

UNIQUENESS OF STATIC VACUUM EINSTEIN METRICS AND THE BARTNIK QUASI-LOCAL MASS

MICHAEL T. ANDERSON AND MARCUS A. KHURI

ABSTRACT. We analyse the issue of uniqueness of solutions of the static vacuum Einstein equations with prescribed ‘geometric’ or Bartnik boundary data. Large classes of examples are constructed where uniqueness fails. We then discuss the implications of this behavior for the Bartnik quasi-local mass. A variational characterization of Bartnik boundary data is also given.

1. INTRODUCTION

General Relativity differs from most classical field theories in that the notion of energy density for the gravitational field is not well defined, as can be seen from Einstein’s principle of equivalence. Thus at best one can only expect to define and calculate the mass or energy contained within a domain, as opposed to a point. Such a concept is referred to as quasi-local mass, i.e. a functional which assigns a real number to each compact spacelike hypersurface in a spacetime. Numerous definitions of quasi-local mass have been proposed, although a consensus has still not been reached on an optimal or best choice, cf. [16] for an extensive review. One of the most natural definitions, which satisfies many requisite properties, is the mass proposed by Bartnik [3].

Bartnik’s idea is to localize the ADM (or total) mass in the following way. Here we restrict attention to the time symmetric case for simplicity. Let (Ω, g) (or Ω for short) be a compact Riemannian 3-manifold of non-negative scalar curvature and with non-empty boundary. Define an *admissible extension* of Ω to be a complete, asymptotically flat 3-manifold $(\widetilde{M}, g)$ of non-negative scalar curvature in which Ω embeds isometrically and is not enclosed by any compact minimal surfaces (horizons). Let $\mathcal{M}^+(\Omega, g)$ be the space of such metrics. Then the Bartnik mass is given by

$$(1.1) \quad m_B(\Omega) = \inf\{m_{ADM}(\widetilde{M}, g) : (\widetilde{M}, g) \in \mathcal{M}^+(\Omega, g)\},$$

where m_{ADM} is the ADM mass of $(\widetilde{M}, g)$. A primary benefit of this construction is that nonnegativity is achieved for free, from the positive mass theorem. However it is not a priori clear that this definition is nontrivial, in the sense that the mass is nonzero whenever Ω is nonflat. That this is the case [11], is a consequence of (and reason for) the no horizons assumption in the class of admissible extensions.

The definition (1.1) is rather abstract and for both conceptual and computational reasons, one would like to know that the infimum is actually realized by a natural extension of the body (Ω, g) . This is the content of the following conjecture, proposed by Bartnik [3].

Static Minimization Conjecture. *The infimum $m_B(\Omega)$ is realized by an admissible extension $(\widetilde{M}, g)$ which is smooth, vacuum and static outside Ω , is $C^{0,1}$ across $\partial\Omega$, and has nonnegative scalar curvature across $\partial\Omega$ (in the distributional sense).*

The first author is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 0905159 while the second author is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 0707086 and a Sloan Research Fellowship.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 58J23, 83C05; Secondary 35J57, 53C25.

Thus the Bartnik mass may be computed as the ADM mass of the static vacuum minimizer (M, g, u) extending Ω . Recall that a 3-manifold (M, g) is static vacuum if there exists a potential function $u > 0$ which satisfies the static vacuum Einstein equations (equivalently, the 4-metric $\pm u^2 dt^2 + g$ is Ricci flat):

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Ric}(g) = u^{-1} \nabla^2 u, \quad \Delta u = 0.$$

The physical reasoning behind this conjecture is that once all mass/energy has been squeezed out, there is nothing left to support matter fields (vacuum) or gravitational dynamics (static). Moreover significant mathematical motivation exists as well. For instance, it follows from [8], cf. also [4], [5], that exterior metrics realizing the Bartnik mass must be static vacuum. Thus, the issue is the existence of smooth minimizers for the ADM mass.

As shown by Bartnik [3]- [5], the boundary conditions for a minimizing configuration are:

$$(1.3) \quad g|_{\partial M} = g|_{\partial \Omega}, \quad H_{\partial M} = H_{\partial \Omega},$$

where $M = \widetilde{M} \setminus \Omega$ is the exterior region and H is the mean curvature. These boundary conditions imply that the metric g is $C^{0,1}$ across the divide between the compact body Ω and the static exterior. Moreover, the scalar curvature is nonnegative in the distributional sense across $\partial \Omega$.

The conjecture may be divided into two distinct parts. The first step is to establish the existence of solutions to the static vacuum equations (1.2) with boundary conditions (1.3) (the static extension conjecture). Then with this candidate mass minimizer in hand, the second step entails showing that the given static solution actually realizes the infimum. In [1] we have addressed the first part, which we now explain.

Let $\text{Met}^{m,\alpha}(S^2)$ be the space of $C^{m,\alpha}$ metrics on the 2-sphere and let $C_+^{m-1,\alpha}(S^2)$ be the space of $C^{m-1,\alpha}$ positive functions. Let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^{m,\alpha} = \text{Met}^{m,\alpha}(S^2) \times C_+^{m-1,\alpha}(S^2)$ be the space of boundary data (γ, H) , and let $\mathcal{B}^{nd} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be the open subset of boundary data defined by the condition that (the mean curvature) H has no critical points in the region on which the Gauss curvature K_γ of γ is nonpositive:

$$(1.4) \quad dH \neq 0 \quad \text{where} \quad K_\gamma \leq 0.$$

The space $\mathcal{B}^{nd}$ is connected and Bartnik boundary data satisfying this property will be called *non-degenerate*. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^{m,\alpha}$ be the moduli space of asymptotically flat static vacuum solutions on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ (where B is a 3-ball) which are $C^{m,\alpha}$, $m \geq 3$, up to the boundary; for simplicity, assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is connected (if not, take the component containing a standard flat solution). Let also $\mathcal{E}^{nd} \subset \mathcal{E}$ be the open subset for which the Bartnik boundary data are non-degenerate. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is a smooth Banach manifold and the Bartnik boundary map

$$(1.5) \quad \Pi_B : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}, \quad \Pi_B(g, u) = (\gamma, H),$$

and its restriction

$$(1.6) \quad \Pi_B : \mathcal{E}^{nd} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{nd},$$

are smooth and Fredholm, of Fredholm index 0. Moreover, when restricted to the connected component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd} \subset \mathcal{E}^{nd}$ containing the trivial flat solution $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B^3(1), g_{flat}, 1)$, the map Π_B is proper. Such proper Fredholm maps have a mod 2 (Smale) degree, and it is shown that, on the component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$,

$$(1.7) \quad \deg_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(\Pi_B) = 1.$$

Hence the boundary map

$$(1.8) \quad \Pi_B : \mathcal{E}_0^{nd} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{nd},$$

is surjective.

This gives a satisfactory answer to the existence of static vacuum solutions with given Bartnik data on the boundary. However, it does not address the uniqueness question, which is the main focus of the present work.

If uniqueness fails, there are likely to be significant conceptual problems with the definition and calculation of the Bartnik mass. Thus, while one could always choose the static solution with minimal mass among all the solutions with given boundary data, the minimizing solution will probably not vary continuously with the boundary data, leading to the situation that the mass is not a smooth function of the boundary data; (there could be jumps or “catastrophes” from one minimizer to another far away). Any proof of the static minimization conjecture would then also be much more difficult. For example a proof by flow methods, as considered in [12], [10], would run into difficulties since the flow lines would not have a unique minimizer to converge to.

The first result of this work is the following:

THEOREM 1.1. *The moduli space $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$ of asymptotically flat static vacuum solutions on $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ having non-degenerate Bartnik boundary data is not connected within $\mathcal{E}$.*

In particular, the map Π_B in (1.6) is not 1-1; there exist smooth non-degenerate Bartnik data on S^2 which have more than one smooth asymptotically flat static vacuum extension.

Theorem 1.1 is proved in §2, where a number of concrete examples illustrating the non-uniqueness are given. The non-uniqueness is strongly tied to the fact that static vacuum solutions $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ have outer-minimizing boundary ∂M in (M, g) .

This result suggests that it may be useful to restrict to the component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, and study the uniqueness of the boundary map Π_B in this space. This is done in §3, where we first prove that the boundary conditions (1.3) arise from a natural Lagrangian on the space of (non-vacuum) static metrics on M . This allows one to extend the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -valued degree in (1.7) to a $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued degree, which is moreover computable. This gives a second main result:

THEOREM 1.2. *Let (γ, H) be a regular value of Π_B on $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ and define*

$$(1.9) \quad \deg_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Pi_B) = \sum (-1)^{ind(g_i, u_i)}.$$

where the sum is over the finite collection of regular points $(g_i, u_i) \in (\Pi_B)^{-1}(\gamma, H)$. Here $ind(g, u)$ is the index of the linearization of the static vacuum Einstein equations (cf. §3 for details).

Then $\deg_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Pi_B)$ is well-defined and

$$(1.10) \quad \deg_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Pi_B) = 1.$$

Theorem 1.2 provides some evidence that Π_B may be one-to-one on the component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ and thus it is natural to look for bodies (Ω, g) whose conjectured static minimizing extensions lie in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. This issue is considered in §4. Since ∂M is outer-minimizing for extensions $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, this issue is closely related to the modification of the Bartnik mass proposed by Bray, [7], in which one restricts the admissible extensions of (Ω, g) to those for which $\partial\Omega$ is outer-minimizing in (M, g) . It is shown however in Proposition 4.1 that the Bartnik-Bray outer mass m_{out} is strictly positive on certain classes of flat domains $(\Omega, g_{flat}) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$,

$$m_{out}(\Omega) > m_B(\Omega) = 0.$$

Hence, in general, the restriction to outer-minimizing extensions, for example those in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, is unreasonable both physically and mathematically.

Nevertheless, it would be very interesting to find a characterization of bodies (Ω, g) whose static minimizing extensions lie in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. We conjecture this is the case for reasonably simple bodies, for example those with $K_\gamma > 0$. However, an overall conclusion of the analysis presented here is that there are likely to be significant difficulties with the existence of static minimizing extensions and the computability of the Bartnik mass for bodies (Ω, g) in full generality.

The discussion above summarizes the contents of the paper. One further result of interest is the following, cf. Proposition 3.4. The map Π_B in (1.5) for *interior* static vacuum solutions (where one replaces the exterior region $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B$ by the interior region B) has image which is nowhere dense in $\mathcal{B}$, in strong contrast to the surjectivity of Π_B in (1.8).

We thank Robert Bartnik, Hubert Bray and Gerhard Huisken for interesting discussions on the topics of this paper and Marcelo Disconzi for assistance with the figures.

2. THE COMPONENTS OF $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$ AND LACK OF UNIQUENESS.

A particularly nice feature common to the static vacuum extensions in the non-degenerate component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ is that the boundary ∂M is area outer-minimizing in (M, g) ; any surface enclosing ∂M has area at least that of ∂M . In fact, each solution possesses a foliation by surfaces of positive mean curvature, realized by a smooth inverse mean curvature flow in (M, g) . In particular, (M, g) has no minimal surfaces enclosing the boundary ∂M , so the admissibility condition is automatically satisfied.

We first show that this outer-minimizing property leads to a lack of uniqueness for the static extension problem in a very simple, concrete example in flat $\mathbb{R}^3$. This suffices to establish Theorem 1.1. Following this, we make several further remarks on the construction and generalizations of it to arbitrary static vacuum backgrounds.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

Suppose one has an embedded 2-sphere S^2 in Euclidean 3-space $\mathbb{R}^3$, which has non-degenerate Bartnik data, and which is not outer-minimizing. The interior Ω of such an S^2 in $\mathbb{R}^3$ obviously has an admissible static vacuum extension, namely $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega$. On the other hand, because $\partial\Omega$ has non-degenerate Bartnik data, the surjectivity in (1.8) implies the existence of another static extension. These two static extensions are distinct, as one has the outer-minimizing property while the other does not.

A simple, explicit method to construct such spheres is to consider the family of constant mean curvature (CMC) Delaunay surfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$, suitably capped off by hemispheres¹. Recall that the Delaunay surfaces D_t , $t \in (0, 1)$, are a 1-parameter family of periodic surfaces, topologically cylinders, of constant mean curvature $H = 2$. They are surfaces of revolution

$$(2.1) \quad X_t(\rho, \theta) = (\rho, r_t(\rho) \cos \theta, r_t(\rho) \sin \theta)$$

with a generating curve r_t obtained from the roulette of an ellipse - the curve traced out by following a focus of an ellipse as it rolls along an axis. The curve r_t is periodic in ρ , with t representing the 'neck size', $t = \min r_t(\rho)$. As $t \rightarrow 0$, the surfaces D_t tend to a periodic array of round spheres $S^2(1)$ centered at the points $\pm(2k+1)$, while as $t \rightarrow 1$, D_t tends to an infinite cylinder, of radius $\frac{1}{2}$. We may assume that the minimal value is realized at $\rho = 0$, and let $\pm T$ be points closest to 0 realizing $\max r_t$. The Gauss curvature K of D_t is then positive near $\pm T$, but negative near 0; note that $K \rightarrow 0$ everywhere as $t \rightarrow 1$ while $K \rightarrow 1$ everywhere away from the nodes $\rho = \pm(2k+1)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$.

To obtain a curve of embedded spheres, consider the portion of D_t over the interval $[-T, T]$; to each circle at the boundary over $\pm T$, one may attach a round disc D^2 , of positive Gauss curvature and match the metrics smoothly at the boundaries. This gives a curve of embedded 2-spheres Σ'_t , bounding 3-balls $\Omega'_t \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. (See Figure 1).

We claim that for any $t \in (0, 1)$, Σ'_t may be perturbed to a non-degenerate surface of revolution. To see this, the mean curvature of a surface of revolution is given by

$$(2.2) \quad H = \frac{1}{2} \frac{rr'' - 1 - r'^2}{r(1 + r'^2)^{3/2}},$$

¹The authors are grateful to Hubert Bray for suggesting such a construction.




FIGURE 1.

where $r' = \frac{dr}{d\rho}$. To prescribe the mean curvature on the interval $[-T, T]$ so that it has no critical points, we seek a function $\tilde{r}$ for which the mean curvature (2.2) is given by

$$H = 2 + \varepsilon\rho,$$

for ε small. For this, one may simply use the inverse function theorem. First note that $r_t(\rho)$ is an approximate solution (for ε small) and furthermore if

$$(2.3) \quad L(v) = DH_{r_t}(v) = av'' + bv' + cv$$

is the linearization at r_t , with coefficient functions a, b, c (depending on t) then $a > 0$ everywhere. Hence if $\tilde{C}^2([-T, T])$ denotes the space of C^2 functions which vanish along with their first derivative at $\rho = 0$, then the map $L : \tilde{C}^2([-T, T]) \rightarrow C^0([-T, T])$ is an isomorphism. It follows that for all sufficiently small ε one can solve the initial value problem

$$(2.4) \quad H(\tilde{r}_t) = 2 + \varepsilon\rho, \quad \tilde{r}_t(0) = r_t(0), \quad \tilde{r}'_t(0) = r'_t(0),$$

with $|\tilde{r}_t - r_t|_{C^2} = O(\varepsilon)$. Hence the new surface of revolution defined by the solution $\tilde{r}_t$ on the interval $[-T, T]$ satisfies the non-degeneracy condition (1.4). Furthermore since $\tilde{r}_t$ is C^2 close to r_t , it will have positive Gauss curvature at the end points $\pm T$. One can then glue on caps of positive curvature as before to obtain a family of embedded spheres $\Sigma_t = \partial\Omega_t$ near Σ'_t in $\mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying the non-degeneracy condition everywhere.

Note that for t small, the Delaunay surface D_t is not outer-minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (since near the region $\rho = 0$ it is close to a catenoid which is not outer-minimizing). This property is clearly preserved under the perturbation above, so that the spheres Σ_t are not outer-minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^3$ for t sufficiently small. The remarks at the beginning of the proof now complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. ■

The construction above gives a curve $\tau(t) = (\gamma_t, H_t) \subset \mathcal{B}^{nd}$ of non-degenerate boundary data with $t \in (0, 1)$ which for t small is close to the boundary data for two round spheres $S^2(1) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and for $t \sim 1$ is close to that of a cylinder, capped off by hemispheres. At $t = 1$, the construction breaks down, since in order to compensate for the arbitrarily small Gauss curvatures at the gluing locus $\pm T$, the perturbation parameter ε is forced to go to 0. Thus the boundary data (γ_t, H_t) becomes degenerate (in that (1.4) does not hold) at $t = 1$. In fact, Theorem 1.1 implies that $\tau(t)$ must become degenerate at $t = 1$, since the curve $\tau(t)$, starting at the capped cylinder, may be extended to the interval $t \in [1, 2]$ to give a curve (γ_t, H_t) of convex surfaces connecting the data $\tau(1)$ to the standard round data $(\gamma_{+1}, 2)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ at $t = 2$. Thus $\tau(t) \in \mathcal{B}^{nd}$ for $t < 1$ and $t > 1$, but $\tau(1) \notin \mathcal{B}^{nd}$; instead $\tau(1) \in \partial\mathcal{B}^{nd}$.

REMARK 2.1. It is worth noting however that there exists a (first) $t_0 < 1$ at which the construction gives a boundary sphere Σ_t which is outer-minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^3$ for $t \geq t_0$. For instance, there exists

$t_0 < 1$ at which the surface Σ_{t_0} is star-shaped; by [9], [18], such surfaces are outer-minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Since Σ_t is non-degenerate, it follows that the component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ is not characterized by the outer-minimizing property, i.e. there exist (flat) static vacuum solutions with non-degenerate outer-minimizing boundary which are not in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$.

Let $\mathcal{E}_1^{nd} \subset \mathcal{E}$ be the component of $\mathcal{E}^{nd} \subset \mathcal{E}$ containing the curve of flat static vacuum solutions $(M_t, g_{flat}, 1)$, with $M_t = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_t$, $t < 1$, so that the boundary values are the curve $\tau(t)$ above. This curve is defined for $t \in (0, 2]$ and lies in $\mathcal{E}_1^{nd}$ for $t < 1$ but for $t > 1$ lies in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. Thus, while the components $\mathcal{E}_1^{nd}$ and $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ are disjoint in $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E}_1^{nd} \cap \mathcal{E}_0^{nd} = \emptyset$, their closures in $\mathcal{E}$ have non-trivial intersection:

$$(2.5) \quad \partial\mathcal{E}_1^{nd} \cap \partial\mathcal{E}_0^{nd} \neq \emptyset.$$

On the other hand, although the curve $(M_t, g_{flat}, 1)$ connects the non-outer-minimizing solution $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_t, g_{flat}, 1)$ for t small to the standard round solution in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B^3(1)$ by passing in and out of $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$, there is a distinct curve (M, q_t, u_t) with $\Pi_B(M, q_t, u_t) = \tau(t)$ for all t and $(M, q_t, u_t) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ for all t (again by (1.8)).

REMARK 2.2. The connected components $\mathcal{E}_i^{nd}$ of $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$ within $\mathcal{E}$ are all open, by definition, since the non-degeneracy condition (1.4) is an open condition. The complementary space

$$\mathcal{E}^d = \mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{E}^{nd}$$

of static vacuum metrics with degenerate boundary data however also has non-trivial interior (at least if not all such metrics are critical points of Π_B). Namely, the failure of the non-degeneracy condition (1.4) is generically stable. That is, given boundary data (γ, H) , if H has a critical point where $K_\gamma < 0$, then typically so will all nearby data (γ', H') ; generic critical points cannot be perturbed away. However, there are situations where degenerate boundary data can be made non-degenerate by (arbitrarily) small perturbations, so that closures of distinct components of $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$ may intersect, as in (2.5). For example, suppose the boundary data (γ, H) satisfies

$$H = \text{const} \quad \text{on} \quad \{K_\gamma \leq \delta\},$$

for some fixed $\delta > 0$. It is then clear that there exist arbitrarily small perturbations of (γ, H) to non-degenerate boundary data. The same argument as in the construction above, via the inverse function theorem, shows this can even be done by moving the boundary within a fixed background static vacuum solution.

While the construction above has been carried out easily and explicitly in the context of simple domains in the standard flat static vacuum solution, the idea can be generalized to give constructions based on any given exterior static vacuum solution $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}^{nd}$ as background (in place of the flat solution $\mathbb{R}^3$). We describe this next.

Consider an arbitrary exterior static solution $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}^{nd}$ with given boundary data $(\gamma, H) \in \mathcal{B}^{nd}$ on ∂M . Pick a point $p \in \partial M$ where $K_\gamma(p) > 0$ and choose a (possibly small) sphere $S_q(r) \subset M$ bounding a ball $B_q(r) \subset M$ near p . By choosing r small for example, one may assume that $S_q(r)$ has positive Gauss curvature everywhere. Now assume $S_q(r)$ almost touches ∂M . We then form a new boundary $\partial M' \subset M$ by taking the connected sum of ∂M and $S_q(r)$ within M ,

$$(2.6) \quad \partial M' = \partial M \# S_q(r).$$

Thus, remove small discs D_i from each and attach a small catenoidal neck joining $\partial M \setminus D_1$ with $S_q(r) \setminus D_2$. This gives a new exterior static vacuum solution (M', g, u) with

$$M' \subset M,$$

i.e. M' is the restriction of M to a smaller domain. Of course M' is diffeomorphic to M . This construction may be arranged so that $H > 0$ and $dH \neq 0$ everywhere within the neck region of $\partial M'$. In fact, one may work in a small enough scale so that the geometry is almost Euclidean, and apply a simple modification of the construction above in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $K > 0$ near the boundaries of the discs D_i and $K \leq 0$ only very near the center of the catenoid, it follows that $(M', g, u) \in \mathcal{E}^{nd}$; however, for the same reasons as before, $\partial M'$ is not outer-minimizing in M' . Again, the surjectivity in (1.8) implies the existence of another distinct static vacuum solution with the same boundary data, for which the boundary is outer-minimizing.

This shows that the non-uniqueness in Theorem 1.1 occurs not only near (exceptional) flat solutions, but occurs in fact near any given solution $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}^{nd}$; nearness is measured here for instance in the C^0 topology. The behavior (2.5) also occurs within any given background solution (M, g, u) .

Moreover, it is likely that the situation in general is considerably more complicated; there are heuristic (but not rigorous) arguments suggesting that the space $\mathcal{E}^{nd} \subset \mathcal{E}$ has in fact infinitely many components within the connected space $\mathcal{E}$,

$$\mathcal{E}^{nd} = \cup_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_i^{nd}.$$

Thus, the connected sum construction described above may be repeated arbitrarily many times (see Figure 2) giving rise to boundaries of (arbitrary) static vacuum solutions with any given number of small catenoidal necks. Based on the reasoning for the proof of Theorem 1.1, it seems likely that each neck gives rise to a distinct component of $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$, in that two distinct necks cannot be joined to each other through non-degenerate curves of boundary data.




FIGURE 2.

The boundary map $\Pi_B : \mathcal{E}_i^{nd} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{nd}$ is smooth and Fredholm on each component, and so has range a variety of finite codimension in $\mathcal{B}^{nd}$. Although such boundary maps may not be surjective on each component, it seems likely that the full boundary map

$$\Pi_B : \mathcal{E}^{nd} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{nd}$$

could well be many-to-one in large parts of $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$. In addition, there may well be further constructions besides the one described above, giving further sources of non-uniqueness. In sum, the map Π_B is highly non-unique and, although surjective at least onto $\mathcal{B}^{nd}$, has a rather complicated global behavior.

3. TOWARDS UNIQUENESS IN $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$.

The analysis in §2 shows that the boundary map $\Pi_B : \mathcal{E}^{nd} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{nd}$ is not injective. However, all examples of non-injectivity arise from components of $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$ distinct from the standard component

$\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. In this section, we study the injectivity of the boundary map (1.8),

$$(3.1) \quad \Pi_B : \mathcal{E}_0^{nd} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{nd},$$

on the standard component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. Since (1.8) already implies this map is surjective, injectivity would imply that Π_B in (3.1) is a homeomorphism.

To set the stage for this, we first prove a result of independent interest, namely the Bartnik boundary conditions (1.4) have a natural variational formulation on the space of static (non-vacuum) metrics, i.e. they arise from a Lagrangian.

To describe the result, let $L(h) = -\Delta trh + \delta\delta(h) - \langle Ric, h \rangle$ be the linearization of the scalar curvature (cf. [6] for instance) with adjoint L^* given by

$$L^*u = D^2u - \Delta u g - u Ric.$$

It is well-known that the static vacuum equations are given by $L^*u = 0$ and $R = 0$.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Suppose (M, g, u) is AF, with compact inner boundary ∂M and with N the inward unit normal, so N points into M at ∂M . Then the Bartnik boundary conditions (γ, H) give a well-defined variational problem for the Lagrangian*

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{L}(g, u) = \int_M u RdV_g - 16\pi m_{ADM} : Met(M) \times C_+(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}.$$

The gradient $\nabla \mathcal{L}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ at (g, u) is given by

$$(3.3) \quad \nabla \mathcal{L} = (L^*u + \frac{1}{2}uRg, R, uA - N(u)\gamma, 2u),$$

in the following sense: if (h, u') is a variation of (g, u) inducing the variation (h^T, H'_h) of the boundary data, then

$$(3.4) \quad d\mathcal{L}(h, u', h^T, H'_h) = \int_M [\langle L^*u + \frac{1}{2}uRg, h \rangle + Ru'] + \int_{\partial M} [\langle uA - N(u)\gamma, h^T \rangle + 2uH'_h].$$

In particular, the static vacuum equations are critical points for $\mathcal{L}$ with data (γ, H) fixed.

Proof: Suppose that D is compact domain in M , with N the outward unit normal from D . Varying (g, u) in the direction (h, u') then gives

$$(3.5) \quad D\mathcal{L}_0(h, u') = \int_D (uR' + u'R + uR(dV)') = \int_D \langle u, L(h) \rangle + \frac{1}{2}uR\langle g, h \rangle + Ru',$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0 = \int_D u RdV_g$. One has

$$(3.6) \quad \int_D \langle L(h), u \rangle = \int_D \langle h, L^*u \rangle + \int_{\partial D} -uN(trh) - (\delta h)(N)u - \langle h(N), du \rangle + trhN(u).$$

This is easily verified by a straightforward integration-by-parts.

The equations (3.5) and (3.6) imply immediately the bulk Euler-Lagrange equations - the first two terms in (3.3). If the bulk term (over D) vanishes, then since u' is arbitrary $R = 0$, so this gives

$$L^*u = 0,$$

which, with $R = 0$, are the static vacuum equations.

For the boundary terms, a standard formula gives:

$$2A'_h = \nabla_N h + 2A \circ h - 2\delta^*(h(N)^T) - \delta^*(h_{00}N),$$

where T denotes tangential projection onto the boundary, so that (since $H' = trA' - \langle A, h \rangle$),

$$2H'_h = N(trh) + 2\delta(h(N)^T) - h_{00}H - N(h_{00}).$$

Also by a simple calculation

$$(\delta h)(N) = \delta(h(N)^T) + \langle A, h \rangle - h_{00}H - N(h_{00}),$$

so that,

$$2H'_h - (\delta h)(N) = N(trh) + \delta(h(N)^T) - \langle A, h \rangle.$$

This gives

$$\int_{\partial D} u(-N(trh) - (\delta h)(N)) = \int_{\partial D} -2uH'_h + \langle du, h(N)^T \rangle - u\langle A, h \rangle.$$

It follows that the boundary term in (3.6) is given by

$$(3.7) \quad \int_{\partial D} -2uH'_h - u\langle A, h \rangle - N(u)h_{00} + N(u)trh = \int_{\partial D} -2uH'_h - u\langle A, h^T \rangle + N(u)\langle h^T, \gamma \rangle.$$

Now let the outer boundary of D equal $S(r)$ and consider the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$. Then $u \rightarrow 1$ and $\int_{S(r)} N(u)\langle h^T, \gamma \rangle \rightarrow 0$. It follows that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S(r)} -2uH'_h - u\langle A, h^T \rangle = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{S(r)} (-N(trh) - (\delta h)(N)) = 16\pi(m_{ADM})',$$

where the second equality follows from standard formulas for the ADM mass and its variation, cf. [14], [5]. Here the variation $(m_{ADM})'$ is taken in the direction h . The formula (3.6)-(3.7) is also valid at the inner boundary ∂M , with respect to the outward normal. Changing to the inner normal changes the sign of each term, and (3.3) and (3.4) then follow immediately. ■

On-shell, i.e. on the space of solutions $\mathcal{E}$, the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -16\pi m : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is a smooth function whose derivative is given by the boundary term in (3.4), a result basically due to Bartnik [5].

Next, we use Proposition 3.1 to prove that the boundary map Π_B on $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ has a well-defined degree in $\mathbb{Z}$, strengthening the existence of the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -degree discussed in §1.

Given a static vacuum solution $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, as preceding (1.2) let $N = \mathbb{R} \times M$ with Ricci-flat static 4-metric $\mathbf{g} = u^2 d\theta^2 + g$. The Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ in (3.2) may be expressed in terms of $(N, \mathbf{g})$ as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{g}) = \int_N R_{\mathbf{g}} dV_{\mathbf{g}} - 8\pi m + 2 \int_{\partial M} N(u) dV_{\gamma}.$$

Let L denote the linearization of the 4-dimensional Einstein tensor $Ric_{\mathbf{g}} - \frac{R_{\mathbf{g}}}{2}\mathbf{g}$, so that

$$(3.8) \quad L(\mathbf{h}) = Ric'_{\mathbf{h}} - \left(\frac{R_{\mathbf{g}}}{2}\mathbf{g}\right)'_{\mathbf{h}}.$$

One has $\mathbf{h} = (h, u')$ where h is a variation of g . At ∂M we impose the boundary conditions $h^T = H'_h = 0$. The operator L then gives the 2nd variation of $\mathcal{L}$ in (3.2) and so is self-adjoint for this choice of boundary values. In a natural gauge (the divergence-free gauge of the 4-dimensional variation (h, u') with respect to $\mathbf{g}$) the operator L with such boundary conditions is both elliptic, Fredholm and self-adjoint, cf. [1]. Here the domain of L is divergence-free asymptotically flat variations (h, u') with decay rate $r^{-\delta}$, $\delta \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. It follows that L has a complete basis of eigenvectors in L^2 , with discrete eigenvalues diverging to $+\infty$. Let

$$(3.9) \quad ind(g, u) \in \mathbb{Z},$$

be the L^2 index of the operator L at $(N, \mathbf{g})$, i.e. the maximal dimension of the subspace of $L_{\delta}^{2,2}(N, \mathbf{g})$ on which L is a negative definite bilinear form, with respect to the L^2 inner product. This equals the dimension of the space on which L is negative definite on a sufficiently large compact domain

in M , with zero boundary values on both inner and outer boundaries. The nullity of (M, g, u) is the dimension of the L^2 kernel K , consisting of forms $(h, u') = \mathbf{h}$ satisfying

$$L(\mathbf{h}) = 0, \quad \text{with } h^T = 0, \quad H'_h = 0 \text{ at } \partial M.$$

Such indices are well-studied in the context of geodesics and minimal surfaces, the basic idea going back to Morse.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let (γ, H) be a regular value of Π_B on $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ and define*

$$(3.10) \quad \deg_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Pi_B) = \sum_{(g_i, u_i) \in (\Pi_B)^{-1}(\gamma, H)} (-1)^{\text{ind}(g_i, u_i)}.$$

Then $\deg_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Pi_B)$ is well-defined, i.e. independent of the choice of (γ, H) among regular values of Π_B .

Proof: Similar results have been proved earlier for simpler variational problems, namely for geodesics and minimal surfaces, cf. [17], [19], [20] for instance and further references therein, as well as in the context of (conformally compact) Einstein metrics, [2]. Hence we refer to [19], [20], [2] for some further details.

First, the general idea is the following. Let (γ_1, H_1) and (γ_2, H_2) be regular values of Π_B and let $\bar{\sigma}(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$ be an oriented curve in $\mathcal{B}^{nd}$ joining them. By genericity, $\bar{\sigma}$ may be assumed to be transverse to Π_B , so that the lift $\sigma = \Pi_B^{-1}(\bar{\sigma})$ is a collection of curves in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, with boundary in the fibers over (γ_1, H_1) and (γ_2, H_2) . Define an orientation on σ by declaring that Π_B is orientation preserving at any regular point of σ which has even index, while Π_B is orientation reversing at regular points of σ of odd index. Thus, provided this orientation is well-defined, the map $\Pi_B|_{\sigma} : \sigma \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}$ has a well-defined mapping degree, as a map of 1-manifolds. By construction, this 1-dimensional degree is given by (3.10) at any regular value of $\Pi_B(\sigma)$ and hence it follows that (3.10) is well-defined. Thus, it suffices to prove that the orientation constructed above is well-defined.

If $D\Pi_B(d\sigma/dt) \neq 0$ for all t , so that all points of σ are regular, then the index of $\sigma(t)$ is constant, and so there is nothing more to prove. Suppose instead that $D\Pi_B(\sigma'(t_0)) = 0$, so that $\sigma(t_0)$ is a critical point of Π ; (without loss of generality, from here on assume σ is connected). Hence $\sigma'(t_0) = \kappa_0 \in K$, and for t near t_0 , $\sigma(t) = \sigma(t_0) + (t - t_0)\kappa_0 + O((t - t_0)^2)$. Without loss of generality (cf. [19]) one may assume that $K = \langle \kappa_0 \rangle$ is the span of κ_0 . Also without loss of generality, we assume that σ_t is in divergence-free gauge with respect to σ_0 .

Let $\text{Met}_{AF}^{m, \alpha}(N)$ denote the space of asymptotically flat $C^{m, \alpha}$ complete static metrics on N , for N as preceding (3.8). Thus $\text{Met}_{AF}^{m, \alpha}(N) \simeq \text{Met}_{AF}^{m, \alpha}(N) \times C_{AF}^{m, \alpha}(M)$. It is proved in [1] (as part of the proof that $\mathcal{E}$ is a smooth Banach manifold) that the divergence-gauged Einstein operator

$$\Phi : \text{Met}_{AF}^{m, \alpha}(N) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_{AF}^{m-2, \alpha}(N),$$

$$\Phi(\mathbf{g}) = \text{Ric}_{\mathbf{g}} - \frac{R_{\mathbf{g}}}{2}\mathbf{g} + \delta^* \delta_{\mathbf{g}_0}(\mathbf{g}),$$

is a submersion at any static vacuum solution $\mathbf{g}_0 = (g_0, u_0) \in \mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathbb{R}^2$ be parametrized by coordinates (t, s) , for t as above and $s \sim s\kappa_0$ parametrizing K . Since $\Phi(g, u) = 0$ on the curve $\sigma(t)$, the implicit function theorem and the self-adjointness of the linearization L in (3.8) imply that there is a map $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{Met}_{AF}^{m, \alpha}(N)$, such that $F(t, 0) = \sigma(t)$, $F(t, s) - F(t, 0) \in K^{\perp}$ and $\Phi(F(t, s)) \in K \simeq \mathbb{R}$. Define then

$$\psi(t, s) = \pi_K(\Phi(F(t, s))),$$

where π_K is the L^2 projection to K .

The curve $\sigma(t)$ is thus the 0-set of the smooth function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Further $\partial_t \psi(t, s) \neq 0$ at $t = 0$, s small, and hence $\sigma(t)$ is (locally) the boundary of the open set $\{\psi > 0\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\sigma(t) = \partial\{\psi > 0\}.$$

Now if $\text{ind } \sigma(t)$ is even, for t near t_0 , $t \neq t_0$, give $\sigma(t)$ the boundary orientation induced by this open domain, while if $\text{ind } \sigma(t)$ is odd for t near t_0 , $t \neq t_0$, give $\sigma(t)$ the reverse orientation. It is now straightforward to see that this definition coincides with the orientation defined at the beginning of the proof. Thus, the point $t_0 \rightarrow \sigma(t_0)$ is a critical point for the map $\pi_1 \circ \sigma$, where $\pi_1 : (t, s) \rightarrow t$ is projection onto the first factor. If this critical point is a folding singularity for $\pi_1 \circ \sigma$, then the index of $\sigma(t)$ changes by 1 in passing through $\sigma(t_0)$ and reverses the orientation of $\lambda(t) = \pi_1(\sigma(t))$ (exactly as is the case with the standard folding singularity $x \rightarrow x^2$). On the other hand, if $\pi_1 \circ \sigma$ does not fold with respect to π_1 (so that one has an inflection point) then the index of $\sigma(t)$ does not change through t_0 and π_1 maps $\sigma(t)$ to $\lambda(t)$ in an orientation preserving way. ■

Proposition 3.2 leads easily to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

It remains only to prove (1.10), i.e.

$$(3.11) \quad \deg_{\mathbb{Z}}(\Pi_B) = 1.$$

This is true for the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -valued degree, as in (1.7). The proof of (1.7) in [1], based on the uniqueness theorem for the Schwarzschild metric (the black hole uniqueness theorem) shows that regular boundary values (γ, H) near the horizon data of the Schwarzschild metric have unique inverse images under Π_B , given by the corresponding domains in the Schwarzschild metric. This uniqueness then gives (3.11). ■

Theorem 1.2 has some implications regarding the uniqueness question within $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. Namely, if all regular points of Π_B have index 0 (or are of even index) then (3.11) implies that Π_B is 1-1 and hence a homeomorphism. On the other hand, if there exists a regular point of Π_B of odd index, then Π_B is not 1-1.

Recall that the operator L gives the 2nd variation of the action $\mathcal{L}$ in (3.2). A regular point (g, u) of Π_B then has index 0 exactly when (g, u) is “stable” for the action $\mathcal{L}$, i.e. the 2nd variation of $\mathcal{L}$ in all directions is non-negative. This corresponds to a convexity property of $\mathcal{L}$ in a neighborhood of the moduli space $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. It would be very interesting to calculate the index of natural regular points $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$.

REMARK 3.3. Consider again the construction in §2 and the curve of domains (Ω_t, g_{flat}) , $t < 1$, with the property (2.5). As noted there, besides the flat extension $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_t, g_{flat})$, there is also a curve $(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_t, q_t, u_t) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ with the same boundary data (γ_t, H_t) . Suppose $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1}(q_t, u_t) = (q_1, u_1) \in \partial \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ exists, and is a smooth static vacuum solution with boundary data (γ_1, H_1) . Then at least if (q_1, u_1) is not a critical point of Π_B , the curve (q_t, u_t) may be continued past $t = 1$ to give a curve in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, distinct from the flat curve, but again with the same boundary data as the flat curve. Since for $t > 1$ the flat curve is also in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, this implies that Π_B is not 1-1 on $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$.

Thus, if uniqueness is to hold in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$, the curve (q_t, u_t) must either converge to a critical point of Π_B or it must diverge to infinity in $\mathcal{E}$ as $t \rightarrow 1$, i.e. as the boundary data become degenerate. The same phenomenon must hold for the more general connected sum constructions also detailed in §2.

It would be interesting to investigate this situation further, to see whether this test or criterion for uniqueness always holds or not.

Proposition 3.1 also gives some interesting information on the “interior” static extension problem (as opposed to the exterior extension problem discussed in §1). Namely, let $\mathcal{E}$ be the moduli space of solutions to the static vacuum Einstein equations on the 3-ball B^3 . Then, as in (1.5), the boundary map

$$\Pi_B : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}, \quad \Pi_B(g, u) = (\gamma, H),$$

is smooth and Fredholm, of Fredholm index 0.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *On the 3-ball B^3 (or on any compact domain) the image of Π_B has codimension at least one in $\mathcal{B}$,*

$$(3.12) \quad \text{codim}(\text{Im}\Pi_B) \geq 1.$$

In fact the tangent space of the image at $\Pi_B(g, u)$ is orthogonal to the span of the vector $(-uA + N(u)\gamma, -2u) \in T\mathcal{B}$,

$$(3.13) \quad T(\text{Im}\Pi_B) \perp (-uA + N(u)\gamma, -2u).$$

In particular $\text{Im}\Pi_B$ has empty interior in $\mathcal{B}$ and all solutions $(g, u) \in \mathcal{E}$ have nullity at least 1, i.e. the linearization L in (3.8) always has a non-trivial kernel.

This result is of course in strong contrast to the surjectivity in (1.8). Here there are no static infillings of *generic* boundary data $(\gamma, H) \in \mathcal{B}$. The idea comes from the fact that the “mass” of such a solution must be 0, which gives a 1-dimensional constraint on (γ, H) ; the constraint is absent in the AF case. Natural analogs of Propositions 3.1 and 3.4 hold in all dimensions, with the same proof.

Proof: The same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 3.1 show that the boundary conditions (γ, H) give a well-defined variational problem for the Lagrangian

$$(3.14) \quad \mathcal{L}(g, u) = \int_M u R dV_g : \text{Met}(M) \times C_+(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where here $M = B^3$. As in (3.4), one has

$$(3.15) \quad d\mathcal{L}(h, u', h^T, H'_h) = \int_M [\langle L^*u + \frac{1}{2}uRg, h \rangle + Ru'] + \int_{\partial M} [\langle -uA + N(u)\gamma, h^T \rangle - 2uH'_h],$$

and again the static vacuum equations are critical points for $\mathcal{L}$ with data (γ, H) fixed.

On the moduli space $\mathcal{E}$ (i.e. on-shell) one has $\mathcal{L} = 0$ and hence $d\mathcal{L} = 0$ on variations tangent to $\mathcal{E}$. The left side of (3.15) thus vanishes, as does the bulk term on the right. Hence, the boundary term on the right vanishes, which is exactly the statement (3.13). ■

4. THE BARTNIK MASS AND OUTER-MINIMIZING EXTENSIONS.

The results of the previous sections indicate that the analysis of the Bartnik mass is likely to be much easier, and its properties likely to be much better behaved, within the component $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ as compared with the full space $\mathcal{E}^{nd}$ or $\mathcal{E}$. In this section, we explore this issue in more depth.

To begin, since the static vacuum solutions in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ have outer-minimizing boundary, it appears natural in this context to restrict the class of admissible extensions of a compact domain (Ω, g) to those with outer-minimizing boundary. Thus, let $\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g) \subset \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega, g)$ be the space of AF extensions $(\widetilde{M}, g)$ of (Ω, g) in $\mathcal{M}_+(\Omega, g)$ for which $\partial\Omega$ is outer-minimizing in (M, g) . Then define

$$(4.1) \quad m_{out}(\Omega) = \inf\{m_{ADM}(\widetilde{M}, g) : (\widetilde{M}, g) \in \mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g)\}.$$

Clearly, since $\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g) \subset \mathcal{M}_+(\Omega, g)$, one has

$$(4.2) \quad m_{out} \geq m_B.$$

The definition (4.2) was in fact introduced by Bray [7] (and called the outer mass) in the context of studies related to the Penrose inequality.

Arguing by analogy with the static minimization conjecture in §1, one might conjecture that if (Ω, g) is a compact domain admitting an outer-minimizing extension (so that $\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g) \neq \emptyset$) then

m_{out} is realized by a static vacuum solution in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ (if the boundary data are non-degenerate) cf. [7]. Moreover, one might expect equality to hold in (4.2):

$$(4.3) \quad m_{out} = m_B.$$

However, there are several simple but serious problems with this perspective. First, the outer-minimizing property does not characterize $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$; as seen in Remark 2.2, there exist even flat domains $\Omega_t \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ with outer-minimizing boundary whose (flat) static extensions do not lie in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. More seriously, the definition of m_{out} gives a positive value to (some) flat domains in $\mathbb{R}^3$, which is clearly unreasonable both physically and mathematically.

To see this, return to the construction in §2, and consider a domain $\Omega = \Omega_t$, for some $t < 1$, as following (2.4). There are (at least) two exterior static vacuum “extensions” for these domains; the flat static extension in the component $\mathcal{E}_1^{nd}$ and an outer-minimizing extension (M, g, u) in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ (g was denoted q before). The first, flat, static extension, i.e. $\mathbb{R}^3$, is clearly a smooth, admissible extension. The second, non-trivial extension $(M, g, u) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ is not apriori smooth at the boundary $\partial\Omega = \partial M$. However, the union $\widetilde{M} = \Omega \cup M \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$ has complete AF metric $\widetilde{g}$ which is globally Lipschitz, smooth away from the corner at ∂M and satisfies (1.3). The scalar curvature of $(\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{g})$ is 0 off the corner ∂M and is distributionally non-negative across ∂M . It is worth emphasizing that in fact (Ω, g_{flat}) is the *only* infilling of (M, g) of non-negative scalar curvature satisfying this property; this follows directly from the positive mass theorem (in the Lipschitz version given in [13], [15]).

This means that although (M, g) itself may not lie in $\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g_{flat})$, in a suitable sense it lies (at worst) in the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g_{flat})$. More precisely, it is proved in [13] that the metric $\widetilde{g}$ may be approximated in the C^0 topology by complete smooth AF metrics g_ε with non-negative scalar curvature, and with $(m_{ADM})_{g_\varepsilon}$ arbitrarily close to the ADM mass of (M, g) . Thus, there is a sequence $(\widetilde{M}, g_i) \in \mathcal{M}_0(\Omega_i, g_i)$ with $(\Omega_i, g_i) \rightarrow (\Omega, g_{flat})$, $(M, g_i) \rightarrow (M, g)$, and with converging masses. This process is of course exactly that envisioned in the static minimization conjecture, [3]-[5].

This discussion leads to the following:

PROPOSITION 4.1. *If m_{out} is realized by a static vacuum extension with outer-minimizing boundary on the flat domains $(\Omega, g_{flat}) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ above, then*

$$(4.4) \quad m_{out}(\Omega, g_{flat}) > 0, \quad \text{but} \quad m_B(\Omega, g_{flat}) = 0.$$

Proof: The construction above shows that (Ω, g_{flat}) has smooth, admissible, outer-minimizing extensions, so that $\mathcal{M}_0(\Omega, g_{flat}) \neq \emptyset$. If the outer mass $m_{out}(\Omega, g_{flat})$ is realized by a static vacuum extension with outer-minimizing boundary (whether in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ or not) then clearly (4.4) holds. ■

A more precise description of the behavior in (4.4) is as follows. In the notation of Remark 2.1, for $t_0 \leq t < 1$ one has $m_{out}(\Omega_t) = 0$, but the mass of any static extension in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ is positive. Further, for $t < t_0$, the domain Ω_t is not outer-minimizing in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $m_{out}(\Omega_t) > 0$, while $m_B(\Omega_t) = 0$. We also expect that similar behavior, i.e. strict inequality in (4.2), occurs for the general construction in (2.6).

The behavior (4.4) implies that the definition (4.1) of mass is not reasonable and shows that one needs to work with the (original) Bartnik mass in (1.1) in general. This of course then brings in all the difficulties tied to the non-uniqueness of static vacuum extensions discussed in earlier sections.

As an alternative, it is worthwhile to seek situations where the equality in (4.3) does or might reasonably hold, i.e. restrict the geometry of the allowable domains (Ω, g) (thus ruling out the flat examples above). The conditions must be phrased in terms of the boundary data $(\gamma, H) \in \mathcal{B}$ of Ω . Thus, one would like to find classes of domains (Ω, g) whose Bartnik mass is (potentially) realized by static vacuum extensions in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ instead of the full space $\mathcal{E}$.

Observe first that it is obvious that not all of $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ can be realized in this way. Namely, the mass functional

$$m_{ADM} : \mathcal{E}_0^{nd} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

is surjective onto $\mathbb{R}$. Thus roughly half the solutions in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$ have negative mass. (Note that if (M, g, u) is a static vacuum solution with mass m , then the solution (M, g', u') with $g' = u^4 g$, $u' = u^{-1}$ is another static vacuum solution with mass m' satisfying $m' = -m$). Also the extensions of (Ω, g) of zero mass lie at the boundary of $\mathcal{M}_+$, while this is certainly not the case for $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$.

Although we currently do not have convincing evidence, we raise for example the following conjecture.

CONJECTURE 4.2. *If (Ω, g) satisfies*

$$(4.5) \quad K_\gamma > 0,$$

then the Bartnik mass $m_B(\Omega, g)$ is realized by a static vacuum extension in $\mathcal{E}_0^{nd}$. Further, static vacuum metrics with boundary data satisfying (4.5) are unique (up to isometry). In particular, under the assumption (4.5),

$$(4.6) \quad m_{out}(\Omega) = m_B(\Omega).$$

Another version of this conjecture of some interest would be to replace the condition (4.5) by

$$(4.7) \quad m_H(\partial\Omega) \geq 0,$$

where m_H is the Hawking mass of $\partial\Omega$, determined by (γ, H) . Note that for any surface $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $m_H(\Sigma) \leq 0$ with equality only for round spheres. Clearly the condition (4.5) rules out all of the constructions described in §2; we do not know if this is the case for the condition (4.7) but expect it is.

An attractive feature of the outer mass is that the proof of the Penrose inequality [11] implies that

$$m_{out} \geq m_H,$$

which, if (4.6) holds, gives the useful lower bound

$$m_B \geq m_H.$$

REMARK 4.3. We close with the following remark on gravitational binding energy properties of the Bartnik mass. This is probably already known, but worth mentioning in the context of the constructions above.

Given a compact domain (Ω, g) , suppose (M, g, u) is a minimizing static vacuum extension so that

$$m_B(\Omega) = m_{ADM}(M, g).$$

Let D be a domain in M (possibly disconnected) with ∂D intersecting ∂M . Let

$$\Omega' = \Omega \cup D$$

with $M' = M \setminus D$, so that $\partial\Omega' = \partial M'$ and M' is an admissible extension of Ω' . A typical example would be the connected sum construction in (2.6). By the monotonicity property of the Bartnik mass, [4], one has

$$(4.8) \quad m_B(\Omega') = m_B(\Omega).$$

Thus, formally $m_B(\Omega' \setminus \Omega) = 0$.

A basic property of the Bartnik mass is $m_B(\Omega) \geq 0$ with equality if and only if Ω is flat (or locally flat). Considering $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$ as an isolated body in its own right, it thus has positive Bartnik mass (if (M, g) is not flat). The behavior (4.8) thus illustrates nicely the negative binding energy property of the Bartnik mass; each piece Ω and $\Omega' \setminus \Omega$ has positive Bartnik mass, but their “union” in a common static vacuum solution has total mass equal to $m_B(\Omega)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Anderson and M. Khuri, *The static extension problem in General Relativity*, (preprint, 2009), arXiv:0909.4550.
- [2] M. Anderson, *Einstein metrics with prescribed conformal infinity on 4-manifolds*, *Geom. & Funct. Anal.*, **18**, (2008), 305-366.
- [3] R. Bartnik, *New definition of quasilocal mass*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **62**, (1989), 2346-2348.
- [4] R. Bartnik, *Mass and 3-metrics of nonnegative scalar curvature*, *Proc. Int. Cong. Math.*, Vol II, Beijing, (2002), 231-240.
- [5] R. Bartnik, *Energy in General Relativity*, in *Tsing Hua Lectures on Geometry and Analysis*, Ed. S.-T. Yau, Hsinchu, Taiwan, 1990-1992, International Press, Boston, (1995), 5-27.
- [6] A. Besse, *Einstein Manifolds*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, (1987).
- [7] H. Bray and P. Chruściel, *The Penrose Inequality*, in *The Einstein equations and the large scale behavior of gravitational fields*, Ed. P. Chruściel and H. Friedrich, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2004, 39-70.
- [8] J. Corvino, *Scalar curvature deformation and gluing construction for the Einstein constraint equations*, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **214**, (2000), 137-189.
- [9] C. Gerhardt, *Flow of nonconvex hypersurfaces into spheres*, *Jour. Diff. Geom.*, **32**, (1990), 299-314.
- [10] L. Gulcev, T. Oliynyk and E. Woolgar, *On long-time existence for the flow of static metrics with rotational symmetry*, preprint, 2009, arXiv:0911.2037.
- [11] G. Huisken and T. Ilmanen, *The inverse mean curvature flow and the Riemannian Penrose Inequality*, *J. Differential Geom.*, **59**, (2001), 353-437.
- [12] B. List, *Evolution of an extended Ricci flow system*, *Comm. Anal. Geom.*, **16**, (2008), 1007-1048.
- [13] P. Miao, *Positive mass theorem on manifolds admitting corners along a hypersurface*, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, **6**, (2002), 1163-1182.
- [14] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, *Role of surface integrals in the Hamiltonian formulation of general relativity*, *Annals of Physics*, **88**, (1974), 286-318.
- [15] Y. Shi and L. Tam, *Positive mass theorem and the boundary behavior of compact manifolds with nonnegative scalar curvature*, *Jour. Diff. Geom.*, **62**, (2002), 79-125.
- [16] L. Szabados, *Quasi-local energy-momentum and angular momentum in general relativity*, *Living Reviews in Relativity*, lrr-2009-4, <http://relativity.livingreviews.org/Articles/lrr-2009-4>.
- [17] A. Tromba, *Degree theory on oriented infinite dimensional varieties and the Morse number of minimal surfaces spanning a curve in $\mathbb{R}^n$* , *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **290**, (1985), 385-415.
- [18] J. Urbas, *On the expansion of star-shaped hypersurfaces by symmetric functions of their principal curvatures*, *Math. Zeit.*, **205**, (1990), 355-372.
- [19] B. White, *The space of m -dimensional surfaces that are stationary for a parametric elliptic functional*, *Ind. Univ. Math. Jour.*, **36**, (1987), 567-602.
- [20] B. White, *The space of minimal submanifolds for varying Riemannian metrics*, *Ind. Univ. Math. Jour.*, **40**, (1991), 161-200.

March, 2010

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY, STONY BROOK, NY 11794-3651

E-mail address: anderson@math.sunysb.edu

E-mail address: khuri@math.sunysb.edu