

## GMT Seminar 12th February.

**Question 1.** [ERIC LARSSON] Let  $V$  be a flat unit disk with center  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , and let  $R$  be smaller than the radius of the disk. Explain why this is not a counterexample to Lemma 19.1.

**Question 2.** [ERIC LARSSON] The first sentence on page 99 states that "It is easy to check that (5) [...] implies that  $\mu_W$  is invariant under homotheties [...]" . How would you check this?

**Question 3.** [ERIC LARSSON] The statement of Lemma 19.5 is somewhat difficult to read. Is there a simpler special case which still captures the essence of the lemma?

**Question 4.** [ANDREAS MINNE AND ERIK DUSE.] On page 95, how does one get the exponent  $n/n - 1$  in the inequality following "we then get...?"

**Question 5.** [ANDREAS MINNE AND ERIK DUSE.] This question concerns the last session, namely 17.9(1) Remarks: why is it true that "... hence we can write  $V|U = v(M_*, \theta_*)$ "?

**Question 6.** [ANDREAS MINNE AND ERIK DUSE.] How would you explain the reasoning for finding the proofs of the results in Chapter 18 and 19 (for example the proofs of 18.6 Theorem and Lemma 19.5)?

**Question 7:** Lemma 19.1 on page 95 looks like one of Leon Simon's normal technical mumbo-jumbo Lemmata. But it has a very intuitive geometric interpretation- what? How does this relate to the maximum principle in elliptic PDE?

**Question 8:** One of the most powerful tools in analysis is the Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem. For many applications it is enough to find the convergent sub-sequence of a bounded sequence whose existence Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem assures. However, in Theorem 19.3 on page 97 we assume the full convergence as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$  (not just convergence for some subsequence  $\rho_j \rightarrow 0$ ).

Is this necessary? Can we weaken the assumptions?

**Question 9:** Again in relation to Theorem 19.3. What does the Theorem say? What is the meaning? How does Theorem 1.3 relate to the theory of minimal surfaces?

**Question 10:** The "normal" Sobolev inequality in  $W_0^{1,1}(U)$  states that there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\left( \int_U |h(x)|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} dx \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \leq C \int_U |\nabla h(x)| dx.$$

This is usually interpreted as a statement that  $W_0^{1,1}(U) \hookrightarrow L^{n/(n-1)}(U)$ .

In Theorem 18.6 on page 93 Simon proves the more general Sobolev inequality on a varifold

$$\left( \int_{B_1(0)} |h(x)|^{\frac{n}{n-1}} d\mu \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \leq C \int_{B_1} (|\nabla^M h(x)| + |H|h(x)) d\mu.$$

Does this imply that  $W_0^{1,1}(V \cap U) \hookrightarrow L^{n/(n-1)}(V \cap U)$  in some meaningful sense?