Ψ , where $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$. We first need a suitable subset $\mathcal{K} \subset C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ for which we can uniquely solve the problem (4.1). The set \mathcal{K} will consist of sections of NM^ϵ with derivatives bounded by powers of ϵ . The powers will differ on distinct pieces of M^ϵ that we will describe below for $n = 4, 5$. For $n \geq 6$, see Section 8.3 in the appendix along with Section 4 in [26].

4.2. Dimensions Four and Five. Suppose $n = 4, 5$. If $n = 5$, let $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_K$ be an increasing sequence of numbers such that

$$\beta_0 = 2 - \frac{1}{5^8}, \quad \beta_K = \frac{5}{2} + \frac{1}{5^8},$$

and

$$\beta_k \geq \beta_{k+1} - \frac{1}{5^8} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1,$$

with equality for all $k < K-1$. Then $K \leq 5^6$. Let

$$\frac{1}{2} = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_{K-1} = \frac{3}{4}$$

be a subdivision of $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$ such that $\sigma_k - \sigma_{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{5^6}$, and set

$$V_0 := M_{\frac{3}{4}}^\epsilon, \quad V_K := S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}}, \quad V_k := S_{\sigma_{K-k-1}, \sigma_{K-k}} \quad (k = 1, \dots, K-1).$$

When $n = 4$, set

$$\beta_0 := 2 - \frac{1}{4^8}, \quad \beta_1 := 2, \quad \beta_2 := 2 + \frac{1}{4^8}$$

define the sets $\mathcal{V}_0, \mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2$ by

$$\mathcal{V}_0 := M_{\frac{3}{4}}^\epsilon, \quad \mathcal{V}_1 := S_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}}, \quad \text{and } \mathcal{V}_2 := S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}}.$$

For $n = 4, 5$, $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $\nu_i \geq 2$, define the spaces $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$ to be the set of all $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ such that $U = \Psi_\lambda$ on ∂M^ϵ for some $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$ and U satisfies the following estimates:

- (i) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon^{2 - \frac{1}{n^8} - k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$;
- (ii) $|\nabla^k U|_{(\alpha), M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} \leq \epsilon^{2 - \frac{1}{n^8} - k - \alpha}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$;
- (iii) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_l)} \leq \epsilon^{\beta_l - k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$ and each l ;
- (iv) $|U|_{k, \alpha, \mathcal{V}_l} \leq \epsilon^{\beta_l - k - \alpha}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$ and each l ;

- (v) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} r^{k-\nu_i} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{n^8} - k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$;
- (vi) $|U|_{k,\alpha,S_{r,2r}^i} r^{k+\alpha-\nu_i} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{n^8} - \alpha - k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$;
- (vii) $\|U\|_{L^2_{h^-}(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{n^8}}$;
- (viii) $\|\nabla^2 U\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{2}{n^8}}$.

The sections $\hat{\Psi}_\lambda$ in (4.4) are in $\mathcal{K}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$ for small $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, where ϵ_0 is universal. Hence, the sets \mathcal{K} are non-empty for small $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Note that \mathcal{K} is a convex closed and bounded subset of $C_{\nu}^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$. To apply the Schauder fixed point theorem we must show that solutions V of (4.1) remain in \mathcal{K} for some $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$ provided $U \in \mathcal{K}$. Notice also that $U \in \mathcal{K}$ is incrementally smaller on each succeeding \mathcal{V}_l . The inclusion of the conditions on the \mathcal{V}_l is a tool for bridging the estimates on $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$ with those on $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$.

To get the desired estimates for solutions V of (4.1) when $U \in \mathcal{K}$, estimates for $E(U)$ are needed.

Proposition 4.2. *If $U \in \mathcal{K}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$, then:*

- (a) *For each $x \in M_\delta^\epsilon$ we have*

$$|E(U)(x)| \leq c(\delta) \left(\eta |U(x)|^2 + \eta |\nabla U(x)| |U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 + |U(x)| |\nabla^2 U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)| \right),$$

where η is a non-negative function on M_δ^ϵ satisfying $\eta \leq c$ on $M_\delta^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon$ and $\eta \leq c\epsilon^{-1}$ on P_ϵ ;

- (b) $|E(U)|_{\alpha, \mathcal{V}_l} \leq c(\delta) (\epsilon^{2\beta_l - 2 - \alpha} + \epsilon^{3\beta_l - 4 - \alpha})$ for $l = 0, 1, \dots, K$;
- (c) *For $x \in C_i$ and $r = |x - p_i|$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, we have*

$$|E(U)(x)| \leq c \left(r^{-3} |U(x)|^2 + r^{-1} |\nabla U(x)|^2 + r^{-1} |U(x)| |\nabla^2 U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)| \right);$$

- (d) $\|E(U)\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} \leq \epsilon^{n-2 + \frac{2}{n^8}} r^{2\nu_i - 2}$ for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$;

- (e) $|E(U)|_{\alpha, S_{r,2r}^i} \leq c\epsilon^{n-2 + \frac{2}{n^8} - \alpha} r^{2\nu_i - 2 - \alpha}$ for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$;

where c is a universal constant and $c(\delta)$ depending only on δ .

Proof. Parts (a) and (b) follow from Lemma 6 in Section 4 of [25] and the definition of \mathcal{K} . Parts (c)-(e) are proved similarly to Proposition 4.2 in [26] using the fact that $U \in \mathcal{K}$ and that $|r^{-1}U|, |\nabla U| < 1$ for $|x - p_i| = r$, since the estimates are on the cone away from P_ϵ . See also [2] and [20]. \square

Observe that, if $U \in \mathcal{K}$, then $E(U) \in C_{\nu'}^{0,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) \subset C_{\bar{\nu}}^{0,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ where $\nu' := 2\nu - (3, \dots, 3)$ and $\bar{\nu} = \nu - (\frac{3}{2}, \dots, \frac{3}{2})$ so we may apply Lemma 3.9 to the solution V of (4.1) given by the lemma. Then on each C_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$), V has the asymptotic expansion in polar coordinates

$$(4.5) \quad V(r\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i} + F_j^i(r) \right) \eta_j^i(\omega),$$

where $F_j^i(r) := F_j^i(E(U))(r)$ and $\alpha_j^i := \alpha_j^i(U, \lambda)$. We need to show that we can kill off the α_j^i for $j \leq J_i$. Toward this end, let

$$(4.6) \quad \Lambda_U(\lambda) := (\alpha_1^1(\lambda), \dots, \alpha_{J_1}^1(\lambda), \alpha_1^2(\lambda), \dots, \alpha_{J_2}^2(\lambda), \dots, \alpha_1^N(\lambda), \dots, \alpha_{J_N}^N(\lambda)).$$

The following lemma is the key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2.4. Its proof relies on the contraction mapping theorem.

Lemma 4.3. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists a universal constant ϵ_0 such that, if $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $U \in \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$, there is a unique $\lambda_* \in \Omega_\epsilon$ such that the solution V of (4.1) satisfies $\Lambda_U(\lambda_*) = 0$. Moreover, λ_* depends continuously on U .*

We will make use of the following lemma:

Lemma 4.4. *There is an ϵ_0 such that, for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, we have*

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon} |D\bar{v}_\lambda| < 1,$$

where $D\bar{v}_\lambda$ is the Jacobian matrix of the map $\lambda \mapsto \bar{v}_\lambda$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 4.3 in [26], with only slight modifications necessary. \square

Using Lemma 4.4, we can prove Lemma 4.3.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [26] (see also Lemma 8.4). However, in lower dimensions one has to be more careful with the estimates. Fix $U \in \mathcal{H}$ and let $V := V_\lambda$ be the solution of (4.1) for $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$. On Σ_i we have the $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ expansion

$$(4.7) \quad V|_{\Sigma_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\alpha_j^i(\lambda) + F_j^i(1) \right) \eta_j^i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, N,$$

while on $\Sigma_i \setminus \cup_k D_{5\delta_0}(q_k)$ we have $V = \Psi_{\lambda^i}^i$ due to the boundary conditions. Take $\delta_0 = 10\epsilon$ for ϵ small enough and, for each $i = 1, \dots, N$, define $\bar{V}^i := \bar{V}_\lambda^i \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Sigma_i)$ by

$$\bar{V}^i(x) = \begin{cases} V(x) & \text{when } x \in D_{50\epsilon}(q_k), q_k \in \Sigma_i \\ 0 & \text{when } x \in \Sigma_i \setminus \cup_k D_{50\epsilon}(q_k). \end{cases}$$

Then \bar{V}^i has an $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ expansion

$$\bar{V}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} \bar{v}_j^i(\lambda) \eta_j^i + (\bar{V}^i)^\perp.$$

It follows that on Σ_i we have $V = \Psi_{\lambda^i}^i + \bar{V}^i$. Explicitly,

$$(4.8) \quad V|_{\Sigma_i} = \sum_{j \leq J_i} (\lambda_j^i + \bar{v}_j^i(\lambda)) \eta_j^i + (\bar{V}^i + \psi_{\lambda^i}^i)^\perp.$$

Setting (4.7) and (4.8) equal, we find

$$\alpha_j^i(\lambda) + F_j^i(1) = \lambda_j^i + \bar{v}_j^i(\lambda) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, J_i, i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Rearranging terms, we see that $\alpha_j^i(\lambda) = 0$ if and only if

$$(4.9) \quad \lambda_j^i - F_j^i(1) + \bar{v}_j^i(\lambda) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \lambda - F + \bar{v}_\lambda = 0$$

where

$$F = (F_1^1(1), \dots, F_{J_1}^1(1), \dots, F_1^N(1), \dots, F_{J_N}^N(1))$$

and

$$\bar{v}_\lambda := (\bar{v}_1^1(\lambda), \dots, \bar{v}_{J_1}^1(\lambda), \dots, \bar{v}_1^N(\lambda), \dots, \bar{v}_{J_N}^N(\lambda)).$$

In other words, (4.9) says that we need to solve a fixed point problem uniquely for $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$, provided ϵ is small. To do so, we show that the map $\lambda \mapsto F - \bar{v}_\lambda$ is a contraction map from Ω_ϵ into Ω_ϵ when ϵ is small by showing that $|F - \bar{v}_\lambda|$ is small relative to ϵ^p with p given by (4.2) when $n = 4, 5$. Going forward, the constants c_1, c_2, \dots are always universal.

First, we estimate F . For $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 1, \dots, K$ we have

$$|F_j^i(1)| = \left| \int_0^1 \tau^{1-n-2\gamma_j^i} \left(\int_0^\tau s^{n-1+\gamma_j^i} E_j^i(U(s)) ds \right) d\tau \right|.$$

Changing the order of integration and using that $2 - n - 2\gamma_j^i < 0$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} |F_j^i(1)| &\leq \Lambda \left| \int_0^1 s^{1-\gamma_j^i} E_j^i(U(s)) ds \right| \\ &\leq c_1 \Lambda \max_{0 \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}} [s^{1-\nu_i} |E(U(s))|] + c_2 \Lambda \int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} |E(U(x))|. \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 4.2(d) and the definition of \mathcal{H} , the first term in the last line is bounded by:

$$c_1 \Lambda \max_{0 \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}} [s^{1-\nu_i} |E(U(s))|] \leq c_3 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

For the second term, we need to be more careful around the bridge due to the bound on η in P_ϵ . To get a good estimate, we split the integral over $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$ into two integrals: the integral over $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon$ and the integral over P_ϵ . Proposition 4.2(a) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} |E(U(x))| dx &\leq c_4 \int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} \left(\eta |U(x)|^2 + \eta |\nabla U(x)| |U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |U(x)| |\nabla^2 U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)| \right) \\ &\leq c_5 \int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} \left(|U(x)|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |U(x)| |\nabla^2 U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

The largest term on the right-hand side is the third one. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the definition of \mathcal{H} , it is bounded by $c_6 \epsilon^{\frac{2n-1}{2}-\frac{3}{n^8}}$. For the integral over P_ϵ , the first inequality above is valid, however, due to the bound $|\eta| \leq c\epsilon^{-1}$ on P_ϵ we cannot conclude the second inequality holds and must rely on the first one. Each of the terms in which η does not appear in the first line is bounded above by $c_6 \epsilon^{\frac{2n-1}{2}-\frac{3}{n^8}}$, so we need to focus on the first two terms. The second is larger than the first, with

$$\int_{P_\epsilon} \eta |\nabla U(x)| |U(x)| \leq c_7 \epsilon^{-1} \|U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \|\nabla U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \text{Vol}(P_\epsilon) \leq c_8 \epsilon^{n+2-\frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

Combining the estimates for the integrals over $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon$ and P_ϵ , we conclude

$$\int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} |E(U(x))| \leq c_9 \epsilon^{\frac{2n-1}{2} - \frac{3}{n^8}}.$$

Hence,

$$(4.10) \quad |F| \leq c_{10} \epsilon^{n-2 + \frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

We now estimate \bar{v}_λ . We have

$$|\bar{v}_j^i(\lambda)| = \sum_{q_k \in \Sigma_i} \left| \int_{D_{50\epsilon}(q_k)} V(\omega) \cdot \eta_j^i d\omega \right| \leq c_{11} \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \epsilon^{n-1}$$

as $\text{Vol}(D_{50\epsilon}(q_k)) = O(\epsilon^{n-1})$. Thus, we need a C^0 estimate for V . Using Lemma 3.7, the definition of \mathcal{H} , the properties of Ψ_λ , and (2.20) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{L^2_{h^-}(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} &\leq \frac{1}{d^2} \left(\|\Psi_\lambda\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|L\Psi_\lambda\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|H_0\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|E(U)\|_{L^2_{h^+}(M^\epsilon)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

Using the coordinate expressions (2.8),(2.13) for L , (8.1)-(8.6), and the definition of Ψ_λ we see that

$$\|L\Psi_\lambda\|_{C^0(M^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon)} \leq c\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{3}{2n^8}} \text{ and } \|L\Psi_\lambda\|_{C^0(P_\epsilon)} \leq c\epsilon^{\frac{n-2}{2} + \frac{3}{2n^8}}.$$

Since $\text{Vol}(P_\epsilon) \leq c\epsilon^n$, the right-hand side is bounded by

$$(4.11) \quad c_{12} \left(\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}} + \|E(U)\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} + \|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \right).$$

The estimate for the third term is the same as the first term in the estimate for $|F|$, and is bounded by $c_{13}\epsilon^{n-2 + \frac{2}{n^8}}$. For the fourth term, we need to apply Proposition 4.2(a) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \|E(U)\|_{L^2(NM_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)}^2 &\leq c_{14} \int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} \left(\eta^2 |U(x)|^4 + \eta^2 |\nabla U(x)|^2 |U(x)|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^4 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^4 |\nabla^2 U(x)|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as was done to estimate $\|E(U)\|_{L^1(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)}$, we then get

$$(4.12) \quad \|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{15} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{3}{n^8}}.$$

Substituting these estimates into (4.11) yields

$$(4.13) \quad \|V\|_{L^2_{h^-}(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq c_{16} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Applying Corollary 3.3, (4.13), and the fact that H_0 is supported in $\cup_j \Gamma_j(\epsilon)$, we obtain

$$(4.14) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{12}})} \leq c_{17} \left(\|V\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2}})} + \|E(U)\|_{L^n(S_{\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2}})} \right)$$

Arguing as in the estimate for $|F|$ gives

$$\|E(U)\|_{L^n(S_{\frac{1}{12}, \frac{1}{2}})} \leq c_{18} \epsilon^{n-2 + \frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

Furthermore, (4.13) shows

$$\|V\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{15}, \frac{1}{2}})} \leq c_{19}\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Combining the previous two estimates, we get

$$(4.15) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{5}{12}})} \leq c_{20}\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

By Proposition 3.5, we have

$$\|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{21} \left(\|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{5}{12}})} + \|E(U)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(S_{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{5}{12}})} \right).$$

The first term on the right-hand side is fine due to (4.15), but we have to be more careful with the second term. Using Proposition 4.2(e), we get:

$$(4.16) \quad \|E(U)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(S_{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{5}{12}})} \leq c_{22}\epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}-\alpha}.$$

Then

$$(4.17) \quad \|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{23}\epsilon^{n-3}.$$

We now let $\varphi \in C^2(M^\epsilon)$ be a (real-valued) cut-off function satisfying

$$\varphi(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & x \in M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon \\ 0, & x \in M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

By Corollary 3.2 and the Minkowski inequality, we have

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\varphi V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} &\leq c(\tau) \left(\|H_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} + \|E(U)\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} + \|V\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} + \|\Psi_\lambda\|_{C^0(\partial M^\epsilon)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We have sufficient estimates for all but the terms involving $E(U)$ and ∇V , so we focus our attention there. From (4.13) and (4.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} &\leq c_{24} \|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})}^{\frac{n-4}{2} + \frac{2\tau}{n+2\tau}} \|\nabla V\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})}^{\frac{4}{n+2\tau}} \\ &\leq c_{25} \epsilon^{\frac{(n-4)(n-3)}{2} + (n-3)\frac{2\tau}{n+2\tau} + \frac{4n}{2n+4\tau}} \end{aligned}$$

Choosing τ small depending on n yields

$$\|\nabla V\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{26} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{2n^8}}.$$

To estimate the second term on the right-hand side in (4.18), we once again break up the integral into the integral over P_ϵ and the integral over $M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|E(U)\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon)} &\leq c_{27} \left(\left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} |U|^{n+2\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} + \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} |\nabla U|^{n+2\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} |\nabla U|^{n+2\tau} |\nabla^2 U|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} |U|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} |\nabla^2 U|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The worst term is the third term:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon \setminus P_\epsilon} |\nabla U|^{n+2\tau} |\nabla^2 U|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} &\leq \|\nabla U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)}^2 \|\nabla^2 U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)}^{\frac{n-4}{n+2\tau} + \frac{2\tau}{n+2\tau}} \|\nabla^2 U\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)}^{\frac{4}{n+2\tau}} \\ &\leq \epsilon^{2 - \frac{2}{n^8} \left(\epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{2}{n^8}} \right)^{\frac{4}{n+2\tau}} \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{n^8} \left(\frac{n-4}{n+2\tau} + \frac{2\tau}{n+2\tau} \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for τ small depending on n the right-hand side is bounded by $\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}$. For the integral over P_ϵ , we apply the Minkowski inequality to the expression in Proposition 4.2(a) as before. The terms in which η does not appear are estimated exactly as above. Of the terms involving η in Proposition 4.2, the second is the largest. Using $\text{Vol}(P_\epsilon) \leq c\epsilon^n$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{P_\epsilon} (\eta |\nabla U(x)| |U(x)|)^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} &\leq c_{28} \epsilon^{\frac{2n}{n+2\tau}-1} \|\nabla U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \|U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \\ &\leq c_{29} \epsilon^{3 - \frac{2}{n^8}} \text{ for } \tau \text{ small.} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the estimates for each integral gives

$$\|E(U)\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{30} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

The mean curvature term is estimated by

$$\|H_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{31} \epsilon^{2-4\tau} \leq c_{32} \epsilon^{2 - \frac{1}{2n^8}},$$

where we have chosen $\tau \leq \frac{1}{8n^8}$ also in the second inequality. Inserting the previous estimates into (4.18), we conclude

$$(4.19) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{33} \epsilon^{2 - \frac{1}{2n^8}}$$

so that

$$(4.20) \quad \|\bar{v}_\lambda\|_{C^0(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq c_{11} \epsilon^{n-1} \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{34} \epsilon^{n+1 - \frac{1}{2n^8}}.$$

Combining (4.10) and (4.20) shows

$$\|F - \bar{v}_\lambda\|_{C^0(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq c_{35} \epsilon^{n-2 + \frac{2}{n^8}} \leq c_{35} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{2}{n^8}}$$

so that $\lambda \mapsto F - \bar{v}_\lambda$ maps Ω_ϵ into Ω_ϵ for small ϵ depending on n and the universal constant c_{35} . Since Lemma 4.4 holds independent of dimension, this map is a contraction and we are done. \square

Next, we show that the unique solution given by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 4.3 is in $C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ for small enough ϵ . Let $\lambda(U)$ be the λ_* in the statement of Lemma 4.3.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose $U \in \mathcal{X}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\nu_i \geq 2$, and $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Then the unique solution V of*

$$\begin{aligned} LW &= H_0 + E(U) \text{ on } M^\epsilon \\ W &= \Psi_{\lambda(U)} \text{ on } \partial M^\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

given by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 4.3 is in $C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$.

Proof. Combining Lemma 3.7 with Lemma 4.3 shows that on each C_i the solution V has the $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ expansion in polar coordinates:

$$V(r\omega) = \sum_{j \leq J_i} F_j^i(r) \eta_j^i(\omega) + \sum_{j > J_i} \left(\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i} + F_j^i(r) \right) \eta_j^i(\omega)$$

for unique α_j^i , $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = J_i + 1, \dots$, where $F_j^i(r) := F_j^i(E(U))(r)$. We need to estimate $\|V(r\omega)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)}$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$. By (4.10), we have

$$|F_j^i(r)| \leq c_1 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}} r^{\nu_i}.$$

so that

$$(4.21) \quad \left\| \sum_{j \leq J_i} F_j^i(r) \eta_j^i(\omega) \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_2 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}} r^{\nu_i} \text{ for } r \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By Lemma 3.9,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j > J_i} \left(\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i} + F_j^i(r) \right) \eta_j^i(\omega) \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} &\leq \left(\sum_{j > J_i} |\alpha_j^i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{\nu_i} \\ &\quad + c \left(\int_0^1 s^{3-2\nu_i} \|E(U(s\omega))\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{\nu_i} \end{aligned}$$

so we need to estimate the right-hand side. Note that

$$(4.22) \quad V|_{\Sigma_i} = \sum_{j \leq J_i} F_j^i(1) \eta_j^i + \sum_{j > K} \alpha_j^i \eta_j^i \text{ and } V|_{\Sigma_i} = \Psi_{\lambda^i}^i + \bar{V}^i.$$

Since $\bar{V}^i = V$ on $D := \cup_k D_{5\epsilon}(q_k)$, is zero on $\Sigma_i \setminus D$, and $\text{Vol}(D) \leq c\epsilon^{n-1}$ the estimate (4.19) gives

$$\|V|_{\Sigma_i}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_3 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

Combining this with (4.10) and (4.22) yields

$$(4.23) \quad \left(\sum_{j > J_i} |\alpha_j^i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c_4 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

By the argument used to estimate (4.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_0^1 s^{3-2\nu_i} \|E(U(s\omega))\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \\ &c_5 \left(\|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} + \max_{0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}} \left(s^{\frac{3}{2}-\nu_i} |E(U(s\omega))| \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

From (4.12) and the argument used to estimate $|F|$ in Lemma 4.3,

$$\|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_6 \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{3}{n^8}} \text{ and } \max_{0 < s \leq \frac{1}{2}} \left(s^{\frac{3}{2}-\nu_i} |E(U(s\omega))| \right) \leq c_7 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

Using the estimates above along with (4.21) and (4.23), we deduce that for $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and each $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$(4.24) \quad \|V(r\omega)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_8 \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8}} r^{\nu_i}.$$

Next, recall that by Corollary 3.3, for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{8}$

$$(4.25) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} \leq c_9 \left(r^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\int_{\frac{r}{2}}^{4r} s^{n-1} \int_{\Sigma_i} |V(s\omega)|^2 d\omega ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + r \|E(U)\|_{L^n(S_{\frac{r}{2},4r})} \right).$$

By prior estimates, both terms are bounded by a similar quantity as in (4.24), so we have

$$(4.26) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} \leq c_{10} \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8} r^{\nu_i}}.$$

Applying (4.26), Proposition 3.5, and Proposition 4.2(e), we find that for each $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{8}$ and each $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{cases} \|V\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} \leq c_{11} \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8} r^{\nu_i}} \\ \|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} \leq c_{12} \epsilon^{n-3+\frac{2}{n^8} r^{\nu_i-k}} \text{ for } k = 1, 2 \\ |V|_{k,\alpha,S_{r,2r}^i} \leq c_{13} \epsilon^{n-2+\frac{2}{n^8} r^{\nu_i-k-\alpha}} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

We have therefore shown that $V \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$. \square

Using Lemma 3.8, Lemma 4.3, and Proposition 4.5 we can define a mapping

$$T : \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu) \rightarrow C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon) \text{ for } \epsilon < \epsilon_0 \text{ and } \alpha \in (0, 1)$$

where, for each $U \in \mathcal{H}$, $T(U)$ is the solution V of

$$\begin{cases} LV = H_0 + E(U) \text{ on } M^\epsilon \\ V = \Psi_{\lambda(U)} \text{ on } \partial M^\epsilon \end{cases}$$

guaranteed by Lemma 3.8. Arguing as in [26], one can show that T is continuous in the $C_\nu^{2,\alpha}$ topology. Since \mathcal{H} is convex, closed, and bounded in $C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$, if $\alpha' < \alpha$ the set \mathcal{H} is contained in $C_\nu^{2,\alpha'}(M^\epsilon)$ as a compact subset by standard properties of Hölder norms. We have:

Lemma 4.6. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there is a universal constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

$$T : \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu) \text{ for all } \epsilon < \epsilon_0.$$

Proof. We need to show that the solution V to the Dirichlet problem in Proposition 4.5 is in \mathcal{H} . More precisely, we need to show

(a) For $\theta > 2 - \frac{1}{n^8}$ and $k = 0, 1, 2$

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq c \epsilon^{\theta-k} \\ |V|_{k,\alpha,M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} \leq c \epsilon^{\theta-k-\alpha}; \end{cases}$$

(b) For $\rho_l > \beta_l$, $l = 1, \dots, K$, and $k = 0, 1, 2$

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_l)} \leq c \epsilon^{\rho_l-k} \\ |V|_{k,\alpha,\mathcal{V}_l} \leq c \epsilon^{\rho_l-k-\alpha}; \end{cases}$$

(c) For $i = 1, \dots, K$, $k = 0, 1, 2$, and $0 < r < \frac{1}{4}$

$$\begin{cases} \|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} r^{k-\nu_i} c\epsilon^{\tau-k} \\ |V|_{k,\alpha,S_{r,2r}^i} r^{k+\alpha-\nu_i} \leq c\epsilon^{\tau-k-\alpha}, \end{cases}$$

where $\tau > \frac{n}{2} + \frac{1}{n^8}$.

(d) For $\zeta_1 > \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{n^8}$

$$\|V\|_{L^2_{h^-}(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq c\epsilon^{\zeta_1};$$

(e) For $\zeta_2 > \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{1}{n^8}$

$$\|\nabla^2 V\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq c\epsilon^{\zeta_2}.$$

In each case, c is a universal constant and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \theta, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_K, \tau$ depend only on n . Note that (d) is just (4.13) with $\zeta_1 = \frac{n}{2}$. Also, when $k = 0$ (4.19) shows we may take $\theta = 2 - \frac{1}{2n^8}$ in (a) when $k = 0$. Using this, Proposition 3.5, and a covering argument we easily obtain

$$(4.28) \quad \|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{2}})} \leq c_1 \epsilon^{1 - \frac{1}{2n^8}}.$$

We now let $V = W + \Psi_{\lambda(U)}$ so that $LW = H_0 + E(U) - L\Psi_{\lambda(U)}$ and $W = 0$ on ∂M^ϵ . Let φ be a smooth cutoff function on $M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon$ such that

$$\varphi(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \\ 0 & \text{for } x \notin M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

Applying Proposition 3.4(a) to φW for $k = 1, 2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^k W\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} &\leq c_2 \left(\epsilon^{2-k} + \epsilon^{2-k} \|E(U)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon)} + \epsilon^{2-k} \|L\Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \epsilon^{-k} \|W\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon)} + \epsilon^{2-k} \|\nabla W\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{2}})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the coordinate expressions (2.8),(2.13) for L , (8.1)-(8.6), and the definition of $\Psi_{\lambda(U)}$ we find

$$\|L\Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon)} \leq c\epsilon^{\frac{n-4}{2} + \frac{3}{2n^8}}.$$

Hence, using the definition of \mathcal{K} , Proposition 4.2, the definition of $\Psi_{\lambda(U)}$, part (a) for $k = 0$, and (4.28), we get

$$\|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq \|\nabla^k W\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} + \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{3}{2n^8}} \leq c_3 \epsilon^{2 - \frac{1}{2n^8} - k}.$$

The proof of the estimate for the Hölder norms is identical with Proposition 3.4(b) replacing Proposition 3.4(a). Hence, condition (a) is proved with $\theta = 2 - \frac{1}{2n^8}$.

Next, we prove condition (e). Set $R_\epsilon := \cup_{j=1}^I \Gamma_j(\epsilon) \cup_{i=1}^{2I} B_{10\epsilon}(q_i)$ and note that on R_ϵ part (a) gives

$$\|\nabla^2 V\|_{C^0(R_\epsilon)} \leq c_4 \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{n^8}}.$$

Thus,

$$(4.29) \quad \|\nabla^2 V\|_{L^2(R_\epsilon)} \leq c_5 \epsilon^{-\frac{1}{n^8}} \text{Vol}(R_\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c_6 \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{1}{n^8}}.$$

Let W and φ be as in the proof of (a) and let $\tilde{\varphi}$ be a smooth cutoff function such that

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in M^\epsilon \setminus R_\epsilon \\ 0 & \text{for } \tilde{R}_\epsilon, \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{R}_\epsilon := \cup_{j=1}^I \Gamma_j(\epsilon) \cup_{i=1}^{2I} B_{7\epsilon}(q_i)$. Suppose further that

$$\|\nabla \tilde{\varphi}\|_{C^0(M^\epsilon)} \epsilon + \|\nabla^2 \tilde{\varphi}\|_{C^0(M^\epsilon)} \epsilon^2 \leq c_7$$

and note that $\text{Vol}(\text{supp}(\nabla^k \tilde{\varphi})) \leq c_8 \epsilon^n$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then $\varphi \tilde{\varphi} W \in C^2(M^\epsilon)$ supported on $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon \setminus \tilde{R}_\epsilon$; hence, it is supported on $S_{\frac{1}{3}, 1}$ and vanishes on the boundary. Since $S_{\frac{1}{3}, 1}$ is a smooth submanifold independent of ϵ , we can apply standard elliptic interior L^2 estimates for L (e.g. [15, 18]) to find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla^2(\varphi \tilde{\varphi} W)\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{3}, 1})} &\leq c_9 (\|L(\varphi \tilde{\varphi} W)\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{3}, 1})} + \|\varphi \tilde{\varphi} W\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{3}, 1})}) \\ &\leq c_9 (\|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon \setminus \tilde{R}_\epsilon)} + \|L\Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \\ &\quad + \|\nabla \Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|\Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \\ &\quad + \|V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla W\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}})}) \\ &\quad + \|\nabla W\|_{C^0(\tilde{R}_\epsilon \setminus R_\epsilon)} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}-1} + \|W\|_{C^0(\tilde{R}_\epsilon \setminus R_\epsilon)} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Each of the terms on the right-hand side can be estimated from the prior estimates. By (4.12), we have

$$\|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{3}}^\epsilon \setminus \tilde{R}_\epsilon)} \leq c_{10} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{3}{n^8}}$$

and the definition of $\Psi_{\lambda(U)}$ gives

$$\|L\Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla \Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|\Psi_{\lambda(U)}\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq c_{11} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} + \frac{3}{2n^8}}.$$

From (4.13), we obtain

$$\|\nabla W\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq c_{12} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

Note that $W = V - \Psi_{\lambda(U)}$, so from part (a) and the definition of $\Psi_{\lambda(U)}$ we have

$$\|W\|_{C^0(\tilde{R}_\epsilon \setminus R_\epsilon)} \leq c_{13} \epsilon^{2 - \frac{1}{2n^8}}.$$

It follows that

$$\|\nabla^2(\varphi \tilde{\varphi} W)\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{1}{3}, 1})} \leq c_{14} \epsilon^{\frac{n}{2} - \frac{2}{n^8}}.$$

Combining this with (4.29), we find that

$$\|\nabla^2 V\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{15} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{1}{n^8}}$$

which proves (e) with $\zeta_2 = \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{1}{n^8}$.

We first prove (b) when $k = 0$. To do so, we need an estimate for the C^0 norm of V on a slightly larger set $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l$ for each l . Recall that, when $n = 5$, $\mathcal{V}_l = S_{\sigma_{K-l-1}, \sigma_{K-l}}$ ($l = 1, \dots, K$), set $\bar{\sigma} := \min_{k=1, \dots, K-1} |\sigma_k - \sigma_{k-1}|$, and define

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l := S_{\sigma_{K-l-1} + \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2}, \sigma_{K-l} - \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{2}}.$$

Applying Corollary 3.3 on balls of radius $\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{4}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l$ we obtain

$$\|V\|_{C^0(\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l)} \leq c_{16} \left(\epsilon^{\frac{n}{2}} + \|E(U)\|_{L^n(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})} + \|E(U)\|_{L^n(\mathcal{V}_l)} + \|E(U)\|_{L^n(\mathcal{V}_{l+1})} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{V}_{l+1} = S_{\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4}}$ when $l = K$. The same estimate holds when $n = 4$, though in this case we set $\bar{\sigma} = 4^{-8}$. We can estimate the right-hand side using the definition of \mathcal{H} . Since the β_l increase on each successive \mathcal{V}_l , the first term is the largest. Using Proposition 4.2(c) and the definition of \mathcal{H} , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|E(U)\|_{L^n(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})} &\leq c_{17} \left(\left(\int_{\mathcal{V}_{l-1}} |U|^{2n} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} + \left(\int_{\mathcal{V}_{l-1}} |\nabla U|^{2n} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\int_{\mathcal{V}_{l-1}} |\nabla U|^{2n} |\nabla^2 U|^n \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} + \left(\int_{\mathcal{V}_{l-1}} |U|^n |\nabla^2 U|^n \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right) \\ &\leq c_{18} \left(\|U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{2n-2}{n}} \|U\|_{L^2(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{2}{n}} + \|\nabla U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{2n-2}{n}} \|\nabla U\|_{L^2(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{2}{n}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|\nabla U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^2 \|\nabla^2 U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{n-2}{n}} \|\nabla^2 U\|_{L^2(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{2}{n}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})} \|\nabla^2 U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{n-2}{n}} \|\nabla^2 U\|_{L^2(\mathcal{V}_{l-1})}^{\frac{2}{n}} \right) \\ &\leq c_{19} \left(\epsilon^{\beta_{l-1} \frac{2n-2}{n} + 1 - \frac{1}{n^9}} + \epsilon^{(\beta_{l-1}-1) \frac{2n-2}{n} + 1 - \frac{1}{n^9}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \epsilon^{2(\beta_{l-1}-1) + (\beta_{l-1}-2) \frac{n-2}{n} + 1 - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{4}{n^9}} + \epsilon^{\beta_{l-1} + (\beta_{l-1}-2) \frac{n-2}{n} + 1 - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{4}{n^9}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The two largest terms are the second and third. Using that $\beta_0 = 2 - \frac{1}{n^8}$ and $\beta_{l-1} \geq \beta_l - \frac{1}{n^8}$, it is straightforward to check that each of the exponents in those terms is larger than β_l . It follows that

$$(4.30) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l)} \leq c_{20} \epsilon^{\rho_l} \text{ for some } \rho_l > \beta_l.$$

Applying Proposition 3.5(b) on a covering of \mathcal{V}_l by balls of radius 2ϵ contained in $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l$ and using (4.30), we find

$$\|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_l)} \leq c_{21} \left(\epsilon^{-k} \|V\|_{C^0(\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l)} + \epsilon^{2-k} \|E(U)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(\hat{\mathcal{V}}_l)} \right).$$

By Proposition 4.2(b), the second term on the right-hand side is bounded above by

$$c_{22} \left(\epsilon^{2\beta_l - \frac{2}{n^8} - k - \alpha} + \epsilon^{3\beta_l - 2 - \frac{3}{n^8} - k - \alpha} \right).$$

In addition,

$$2\beta_l - \frac{2}{n^8} - k - \alpha > \beta_l - k \text{ and } 3\beta_l - 2 - \frac{3}{n^8} - k - \alpha > \beta_l - k.$$

Combining this with (4.30) proves the C^0 estimates in (b) for $k = 1, 2$. The proof of the C^α estimates in (b) is identical. Thus, the lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 4.6 gives us the desired solution to Theorem 2.4. Indeed, from the discussion preceding Lemma 4.6, \mathcal{H} is a convex, compact subset in $C_\nu^{2, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(M^\epsilon)$ and

$$T : \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu) \subset \mathcal{H}\left(n, \epsilon, \frac{\alpha}{2}, \nu\right) \rightarrow C_\nu^{2, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(M^\epsilon)$$

is continuous in the $C_\nu^{2, \frac{\alpha}{2}}$ topology. By the Schauder fixed point theorem, T has a fixed point $U \in \mathcal{H}$ for $\epsilon < \min\{\epsilon_0(\alpha), \epsilon_0(\frac{\alpha}{2})\}$. In particular, U solves the Dirichlet problem (4.1) with $\Psi = \Psi_{\lambda(U)}$. This implies the perturbed submanifold M_U^ϵ

determined by U is minimal. Since $U \in C_v^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$, we have the pointwise estimate

$$|U(x)| \leq c|x - p_i|^{\nu_i} \text{ for } x \in C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

In addition, M_U^ϵ is embedded if ϵ is sufficiently small since $\|U\|_{C^1(M^\epsilon)}$ is small and M^ϵ is embedded.

To prove M_U^ϵ in Theorem 2.4 is smooth away from the vertices p_i of the cones C_i , we need to show U is smooth in $M^\epsilon \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_N\}$. Let (Ω, ψ) be any coordinate chart for M^ϵ satisfying the conditions in Section 8.1. Then $(\Omega, \psi + U)$ is a coordinate chart for M_U^ϵ . Since M_U^ϵ is minimal, $\psi + U$ solves

$$H(U) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g(U)}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} \left(\sqrt{g(U)} g^{ij}(U) \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} (\psi + U) \right) = 0,$$

where $g(U)$ and $g^{ij}(U)$ are given by (2.25) and (2.26), respectively. Notice that, since ψ is smooth and $U \in C^{2,\alpha}$, the divergence form system above is uniformly elliptic with $C^{1,\alpha}$ coefficients. Using that $\Psi_{\lambda(U)}$ is smooth in the case ψ is a boundary coordinate map, we conclude that $\psi + U$ is smooth by a standard bootstrapping argument. Since ψ is smooth, U must be smooth also. It follows that M_U^ϵ is a smooth submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} away from the p_i . Combining the results in this section with those of Section 8.3, Theorem 2.4 is proven for each $n \geq 4$ excluding the strict stability statement and the graphical case.

5. STABILITY

We show that the submanifold M_U^ϵ obtained from Theorem 2.4 is strictly stable for ϵ small enough and each $n \geq 4$. To do so, we will need to derive an appropriate local frame for NM_U^ϵ around each of its points so that we may compare the first eigenvalue for the stability operator L_U on M_U^ϵ to the first eigenvalue for the stability operator L on M^ϵ when ϵ is small.

Let $\psi : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ be a coordinate map for M^ϵ about a point $p := \psi(x_0)$ and let n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} be a local orthonormal frame for NM^ϵ in a neighborhood of p . Applying Theorem 2.4 for ϵ small enough, we obtain $U \in \mathcal{K}$ solving (4.1) and an associated minimal submanifold M_U^ϵ .⁷ The map $\phi := \psi + U$ is a local parameterization of M_U^ϵ near $q := p + U(x_0)$. A local frame for TM^ϵ near p is given by $\{\psi_{x^i}\}_{i=1}^n$ and a local frame for TM_U^ϵ near q is $\{\phi_{x^i}\}_{i=1}^n$. Let $g_{ij} := \psi_{x^i} \cdot \psi_{x^j}$ be the components of the metric on M^ϵ and set $g := (g_{ij})$, $g^{-1} := (g^{ij})$. We want to find a local frame for NM_U^ϵ of the form

$$\nu_k := n_k + \epsilon_k \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, m+1,$$

where ϵ_k is a smooth section of TM^ϵ near p . To do so, we solve the system

$$\phi_{x^i} \cdot \nu_j = 0 \text{ for each } i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, m+1.$$

Write $U = u^k n_k$. Expanding the above expression gives

$$(5.1) \quad \psi_{x^i} \cdot \epsilon_j + u^k (n_k)_{x^i} \cdot \epsilon_j = -u_{;i}^j \text{ for each } i, j,$$

where $u_{;i}^j$ is defined by (2.6). Since $\epsilon_j \in TM^\epsilon$, we may write $\epsilon_j := a^{lj} \psi_{x^l}$. Plugging this into (5.1), we get

$$(5.2) \quad g_{il} a^{lj} + u^k ((n_k)_{x^i} \cdot \psi_{x^l}) a^{lj} = -u_{;i}^j.$$

⁷See Section 8.3 for the definition of \mathcal{K} when $n \geq 6$.

Define the column vectors

$$a_j := \begin{pmatrix} a^{1j} \\ \vdots \\ a^{nj} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } b_j := \begin{pmatrix} -u_{;1}^j \\ \vdots \\ -u_{;n}^j \end{pmatrix}.$$

For j fixed, we can then write (5.2) as

$$(5.3) \quad Ba_j = b_j,$$

where $B := B(\epsilon) = g + S$ and $S := S(\epsilon) = (s_{rs}(\epsilon))$ is given by

$$s_{rs} = u^k ((n_k)_{x^r} \cdot \psi_{x^s}).$$

Using (8.1)-(8.6), we get the pointwise bound

$$|s_{rs}| \leq c(\delta)|U| \text{ for each } n \geq 4.$$

Notice that $S \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in C^0 since $U \in \mathcal{X}$. By continuity and the invertibility of g , it follows that B is invertible for small ϵ with

$$(5.4) \quad B^{-1} = (I + g^{-1}S)^{-1}g^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k (g^{-1}S)^k g^{-1}.$$

Inverting the expression (5.3) for each j , we find $a_j = B^{-1}b_j$. Applying (2.6), (2.7), (8.1)-(8.6), $U \in \mathcal{X}$, and the standard fact

$$\frac{\partial C^{-1}}{\partial x^i} = -C^{-1} \frac{\partial C}{\partial x^i} C^{-1}$$

for any invertible matrix C , we obtain the following pointwise bounds on M_δ^ϵ for $n \geq 4$ and small ϵ :⁸

$$\begin{cases} |a_j| & \leq c(\delta)(1 + |U|)|\nabla U| \\ |Da_j| & \leq c(\delta)(|\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|). \end{cases}$$

It follows that on M_δ^ϵ

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{cases} |\epsilon_j| \leq c(\delta)(1 + |U|)|\nabla U| \leq c(\delta)|\nabla U| \\ |(\epsilon_j)_{x^i} \cdot n_k| \leq c(\delta)|\nabla U| \\ |(\epsilon_j)_{x^i} \cdot \epsilon_k| \leq c(\delta)(|\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|)|\nabla U| \end{cases}$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and each $j, k = 1, \dots, m+1$. Let h be the function (3.8). A similar argument shows that on $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{cases} |\epsilon_j| \leq c(1 + h^{-1}|U|)|\nabla U| \leq c|\nabla U| \\ |(\epsilon_j)_{x^i} \cdot n_k| \leq c|\nabla U| \\ |(\epsilon_j)_{x^i} \cdot \epsilon_k| \leq c(|\nabla^2 U| + h^{-1}|\nabla U| + h^{-2}|U|)|\nabla U| \end{cases}$$

for each i, j, k , where c is independent of δ, ϵ . Since $U \in \mathcal{X}$, (5.5) and (5.6) together imply that for small ϵ the normal sections ν_k are linearly independent near q . Hence, they form a smooth local normal frame for M_U^ϵ near q .

Denote the metric on M_U^ϵ by $g(U) := (g_{ij}(U))$, denote the second fundamental form for M^ϵ and M_U^ϵ by A and $A(U)$, respectively, and set $\epsilon_{ij} := \epsilon_i \cdot \epsilon_j$. Write

$$A_{ij}^k := \psi_{x^i x^j} \cdot n_k \text{ and } A_{ij}^k(U) := (\psi_{x^i x^j} + U_{x^i x^j}) \cdot \nu_k.$$

⁸When $n \geq 6$, we can drop the ϵ from the second expression.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{ij}(U) &= g_{ij} + U_{x^i} \cdot U_{x^j} - 2\psi_{x^i x^j} \cdot U \\ &=: g_{ij} + R_{ij}(U) \\ A_{ij}^k(U) &= A_{ij}^k + \psi_{x^i x^j} \cdot \epsilon_k + U_{x^i x^j} \cdot n_k + U_{x^i x^j} \cdot \epsilon_k \\ &=: A_{ij}^k + R_{ij}^k(U). \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.6), (2.7), (5.5), and (5.6) we obtain pointwise bounds for the remainders in the expressions above on M_δ^ϵ .

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{cases} |R_{ij}(U)| \leq c(\delta)(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|) \\ |R_{ij}^k(U)| \leq c(\delta)(|\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|), \end{cases}$$

On $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$ we get

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{cases} |R_{ij}(U)| \leq ch^{-1}(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|) \\ |R_{ij}^k(U)| \leq c(|\nabla^2 U| + h^{-1}|\nabla U| + h^{-2}|U|). \end{cases}$$

By (5.7), (5.8), and the fact that $U \in \mathcal{K}$, we may compute g^{-1} precisely as in (5.4). This, along with the previous estimates, shows that on M_δ^ϵ we have

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{cases} |g_{ij}(U) - g_{ij}| \leq c(\delta)(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|) \\ |g^{ij}(U) - g^{ij}| \leq c(\delta)(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|) \end{cases}$$

and on $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$ we have

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{cases} |g_{ij}(U) - g_{ij}| \leq ch^{-1}(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|) \\ |g^{ij}(U) - g^{ij}| \leq ch^{-1}(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|). \end{cases}$$

Let $d\mathcal{H}^n$ be the volume measure on M^ϵ and write $d\mathcal{H}_U^n$ for the volume measure on M_U^ϵ . Since

$$\det g(U) = \det g \det(I + g^{-1}R(U))$$

for $R(U) := (R_{ij}(U))$, direct computation shows

$$(5.11) \quad d\mathcal{H}_U^n = \sqrt{\det g(U)} d\mathcal{H}^n = (1 + \mu(x)) d\mathcal{H}^n$$

where $\mu(x)$ is some function on M^ϵ that is a polynomial in the components of g , g^{-1} , and $R(U)$. Furthermore,

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R_{ij}(U)}{\partial x^r} &= U_{x^i x^r} \cdot U_{x^j} \\ &\quad + U_{x^i} \cdot U_{x^j x^r} - 2(\psi_{x^i x^j x^r} \cdot U + \psi_{x^i x^j} \cdot U_{x^r}) \end{aligned}$$

so (2.6), (2.7), (5.7), (5.8), (5.11), and (5.12) along with the fact that $U \in \mathcal{K}$ show

$$(5.13) \quad |\mu(x)| + |\nabla \mu(x)| \leq c\epsilon^{\gamma_0} \text{ for } x \in M^\epsilon$$

for some constants c, γ_0 independent of ϵ . With the above estimates in hand, we can now prove strict stability of M_U^ϵ for ϵ small.

Proof of Strict Stability. In the proof, the constants c, γ will always denote constants independent of ϵ and δ . Set

$$M_U^\epsilon(\delta) := \{x + U(x) : x \in M_\delta^\epsilon, \delta > 0\},$$

and let λ_δ be the smallest eigenvalue of $h^2 L_U$ as an operator on

$$L_h^2(U) := L^2(NM_U^\epsilon(\delta); h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}_U^n).$$

Let $V \in NM_U^\epsilon(\delta)$ be a unit eigensection for L_U on $M_U^\epsilon(\delta)$ corresponding to λ_δ so that $V \in C^\infty$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} L_U V &= -\lambda_\delta h^{-2} V \text{ on } M_U^\epsilon(\delta) \\ V &= 0 \text{ on } \partial M_U^\epsilon(\delta), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{M_U^\epsilon(\delta)} h^{-2} |V|^2 d\mathcal{H}_U^n = 1.$$

We will show $\inf_{\delta > 0} \lambda_\delta > 0$. Since λ_δ is decreasing in δ , we may assume $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{10})$.

Before we continue, we need to do some preliminary calculations. In the chosen coordinates, we can write $V := v^k \nu_k$. Let \bar{V} denote the orthogonal projection of V onto NM_δ^ϵ , so that $\bar{V} = v^k n_k$. Set $v_{;i}^k := V_{x^i} \cdot \nu_k$ and $\bar{v}_{;i}^k := \bar{V}_{x^i} \cdot n_k$. Computing, we find

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{cases} \bar{v}_{;i}^k = v_{x^i}^k + B_{li}^k v^l \\ v_{;i}^k = \bar{v}_{;i}^k + \epsilon_{lk} \bar{v}_{;i}^l + c_{li}^k(\epsilon) v^l, \end{cases}$$

where

$$c_{li}^k(\epsilon) := (n_l)_{x^i} \cdot \epsilon_k + (\epsilon_l)_{x^i} \cdot n_k + (\epsilon_l)_{x^i} \cdot \epsilon_k - B_{li}^t \epsilon_{tk}.$$

By (5.5) and (5.6), we have $\|c_{li}^k\|_{C^0} \leq c\epsilon^\gamma$. Using this, (5.5), (5.6), (5.9), (5.10), and (5.14), we obtain the pointwise estimate

$$(5.15) \quad |\nabla \bar{V}|^2 \leq c(|\nabla_U V|^2 + |V|^2)$$

for small ϵ , where ∇_U is the connection on NM_U^ϵ . Since $|\bar{V}|^2 \leq |V|^2$ always, the estimate above shows $\bar{V} \in H_{0,h}^1(M_\delta^\epsilon)$ for small enough ϵ . We further note that if we represent the Simons' operators on M^ϵ and M_U^ϵ by \tilde{A} and \tilde{A}_U , respectively, then

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{A}(\bar{V}) = (g^{sj} g^{it} A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k v^l) n_k \\ \tilde{A}_U(V) = (g^{sj}(U) g^{it}(U) A_{st}^l(U) A_{ij}^k(U) (v^l + v^r \epsilon_{lr})) \nu_k \end{cases}$$

in the chosen coordinates. Here, we have summed over repeated indices. Let Δ_U^\perp be the connection Laplacian on NM_U^ϵ . Then integration by parts combined with (5.11) shows

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} \langle \bar{V}, L\bar{V} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n &= \lambda_\delta \int_{M_U^\epsilon(\delta)} h^{-2} |V|^2 d\mathcal{H}_U^n \\ &+ \left(\int_{M_U^\epsilon(\delta)} \langle V, \Delta_U^\perp V \rangle d\mathcal{H}_U^n - \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} \langle \bar{V}, \Delta^\perp \bar{V} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n \right) \\ &+ \left(\int_{M_U^\epsilon(\delta)} \langle V, \tilde{A}_U(V) \rangle d\mathcal{H}_U^n - \int_{M_\delta^\epsilon} \langle \bar{V}, \tilde{A}(\bar{V}) \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n \right) \\ &\leq \lambda_\delta + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} (|\nabla \bar{V}|^2 - |\nabla_U V|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} (\langle V, \tilde{A}_U(V) \rangle - \langle V^\perp, \tilde{A}(\bar{V}) \rangle) d\mathcal{H}^n \right| \\ &+ \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla \bar{V}|^2 \mu d\mathcal{H}^n \right| + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla_U V|^2 \mu d\mathcal{H}^n \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where we have extended V to be zero outside $M_U^\epsilon(\delta)$ in the last line. By (5.15), we can apply Lemma 3.6 to get

$$(5.17) \quad 0 < \bar{d} \leq \lambda_\delta + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} (|\nabla \bar{V}|^2 - |\nabla_U V|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n \right| \\ + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} (\langle V, \tilde{A}_U(V) \rangle - \langle \bar{V}, \tilde{A}(\bar{V}) \rangle) d\mathcal{H}^n \right| \\ + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla \bar{V}|^2 \mu d\mathcal{H}^n \right| + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla_U V|^2 \mu d\mathcal{H}^n \right|.$$

If we can show each of the integral terms on the right-hand side is bounded by $c\epsilon^\gamma$, we are done. We begin with the second integral term (i.e. the one involving the Simons' operator).

Using (5.16), we deduce

$$(5.18) \quad |\langle \tilde{A}_U(V), V \rangle - \langle \tilde{A}(\bar{V}), \bar{V} \rangle| \leq |(g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l(U)A_{ij}^k(U) - g^{sj}g^{it}A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k)v^k v^l| \\ + |g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l(U)A_{ij}^k(U)\epsilon_{lr}v^r v^k| \\ + |g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l(U)A_{ij}^k(U)v^l v^q \epsilon_{kq}| \\ + |g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l(U)A_{ij}^k(U)v^r v^q \epsilon_{lr} \epsilon_{kq}|.$$

We estimate each term on the right-hand side individually, beginning with the first. Observe that

$$|g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l(U)A_{ij}^k(U) - g^{sj}g^{it}A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k| \leq |(g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U) - g^{sj}g^{it})A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k| \\ + |g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l R_{ij}^k(U)| \\ + |g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{ij}^k R_{st}^l(U)| \\ + |g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)R_{st}^l(U)R_{ij}^k(U)|.$$

Note that the A_{ij}^k are uniformly bounded on $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$ independent of ϵ for small ϵ . Due to (5.9) and the formula for g^{-1} , we can write

$$g^{ij}(U) = g^{ij} + \tilde{R}^{ij}(U)$$

for some $\tilde{R}^{ij}(U)$ satisfying the same bounds as $R_{ij}(U)$ in (5.7). Thus,

$$(5.19) \quad |(g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U) - g^{sj}g^{it})A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k| \leq c(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|) \text{ on } M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon.$$

Since $g^{ij}(U)$ is also uniformly bounded independent of ϵ on $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$ when ϵ is small, the middle two terms are each bounded by

$$c(|\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|),$$

and the last term is bounded by

$$c(|\nabla^2 U|^2 + |\nabla U|^2 + \epsilon^{-2}|U|^2).$$

Moreover, since $|\bar{V}|^2 = \sum (v^k)^2 \leq |V|^2$, we have the pointwise bound on $M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon$:

$$|(g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l(U)A_{ij}^k(U) - g^{sj}g^{it}A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k)v^k v^l| \leq c(|\nabla^2 U|^2 + |\nabla U|^2 \\ + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|)|V|^2.$$

Using that $|\epsilon_{ij}| \leq c|\nabla U|^2$ pointwise and the fact that $g^{ij}(U)$ and A_{ij}^k are uniformly bounded on $M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$ for small ϵ shows the remaining terms in (5.18) are bounded by the same quantity on the right-hand side above. Hence, on $M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$

$$(5.20) \quad |\langle \tilde{A}_U(V), V \rangle - \langle \tilde{A}(\bar{V}), \bar{V} \rangle| \leq c(|\nabla^2 U|^2 + |\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|)|V|^2.$$

On $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$ we need to be a little more careful since $|A| \leq ch^{-1}$ in this region. On $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$, (5.19) becomes

$$|(g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U) - g^{sj}g^{it})A_{st}^l A_{ij}^k| \leq ch^{-3}(|\nabla U|^2 + |U|).$$

Similarly,

$$|g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)A_{st}^l R_{ij}^k(U)| \leq ch^{-1}(|\nabla^2 U| + h^{-1}|\nabla U| + h^{-2}|U|)$$

and

$$|g^{sj}(U)g^{it}(U)R_{st}^l(U)R_{ij}^k(U)| \leq c(|\nabla^2 U|^2 + h^{-2}|\nabla U|^2 + h^{-4}|U|^2).$$

Combining the previous three estimates and arguing as before for the remaining terms in (5.18) shows that on $M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$

$$(5.21) \quad |\langle \tilde{A}_U(V), V \rangle - \langle \tilde{A}(\bar{V}), \bar{V} \rangle| \leq ch^{-2}(|\nabla^2 U| + h^{-1}|\nabla U| + h^{-2}|U|)|V|^2.$$

Next, we show that $\|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5}))}$ is bounded independent of ϵ . Note that $M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5})$ has a uniform Sobolev inequality independent of ϵ since it has zero mean curvature and has volume bounded independent of ϵ (see [17]). In addition, it is not hard to show that Lemma 3.1 holds for equations of the form $\Delta_U^\perp W = F$ allowing us to use Theorem 8.16 in [5] as well as Corollary 3.3. Let Δ_U be the Laplace-Beltrami operator on $M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon$. Applying Theorem 8.16 in [5] to $|V|$, we find

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5}))} &\leq c(\tau)(\|\Delta_U|V|\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5}))} + \|V\|_{C^0(\partial M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5}))}) \\ &\leq c(\tau) \left(\left(\int_{M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5})} |A(U)|^{n+2\tau} |V|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |\lambda_\delta| \left(\int_{M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5})} h^{-n-2\tau} |V|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} + \|V\|_{C^0(\partial M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5}))} \right) \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the terms on the right-hand side above separately.

By basic Hilbert space theory, we have the inequality

$$(5.23) \quad |\lambda_\delta| \leq \left| \int_{M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\delta)} \langle W, h^2 L_U W \rangle h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right|$$

for any $W \in H_{0,h}^1(U)$ which is a unit vector in $L_h^2(U)$, where

$$H_{0,h}^1(U) := H_0^1(NM_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\delta); h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}_U^n).$$

Choosing smooth W vanishing in the interior of $\cup_{i=1}^N (C_{i,\frac{1}{2}} + U)$, where $C_{i,\frac{1}{2}}$ are the truncated cones (2.21), we see that $|\lambda_\delta| \leq c_0$ for some c_0 independent of ϵ, δ whenever ϵ is small. Thus,

$$|\lambda_\delta| \left(\int_{M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon(\frac{1}{5})} h^{-n-2\tau} |V|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} \leq c_0 \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon)}^{\frac{n-4+2\tau}{n+2\tau}} \|V\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}^\epsilon)}^{\frac{4}{n+2\tau}}.$$

Applying Young's inequality $ab \leq \sigma a^p + c_\sigma b^q$ with $\sigma = (4c(\tau)c_0)^{-1}$ and

$$p = \frac{n+2\tau}{n-4+2\tau}, \quad q = \frac{p}{p-1}$$

gives

$$(5.24) \quad |\lambda_\delta| \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} h^{-n-2\tau} |V|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} \leq \frac{1}{4c(\tau)} \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon)} + c_\sigma \|V\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon)}.$$

Using Young's inequality as above with $\sigma = (4c(\tau))^{-1}$, the Schwartz inequality, and the fact that $\|V\|_{L_h^2(U)} = 1$, we find

$$(5.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} |A(U)|^{n+2\tau} |V|^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{2}{n+2\tau}} &\leq \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon)}^{\frac{n-2+2\tau}{n+2\tau}} \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} h^2 |A(U)|^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{n+2\tau}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} h^{-2} |V|^2 d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{n+2\tau}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4c(\tau)} \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon)} + c_\sigma \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} |A(U)|^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

By (5.7), the boundedness of $|A|$ on $M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon$, the Minkowski inequality, and the fact that $U \in \mathcal{X}$ we have

$$(5.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} |A(U)|^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} (c + |\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|)^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq c \left(1 + \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} |\nabla^2 U|^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2n+4\tau}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} (\epsilon^{-1}|U|)^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2n+4\tau}} + \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} |\nabla U|^{2n+4\tau} d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2n+4\tau}} \right)^{n+2\tau} \\ &\leq c \left(1 + \epsilon^{\gamma_1} + \|\nabla^2 U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon)}^{1-\frac{1}{n+2\tau}} \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{5}}^\epsilon} |\nabla^2 U|^2 d\mathcal{H}_U^n \right)^{\frac{1}{2n+4\tau}} \right)^{n+2\tau} \\ &\leq c(1 + \epsilon^{\gamma_2}) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\gamma_2 > 0$ depending on n and τ small depending on n . Hence, the right-hand side is bounded by $2c$ for ϵ small. By covering $M_U^\epsilon(\frac{1}{8}) \setminus M_U^\epsilon(\frac{1}{4})$ with geodesic balls and applying Corollary 3.3, one can use a similar argument to show

$$(5.27) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(\partial M_U^\epsilon(\frac{1}{8}))} \leq c.$$

Combining (5.22)-(5.27) gives

$$(5.28) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(M_U^\epsilon(\frac{1}{8}))} \leq c.$$

Now, we may combine (5.20), (5.21), and (5.28) and use that $U \in \mathcal{K}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} \langle \tilde{A}_U(V), V \rangle - \langle \tilde{A}(\bar{V}), \bar{V} \rangle d\mathcal{H}^n \right| &\leq c \left(\int_{M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} (|\nabla^2 U|^2 + |\nabla^2 U| + |\nabla U| + \epsilon^{-1}|U|) d\mathcal{H}^n \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c\epsilon^{\gamma_3} \int_{M^\epsilon \setminus M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} |V|^2 h^{-2} d\mathcal{H}^n \right) \\ &\leq c\epsilon^{\gamma_4}. \end{aligned}$$

We have thereby obtained the desired estimate.

The remaining terms on the right-hand side of (5.17) are easier. Integrating by parts in the expression

$$\int_{M_U^\epsilon(\delta)} |\nabla_U V|^2 d\mathcal{H}_U^n$$

and using that V solves the eigenvalue equation, (5.28), $|\lambda_\delta| \leq c_0$, and $U \in \mathcal{K}$, we deduce

$$(5.29) \quad \int_{M_U^\epsilon} |\nabla_U V|^2 d\mathcal{H}_U^n \leq c.$$

As a consequence of (5.15) and (5.29), we have

$$(5.30) \quad \int_{M_U^\epsilon} |\nabla \bar{V}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq c.$$

A similar calculation as before using (5.9), (5.10), (5.14), (5.29), and (5.30) now shows

$$\left| \int_{M^\epsilon} (|\nabla \bar{V}|^2 - |\nabla_U V|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n \right| \leq c\epsilon^{\gamma_5}.$$

On the other hand, (5.13), (5.29), and (5.30) give

$$\left| \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla \bar{V}|^2 \mu d\mathcal{H}^n \right| + \left| \int_{M^\epsilon} |\nabla_U V|^2 \mu d\mathcal{H}^n \right| \leq c\epsilon^{\gamma_6}.$$

Hence, M_U^ϵ is strict stability for ϵ small enough. \square

This completes the generalization of [26] to dimensions $n \geq 4$ and arbitrary codimension.

6. THE GRAPHICAL CASE

Let C_1, \dots, C_N be n -dimensional graphical strictly stable minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with smooth links $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N$ in \mathbb{S}^{n+m} . In this case, the C_i can be represented as the graphs of Lipschitz functions $v_i : \Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ that are stationary solutions to the minimal surface system (2.33) which are smooth away from $p_i \in \Omega_i$. The domains Ω_i are compact regions with smooth boundary contained in the closed n -ball $\bar{B}_1^n(p_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for each i . The following proposition completes the proof of Theorem 2.4.

Proposition 6.1. *Let C_1, \dots, C_N be n -dimensional graphical strictly stable minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with smooth links $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_N$ in \mathbb{S}^{n+m} ($n \geq 4$), and suppose M^ϵ has been constructed so that it is graphical in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} over a compact domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary and satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4. Then there is a universal constant ϵ_0 such that $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ implies the perturbed submanifold M_U^ϵ guaranteed by Theorem 2.4 remains graphical.*

Proof Sketch. Apply Theorem 2.4 to obtain a solution U to (2.30) for small enough $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ with corresponding strictly stable minimal submanifold M_U^ϵ . Choosing ϵ_0 smaller if necessary depending on $\max_{i=1,\dots,N} \|Dv_i\|_{C^0(\Omega)}$, we can ensure that M_U^ϵ is graphical since $\|U\|_{C^1(M^\epsilon)}$ can be made as small as we like. \square

Using Proposition 6.1, we can now prove Theorem 2.5.

6.1. Graphical Bridges. In order to apply Proposition 6.1, we need to show that for each $n \geq 4$ the approximate solution M^ϵ can be constructed so that it is graphical and satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 when the C_i are assumed graphical. Applying this to the Lawson-Osserman cone will prove Theorem 2.5. We split the construction into two cases: $n \geq 6$ and $n = 4, 5$. When $n = 4, 5$, we will need to improve the bridge region of M^ϵ constructed when $n \geq 6$ so that (2.20) is satisfied. In addition, we only consider the case $N = 2$, since the case of general N follows by applying the case $N = 2$ inductively.

6.1.1. The Case $n \geq 6$. Assume $n \geq 6$ and suppose the vertex of C_1 is at $\bar{p}_1 := (p_1, v_1(p_1)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ and C_1 is the graph of $v_1 : \Omega_1 \subset \overline{B_1^n}(p_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Similarly, we may position C_2 so that its vertex is at $\bar{p}_2 := (p_2, v_2(p_2)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$, p_2 is at least distance 3 away from p_1 , and C_2 is the graph of $v_2 : \Omega_2 \subset \overline{B_1^n}(p_2) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Define the cones $C_i(\delta)$ by

$$C_i(\delta) := \{(1-t)\bar{p}_i + t\theta : \theta \in \Sigma_i, t \in (0, 1+\delta)\} \text{ for each } i = 1, 2.$$

Then there is a small $\delta > 0$ such that both of the $C_i(\delta)$ remain graphical. That is, for this δ we can extend the v_i to Lipschitz functions $\tilde{v}_i : \tilde{\Omega}_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ which are smooth away from the p_i , where $\tilde{\Omega}_i$ is a compact region with smooth boundary in \mathbb{R}^n lying in

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{dist}(x, \Omega_i) \leq \delta\}.$$

For each $i = 1, 2$, let $\varphi_i \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a function that is radial about p_i (i.e. $\varphi_i(x) = \varphi_i(|x - p_i|)$) with

$$\varphi_i(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & x \in \Omega_i \\ 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \tilde{\Omega}_i \end{cases}$$

and set $w_i := \varphi_i \tilde{v}_i$. Then w_i is a smooth function on \mathbb{R}^n that restricts to v_i on Ω_i and is zero outside of $\tilde{\Omega}_i$ for each i .

Without loss of generality, we may assume $p_1 = 0$ and that p_2 lies on the x^n -axis in \mathbb{R}^n . For each $i = 1, 2$, let $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a point where $R_i := \max_{\partial\Omega_i} |x - p_i|$ is achieved. After rotation of the C_i , we may assume that each of the q_i lie on the x^n -axis, with $q_i = (0, \dots, 0, q_i^n)$ for each i . We further suppose that Ω_1 lies to the $\{x^n \leq q_1^n\}$ side of \mathbb{R}^n and that Ω_2 lies to the $\{x^n \geq q_2^n\}$ side of \mathbb{R}^n . Denote the line segment in \mathbb{R}^n joining p_1 to p_2 along the x^n -axis by ℓ . Then ℓ meets $\partial\Omega_i$ orthogonally at q_i for each i since $\partial\Omega_i$ is tangent to $\partial B_{R_i}^n(p_i)$ at q_i for each i . Let $\ell_0 := |p_2|$ and, for small $\epsilon > 0$, define $S_\ell(\epsilon)$ to be the strip in \mathbb{R}^n

$$S_\ell(\epsilon) := ([-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times \cdots \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [0, \ell_0]) \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2).$$

Define $\Omega \subset \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup S_\ell(\epsilon)$ to be the compact region in \mathbb{R}^n enclosed by the boundary

$$\left[(\partial\Omega_1 \cup \partial\Omega_2) \setminus \partial S_\ell\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \right] \cup \left[\partial S_\ell\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \setminus (\partial\Omega_1 \cup \partial\Omega_2) \right].$$

Then Ω has smooth boundary away from where $\partial\Omega_1 \cup \partial\Omega_2$ intersects $\partial S_\ell(\frac{\epsilon}{2})$. Using that, for small ϵ , the regions where the $\partial\Omega_i$ intersect $\partial S_\ell(\frac{\epsilon}{2})$ are graphical over and lie to one side of the $(n-1)$ -planes

$$\left[-\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right] \times \cdots \times \left[-\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right] \times \{q_i\} \text{ for } i = 1, 2,$$

it is not hard to construct a diffeomorphism ϕ taking $S_\ell(\frac{\epsilon}{2}) \setminus (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2)$ to the strip

$$(6.1) \quad \left[-\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right] \times \cdots \times \left[-\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right] \times [0, s_0],$$

where $s_0 := |q_1 - q_2|$. Arguing similarly to the construction of S_ϵ in [25] (see f_ϵ on pg. 508-509), we can smooth $\partial\Omega$ by restricting ϕ^{-1} to a smooth domain Ω_ϵ contained in (6.1). Doing so, we obtain a compact region in \mathbb{R}^n with smooth boundary (which we also denote Ω) contained in $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup S_\ell(\epsilon)$.

We now connect the cones by a graphical bridge⁹ via the function $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ defined by

$$v(x) := \begin{cases} w_i(x), & x \in \tilde{\Omega}_i \cap \Omega \text{ } i = 1, 2 \\ 0, & x \in \Omega \setminus (\tilde{\Omega}_1 \cup \tilde{\Omega}_2). \end{cases}$$

Then v is Lipschitz and is smooth away from two isolated singularities at the p_i . In addition, v restricts to v_i on $\Omega_i \cap \Omega$ for each $i = 1, 2$. Thus, the graph of v is an n -dimensional Lipschitz submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} which is smooth away from p_1 and p_2 (including the boundary) and joins C_1 to C_2 by a thin strip having diameter less than $c\epsilon$ for some constant c depending on $\|Dv_i\|_{C^0}$ ($i = 1, 2$) which is independent of ϵ . We denote the graph of v by M^ϵ . Iterating this procedure, we can construct M^ϵ for any finite number of cones C_i when $n \geq 6$, and it is not hard to see that Theorem 2.4 applies to this M^ϵ for $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ small enough.

6.1.2. The Case $n = 4, 5$. When $n = 4, 5$, we begin by repeating the construction for $n \geq 6$ to obtain a submanifold $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ for ϵ_0 satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4, which is the graph of $v_0 : \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, where v_0 is the same as v above. We need to modify the bridge of $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ so that its L^p mean curvature is bounded by $c\epsilon^{\frac{n}{p}}$ for $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, each $p \in [1, \infty)$, and some constant c independent of ϵ . Since the proofs when $n = 4$ and $n = 5$ are identical, we focus on the case $n = 4$.

Let $\gamma : [0, s_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ be a unit-speed parameterization of the curve in $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ from $\gamma(0) := (q_1, v_0(q_1))$ to $\gamma(s_0) := (q_2, v_0(q_2))$ tracing the graph of the restriction of v_0 to the segment of ℓ joining q_1 and q_2 , where the q_i and ℓ are defined as in the case $n \geq 6$. Then

- (i) $\gamma'(0) \perp \Sigma_1$ and $\gamma'(s_0) \perp \Sigma_2$;
- (ii) γ is smoothly tangent to $C_1 \cup C_2$ at q_1 and q_2 .

We construct a new strip S_ϵ from $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ as the image of a smooth embedding

$$\psi : [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [0, s_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{5+m},$$

where $0 < \epsilon < r_0 < \epsilon_0$, satisfying

- (iii) $\psi(0, 0, 0, t) = \gamma(t)$ for each $t \in [0, s_0]$;
- (iv) S_ϵ is tangent to $C_1 \cup C_2$ at $\gamma(0)$ and $\gamma(s_0)$;
- (v) The mean curvature of S restricted to γ is identically zero;
- (vi) S_ϵ is graphical for ϵ small.

⁹If ψ is the graph map $\psi(x) := (x, v(x))$, the bridge is $\psi(\phi^{-1}(\Omega_\epsilon))$.

Choose smooth vector fields μ_1, μ_2, μ_3 along γ so that $\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \gamma'$ are an orthonormal basis for $T_{\gamma(t)}M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ for each $t \in [0, s_0]$. Define ψ by

$$\psi(x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4) := \gamma(x^4) + \sum_{i=1}^3 x^i \mu_i(x^4) - \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(x^i)^2}{6} \gamma''(x^4)$$

and set $S := \psi([-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [0, s_0])$. Properties (iii)-(v) follow immediately from the definition of ψ with S replacing S_ϵ . To see that (vi) holds, note that the partials $\frac{\partial \psi(0,0,0,x^4)}{\partial x^i}$ span the tangent space to $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ at $\psi(0,0,0,x^4)$ for each $x^4 \in [0, s_0]$. Since $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ is a graph, the projection map from $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ onto \mathbb{R}^n is non-singular at each point $\psi(0,0,0,x^4)$. By continuity, the projection map $TS \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is non-singular in a small neighborhood of $\psi(0,0,0,x^4)$ in S for each $x^4 \in [0, s_0]$. A covering argument gives (vi).

Using (i)-(vi), we can then argue as in [25] (see pg. 511) when $n = 2$ to smoothly attach the strip S to the cones C_i near $\gamma(0)$ and $\gamma(s_0)$. To do so, we push the strip S down onto $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$. Near $\gamma(0)$, $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ and S are graphs over $T_{\gamma(0)}M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ of smooth functions

$$f, \tilde{f} : T_{\gamma(0)}M_0^{\epsilon_0} \rightarrow (T_{q_1}M_0^{\epsilon_0})^\perp$$

in \mathbb{R}^{5+m} satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) &= \tilde{f}(0) = 0 \\ Df(0) &= D\tilde{f}(0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $z \in T_{q_1}M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ with $|z|$ sufficiently small, $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ can be locally represented as $\{\gamma(0) + (z, f(z))\}$ and S can be represented as $\{\gamma(0) + (z, \tilde{f}(z))\}$. Moreover, for x near 0 in $[-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [0, s_0]$, we can write $\psi(x) = \gamma(0) + (z, \tilde{f}(z))$ for a unique z near 0 in $T_{\gamma(0)}M_0^{\epsilon_0}$. In particular, the composition $z(x)$, where $x \mapsto \psi(x) \mapsto z$, is well-defined, smooth, and

$$c^{-1}|x| \leq |z| \leq c|x|$$

for some constant c . Let ϕ be a cutoff function on $T_{\gamma(0)}M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \phi(z) \leq 1, \\ \phi(z) = 1 \text{ for } |z| \leq \frac{1}{4}c^{-1}\epsilon, \\ \phi(z) = 0 \text{ for } \frac{1}{2}c^{-1}\epsilon \leq |z| \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \max |D^k \phi(z)| \leq c_1 \epsilon^{-k} \text{ for } k = 1, 2, 3, \\ |\phi|_{k,\alpha} \leq c_1 \epsilon^{-k-\alpha} \text{ for } k = 1, 2, 3, \alpha \in (0, 1) \end{cases}$$

for some constant c_1 . Choose r_0 small relative to ϵ_0 and let $\epsilon < r_0$ as above. Using a Taylor expansion for g and h , we can define a new parameterization ψ_ϵ satisfying (8.4) as follows:

$$\psi_\epsilon(x) := \begin{cases} \psi(x), & x \in [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [\epsilon, s_0 - \epsilon] \\ (z, \phi(z)\tilde{f}(z) + (1 - \phi(z))f(z)), & x^4 \in [0, \epsilon]. \end{cases}$$

Repeating this process near $\gamma(s_0)$, we can extend ψ_ϵ to $[-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [0, s_0]$. Next, we smooth the boundary by restricting ψ_ϵ to a subdomain S_ϵ as before, and identify S_ϵ with $\psi_\epsilon(S_\epsilon)$. It is clear that S_ϵ satisfies (iii)-(v) and, when ϵ is small, (vi) follows from the fact that both S and $M_0^{\epsilon_0}$ are graphs. The resulting

submanifold M^ϵ is an approximate solution that is a Lipschitz graph of a map $v : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{5+m}$, where Ω is a compact region with smooth boundary. Repeating the construction when $n = 5$, we see that M^ϵ satisfies the necessary hypotheses for Theorem 2.4 when $n = 4, 5$. Since the Lawson-Osserman cone is a graphical strictly stable four dimensional minimal cone in \mathbb{R}^7 with an isolated singularity, we can apply Proposition 6.1 to N copies of the Lawson-Osserman cone to conclude Theorem 2.5.

7. REMARKS

Before we conclude, we make a few remarks about remaining questions and future directions. As mentioned in [26], it is still unclear whether the gluing methods used in this paper can be extended to minimal cones that are not strictly stable (see Section 5 in [26]). In addition, the methods used here do not immediately extend to the case $n = 3$ since the estimates needed to solve the Dirichlet problem (4.1) as a fixed point problem break down in this case. For example, the estimates for the β_l at the end of Lemma 4.6 do not hold. It would be ideal to extend Theorem 2.4 to the case $n = 3$. However, since the results on strict stability of calibrated cones in [3] only hold in dimensions $n \geq 4$, it is unclear whether there exist strictly stable minimal cones when $n = 3$. Thus, Theorem 2.4 is satisfactory for current applications. We further remark that the results in [26] and in this paper only allow us to glue strictly stable minimal cones in a way that ensures the resulting submanifold is minimal. An interesting question is whether one can construct specified types of minimal submanifolds via the bridge principle (e.g. special Lagrangian submanifolds). Finally, we note that the constructions in the previous section show that the domain in Theorem 2.5 is dumbbell shaped. It would be of interest to prove Theorem 2.5 on a convex domain.

8. APPENDIX

8.1. Constructing Approximate Solutions. For completeness, we sketch the construction of the approximate solutions M^ϵ . We only consider the bridge construction for two minimal cones since the procedure can be easily extended to any finite number of cones inductively. For the full details, we refer the reader to Section 2 in [26].

8.1.1. The Case $n \geq 6$. Fix $n \geq 6$ and let C_1 and C_2 be n -dimensional minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4. Denote the links of the C_i by Σ_1 and Σ_2 , respectively. Let γ be a smooth embedded curve connecting Σ_1 to Σ_2 which intersects the Σ_i only at its endpoints. We let \mathcal{N} be any tubular neighborhood of γ and perturb γ so that it is smoothly tangent to $C_1 \cup C_2$ at its endpoints and remains well inside \mathcal{N} . Let γ be parameterized by arc-length so that $\gamma : [0, \ell_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$, with $\gamma(0) = q_1 \in \Sigma_1$ and $\gamma(\ell_0) = q_2 \in \Sigma_2$ where ℓ_0 is the length of the curve γ . The idea is to embed γ in a smooth n -dimensional strip which is smoothly attached to C_1 and C_2 at its ends. The submanifold M^ϵ is obtained by appropriately shrinking the boundary of the strip towards γ so that the strip lies within \mathcal{N} . The strip is constructed as a ruled surface such that cross-sections to γ are $(n-1)$ -disks.

Let $\mu_1(t), \dots, \mu_{n-1}(t)$ be an orthonormal set of vector fields along γ which are perpendicular to γ' and tangent to C_1 and C_2 at $t = 0$ and $t = \ell_0$, respectively.

Then the parameterization

$$\psi : B_{r_0}^{n-1}(0) \times [0, \ell_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$$

given by

$$\psi(x^1, \dots, x^n) := \gamma(x^n) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x^i \mu_i(x^n)$$

is a smooth embedding of the strip $B_{r_0}^{n-1}(0) \times [0, \ell_0]$ into \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} if r_0 is sufficiently small. Here, $B_{r_0}^{n-1}(0)$ is the $(n-1)$ -ball in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} centered at the origin with radius r_0 . The radius r_0 can also be chosen small enough so that the image of this strip under ψ is contained in \mathcal{N} .

At this point, the image of the strip (i.e. $\psi(B_{r_0}^{n-1}(0) \times [0, \ell_0])$) does not smoothly attach to $C_1 \cup C_2$, though it is tangent to $C_1 \cup C_2$ at q_1 and q_2 . After making small changes in the embedding ψ in neighborhoods of $(0, \dots, 0)$ and $(0, 0, \dots, \ell_0)$, we obtain an n -dimensional submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} that is smooth in the interior away from two isolated singularities at the vertices of the cones C_1 and C_2 (see pg. 508 in [25] for details), which is just C_1 joined to C_2 by a thin strip $\psi(B_{r_0}^{n-1}(0) \times [0, \ell_0])$ contained in \mathcal{N} . The curve γ is the image of $(0, \dots, 0) \times [0, \ell_0]$ under ψ . To smooth the boundary, one restricts ψ to an appropriate domain $S_\epsilon \subset B_{r_0}^{n-1}(0) \times [0, \ell_0]$, depending on ϵ , whose boundary is a smooth surface of revolution about $[0, \ell_0]$ (see f_ϵ on pg. 508 in [25]). Intuitively, this corresponds to pushing the boundary of the strip toward γ so that it is smoothly tangent to the Σ_i at the points of intersection. The resulting n -dimensional submanifold $M^\epsilon := C_1 \cup C_2 \cup \psi(S_\epsilon)$ is an embedded submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with boundary that is smooth (including the boundary) away from two isolated singularities at the vertices of the cones C_i . We call the submanifolds M^ϵ *approximate solutions* and identify S_ϵ with $\psi(S_\epsilon)$. We further note that $M^\epsilon \subset M^\delta \subset M^{r_0}$ for $0 < \epsilon < \delta < r_0$.

Since ψ parameterizes the strip and $\|\psi\|_{C^4}$ is bounded independent of ϵ , there is a finite collection of parameterizations of M^ϵ , we denote $\mathcal{U} := \{(\Omega_l, \psi_l)\}_{l=1}^J$, with $\psi_1 = \psi$, $\Omega_1 = S_\epsilon$,

$$\psi_l : \Omega_l \rightarrow M^\epsilon \text{ for } l = 2, \dots, J \text{ covering } C_1 \cup C_2,$$

and

$$(8.1) \quad \|\psi_l\|_{C^4} \leq c_0 \text{ and } c_0^{-1} \leq \|D\psi_l\|_{C^0} \text{ for each } l = 1, \dots, J$$

for some constant c_0 depending only on Σ_1 , Σ_2 , and a C^4 bound for S_ϵ which is independent of ϵ . Since

$$c_0^{-1} \leq \|D\psi_1\|_{C^0} \leq c_0,$$

lengths and volumes are equivalent in Ω_1 and $\psi_1(\Omega_1)$. Furthermore, if (g_{ij}) is the metric tensor on M^ϵ (i.e. $g_{ij} = \psi_{x^i} \cdot \psi_{x^j}$ in any coordinate system ψ) in one of the coordinate systems (Ω_l, ψ_l) ($l = 2, \dots, J$) and $(g^{ij}) = (g_{ij})^{-1}$, then

$$(8.2) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\|g_{ij}\|_{C^k} + \|g^{ij}\|_{C^k}) \leq c_0 r^{-k}, & k = 0, 1, 2, 3 \\ \lambda_0^{-1} I < (g_{ij}) < \lambda_0 I \\ \lambda_0^{-1} I < (g^{ij}) < \lambda_0 I, \end{cases}$$

where I is the identity matrix, λ_0 is a positive constant independent of ϵ , and r is the shortest distance on M^ϵ from the vertices of the cones C_i to $\psi(\Omega_l)$. When $l = 1$,

the first bound in (8.2) is independent of r . Furthermore, for each $l = 2, \dots, J$ we can find an orthonormal frame n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} for $NM^\epsilon|_{\Omega_l}$ such that

$$(8.3) \quad \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{m+1} \|n_j\|_{C^k} \leq c_0 r^{-k}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, 3. \right.$$

When $l = 1$, the bound in (8.3) is again independent of r .

The resulting submanifold M^ϵ is an approximate solution in the sense that the mean curvature of M^ϵ is small in any L^p -norm as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. If H is the mean curvature of M^ϵ , then H is bounded and supported in S_ϵ since C_1 and C_2 are minimal. Thus, when $n \geq 6$

$$\left(\int_{M^\epsilon} |H|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq c \text{Vol}(S_\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq c \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{p}}$$

for some constant c independent of ϵ . The mean curvature estimate above plays a critical role in deriving the estimates necessary to solve the fixed point problem. This is related to the fact that the mean curvature estimate is better in higher dimensions. It turns out that this estimate is no good when $n = 4, 5$ so we have to construct a better approximate solution in this case. This is done by constructing a strip whose mean curvature is pointwise small depending on ϵ .

8.1.2. *The Cases $n = 4, 5$.* We now consider the case $n = 4, 5$. As before, we let C_1, C_2 be minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1} with links Σ_1 and Σ_2 , respectively, which satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4 and let γ be a smooth embedded curve connecting Σ_1 to Σ_2 which intersects $C_1 \cup C_2$ only at its endpoints. Let \mathcal{N} be any tubular neighborhood of γ . Further suppose that γ is parameterized by arc-length so that $\gamma : [0, \ell_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+m+1}$ with $\gamma(0) = q_1 \in \Sigma_1$ and $\gamma(\ell_0) = q_2 \in \Sigma_2$ and ℓ_0 is the length of γ . We make the following additional assumptions on γ :

- (i) $\gamma'(0) \perp \Sigma_1$ and $\gamma'(\ell_0) \perp \Sigma_2$;
- (ii) γ is smoothly tangent to $C_1 \cup C_2$ at q_1 and q_2 and lies inside \mathcal{N} ;
- (iii) $\gamma''(0) \perp T_{q_1} C_1$ and $\gamma''(\ell_0) \perp T_{q_2} C_2$;
- (iv) $\gamma''(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \in [0, \ell_0]$.

The conditions (i) and (iv) are not necessary, but simplify the construction. The condition (iv) is possible since $n + m + 1 > 3$.

The idea is to construct S as a foliation of $(n-1)$ -spheres with mean curvature vector equal to the negative of the curvature of γ , similar to the construction in [25] when $n = 2$. To simplify the notation, we fix $n = 4$ and note that the construction when $n = 5$ is identical with only minor modifications. We first construct a strip S as the image of a smooth embedding

$$\psi : [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [0, \ell_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{5+m}$$

satisfying:

- (v) $\psi(0, 0, 0, t) = \gamma(t)$ for $t \in [0, \ell_0]$;
- (vi) S is tangent to $C_1 \cup C_2$ at q_1 and q_2 ;
- (vii) The mean curvature of S restricted to γ is identically zero.

As before, r_0 is chosen small enough that the image of the strip under ψ lies in \mathcal{N} and ψ is an embedding. For each $t \in [0, \ell_0]$, let $N(t) := N_{\gamma(t)}\gamma(t)$ be the normal space to $\gamma(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^{5+m} and note that $\dim N(t) = m + 4$. Then for each t there is a $2 + m$ parameter family of circles in $N(t)$ that pass through $\gamma(t)$ and have curvature $-\frac{1}{3}\gamma''(t)$ at $\gamma(t)$. Fix smooth unit vector fields $V_1(t), V_2(t), V_3(t)$ along γ such that each $V_i(t)$ lies in the smooth vector bundle $N(t) \cap \gamma''(t)^\perp$ over γ for each

$t \in [0, \ell_0]$ with $V_i(0)$ tangent to C_1 and $V_i(\ell_0)$ tangent to C_2 for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. Further suppose that the $V_i(t)$ are orthogonal for each t . For each $t \in [0, \ell_0]$ and each $i = 1, 2, 3$, let $\mathcal{C}_i(t)$ be the circle tangent to $V_i(t)$ with curvature $-\frac{1}{3}\gamma''(t)$ and let $\mathcal{S}(t)$ be the 3-sphere containing each of the $\mathcal{C}_i(t)$ as a great circle. Since $\gamma'' \neq 0$ and γ is smooth, the sphere $\mathcal{S}(t)$ varies smoothly. Let $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \mapsto c_t(s_1, s_2, s_3)$, $c_t : [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{5+m}$, be a parameterization of the sphere $\mathcal{S}(t)$ satisfying:

- (a) $c_t(0, 0, 0) = \gamma(t)$ for each $t \in [0, \ell_0]$;
- (b) For each $t \in [0, \ell_0]$, $c_t(s_1, 0, 0)$ is a unit speed parameterization of the great circle $\mathcal{C}_1(t)$ with initial position $\gamma(t)$ and initial velocity $V_1(t)$;
- (c) For each $t \in [0, \ell_0]$, $c_t(0, s_2, 0)$ is a unit speed parameterization of the great circle $\mathcal{C}_2(t)$ with initial position $\gamma(t)$ and initial velocity $V_2(t)$;
- (d) For each $t \in [0, \ell_0]$, $c_t(0, 0, s_3)$ is a unit speed parameterization of the great circle $\mathcal{C}_3(t)$ with initial position $\gamma(t)$ and initial velocity $V_3(t)$.

Define

$$\psi : [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [-r_0, r_0] \times [0, \ell_0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{5+m}$$

by

$$\psi(x^1, x^2, x^3, x^4) := c_{x^4}(x^1, x^2, x^3).$$

It is not hard to show that ψ is an injective immersion for small r_0 (hence, an embedding) and that (v), (vi), and (vii) hold (see [25] as an example).

Let ψ_ϵ be the restriction of ψ to

$$[-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [\epsilon, \ell_0 - \epsilon] \text{ for } \epsilon < r_0.$$

Using a cutoff argument, one can then extend ψ_ϵ to $[-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [0, \ell_0]$ so that its image is a smooth extension of $C_1 \cup C_2$ satisfying:

$$(8.4) \quad \begin{cases} \|D\psi_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \geq c_0^{-1} \\ \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{C^2} \leq c_0 \\ \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} \leq c_0\epsilon^{-\alpha} \text{ for } \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{C^3} \leq c_0\epsilon^{-1} \\ \|\psi_\epsilon\|_{C^{3,\alpha}} \leq c_0\epsilon^{-1-\alpha} \text{ for } \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

The proof is precisely as in [25] (see pg. 511) with only minor adjustments. After smoothing ψ_ϵ , we once again smooth the boundary of the approximate solution by restricting the domain of ψ_ϵ to a subdomain S_ϵ .

We now let

$$\psi_1 := \psi_\epsilon \text{ and } \Omega_1 := S_\epsilon$$

and let

$$\psi_l : \Omega_l \rightarrow M^\epsilon \text{ for } l = 2, \dots, J$$

be a covering of $C_1 \cup C_2$ by smooth parameterizations over $\Omega_l \subset \mathbb{R}^4$, and let \mathcal{U} be the collection $\{(\Omega_l, \psi_l)\}_{l=1}^J$. Next, we decompose S_ϵ as $S_\epsilon := T_\epsilon \cup P_\epsilon$, where the patching region P_ϵ is the part of S_ϵ lying in

$$([-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [0, 2\epsilon]) \cup ([-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [\ell_0 - 2\epsilon, \ell_0])$$

and T_ϵ is the part of S_ϵ lying in the length of the strip

$$[-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \times [2\epsilon, \ell_0 - 2\epsilon].$$

Then $\psi_1|_{T_\epsilon}$ and ψ_l ($l > 1$) satisfy the bounds of (8.1), whereas $\psi_1|_{P_\epsilon}$ satisfies the bounds of (8.4) and

$$(8.5) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i,j} (\|g_{ij}\|_{C^k(P_\epsilon)} + \|g^{ij}\|_{C^k(P_\epsilon)}) \leq c_0 \epsilon^{1-k}, & k = 1, 2 \\ \sum_{i,j} (\|g_{ij}\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(P_\epsilon)} + \|g^{ij}\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(P_\epsilon)}) \leq c_0 \epsilon^{1-k-\alpha}, & k = 1, 2, \alpha \in (0, 1) \\ \lambda_0^{-1} I \leq (g_{ij}) \leq \lambda_0 I \\ \lambda_0^{-1} I \leq (g^{ij}) \leq \lambda_0 I, \end{cases}$$

where I is the identity matrix and λ_0, c_0 are constants satisfying the same properties as in the case $n \geq 6$. Thus, when $l \in \{2, \dots, J\}$ we can find a smooth orthonormal frame for $NM^\epsilon|_{\Omega_l}$ satisfying (8.3). When $l = 1$, we can find n_1, \dots, n_{m+1} so that

$$(8.6) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^m \|n_j\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(\Omega_1 \setminus P_\epsilon)} \leq c_0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^m \|n_j\|_{C^k(P_\epsilon)} \leq c_0 \epsilon^{1-k} \text{ for } k = 1, 2 \\ \sum_{j=1}^m \|n_j\|_{C^{k,\alpha}(P_\epsilon)} \leq c_0 \epsilon^{1-k-\alpha} \text{ for } k = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

Suppose now that the construction above has been repeated for $n = 5$ and let H be the mean curvature vector on M^ϵ . By the construction above, $H = 0$ on the center of T_ϵ (i.e. on γ) and, since H is at least C^1 , a Taylor expansion shows that $|H(x)| \leq c\epsilon$ for $x \in T_\epsilon$ and c is a constant independent of ϵ . Also, by (8.5) we have $|H(x)| \leq c$ for $x \in P_\epsilon$. Using that C_1 and C_2 are minimal, we find

$$\int_{M^\epsilon} |H|^p dx = \int_{S_\epsilon} |H|^p dx \leq c \text{Vol}(P_\epsilon) + c\epsilon^p \text{Vol}(T_\epsilon) \leq c\epsilon^n.$$

It follows that, for $n = 4, 5$ and $p \geq 1$, M^ϵ is an approximate solution with

$$\left(\int_{M^\epsilon} |H|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq c\epsilon^{\frac{n}{p}}.$$

8.2. Schauder Estimates. To prove Proposition 3.5, we need interior Schauder estimates in $B_1 := B_1^n(0)$ for elliptic systems in \mathbb{R}^n . Define the operator L_1 on $u := (u^1, \dots, u^{m+1}) \in C^2(B_1; \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ given component-wise by

$$(8.7) \quad (L_1 u)^k := a^{ij} u_{x^i x^j}^k + b_t^{ik} u_{x^i}^t + c_t^k u^t \text{ for each } k = 1, 2, \dots, m+1,$$

where we have used summation notation in the variables i, j, t . We assume the coefficients are uniformly bounded in $C^{0,\alpha}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} (\|a^{ij}\|_{C^0(B_1)} + |a^{ij}|_{\alpha, B_1}) &\leq c_0 \\ \sum_{i,k,t} (\|b_t^{ik}\|_{C^0(B_1)} + |b_t^{ik}|_{\alpha, B_1}) &\leq c_0 \\ \sum_{t,k} (\|c_t^k\|_{C^0(B_1)} + |c_t^k|_{\alpha, B_1}) &\leq c_0. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we assume that L_1 is uniformly elliptic:

$$\lambda_0^{-1} I \leq (a^{ij}) \leq \lambda_0 I.$$

The Schauder estimates we need for the system (8.7) are as follows:

Proposition 8.1. *If $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_1; \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ satisfies $L_1 u = f$ in B_1 for some $f \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_1; \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$, then there is a constant c depending on n, m, α , and c_0 such that*

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

A simple rescaling argument then gives the following useful corollary:

Corollary 8.2. *If $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(B_{2r}; \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$ satisfies $L_1 u = f$ in B_{2r} for some $f \in C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2r}; \mathbb{R}^{m+1})$, then there is a constant c depending on n, m, α , and c_0 such that*

$$|D^2 u|_{(\alpha), B_r} \leq c(r^{-2-\alpha} \|u\|_{C^0(B_{2r})} + r^{-\alpha} \|f\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(B_{2r})}).$$

Since the second-order term in (8.7) does not have any coupling of the components of u , Proposition 8.1 and Corollary (8.2) can be proved by the usual perturbation methods used in the proof of the Schauder estimates for uniformly elliptic scalar equations (i.e. comparing with the Laplacian). We leave the details to the reader (see also Section 3 in [25]).

8.3. The Case $n \geq 6$. The proof when $n \geq 6$ follows Section 4 in [26] with only minor changes. Despite this, we chose to present the proof for completeness and comparison to the case $n = 4, 5$. Since the structure of the arguments are similar in form, regardless of dimension, we just need to prove versions of results in Section 4 above.

Let $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_K$ be an increasing sequence of numbers such that

$$\beta_0 := 2 - \frac{2}{n} - \frac{2}{n^4} \text{ and } \beta_K := \frac{(n-1)}{2} - \frac{2}{n^4}.$$

Further suppose

$$\beta_k \geq \beta_{k+1} - \frac{1}{n^2} \text{ for } k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1.$$

Since $n^2(\beta_K - \beta_0) < n^3$ for each n , we can assume $K := K(n) \leq n^3$. Let

$$\frac{1}{2} = \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \dots < \sigma_{K-1} = \frac{3}{4}$$

be a subdivision of $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}]$ such that $\sigma_k - \sigma_{k-1} \leq \frac{1}{n^3}$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_k &:= S_{\sigma_{K-k-1}, \sigma_{K-k}} \text{ for each } k = 1, \dots, K-1, \\ \mathcal{V}_0 &:= M_{\frac{3}{4}}^\epsilon, \text{ and } \mathcal{V}_K := S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$ to be the set of all $U \in C_\nu^{2,\alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ such that $U = \Psi_\lambda$ on ∂M^ϵ for some $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$ and U satisfies the following estimates:

- (i) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon^{2-k-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$;
- (ii) $|U|_{k,\alpha, M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon} \leq \epsilon^{2-k-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}-\alpha}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$;
- (iii) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(\mathcal{V}_l)} \leq \epsilon^{\beta_l - k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $l = 1, \dots, K$;
- (iv) $|U|_{k,\alpha, \mathcal{V}_l} \leq \epsilon^{\beta_l - k - \alpha}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$ and $l = 1, \dots, K$;
- (v) $\|\nabla^k U\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} r^{k-\nu_i} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\frac{1}{n^4}-k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$;
- (vi) $|U|_{k,\alpha, S_{r,2r}^i} r^{k+\alpha-\nu_i} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\frac{1}{n^4}-\alpha-k}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2$, $r \in (0, \frac{1}{4}]$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$;
- (vii) $\|U\|_{L_{n-}^2(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla U\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\frac{1}{n^4}}$;
- (viii) $\|\nabla^2 U\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq \epsilon^{\frac{n-2-n-4}{2n}-\frac{1}{n^4}}$.

Proposition 8.3. *If $U \in \mathcal{K}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$, then:*

(a) *For each $x \in M_\delta^\epsilon$ we have*

$$|E(U)(x)| \leq c(\delta) \left(|U(x)|^2 + |\nabla U(x)|^2 + |U(x)| |\nabla^2 U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)| \right);$$

(b) $|E(U)|_{\alpha, \nu_l} \leq c(\delta) (\epsilon^{2\beta_l - 2 - \alpha} + \epsilon^{3\beta_l - 4 - \alpha})$ for $l = 0, 1, \dots, K$;

(c) *For $x \in C_i$ and $r = |x - p_i|$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, we have*

$$|E(U)(x)| \leq c \left(r^{-3} |U(x)|^2 + r^{-1} |\nabla U(x)|^2 + r^{-1} |U(x)| |\nabla^2 U(x)| + |\nabla U(x)|^2 |\nabla^2 U(x)| \right);$$

(d) $\|E(U)\|_{C^0(S_{r, 2r}^i)} \leq c \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}} r^{2\nu_i-2}$ for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$;

(e) $|E(U)|_{\alpha, S_{r, 2r}^i} \leq c \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}-\alpha} r^{2\nu_i-2-\alpha}$ for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{4}$,

where c is a universal constant and $c(\delta)$ depending only on δ .

Proof. The proof is similar to Proposition 4.2. \square

If $U \in \mathcal{K}$, then $E(U) \in C_{\nu'}^{0, \alpha}(M^\epsilon) \subset C_{\bar{\nu}}^{0, \alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ where $\nu' := 2\nu - (3, \dots, 3)$ and $\bar{\nu} = \nu - (\frac{3}{2}, \dots, \frac{3}{2})$ so we may apply Lemma 3.9 to the solution V of (4.1). Then on each C_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$), V has the asymptotic expansion (4.5) in polar coordinates. As before, define $\Lambda_U(\lambda)$ by (4.6).

Lemma 8.4. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any ν such that $\nu_i \geq 2$ for each i , there exists a universal constant ϵ_0 such that, if $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and $U \in \mathcal{K}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$, there is a unique $\lambda_* \in \Omega_\epsilon$ such that the solution V of (4.1) satisfies $\Lambda_U(\lambda_*) = 0$. Moreover, λ_* depends continuously on U .*

Proof. Fix $U \in \mathcal{K}$ and let $V := V_\lambda$ be the solution of (4.1) for $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$. On Σ_i , V has the $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ expansion (4.7). However, on $\Sigma_i \setminus \cup_k D_{5\delta_0}(q_k)$ we have $V = \Psi_{\lambda^i}^i$ due to the boundary conditions. For each $i = 1, \dots, N$, define $\bar{V}^i := \bar{V}_\lambda^i \in C^{2, \alpha}(\Sigma_i)$ by

$$\bar{V}^i(x) = \begin{cases} V(x) & \text{when } x \in D_{50\epsilon}(q_k), q_k \in \Sigma_i \\ 0 & \text{when } x \in \Sigma_i \setminus \cup_k D_{50\epsilon}(q_k). \end{cases}$$

Then \bar{V}^i has an $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ expansion

$$\bar{V}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{J_i} \bar{v}_j^i(\lambda) \eta_j^i + (\bar{V}^i)^\perp$$

and on Σ_i we have $V = \Psi_{\lambda^i}^i + \bar{V}^i$. Explicitly,

$$(8.8) \quad V|_{\Sigma_i} = \sum_{j \leq J_i} (\lambda_j^i + \bar{v}_j^i(\lambda)) \eta_j^i + (\bar{V}^i + \psi_{\lambda^i}^i)^\perp.$$

As before, we need to solve the fixed point problem

$$F - \bar{v}_\lambda = \lambda$$

uniquely for $\lambda \in \Omega_\epsilon$ and ϵ sufficiently small. Here,

$$F = (F_1^1(1), \dots, F_{J_1}^1(1), \dots, F_1^N(1), \dots, F_{J_N}^N(1))$$

and

$$\bar{v}_\lambda := (\bar{v}_1^1(\lambda), \dots, \bar{v}_{J_1}^1(\lambda), \dots, \bar{v}_1^N(\lambda), \dots, \bar{v}_{J_N}^N(\lambda)).$$

We first estimate F . For $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = 1, \dots, J_i$ we have

$$|F_j^i(1)| = \left| \int_0^1 \tau^{1-n-2\gamma_j^i} \left(\int_0^\tau s^{n-1+\gamma_j^i} E_j^i(U(s)) ds \right) d\tau \right|.$$

Using the definition of $E_j^i(U(s))$, Proposition 8.3, and the definition of \mathcal{K} , we may argue as in Lemma 4.3 to find

$$(8.9) \quad |F| \leq c_1 \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}}.$$

We now estimate \bar{v}_λ . As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, we have

$$|\bar{v}_j^i(\lambda)| \leq c_2 \|V\|_{C^0(M_\frac{1}{2}^\epsilon)} \epsilon^{n-1}.$$

Hence, we need an estimate for $\|V\|_{C^0(M_\frac{1}{2}^\epsilon)}$. Using Lemma 3.7, the definition of \mathcal{K} , the properties of Ψ_λ , and (2.19) we find that

$$(8.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|V\|_{L^2_{h^-}(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} &\leq c_7 \left(\epsilon^{n-3-\frac{3}{n^4}} + \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|E(U)\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon \setminus M_\frac{1}{2}^\epsilon)} + \|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_\frac{1}{2}^\epsilon)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Arguing similarly as was done to estimate $|F|$ gives

$$\|E(U)\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon \setminus M_\frac{1}{2}^\epsilon)} \leq c_8 \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}}.$$

By Proposition 8.3(a), the definition of \mathcal{K} , and the Minkowski inequality, we obtain

$$(8.11) \quad \|E(U)\|_{L^2(M_\frac{1}{2}^\epsilon)}^2 \leq c_9 \epsilon^{n+1-\frac{4}{n}-\frac{4}{n^4}}.$$

Piecing these estimates together yields

$$(8.12) \quad \|V\|_{L^2_{h^-}(M^\epsilon)} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^2(M^\epsilon)} \leq c_{10} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

Using (8.12) and the prior estimates, we can now repeat the arguments in Lemma 4.3 to find

$$(8.13) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{12}})} \leq c_{11} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

By Proposition 3.5, we have

$$\|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{12} \left(\|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{12}})} + \|E(U)\|_{C^{0,\alpha}(S_{\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{12}})} \right).$$

Hence, (8.13) and Proposition 8.3 yield

$$(8.14) \quad \begin{cases} \|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{13} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}} & \text{when } n \geq 8 \\ \|\nabla V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{13} \epsilon^{n-4-\frac{2}{n^4}} & \text{when } n = 6, 7. \end{cases}$$

We now let $\varphi \in C^2(M^\epsilon)$ be a cutoff function satisfying

$$\varphi(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & x \in M_\frac{1}{3}^\epsilon \\ 0, & x \in M^\epsilon \setminus M_\frac{1}{4}^\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

By Corollary 3.2, we have

$$(8.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\varphi V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} &\leq c(\tau) \left(\|H_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} + \|E(U)\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} + \|V\|_{L^2(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|V\|_{C^0(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} + \|\nabla V\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} + \|\Psi_\lambda\|_{C^0(\partial M^\epsilon)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 8.3(a) and the Minkowski inequality (see pg. 628 in [26]), one finds

$$\|E(U)\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{14} \epsilon^{4 - \frac{10}{n} + \frac{8}{n^2} - \frac{4}{n^4}}$$

for τ small enough, and arguing similarly to the case $n = 4, 5$ shows

$$\|\nabla V\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(S_{\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3}})} \leq c_{15} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}}.$$

Furthermore, (2.19) shows

$$\|H_0\|_{L^{\frac{n}{2}+\tau}(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{16} \epsilon^{2 - \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n^8}}$$

for small τ . Combining the previous three estimates above with (8.12), (8.14), and (8.15) shows that

$$(8.16) \quad \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{4}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{17} \epsilon^{2 - \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n^8}}.$$

Using (8.16), we see that

$$(8.17) \quad \|\bar{v}_\lambda\|_{C^0(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq c_2 \epsilon^{n-1} \|V\|_{C^0(M_{\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon)} \leq c_{18} \epsilon^{n+1 - \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n^8}}.$$

By (8.9) and (8.17), we conclude

$$\|F - \bar{v}_\lambda\|_{C^0(\Omega_\epsilon)} \leq c_{19} \epsilon^{n-3 - \frac{2}{n^4}}.$$

It follows that $\lambda \mapsto F - \bar{v}_\lambda$ maps Ω_ϵ into Ω_ϵ for all $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$, where $\epsilon_0 = c_{17}^{-n^4}$. That this map is a contraction is an immediate consequence of the Lemma 4.4. \square

Denote the λ_* in Lemma 8.4 by $\lambda(U)$.

Proposition 8.5. *Suppose $U \in \mathcal{H}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\nu_i \geq 2$, and $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ where ϵ_0 satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 8.4 and Lemma 4.4. Then the unique solution V of*

$$\begin{aligned} LV &= H_0 + E(U) \text{ on } M^\epsilon \\ V &= \Psi_{\lambda(U)} \text{ on } \partial M^\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

given by Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 8.4 is in $C_\nu^{2, \alpha}(M^\epsilon)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 8.4, on each C_i the solution V has the $L^2(\Sigma_i)$ expansion in polar coordinates:

$$V(r\omega) = \sum_{j \leq J_i} F_j^i(r) \eta_j^i(\omega) + \sum_{j > J_i} \left(\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i} + F_j^i(r) \right) \eta_j^i(\omega)$$

for unique α_j^i , $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $j = J_i + 1, \dots$. The first step is to estimate $\|V(r\omega)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)}$ for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$. By (8.9), we have

$$|F_j^i(r)| \leq c_1 \epsilon^{n-3 - \frac{2}{n^4}} r^{2\nu_i - 1}.$$

Hence, for $r \leq \frac{1}{2}$

$$(8.18) \quad \left\| \sum_{j \leq J_i} F_j^i(r) \eta_j^i(\omega) \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_2 \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}} r^{2\nu_i-1}.$$

By Lemma 3.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{j > J_i} \left(\alpha_j^i r^{\gamma_j^i} + F_j^i(r) \right) \eta_j^i(\omega) \right\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} &\leq \left(\sum_{j > J_i} |\alpha_j^i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{\nu_i} \\ &\quad + c \left(\int_0^1 s^{3-2\nu_i} \|E(U(s\omega))\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} r^{\nu_i}. \end{aligned}$$

We need an estimate for each of the terms on the right-hand side. Setting $r = 1$ and using that $F_j^i(1) = 0$ for $j > J_i$, we get

$$(8.19) \quad V|_{\Sigma_i} = \sum_{j \leq J_i} F_j^i(1) \eta_j^i + \sum_{j > J_i} \alpha_j^i \eta_j^i.$$

On the other hand, in the proof of Lemma 8.4 it was seen that

$$V|_{\Sigma_i} = \Psi_{\lambda^i}^i + \bar{V}^i.$$

Since $\bar{V}^i = V$ on $D := \cup_k D_{5\epsilon}(q_k)$ and is zero on $\Sigma_i \setminus D$, by (8.16) and the fact that $\text{Vol}(D) \leq c\epsilon^{n-1}$ we see that

$$\begin{cases} \|V|_{\Sigma_i}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_3 \epsilon^{\frac{n+3}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^8}} \text{ for } n \geq 8 \\ \|V|_{\Sigma_i}\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_3 \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{3}{n^4}} \text{ for } n = 6, 7. \end{cases}$$

Rearranging terms in (8.19) and combining the above estimate with (8.9) shows

$$(8.20) \quad \begin{cases} \left(\sum_{j > J_i} |\alpha_j^i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c_4 \epsilon^{\frac{n+3}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^8}} \text{ for } n \geq 8 \\ \left(\sum_{j > J_i} |\alpha_j^i|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c_4 \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{3}{n^4}} \text{ for } n = 6, 7. \end{cases}$$

Arguing as in (8.9) and (8.11), we find

$$(8.21) \quad \left(\int_0^1 s^{3-2\nu_i} \|E(U(s\omega))\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq c_5 \left(\epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} + \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}} \right).$$

Together, (8.18), (8.20), and (8.21) show that for $r \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$ we have

$$(8.22) \quad \begin{cases} \|V(r\omega)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_6 \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} r^{\nu_i} \text{ when } n \geq 7 \\ \|V(r\omega)\|_{L^2(\Sigma_i)} \leq c_6 \epsilon^{3-\frac{3}{6^4}} r^{\nu_i} \text{ when } n = 6. \end{cases}$$

We can use (8.22) to get a C^0 estimate for V near p_i . By Corollary 3.3 together with a covering argument, for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{8}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|_{C^0(S_{r,2r}^i)} &\leq c_7 \left(r^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|V\|_{L^2(S_{\frac{r}{2},4r}^i)} + r \|E(U)\|_{L^n(S_{\frac{r}{2},4r}^i)} \right) \\ &\leq c_8 \left(r^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\int_{\frac{r}{2}}^{4r} s^{n-1} \int_{\Sigma_i} |V(s\omega)|^2 d\omega ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + r \|E(U)\|_{L^n(S_{\frac{r}{2},8r}^i)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in (8.9), we find that for $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{8}$

$$r \|E(U)\|_{L^n(S_{\frac{r}{2}, 4r})} \leq c_9 \epsilon^{n-3-\frac{2}{n^4}} r^{2\nu_i-2} \text{ for } n \geq 6.$$

Using (8.22), we deduce that the first term in the sum on the right-hand side is bounded by

$$\begin{cases} c_{10} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} r^{\nu_i} & \text{for } n \geq 7 \\ c_{10} \epsilon^{3-\frac{3}{6^4}} r^{\nu_i} & \text{for } n = 6 \end{cases}$$

implying

$$(8.23) \quad \begin{cases} \|V\|_{C^0(S_{r, 2r}^i)} \leq c_{11} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} r^{\nu_i} & \text{when } n \geq 7 \\ \|V\|_{C^0(S_{r, 2r}^i)} \leq c_{11} \epsilon^{3-\frac{3}{6^4}} r^{\nu_i} & \text{when } n = 6. \end{cases}$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{8}$. Hence, Corollary 3.5(b) shows

$$(8.24) \quad \begin{cases} |V|_{\alpha, S_{r, 2r}^i} \leq c_{12} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} r^{\nu_i-\alpha} & \text{for } n \geq 8 \\ |V|_{\alpha, S_{r, 2r}^i} \leq c_{12} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\frac{1}{2n^4}-\alpha} r^{\nu_i-\alpha} & \text{for } n = 6, 7. \end{cases}$$

We can now deduce higher derivative estimates by applying Corollary 3.5 (a) and (b), (8.23), and Proposition 8.3 to find that for each $i = 1, \dots, N$, $k = 1, 2$, and $0 < r < \frac{1}{8}$

$$(8.25) \quad \begin{cases} \|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(S_{r, 2r}^i)} \leq c_{13} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} r^{\nu_i-k} & \text{for } n \geq 8 \\ \|\nabla^k V\|_{C^0(S_{r, 2r}^i)} \leq c_{13} \epsilon^{\frac{n-3}{2}-\frac{1}{2n^4}} r^{\nu_i-k} & \text{for } n = 6, 7. \end{cases}$$

and when $k = 1, 2$ we have

$$(8.26) \quad \begin{cases} |V|_{k, \alpha, S_{r, 2r}^i} \leq c_{14} \epsilon^{\frac{n+1}{2}-\frac{2}{n}-\frac{1}{n^4}} r^{\nu_i-k-\alpha} & \text{when } n \geq 8 \\ |V|_{k, \alpha, S_{r, 2r}^i} \leq c_{14} \epsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2}-\frac{1}{2n^4}-\alpha} r^{\nu_i-k-\alpha} & \text{for } n = 6, 7. \end{cases}$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{8}$. Thus, (8.23), (8.24), (8.25), and (8.26) imply $V \in C_\nu^{2, \alpha}(M^\epsilon)$ so the proof is complete. \square

The final lemma needed to prove Theorem 2.4 when $n \geq 6$ is the following:

Lemma 8.6. *For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and any ν with $\nu_i \geq 2$ for each i , there is a universal constant $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

$$T : \mathcal{K}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(n, \epsilon, \alpha, \nu) \text{ for all } \epsilon < \epsilon_0.$$

Since the proof is exactly the same as Lemma 4.6, we omit the details (see also Lemma 4.2 in [26]). Combining the results in this section with those in Section 4 and Section 5 yields Theorem 2.4.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aubin, T. Nonlinear Analysis on Manifolds. Monge-Ampère Equations. Grundlehren Math. Wiss., 252 [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences] *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 1982.
- [2] Caffarelli, L., Hardt, R., Simon, L. Minimal surfaces with isolated singularities. *Manuscripta Math.* **48** (1984), 1-18.
- [3] Dimler, B., Lee, J. Strict stability of calibrated cones. Preprint 2024, arXiv:2409.06094.
- [4] Fischer-Colbrie, D. Some rigidity theorems for minimal submanifolds of the sphere, *Acta Math.* **145** (1980), no. 1-2, 29-46.

- [5] Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N.S. Elliptic partial differential equations of second order. Classics Math. *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*, 2001.
- [6] Han, Q., Lin, F. Elliptic partial differential equations. Courant Lect. Notes Math., 1, *Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York; American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 2011.
- [7] Harvey, R., Lawson, H.B. Calibrated geometries. *Acta Math.* **148** (1982), 47-157.
- [8] Lawlor, G.R. A sufficient criterion for a cone to be area-minimizing. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **91** (1991), no. 446.
- [9] Lawson, H.B., Michelsohn, M.L. Approximation by positive mean curvature immersions: frizzing. *Invent. Math.* **77** (1984), 421-426.
- [10] Lawson, H. B., Osserman R. Non-existence, non-uniqueness, and irregularity of solutions to the minimal surface system. *Acta Math.* **139** (1977), no. 1-2, 1-17.
- [11] Lee, Y., Wang, A.N., Wu, D. A bridge principle for harmonic maps. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **18** (2000), 107-127.
- [12] Lee, Y., Wang, A.N., Wu, D. A bridge principle for harmonic diffeomorphisms between surfaces. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.* **2** (2002), 141-149.
- [13] Lévy, P. Le problème de Plateau. *Math. Timisoara (Cluj)* **23** (1948), 1-45.
- [14] Lin, F.H. Minimality and stability of minimal hypersurfaces in \mathbb{R}^n . *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **36** (1987), 209-214.
- [15] Martinazzi, L., Giaquinta, M. An introduction to the regularity theory for elliptic systems, harmonic maps and minimal graphs. Appunti. Sc. Norm. Super. di Pisa (N.S.), 11 [Lecture Notes. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (New Series)] *Edizioni della Normale, Pisa*, 2012.
- [16] Meeks, W.H., Yau, S.-T. The existence of embedded minimal surfaces and the problem of uniqueness. *Math. Z.* **179** (1982), 151-168.
- [17] Michael, J.H., Simon, L. Sobolev and mean value inequalities on generalized submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^n . *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **26** (1983), 361-397.
- [18] Morrey, C.B. Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations. Classics. Math. *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*, 2008.
- [19] Nicolaescu, L.I. Lectures on the geometry of manifolds. *World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ*, 2021.
- [20] Ooi, Y.S. Higher Codimensional Minimal Submanifold with Isolated Singularity. *J. Geom. Anal.* **32** (2022), no. 164.
- [21] Osserman, R. Minimal varieties. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **75** (1969), 1092-1120.
- [22] Savin, O. Viscosity solutions and the minimal surface system. *Nonlinear analysis in geometry and applied mathematics. Part 2*, 135-145, Harv. Univ. Cent. Math. Sci. Appl. Ser. Math., 2, *Int. Press, Somerville, MA*, 2018.
- [23] Simoes, P. On a class of minimal cones in \mathbb{R}^n . *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **80** (1974), 488-489.
- [24] Simons, J. Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds. *Ann. of Math.* **88** (1968), no. 1, 62-105.
- [25] Smale, N. A bridge principle for minimal and constant mean curvature submanifolds of \mathbb{R}^N . *Invent. Math.* **90** (1987), 505-549.
- [26] Smale, N. Minimal hypersurfaces with many isolated singularities. *Ann. of Math.* **130** (1989), no. 3, 603-642.
- [27] White, B. The bridge principle for stable minimal surfaces. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* **2** (1994), 405-425.
- [28] White, B. The bridge principle for unstable and for singular minimal surfaces. *Commun. Anal. Geom.* **2** (1994), no. 4, 513-532.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UC IRVINE
 Email address: bdimler@uci.edu