



Cones in the Euclidean space with vanishing scalar curvature

JOÃO LUCAS M. BARBOSA^{1*} and MANFREDO DO CARMO^{2*}

¹Universidade Federal do Ceará (UFC), Departamento de Matemática
Campus do Pici, 60455-760 Fortaleza, Ce, Brasil

²Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA)
Estrada Dona Castorina 110, 22460-320 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Manuscript received on April 22, 2004; accepted for publication on May 12, 2004.

ABSTRACT

Given a hypersurface M on a unit sphere of the Euclidean space, we define the cone based on M as the set of half-lines issuing from the origin and passing through M . By assuming that the scalar curvature of the cone vanishes, we obtain conditions under which bounded domains of such cone are stable or unstable.

Key words: stability, r -curvature, cone, scalar curvature.

1 INTRODUCTION

A natural generalization of minimal hypersurfaces in Euclidean spaces was introduced in (Reilly 1973). Reilly considered the elementary symmetric functions S_r , $r = 0, 1, \dots, n$, of the principal curvatures k_1, \dots, k_n of an orientable hypersurface $x : M^n \rightarrow R^{n+1}$ given by

$$S_0 = 1, \quad S_r = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_r} k_{i_1} \dots k_{i_r}.$$

Here, k_{i_1}, \dots, k_{i_n} are the eigenvalues of $A = -dg$, where $g : M^n \rightarrow S^n(1)$ is the Gauss map of the hypersurface. Reilly showed that orientable hypersurfaces with $S_{r+1} = 0$ are critical points of the functional

$$A_r = \int_M S_r dM$$

for variations of M with compact support. Thus, such hypersurfaces generalize the fact that minimal hypersurfaces are critical points of the area functional $A_0 = \int_M S_0 dM$ for compactly supported variations.

*Member Academia Brasileira de Ciências
Correspondence to: João Lucas M. Barbosa
E-mail: jlucas@secrel.com.br

A breakthrough in the study of these hypersurfaces occurred in the last five years of last century: in (Hounie and Leite 1995) and (Hounie and Leite 1999) conditions for the linearization of the partial differential equation $S_{r+1} = 0$ to be an elliptic equation were found. This linearization involves a second order differential operator L_r (see the definition of L_r in Section 2) and the Hounie-Leite conditions read as follows:

$$L_r \text{ is elliptic} \iff \text{rank}(A) > r + 1 \iff S_{r+2} \neq 0 \text{ everywhere.}$$

In this paper, we will be interested in the case $S_2 = 0$. For this situation, since $\text{rank}(A)$ cannot be two, the ellipticity condition is equivalent to $\text{rank}(A) \geq 3$.

In (Alencar et al. 2003) a general notion of stability was introduced for bounded domains of hypersurfaces of Euclidean spaces with $S_{r+1} = 0$. In the case we are interested, namely $S_2 = 0$, it can be shown that if we assume that L_1 is elliptic, an orientation can be chosen so that a bounded domain $D \subset M$ is stable if

$$\frac{d^2 A_1}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} > 0 \quad \text{for all variations with support in (the open set) } D.$$

In what follows, we denote by $B_r(0)$ the ball of radius r centered at the origin 0 of R^{n+1} . Let M^{n-1} be a smooth hypersurface of the sphere $S^n(1)$. A cone $\mathcal{C}(M)$ in R^{n+1} is the union of half-lines starting at 0 and passing through the points of M . It is clear that $\mathcal{C}(M) \cap S^n(1) = M$. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{C}(M) - \{0\}$ is a smooth n -dimensional hypersurface of R^{n+1} . The manifold $\mathcal{C}(M)$ is referred to as the *cone based on* M^{n-1} . The part of the cone contained in the closure of the ring $B_1(0) \setminus B_\varepsilon(0)$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, is called a *truncated cone* and is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(M)_\varepsilon$.

In this note we present the following two theorems which provide a nice description of the stability of truncated cones in R^{n+1} based on compact, orientable hypersurfaces of $S^n(1)$, with $S_2 = 0$ and $S_3 \neq 0$ everywhere.

THEOREM 1. *Let M^{n-1} , $n \geq 4$, be an orientable, compact, hypersurface of $S^n(1)$ with $S_2 = 0$ and $S_3 \neq 0$ everywhere. Then, if $n \leq 7$, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ so that the truncated cone $\mathcal{C}(M)_\varepsilon$ is not stable.*

THEOREM 2. *For $n \geq 8$, there exist compact, orientable hypersurfaces M^{n-1} of the sphere $S^n(1)$, with $S_2 = 0$ and $S_3 \neq 0$ everywhere, so that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathcal{C}(M)_\varepsilon$ is stable.*

Although Theorems 1 and 2 are interesting on their own right, a further motivation to prove these theorems is that, for the minimal case, they provide the geometric basis to prove the generalized Bernstein theorem, namely, that a complete minimal graph $y = f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ in R^n , $n \leq 8$, is a linear function (See (Simons 1968), Theorems 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.2.1, 6.2.2).

For elliptic graphs in R^n with vanishing scalar curvature the question appears in a natural way. Of course, since we want to consider graphs with $S_2 = 0$ and S_3 never zero, we must start with $n \geq 4$, and the solution cannot be a hyperplane. Thus the question is whether there exists an elliptic graph in R^n , $n \geq 4$, with vanishing scalar curvature.

2 PRELIMINARIES

For notational reasons, it will be convenient to denote the hypersurface of the Introduction by $x : \bar{M} \rightarrow R^{n+1}$. We first need to consider the Newton Transformations P_r , that are inductively given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= I \\ P_r &= S_r I - A P_{r-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

and then define the differential operator L_r by

$$L_r f = \text{trace}\{P_r \text{Hess } f\} . \tag{2}$$

It turns out that L_r is self-adjoint and that $L_r f = \text{div}(P_r \text{grad } f)$.

The second variation formula for the variational problem of the functional \mathcal{A}_1 is, up to a positive constant, given by

$$I(f) = - \int_{\bar{M}} f(L_1 f - 3S_3 f) d\bar{M} , \tag{3}$$

for test functions f of compact support in \bar{M} .

Consider now a compact orientable $(n - 1)$ -dimensional manifold M immersed as a hypersurface of the unit sphere $S^n(1)$ of the Euclidean space R^{n+1} . The cone $\mathcal{C}(M)$ based on M is described by

$$\begin{aligned} M \times (0, \infty) &\rightarrow R^{n+1} \\ (m, t) &\rightarrow tm . \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Of course, the geometry of $\mathcal{C}(M)$ is closely related to the one of M and it is simple to compute the second fundamental form \bar{A} of $\mathcal{C}(M)$ in terms of the second fundamental form A of M . In fact, one finds

$$\bar{A} = \frac{1}{t} A .$$

From this relation on the second fundamental forms it follows that

PROPOSITION 1. *If \bar{S}_r represents the elementary symmetric function of order r of $\mathcal{C}(M)$ and \bar{P}_r its Newton transformations, then:*

- a) $\bar{S}_r = (1/t^r) S_r$,
- b) $\bar{S}_r = 0$ if and only if $S_r = 0$,
- c) $|\bar{A}| = (1/t)|A|$,

$$d) \bar{P}_r = (1/t^r) \left[\begin{array}{ccc} S_r & | & 0 \\ \hline & + & \\ 0 & | & P_r \end{array} \right].$$

PROOF. The proof is direct except for the last item. But this can be done using finite induction and the definition of \bar{P}_r .

Let $F : \mathcal{C}(M) \rightarrow R$ be a C^2 function. For each $t > 0$, define $\tilde{F}_t : M \rightarrow R$ by $\tilde{F}_t(m) = F(m, t)$.

Proposition 2. *With the above notation we have:*

$$\bar{L}_r F = \frac{1}{t^r} S_r \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial t^2} + \frac{n-r-1}{t^{r+1}} S_r \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{t^{r+1}} L_r(\tilde{F}_t).$$

PROOF. The proof of this Lemma follows the same lines used to find the expression of the Laplacian in polar coordinates and using the previous proposition.

3 SKETCH OF PROOF OF THEOREM 1

First of all let us observe that since $S_2 \equiv 0$ then $(S_1)^2 = |A|^2 \geq 0$. Hence, at a point where $S_1 = 0$ we would have that all the entries of the matrix A are zero and so $S_3 = 0$ what is forbidden by our hypothesis. Therefore, we will have $(S_1)^2 > 0$ everywhere.

According to Proposition 1, our hypotheses then imply that, for the cone $\mathcal{C}(M)$, we have $\bar{S}_2 \equiv 0$ and \bar{S}_1 and \bar{S}_3 never zero.

It was proved in (Hounie and Leite 1999) that, for a hypersurface of R^{n+1} with $\bar{S}_r \equiv 0$, $2 \leq r < n$, the operator \bar{L}_{r-1} is elliptic if and only if \bar{S}_{r+1} is never zero. Then we conclude that L_1 and \bar{L}_1 are elliptic.

To prove the theorem, we are going to show the existence of a truncated cone $\mathcal{C}(M)_\epsilon$ for which the second variation formula attains negative values. Hence, from now on we are going to work on a truncated cone, with test functions f that have a support contained in the interior of the truncated cone. As we did before, for each test function $f : \mathcal{C}(M)_\epsilon \rightarrow R$ and each fixed t we define $\tilde{f}_t : M \rightarrow R$ by $\tilde{f}_t(m) = f(m, t)$. From Proposition 2 we have that

$$\bar{L}_1 f = \frac{1}{t} S_1 \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial t^2} + \frac{n-2}{t^2} S_1 \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{t^3} L_1(\tilde{f}_t). \tag{5}$$

The volume element of $\mathcal{C}(M)$ is easily seen to be

$$d\bar{M} = t^{n-1} dt \wedge dM. \tag{6}$$

Hence, using (3), (5) and the expression of the volume, the second variation formula on f becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(f) = & - \int_{M \times [\epsilon, 1]} (\tilde{f}_t L_1(\tilde{f}_t) - 3S_3(\tilde{f}_t)^2) t^{n-4} dt \wedge dM - \\
 & - \int_{M \times [\epsilon, 1]} \left(t^2 f \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial t^2} + (n-2) t f \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) t^{n-4} S_1 dt \wedge dM .
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{7}$$

Since $S_1 > 0$, then $t^{n-4} S_1 dt \wedge dM$ is a volume element in $\mathcal{C}(M)$, in particular in $\mathcal{C}(M)_\epsilon$. We will represent it by dS . In fact, dS is a product of two measures. The first one on the real line: $d\xi = t^{n-4} dt$; the second, on M , given by $d\mu = S_1 dM$. So, $dS = d\xi \wedge d\mu$. We can then rewrite the second variation formula on f as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(f) = & - \int_{M \times [\epsilon, 1]} \frac{1}{S_1} (\tilde{f}_t L_1(\tilde{f}_t) - 3S_3(\tilde{f}_t)^2) d\xi \wedge d\mu \\
 & - \int_{M \times [\epsilon, 1]} \left(t^2 f \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial t^2} + (n-2) t f \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) d\xi \wedge d\mu .
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{8}$$

Define, now, the following two operators:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{L}_1 : C^\infty(M) &\rightarrow C^\infty(M) & \text{by: } \mathcal{L}_1 f &= -(1/S_1)L_1 f + 3(S_3/S_1)f . \\
 \mathcal{L}_2 : C^\infty[\epsilon, 1] &\rightarrow C^\infty[\epsilon, 1] & \text{by: } \mathcal{L}_2 g &= -t^2 g'' - (n-2) t g' .
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{9}$$

Observe that we are considering the space $C^\infty(M)$ with the inner product:

$$\langle\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle\rangle = \int_M f_1 f_2 d\mu
 \tag{10}$$

and $C^\infty[\epsilon, 1]$ with the inner product:

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle = \int_\epsilon^1 g_1 g_2 d\xi .
 \tag{11}$$

Since L_1 is elliptic and M is compact then L_1 , and so \mathcal{L}_1 , is strongly elliptic. The same is true for the operator \mathcal{L}_2 . Let $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \nearrow \infty$ be the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_1 and $\delta_1 < \delta_2 < \dots \nearrow \infty$ be the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L}_2 . Using orthonormal bases of eigenfunctions for these operators one deduces the following Lemma:

LEMMA 1. *For any test function f we have*

$$I(f) \geq (\lambda_1 + \delta_1) \int_{M \times [\epsilon, 1]} f^2 d\xi \wedge d\mu .$$

There exists a test function f such that $I(f) < 0$ if and only if $\lambda_1 + \delta_1 < 0$.

The operator \mathcal{L}_2 is well known. In fact it has been used in (Simmons 1968) to prove his celebrated theorem. The following lemma contains all the information we need about this operator:

LEMMA 2. *The operator \mathcal{L}_2 has eigenvalues*

$$\delta_k = \left(\frac{n-3}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{k\pi}{\log \epsilon}\right)^2, \tag{12}$$

where $1 \leq k < \infty$.

We will also need the following lemma whose proof uses Lemmas (3.7) and (4.1) in (Alencar et al. 1993).

LEMMA 3. *Let M^{n-1} be a compact, orientable, immersed hypersurface of $S^n(1)$ with $S_2 \equiv 0$ e S_3 never zero. Suppose $n \geq 4$. The first eigenvalue of the operator \mathcal{L}_1 in M satisfy: $\lambda_1 \leq -(n-2)$.*

Finally, we observe that the lemma below completes the proof of Theorem 1.

LEMMA 4. *Let M^{n-1} be a compact, orientable, immersed hypersurface of $S^n(1)$ with $S_2 \equiv 0$, S_3 never zero and $n \geq 4$. If $n \leq 7$ then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that the truncated cone $\mathcal{C}M_\epsilon$ is not stable.*

PROOF OF THE LEMMA: From Lemmas 2 and 3 we have

$$\lambda_1 + \delta_1 \leq -(n-2) + \left(\frac{n-3}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\pi}{\log \epsilon}\right)^2.$$

It is trivial to verify that the sum of the first two terms of the right hand side of this inequality is a quadratic polynomial, with positive second order term, whose roots are approximately 2.2 and 7.8 . Hence it is strictly negative for values of $n \in \{4, 5, 6, 7\}$, in fact, it is less than or equal to -1 . Hence,

$$\lambda_1 + \delta_1 \leq -1 + \left(\frac{\pi}{\log \epsilon}\right)^2.$$

Choosing ϵ sufficiently small we can guarantee that the right hand side is negative. Now, by Lemma 1, we see that $\mathcal{C}M_\epsilon$ is not stable. This proves Lemma 4 and completes the proof of the Theorem 1.

4 EXISTENCE OF STABLE CONES

In this section we sketch the proof o Theorem 2.

The following example has been considered by various people in different contexts (see e.g. (Chern 1968) and (Alencar et al. 2002)). Consider $R^{p+2} = R^{r+1} \oplus R^{s+1}$, $r + s = p$. Write down the vectors of R^{p+2} as $\xi_1 + \xi_2$, $\xi_1 \in R^{r+1}$, $\xi_2 \in R^{s+1}$. When ξ_1 describes $S^r(1) \subset R^{r+1}$ and ξ_2 describes $S^s(1) \subset R^{s+1}$, by taking positive numbers a_1 and a_2 with $a_1^2 + a_2^2 = 1$, we have that

$$x = a_1\xi_1 + a_2\xi_2$$

describes a submanifold M of dimension $p = r + s$ of the sphere $S^{p+1}(1) \subset R^{p+2}$. The manifold M is diffeomorphic to $S^r(1) \times S^s(1)$ and so is compact and orientable. It can be shown that a_1 and a_2 can be chosen so that $S_2 = 0$ and $S_3 \neq 0$. We will show that, in this case, the truncated cone $\mathcal{C}(M)_\epsilon$ is stable as a hypersurface of R^{r+s+1} when $r + s + 1 \geq 8$.

It can be shown that the L_1 operator on M is given by

$$L_1 f = \left[(r - 1) \frac{a_2}{a_1} - s \frac{a_1}{a_2} \right] \Delta^r f + \left[r \frac{a_2}{a_1} - (s - 1) \frac{a_1}{a_2} \right] \Delta^s f ,$$

where Δ^r and Δ^s denote the Laplacian operators in the Euclidean spheres $S^r(a_1)$ and $S^s(a_2)$, respectively. Since the first nonzero eigenvalue of the Laplace operator on a sphere $S^k(b)$ is known to be k/b^2 , the first nonzero eigenvalue of L_1 will be

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1 = \min \left\{ \left[(r - 1) \frac{a_2}{a_1} - s \frac{a_1}{a_2} \right] \frac{r}{a_1^2} , \left[r \frac{a_2}{a_1} - (s - 1) \frac{a_1}{a_2} \right] \frac{s}{a_2^2} \right\} .$$

It will then follow that the first eigenvalue of the operator

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \frac{1}{S_1} L_1 + 3 \frac{S_3}{S_1}$$

will be given by

$$\lambda_1 = 3 \frac{S_3}{S_1} = -(p - 1) ,$$

where the last equality comes from a long but straightforward computation.

Therefore, using Lemma 2, the above value for λ_1 , and the fact that, in our case, $n = p + 1$, we obtain

$$\lambda_1 + \delta_1 = -(n - 2) + \left(\frac{n - 3}{2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\pi}{\log \varepsilon} \right)^2 .$$

For $n \geq 8$, the sum of the first two terms becomes $> 1/4$. Thus, for any choice of ε , $\lambda_1 + \delta_1 > 0$. Together with Lemma 1, this completes the proof of Theorem 2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Both authors were partially supported by PRONEX and CNPq.

RESUMO

Dada uma hipersuperfície M de uma esfera unitária do espaço euclidiano, definimos o cone sobre M como o conjunto das semi-retas que saem da origem e passam por M . Admitindo que a curvatura escalar de um dado cone é nula, estabelecemos condições para que os seus domínios limitados sejam estáveis ou instáveis.

Palavras-chave: estabilidade, r -curvatura, cone, curvatura escalar.

REFERENCES

ALENCAR H, DO CARMO MP AND COLARES AG. 1993. Stable hypersurfaces with constant scalar curvature. *Math Z* 213: 117-131.

ALENCAR H, DO CARMO MP AND SANTOS W. 2002. A gap theorem for hypersurfaces of the sphere with constant scalar curvature one. *Comm Math Helv* 77: 549-562.

- ALENCAR H, DO CARMO MP AND ELBERT MF. 2003. Stability of hypersurfaces with vanishing r -mean curvatures in euclidean spaces. *J Reine Angew Math* 554: 201-216.
- CHEMN SS. 1968. Minimal submanifolds in a Riemannian manifold. Lecture Notes, Lawrence, Kan., Univ. of Kansas.
- HOUNIE J AND LEITE ML. 1995. The maximum principle for hypersurfaces with vanishing curvature functions. *J Diff Geom* 41: 247-258.
- HOUNIE J AND LEITE ML. 1999. Two-ended hypersurfaces with zero scalar curvature. *Indiana Univ Math J* 48: 867-882.
- REILLY R. 1973. Variational properties of functions of the mean curvatures for hypersurfaces in space forms. *J Diff Geom* 8: 465-477.
- SIMMONS J. 1968. Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds. *Ann Math* 88: 62-105.