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# On the Isoperimetric Inequality for Minimal Surfaces. 

PETER LI (*) - RICHARD SOHOEN (**) - SHING-TUNG YAU

For any compact minimal submanifold of dimension $k$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, it is known that there exists a constant $\bar{C}_{k}$ depending only on $k$, such that

$$
V(\partial M)^{k / k-1} \geqslant \bar{C}_{k} V(M),
$$

where $V(\partial M)$ and $V(M)$ are the $(k-1)$-dimensional and $k$-dimensional volumes of $\partial M$ and $M$ respectively. We refer to [6] for a more detailed reference on the inequality. An open question [6] is to determine the best possible value of $\bar{C}_{k}$. When $M$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{k} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$, the sharp constant is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{k}=\frac{V(\partial D)^{k i k-1}}{V(D)}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $D$ is the unit disk in $\mathbb{R}^{k}$. One speculates that $C_{k}$ is indeed the sharp constant for general minimal submanifolds in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.

In the case $k=2, C_{2}=4 \pi$, it was proved [1] (see [7]) that if $\Sigma$ is a. simplyconnected minimal surface in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
l(\partial \Sigma)^{2} \geqslant 4 \pi A(\Sigma), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $l(\partial \Sigma)$ and $A(\Sigma)$ denote the length of $\partial \Sigma$ and the area of $\Sigma$ respectively.
In 1975, Osserman-Schiffer [5] showed that (2) is valid with a strict inequality for doubly-connected minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Feinberg [2] later generalized this to doubly-connected minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ for all $n$. So far, the sharp constant, (1), has been established for minimal surfaces with topological restrictions.
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The purpose of this article is to prove the isoperimentric inequality (2) for those minimal surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ whose boundaries satisfy some connectedness assumption (see Theorem 1). This has the advantage that the topology of the minimal surface itself can be arbitrary. An immediate consequence of Theorem 1 is a generalization of the theorem of Osserman-Schiffer. In fact, Theorem 2 states that any minimal surface (not necessarily doublyconnected) in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ whose boundary has at most two connected components must satisfy inequality (2).

Finally, in Theorem 3, we also generalize the non-existence theorem of Hildebrandt [3], Osserman [4], and Osserman-Schiffer [5] to higher codimension.

## 1. - Isoperimetric inequality.

Definition. The boundary $\partial \Sigma$ of a surface $\Sigma$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is weakly connected if there exists a rectangular coordinate system $\left\{x^{x}\right\}_{\alpha=1}^{n}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, such that, for every affine hypersurface $H^{n-1}=\left\{x^{\alpha}=\right.$ const. $\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n}, H$ does not separate $\partial \Sigma$. This means, if $H \cap \partial \Sigma=\phi$, then $\partial \Sigma$ must lie on one side of $H$.

In particular, if $\partial \Sigma$ is a connected set, then $\partial \Sigma$ is weakly connected.
Theorem 1. Let $\Sigma$ be a compact minimal surface in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. If $\partial \Sigma$ is weakly connected, then

$$
l(\partial \Sigma)^{2}>4 \pi A(\Sigma)
$$

Moreover, equality holds iff $\Sigma$ is a flat disk in some affine 2 -plane of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.
Proof. Let us first prove the case when $\partial \Sigma$ is connected. By translation, we may assume that the center of mass of $\partial \Sigma$ is at the origin, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\partial \Sigma} x^{\alpha}=0, \quad \text { for all } 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the assumption on the connectedness of $\partial \Sigma$, any coordinate system $\left\{x^{\alpha}\right\}_{\alpha=1}^{n}$ satisfies the definition of weakly connectedness.

Let $X=\left(x^{2}, \ldots, x^{n}\right)$ be the position vector, then $|X|^{2}=\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n}\left(x^{\alpha}\right)^{2}$ must satisfy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta\left(|X|^{2}\right)=4, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

due to the minimality assumption on $\Sigma$. Here $\Delta$ denotes the Laplacian on $\Sigma$ with respect to the induced metric from $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Integrating (4) over $\Sigma$, and
applying the divergence theorem, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 A(\Sigma)=2 \int_{\partial \Sigma}|X| \frac{\partial|X|}{\partial v} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\partial / \partial v$ is the outward unit normal vector to $\partial \Sigma$ on $\Sigma$. Since $\partial|X| / \partial v \leqslant 1$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 A(\Sigma) \leqslant \int_{\partial \Sigma}|X| \leqslant(\partial \Sigma)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\partial \Sigma}\left(|X|^{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to estimate the right hand side of (6), we will estimate $\int_{\partial \Sigma}\left(x^{\alpha}\right)^{2}$ for each $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n$. By (3), the Poincaré inequality implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\partial \Sigma}\left(x^{x}\right)^{2} \leqslant \frac{l(\partial \Sigma)^{2}}{4 \pi^{2}} \int_{\partial \Sigma}\left(\frac{d x^{x}}{d s}\right)^{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d / d s$ is differentiation with respect to arc-length. Combining with (6) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 \pi A(\Sigma) \leqslant l(\partial \Sigma)^{\frac{8}{2}}\left(\int_{\partial \Sigma}\left|\frac{d x}{d s}\right|^{2}\right)^{\ddagger}=l(\partial \Sigma)^{2} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

because ( $d X / d s$ ) is just the unit tangent vector to $\partial \Sigma$.
Equality holds at (8), implies

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\partial|X|}{\partial v} \equiv 1  \tag{9}\\
&|X| \equiv \mathrm{constant}=R \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

and equality at (7). The latter implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{\alpha}=a_{\alpha} \sin \frac{2 \pi s}{l(\partial \Sigma)}+b_{\alpha} \cos \frac{2 \pi s}{l(\partial \Sigma)} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{\alpha}$ and $b_{\alpha}$ 's are constants for all $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n$. By rotation, we may assume that
(12)

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
X(0)=(R, 0,0, \ldots, 0) \\
\frac{d X}{d s}(0)=(0,1,0, \ldots, 0)
\end{array}\right.
$$

because (10) implies that $\partial \Sigma$ lies on the sphere of radius $R$. Evaluating (11) at $s=0$, we deduce that

$$
b_{1}=R, \quad b_{\alpha}=0 \quad \text { for } 2 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n
$$

(13) and

$$
a_{2}=\frac{l(\partial \Sigma)}{2 \pi}, \quad a_{\alpha}=0 \quad \text { for } \alpha \neq 2
$$

On the other hand, summing over $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n$ on (7), we derive

$$
\begin{equation*}
R^{2} l(\partial \Sigma)=\int_{\partial \Sigma}|X|^{2}=\left(\frac{l(\partial \Sigma)}{2 \pi}\right)^{2} l(\partial \Sigma) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence

$$
R=\frac{l(\partial \Sigma)}{2 \pi}
$$

Combining with (13), (11) becomes

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
x^{1}=R \cos \left(\frac{s}{R}\right)  \tag{15}\\
x^{2}=R \sin \left(\frac{s}{R}\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

and

$$
x^{\alpha} \equiv 0 \quad \text { for } 3 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n
$$

This implies $\partial \Sigma$ is a circle on the $x^{1} x^{2}$-plane centered at the origin of radius $R$. Equation (9) shows that $\Sigma$ is tangent to the $x^{1} x^{2}$-plane along $\partial \Sigma$. By the Hopf boundary lemma, this proves that $\Sigma$ must be the disk spanning $\partial \Sigma$.

For the general case when $\partial \Sigma$ is not connected. Let $\partial \Sigma=\bigcup_{i=1}^{p} \sigma_{i}$, where $\sigma_{i}$ 's are connected closed curves. By the assumption on weakly connectedness, we may choose $\left\{\alpha^{\alpha}\right\}_{\alpha=1}^{n}$ to be the appropriate coordinate system. For any fixed $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n$, we claim that there exist translations $A_{i}^{\alpha}, 2 \leqslant i \leqslant p$, generated by vectors $v_{i}^{\alpha}$ perpendicular to $\bar{\delta} / \partial x^{\alpha}$, such that the union of the set of translated curves $\left\{A_{i}^{\alpha} \sigma_{i}\right\}_{i=2}^{p}$ together with $\sigma_{1}$ form a connected set. We prove the claim by induction on the number of curves, $p$. When $p=2$, we observe that since no planes of the form $x^{\alpha}=$ constant separates $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$, this is equivalent to the fact that there exists a number $x$, such that the plane $\mathbb{H}=\left\{x^{\alpha}=x\right\}$ must intersect both $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$. Let $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ be the points of intersection between $\mathbb{H}$ with $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ respectively.

Clearly one can translate $q_{2}$ along $\mathbf{H}$ to $q_{1}$. Denote this by $A_{2}^{\alpha}$, and $\sigma_{1} \cup A_{2}^{\alpha} \sigma_{2}$ is connected now. For general $p$, we consider the set of numbers defined by

$$
y_{i}=\max \left\{\left.x^{\alpha}\right|_{\sigma_{i}}\right\}
$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $y_{1} \leqslant y_{2} \leqslant \ldots \leqslant y_{p}$. Now we claim that the set $\bigcup_{i=2}^{p} \sigma_{i}$ cannot be separated by hyperspaces of the form $\mathbf{H}=\left\{x^{\alpha}=\right.$ constant $\}$. If so, say $\mathrm{H}=\left\{x^{\alpha}=x\right\}$ separates $\bigcup_{i=2}^{p} \sigma_{i}$, then $x$ must be in the range of $\left.x^{\alpha}\right|_{\sigma_{1}}$. This is because $\bigcup_{i=1}^{p} \sigma_{i}$ cannot be separated hence $H \cap \sigma_{1} \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $\mathbb{H}$ separates $\bigcup_{i=2}^{i=1} \sigma_{i}$, this means there exists some $\sigma_{i}, 2 \leqslant i \leqslant p$, lying on the left of $H$, hence $y_{i}<x \leqslant y_{1}$, for some $2 \leqslant i \leqslant p$, which is a contradiction. By induction, there exist translations, $A_{i}^{\alpha}, 3 \leqslant i \leqslant p, \underset{p}{\text { perpendicular to }} \partial / \partial x$ such that $\sigma=\sigma_{2} \cup\left\{\bigcup_{i=3}^{p} A_{i}^{\alpha} \sigma_{i}\right\}$ is connected. However, $\bigcup_{i=1}^{p} \sigma_{i}$ is non-separable by $\mathbb{H}=\left\{x^{\alpha}=\right.$ constant $\}$ implies $\sigma_{1} \cup \sigma$ is non-separable also. Hence, there exists a translation $A^{\alpha}$ perpendicular to $\partial / \partial x^{\alpha}$, such that $\sigma_{1} \cup A_{\sigma}^{\alpha}$ is connected. The set $A=A_{2}, A A_{3}$, $A A_{4}, \ldots, A A_{p}$ gives the desired translations. Notice that since all translations are perpendicular to $\partial / \partial x^{\alpha}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.x^{\alpha}\right|_{\sigma_{i}} \equiv x^{\alpha}\right|_{A^{\alpha} \sigma_{i}}, \quad \text { for all } i \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the connectedness of $\sigma^{\alpha}=\sigma_{1} \cup A_{2}^{\alpha} \sigma_{2} \cup \ldots \cup A_{p}^{\alpha} \sigma_{p}$ : we can view $\sigma^{\alpha}$ as a Lipschitz curve in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Clearly

$$
\int_{\sigma^{\alpha}} x^{\alpha}=\sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_{\sigma_{i}} x^{\alpha}=0
$$

hence the Poincaré inequality can be applied to yield

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_{\sigma_{i}}\left(x^{\alpha}\right)^{2}=\int_{\sigma^{\alpha}}\left(x^{\alpha}\right)^{2} \leqslant \frac{l(\partial \Sigma)^{2}}{4 \pi^{2}} \int_{\sigma^{\alpha}}\left(\frac{d x^{\alpha}}{d x}\right)^{2}=\frac{l(\partial \Sigma)^{2}}{4 \pi^{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \int_{\sigma_{i}}\left(\frac{d x^{\alpha}}{d s}\right)^{2} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Summing over all $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant n$ and proceeding as the connected case we derived the inequality (8).

When equality occurs, we will show that $\partial \Sigma$ is actually connected, and hence by the previous argument it must be a circle and $\Sigma$ must be a disk. To see this, we observe that (10) still holds on $\partial \Sigma$. In particular, we may
assume that $X(0)$ is a point on $\sigma_{1}$, and (12) is valid. However, Poincaré inequality is now applied on $\sigma^{\alpha}$ instead of $\partial \Sigma$, therefore equation (11) only applies to the curve $\sigma^{\alpha}$. On the other hand, since $X(0) \in \sigma_{1}$, and $\sigma^{\alpha}=\sigma_{1}$ $\cup\left\{\bigcup_{i=2}^{P} A_{i}^{\alpha} \sigma_{i}\right\}$, the argument concerning the coefficients $a_{\alpha}$ and $b_{\alpha}$ 's is still valid. Equations (15) can still be concluded on each $\sigma^{\alpha}$, hence on $\partial \Sigma$, by (17). This implies $\partial \Sigma$ is a circle, and the Theorem is proved.

Theorem 2. Let $\Sigma$ be a compact minimal surface in $\mathbf{R}^{3}$. If $\partial \Sigma$ oonsists of at most two components, then

$$
l(\partial \Sigma)^{2} \geqslant 4 \pi A(\Sigma)
$$

Moreover, equality holds iff $\Sigma$ is a flat disk in some affine 2 -plane of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.
Proof. In view of Theorem 1, it suffices to prove that when $\partial \Sigma=\sigma_{1} \cup \sigma_{2}$ has exactly two connected components and is not weakly oonnected, $\Sigma$ must be disconnected into two components $\Sigma_{1}$ and $\Sigma_{2}$ with $\partial \Sigma_{1}=\sigma_{1}$ and $\partial \Sigma_{2}=\sigma_{2}$. Indeed, if this is the case, we simply apply Theorem 1 to $\Sigma_{1}$ and $\Sigma_{2}$ separately and derive

$$
\begin{aligned}
l(\partial \Sigma)^{2}= & =\left(l\left(\sigma_{1}\right)+l\left(\sigma_{2}\right)\right)^{2} \\
& >l\left(\sigma_{1}\right)^{2}+l\left(\sigma_{2}\right)^{2} \\
& \geqslant 4 \pi\left(A\left(\Sigma_{1}\right)+A\left(\Sigma_{2}\right)\right) \\
& =4 \pi A(\Sigma) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In this case, equality will never be achieved for (2).
To prove the above assertion, we assume that $\partial \Sigma=\sigma_{1} \cup \sigma_{2}$ is not weakly connected. This implies, there exists an affine plane $P_{1}^{\prime}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ separating $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$. For any oriented affine 2 -plane in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ must be divided into two open half-spaces. Defining the sign of these half-spaces in the manner corresponding to the orientation of the 2 -plane, we consider the sets $S_{i}^{+}$(or $S_{i}^{-}$) as follows: a 2 -plane $P$ is said to be in $S_{i}^{+}$(or $S_{i}^{-}$) for $i=1$ or 2 , if $\sigma_{i}$ is contained in the positive (or negative) open half-space defined by $P$. Obviously, $P_{1}^{\prime} \in S_{1}^{+} \cap S_{2}^{-}$for a fixed orientation of $P_{1}^{\prime}$. However, by the compactness of $\partial \Sigma=\sigma_{1} \cup \sigma_{2}, S_{1}^{+} \cap \mathrm{S}_{2}^{+} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathrm{S}_{2}^{-} \cap \mathrm{S}_{1}^{-} \neq \emptyset$. Hence $\partial \mathrm{S}_{1}^{+} \cap \partial \mathrm{S}_{2}^{-} \neq \emptyset$, by virtue of the fact that both $S_{1}^{+}$and $S_{2}^{-}$are connected sets. This gives a 2 -plane in $\mathbb{R}^{3}, P_{1}$, which has the property that $\sigma_{1}$ (and $\sigma_{2}$ ) lies in the closed positive (respectively negative) half-space defined by $P_{1}$. Moreover, both the sets $\sigma_{1} \cap P_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2} \cap P_{1}$ are nonempty.

By the assumption that $\partial \Sigma$ is not weakly connected and since $P_{1}$ does not separate $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$, there exists an affine 2 -plane in $\mathbb{R}^{3}, P_{2}^{\prime}$, which is perpendicular to $P_{1}$ and separating $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$. Let us define $\bar{\delta}$ to be the set of
oriented affine 2 -planes in $\mathbf{R}^{3}$ which are perpendicular to $\boldsymbol{P}_{1}$. Setting $\overline{\mathrm{S}}_{i}^{+}$ (or $S_{i}^{-}$) to be $\mathcal{S}_{i}^{+} \cap \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ (or $\delta_{i}^{-} \cap \overline{\mathcal{S}}$ ), and as before, we conclude that $\partial \overline{\mathrm{S}}_{1}^{+} \cap \partial \overline{\mathrm{S}}_{2}^{-} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, there exists an affine 2-plane, $P_{2}$, perpendicular to $P_{1}$, and having the property that $\sigma_{1}$ (and $\sigma_{2}$ ) lie in the closed positive (respectively negative) half-space defined by $P_{2}$ and both sets $\sigma_{1} \cap P_{2}$ and $\sigma_{2} \cap P_{2}$ are nonempty.

Arguing once more that $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ do not separate the $\sigma_{i}$ 's, there must be an affine 2-plane $P_{3}$ perpendicular to both $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$. Moreover, $P_{3}$ must separate $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ by the assumption the $\partial \Sigma$ is not weakly connected. We defined a rectangular coordinate system xyz such that $P_{1}, P_{2}$ and $P_{3}$ are the $x y, y z$, and $x z$ planes respectively. Clearly by the properties of the 2 -planes $P_{i}$ 's, $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ are contained in the closed octant $\{x \geqslant 0, y \geqslant 0, z \geqslant 0\}$ and the closed octant $\{x \leqslant 0, y \leqslant 0, z \leqslant 0\}$ respectively. In particular, $\sigma_{1}$ is contained in the cone defined by $C_{1}=\left\{X \in \mathbf{R}^{3}|X \cdot V \geqslant|X| / \sqrt{3}\right.$, where $V=(1 / \sqrt{3}, 1 / \sqrt{3}, 1 / \sqrt{3})\}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ is contained in the cone $C_{2}=\left\{X \in \mathbb{R}^{3} \mid X\right.$ $\leqslant-|X| / \sqrt{3}$, where $V=(1 / \sqrt{3}, 1 / \sqrt{3}, 1 / \sqrt{3})\}$. However, one verifies that the two cones $C_{i}, i=1,2$, are contained in the positive and negative cones defined by the catenoid obtained from rotating the catenary along the line given by $V$. In view of Theorem 6 in [4], the minimal surface $\Sigma$ must be disconnected. This concludes our proof.

## 2. - Nonexistence.

Let $\left(x^{1}, \ldots, x^{n}\right)$ be a rectangular coordinate system in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$. We consider the ( $n-1$ )-dimensional surface of revolution $\mathcal{S}_{a}$ obtained by rotating the catenary $x^{n-1}=\mathrm{a} \cosh \left(x^{n} / a\right)$ around the $x^{n}$-axis. One readily computes that its principal curvatures are

$$
\left(\cosh ^{-1}(z / a), \frac{\left.-\cosh ^{-1}(z / a),-\cosh ^{-1}(z / a), \ldots,-\cosh ^{-1}(z / a)\right)}{(n-2)}\right.
$$

with respect to the inward normal vector (i.e. the normal vector pointing towards the $x^{n}$-axis). The set of hypersurfaces $\left\{\delta_{a}\right\}_{a>0}$ defines a cone in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ as in the case when $n=3$ (see [4]). This cone (positive and negative halves) is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{C}=\left\{\left(x^{1}, \ldots, x^{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid\left(x^{1}\right)^{2}+\ldots+\left(x^{n-1}\right)^{2}<\left(x^{n}\right)^{2} \sinh ^{2} \tau\right\} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tau$ is the unique positive number satisfying $\cosh \tau-\tau \sinh \tau=0$. If $\Sigma$ is a compact connected minimal surface in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ with boundary decomposed into $\partial \Sigma=\sigma_{1} \cup \sigma_{2}$, where $\sigma_{1}$ and $\sigma_{2}$ (each could have more than one connected component) lie inside the positive and negative part of $\mathcal{C}$ respect-
ively, then arguing as in [5], $\Sigma$ must intersect one of the surfaces $\mathcal{S}_{a}$ tangentially. Moreover, $\Sigma$ must lie in the interior (the part containing the $x^{n}$-axis) of $\mathbb{S}_{a}$, except at those points of intersection. This violates the maximum principle since $\Sigma$ is minimal and any 2 -dimensional subspace of the tangent space of $\mathbb{S}_{a}$ must have nonpositive mean curvature. Hence $\Sigma$ must be disconnected. This gives the following:

Theorem 3. Let $\mathrm{C}^{+}$and $\mathrm{C}^{-}$be the positive and negative halves of the cone in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$ defined by (18). Suppose $\Sigma$ is a minimal surface spanning its boundary $\partial \Sigma=\sigma_{1} \cup \sigma_{2}$. If $\sigma_{1} \subset \mathrm{C}^{+}$and $\sigma_{2} \subset \mathrm{C}^{-}$, then $\Sigma$ must be disconnected.

We remark that using similar arguments, one can use surfaces of revolution having principal curvatures of the form ( $k \lambda, \frac{-\lambda,-\lambda,-\lambda, \ldots,-\lambda)}{(n-2) \text { copies }}$ as barrier to yield nonexistence type theorems for $(k+1)$-dimensional minimal submanifolds in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.
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