

June 28, 2016

A non-vanishing result for the CMC flux

William H. Meeks III, Pablo Mira, and Joaquín Pérez

ABSTRACT. We prove the non-vanishing of the CMC flux of the boundaries of certain Riemannian n -manifolds with constant mean curvature.

1. Introduction.

Let W be a Riemannian $(n+1)$ -manifold and $M \subset W$ a two-sided n -hypersurface with constant mean curvature $H \in \mathbb{R}$ (here we define the mean curvature of M to be the trace of its second fundamental form divided by n). The CMC flux of M associated to a Killing vector field K on W and to a piecewise smooth $(n-1)$ -chain α in M which is the boundary of a piecewise smooth two-sided n -chain β in W , is the real number

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Flux}(M, \alpha, K) = \int_{\alpha} \langle K, \eta \rangle + nH \int_{\beta} \langle K, N \rangle,$$

where η is a unit conormal vector to M along α and N is a unit normal vector field along β (in order for (1.1) not to depend on orientation choices, certain compatibility between H, η and N must be satisfied, see a more precise definition in Definition 2.1 at the beginning of Section 2). A key property of $\text{Flux}(M, \alpha, K)$ is that it does not depend on the homology class of α in M .

The CMC flux is an important tool in the study of constant mean curvature (CMC) surfaces. In [4] Korevaar, Kusner and Solomon used it to prove that a properly embedded surface of finite topology and non-zero CMC in Euclidean space has uniformly bounded curvature, and that each of its annular ends are asymptotic to a rotationally invariant Delaunay example. In [3] the CMC flux was used to prove an analogous result for $|H| > 1$ CMC surfaces in hyperbolic three-space. Other examples of uses of the CMC flux in three-manifolds of non-constant sectional curvature can be found in the literature; see for instance, [2, 6].

In the proof of these previously mentioned results, a key step is to establish that $\text{Flux}(M, \alpha, K)$ is different from zero for appropriately chosen homology classes $[\alpha] \in H_1(M)$ of certain CMC surfaces M and ambient Killing vector fields K . The homology invariance of the CMC flux implies that if $\text{Flux}(M, \alpha, K) \neq 0$, then the triple (M, α, K) cannot be a smooth limit (in an appropriate sense) of a sequence of triples (M_n, α_n, K_n) with M_n homologically trivial, what allows for a better control of the geometrical situation under study. In this sense, non-vanishing properties of the CMC flux are of interest for applications in constant mean curvature theory.

The following theorem, which is the main result of this paper, provides a general situation in which the CMC flux of an n -hypersurface $M = \partial\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$ with respect to certain Killing vector field $K = K_1$ is non-zero. As an example of an application, Theorem 1.1 will be used in [7] to understand the possible limits of immersed spheres of constant mean curvature in homogeneous three-manifolds diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$ when the areas of the spheres blow up. More specifically, Theorem 1.1 shows that some complete CMC surfaces in homogeneous three-manifolds cannot arise as limits of immersed CMC spheres (which have zero CMC flux), and this property will be important for our classification in [7] of constant mean curvature spheres in homogeneous manifolds diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let Σ be a smooth, compact oriented n -manifold with non-empty boundary, $n \leq 6$. Let W be $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$ equipped with a Riemannian metric such that:*

(1) *The boundary $\partial\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$ of W is mean convex, with constant mean curvature $h_0 \geq 0$.*

Key words and phrases. Constant mean curvature, stability, curvature estimates, homogeneous manifold, CMC flux.

First author's financial support: this material is based upon work for the NSF under Award No. DMS-1309236. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

Second author's financial support: Research partially supported by the MICINN-FEDER grant no. MTM2013-43970-P, and Programa de Apoyo a la Investigacion, Fundacion Seneca-Agencia de Ciencia y Tecnologia Region de Murcia, reference 19461/PI/14.

Third author's financial support: Research partially supported by the MINECO/FEDER grant no. MTM2014-52368-P.

With the above definition in hand, we now prove Theorem 1.1 stated in the Introduction.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1. Without loss of generality, we will assume that the Killing field K_2 is bounded on the end $\Sigma \times (-\infty, 0]$ of W . Let $\{\phi_s \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be the 1-parameter group of isometries of X corresponding to the flow of the Killing field K_1 . Since the action $(s, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times W \mapsto \phi_s(x)$ is proper, then after possibly changing K_1 by $-K_1$, we may suppose that $\phi_s(\Sigma \times \{0\})$ lies eventually in the upper end $\Sigma \times [0, \infty)$ of W as $s \rightarrow +\infty$. Consider the quotient map $\Pi: W \rightarrow W/G = \widehat{W}$, where $G = \{\phi_s \mid s \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\}$ (note that the discrete group of isometries G acts properly discontinuously on W). We will denote by $\mathbb{S}^1$ the related 1-parameter group of isometries of $\widehat{W}$.

Let $\widehat{\Gamma}$ be an area-minimizing oriented $(n-1)$ -dimensional hypersurface in $\partial\widehat{W}$ that represents $[\partial\Sigma] \in H_{n-1}(\partial\widehat{W})$ ($\widehat{\Gamma}$ is an area-minimizing integral current, which is smooth in this dimension and it exists since $\partial\widehat{W}$ is a closed Riemannian manifold). By cut-and-paste type arguments and the maximum principle for minimal hypersurfaces, any two distinct solutions to this area minimization problem in $\partial\widehat{W}$ are disjoint or equal. It follows that $\partial\widehat{W}$ is foliated by the area-minimizing oriented $(n-1)$ -dimensional submanifolds $\phi_s(\widehat{\Gamma})$, $\phi_s \in \mathbb{S}^1$. For homological reasons, $\widehat{\Gamma}$ lifts to a compact $(n-1)$ -dimensional hypersurface Γ in ∂W that is area-minimizing in ∂W , and when considered to lie in W , it is the boundary of an integral n -chain. By the properness of the $\mathbb{R}$ -action giving rise to K_1 and the compactness of Γ , we deduce that K_1 cannot be everywhere tangent to Γ . On the other hand, since for $s \neq 0$ it holds $\phi_s(\Gamma) \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$, then the Jacobi function $J_\Gamma = \langle K_1, N_\Gamma \rangle: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is non-negative on Γ (after choosing an appropriate orientation of Γ , or equivalently a unit normal N_Γ along Γ , i.e., N_Γ is tangent to ∂W , orthogonal to Γ and unitary); note that J_Γ is positive at the points of Γ where K_1 is not tangent to Γ . The maximum principle (see e.g., Assertion 2.2 in [8]) implies that $J_\Gamma > 0$ on Γ ; in particular, K_1 is transverse to Γ and each integral curve of K_1 intersects Γ in a single point.

Let $\Delta \subset W$ be an area-minimizing hypersurface with boundary Γ , which in this dimension is smooth by standard interior and boundary regularity results for minimizing integral varifolds; see for example, Hardt and Simon [1] for boundary regularity results and also see [9, 10] for related barrier arguments. By the mean curvature comparison principle, Δ is never tangent to ∂W along Γ . Since $J_\Gamma > 0$ by the previous paragraph, then we can choose a unit normal vector N_Δ to Δ such that $\langle (N_\Delta)|_{\partial\Gamma}, N_\Gamma \rangle$ is positive along Γ . As K_1 is tangent to ∂W , $(N_\Delta)|_\Gamma$ is orthogonal to Γ and both $\langle K_1, N_\Gamma \rangle$, $\langle (N_\Delta)|_{\partial\Gamma}, N_\Gamma \rangle$ are positive along Γ , then we conclude that $\langle K_1, N_\Delta \rangle > 0$ along Γ . As Δ is stable and $\langle K_1, N_\Delta \rangle > 0$ along $\partial\Delta$, then $\langle K_1, N_\Delta \rangle$ is positive on Δ and so, Δ intersects each of the integral curves of K_1 transversely in a single point. Therefore, the set $\mathcal{F} = \{\phi_s(\Delta) \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a smooth minimal foliation of W , where each leaf $\phi_s(\Delta)$ of this foliation intersects every integral curve of K_1 transversely in a single point.

We will now deform the minimal surface Δ by a 1-parameter family of surfaces with constant mean curvature and the same boundary as Δ . By the "blowing a bubble" technique described in detail in [3], for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small there exists a unique 1-parameter family of hypersurfaces $t \in [0, \delta) \mapsto \Delta(t) \subset W$ depending smoothly on t such that for all $t \in [0, \delta)$:

- (1) $\Delta(t)$ is the graph of a smooth function $f_t: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (in the direction of K_1), with $\Delta(0) = \Delta$ and $f_0 = 0$.
- (2) $\Delta(t)$ has constant mean curvature $-t$ with respect to the unit normal vector field $N_{\Delta(t)}$ to $\Delta(t)$ that satisfies $\langle K_1, N_{\Delta(t)} \rangle > 0$.
- (3) $f_t = 0$ on $\partial\Delta$.
- (4) $f_t(x) > f_{t'}(x)$ whenever $t > t'$ and $x \in \text{Int}(\Delta)$.

We now study the maximal half-open interval $[0, T_0)$ of t -values in which the family $\Delta(t)$ can be defined (here $T_0 \in (0, \infty]$).

First consider the case in which the constant mean curvature h_0 of ∂W satisfies $h_0 < T_0$. Then, there exists a hypersurface $\Delta(t_1) \subset X$ with constant mean curvature $-t_1$, which is the graph of a function $f_{t_1}: \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_{t_1} = 0$ on $\partial\Delta$ and $t_1 > h_0$. Since $\partial\Delta(0) = \partial\Delta(t_1)$, then the CMC flux of $\Delta(t_1)$ along $[\partial\Delta(t_1)]$ associated to K_1 is given by

$$\text{Flux}(\Delta(t_1), \partial\Delta(t_1), K_1) = \int_{\partial\Delta(0)} \langle K_1, \eta_{\Delta(t_1)} \rangle + nt_1 \int_{\Delta(0)} \langle K_1, N_{\Delta(0)} \rangle,$$

where $\eta_{\Delta(t_1)}$ is the outward pointing unit conormal vector field to $\Delta(t_1)$ along $\partial\Delta(t_1)$ and $N_{\Delta(0)}$ is the unit normal vector field to $\Delta(0)$ pointing towards the compact region of W bounded by $\Delta(0)$ and $\Delta(t_1)$. Note that

$$\text{Flux}(\Delta(t_1), \partial\Delta(t_1), K_1) = 0$$

by the homological invariance of the CMC flux ($\partial\Delta(t_1)$ is homologically trivial in $\Delta(t_1)$). On the other hand, along $\partial\Delta(0)$ the inequality

$$(2.4) \quad \langle K_1, \eta_{(\partial W)^+} \rangle \leq \langle K_1, \eta_{\Delta(t_1)} \rangle$$

holds, where $\eta_{(\partial W)^+}$ denotes the outward pointing unit conormal field to the portion $(\partial W)^+$ of ∂W which lies above $\partial\Delta(0)$. This last inequality together with $h_0 < t_1$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Flux}((\partial W)^+, \partial\Delta(0), K_1) &= \int_{\partial\Delta(0)} \langle K_1, \eta_{(\partial W)^+} \rangle + nh_0 \int_{\Delta(0)} \langle K_1, N_{\Delta(0)} \rangle \\ &< \int_{\partial\Delta(0)} \langle K_1, \eta_{(\partial W)^+} \rangle + nt_1 \int_{\Delta(0)} \langle K_1, N_{\Delta(0)} \rangle \\ &\stackrel{(2.4)}{\leq} \text{Flux}(\Delta(t_1), \partial\Delta(t_1), K_1) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the homological invariance of the CMC flux gives

$$\text{Flux}(\partial W, \partial\Sigma \times \{0\}, K_1) = \text{Flux}((\partial W)^+, \partial\Sigma \times \{0\}, K_1) = \text{Flux}((\partial W)^+, \partial\Delta(0), K_1) < 0,$$

which completes the proof of the theorem in the case $h_0 < T_0$.

Assume in the sequel that $T_0 \leq h_0$ and we will find a contradiction, which will finish the proof of the theorem. We first prove the following property.

ASSERTION 2.2. $\cup_{t \in [0, T_0)} \Delta(t)$ is not contained in any compact region of W . In particular, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a $t(n) \in [0, T_0)$ such that $\Delta(t)$ contains points at distance at least n from $\Delta(0)$ whenever $t \geq t(n)$.

PROOF OF THE ASSERTION. Suppose the assertion does not hold and we will check that the top boundary component of $\cup_{t \in [0, T_0)} \Delta(t)$, which is a limit as $t \nearrow T_0$ of the K_1 -graphs $\Delta(t)$ below it, is also a K_1 -graph for a related smooth function $f_{T_0} : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and has constant mean curvature $-T_0$. The failure of the assertion to hold implies that the constant mean curvature hypersurfaces $\{\Delta(t) \mid t \in [0, T_0)\}$ have uniform height estimates (as K_1 -graphs). By the "blowing a bubble" technique in [3], these height estimates imply that the $\{\Delta(t) \mid t \in [0, T_0)\}$ satisfy uniform curvature estimates, i.e., they have *uniform* bounds on the length of their second fundamental forms; these uniform curvature estimates can also be seen to hold since $\Delta(t)$ minimizes the functional $\text{Volume}_n + nt\text{Volume}_{n+1}$ with respect to compact hypersurfaces in W with boundary $\partial\Delta$ that are homologous to Δ relative to $\partial\Delta$, where Volume_k is the volume of any k -chain. From here, standard compactness results show that the top boundary component of $\cup_{t \in [0, T_0)} \Delta(t)$ is a hypersurface $\Delta(T_0)$ with constant mean curvature $-T_0$. Note that with respect to the unit normal vector field $N_{\Delta(T_0)}$ to $\Delta(T_0)$ that is the limit of the $N_{\Delta(t)}$ as $t \nearrow T_0$, the function $\langle K_1, N_{\Delta(T_0)} \rangle$ is non-negative, and it is positive at some point by previous arguments. Since $\langle K_1, N_{\Delta(T_0)} \rangle$ is a Jacobi function on $\Delta(T_0)$, then the maximum principle (see e.g., Assertion 2.2 in [8]) implies that $\langle K_1, N_{\Delta(T_0)} \rangle > 0$ at $\text{Int}(\Delta(T_0))$. In particular, $\Delta(T_0)$ is the K_1 -graph of a continuous function $f_{T_0} : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is smooth at $\text{Int}(\Delta(T_0))$. As $\Delta(T_0)$ is not contained in ∂W , then the mean curvature comparison principle and the Hopf boundary maximum principle imply that the gradient of f_{T_0} is bounded as we approach $\partial\Delta(T_0)$; hence, $\langle K_1, N_{\Delta(T_0)} \rangle$ is positive along $\partial\Delta(T_0)$. It follows from the maximum principle that $\langle K_1, N_{\Delta(T_0)} \rangle$ is positive in $\Delta(T_0)$ and thus, f_{T_0} is smooth in Δ . Therefore, items (1)-(4) for $t = T_0$. In this situation, the strict stability of $\Delta(T_0)$ implies that the family of hypersurfaces $\{\Delta(t) \mid t \in [0, T_0]\}$ can be extended to a related family of hypersurfaces defined for t -values in a larger interval $[0, T_0 + \varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon > 0$, which contradicts the definition of the value T_0 . This contradiction proves the assertion. $\square$

For each $t \in [0, T_0)$ fixed, consider the related foliation of W

$$\mathcal{F}(t) = \{\phi_s(\Delta(t)) \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

all whose leaves have constant mean curvature $-t$, see Figure 2 left. Let

$$L(t) = \phi_{s(t)}(\Delta(t))$$

be the unique leaf of $\mathcal{F}(t)$ such that $L(t)$ intersects $\Delta(0)$ and lies on the lower side of $\Delta(0)$. Then, Assertion 2.2 implies that $s(t) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow T_0$. Let $L(T_0)$ be the limit of the hypersurfaces $L(t)$ as $t \nearrow T_0$. Such a limit exists and it is a graphical hypersurface with constant mean curvature $-T_0$ by the stability of the $L(t)$, $t < T_0$, and the same arguments as in the proof of Assertion 2.2. Let Δ' be the open subdomain of Δ over which $L(T_0)$ is a K_1 -graph. Clearly, $L(T_0)$ intersects $\Delta(0)$ and lies below $\Delta(0)$. Define $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L(T_0)$ lies in $\Sigma \times (-\infty, t_0]$ and t_0 is the




FIGURE 2. Left: After blowing a bubble $\Delta(t)$ with CMC $-t \in (-T_0, 0]$ (which is K_1 -graphical over $\Delta = \Delta(0)$), we translate it with $\{\phi_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$ to produce a foliation $\mathcal{F}(t)$, and we highlight the highest graphical leaf $L(t)$ of $\mathcal{F}(t)$ lying below $\Delta(0)$ with $L(t) \cap \Delta(0) \neq \emptyset$. Right: Since the $\Delta(t)$ with $t \rightarrow T_0^-$ do not lie in a fixed compact set, we produce a non-compact limit $L(T_0) = \lim_{t \rightarrow T_0^-} L(t)$ which is a graph over a domain Δ' of Δ . After translating by $\{\phi_s\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}$, $L(T_0)$ gives rise to a foliation $\mathcal{F}_1(T_0)$.

smallest value with this property. Observe that K_2 is bounded in $\Sigma \times (-\infty, t_0]$, as it was assumed to be bounded in $\Sigma \times (-\infty, 0]$. Also, $L(T_0)$ intersects $\Sigma \times \{t_0\}$ tangentially at some interior point of $\Sigma \times \{t_0\}$.

ASSERTION 2.3. *$L(T_0)$ has linear volume growth. In particular, $L(T_0)$ is recurrent for Brownian motion.*

PROOF OF THE ASSERTION. As $L(T_0)$ has bounded second fundamental form, then we conclude that the gradient of the graphing function $h: \Delta' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which produces $L(T_0)$ becomes unbounded as we approach the boundary of Δ' (otherwise we could enlarge Δ'). Therefore the assertion holds provided that we check that the total $(n-1)$ -dimensional volume function of the submanifold $\Gamma_s := L(T_0) \cap \phi_s(\Delta(0))$ of $L(T_0)$ is bounded as $s \rightarrow -\infty$. To see this, for s large ($s \ll -1$) let us denote by $\Omega(s)$ the portion of $L(T_0)$ lying above $\phi_s(\Delta(0))$, and let η_s be the outward pointing unit conormal vector field of $\Omega(s)$ along its boundary Γ_s . Note that

$$(2.5) \quad \langle K_1, \eta_s \rangle \leq -1 + \varepsilon \quad \text{along } \Gamma_s,$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ independent of s . On the other hand,

$$(2.6) \quad \text{Flux}(\Omega(s), \Gamma_s, K_1) = \int_{\Gamma_s} \langle K_1, \eta_s \rangle + nT_0 \int_{\phi_s(\Delta_s)} \langle K_1, N_{\phi_s(\Delta_s)} \rangle,$$

where Δ_s is the subdomain of Δ' over which $\Omega(s)$ is a K_1 -graph, and $N_{\phi_s(\Delta_s)} = (\phi_s)_*(N_{\Delta(0)})$. Since by homology invariance of the flux we have $\text{Flux}(\Omega(s), \Gamma_s, K_1) = 0$ and the second integral in the right-hand-side of (2.6) is bounded above in absolute value by $\|K_1\|_\infty$ times the n -dimensional volume of $\Delta(0)$ (here $\|K_1\|_\infty = \max_\Delta |K_1|$, which exists since Δ is compact and K_1 is generated by $\{\phi_s \mid s \in \mathbb{R}\}$), then the first integral in the right-hand-side of (2.6) is bounded. This property together with (2.5) insure that the $(n-1)$ -dimensional volume of Γ_s is bounded as $s \rightarrow -\infty$. Now the assertion is proved. $\square$

Recall that by assumption, K_2 is bounded in $\Sigma \times (-\infty, 0]$. Consider the function $u = \langle K_2, N_{L(T_0)} \rangle$ defined on $L(T_0)$, where $N_{L(T_0)}$ denotes a unit normal vector field along $L(T_0)$. Then u is a bounded Jacobi function on $L(T_0)$, which vanishes at each of the points of the non-empty set $L(T_0) \cap (\Sigma \times \{t_0\})$. Since every integral curve of K_2 that intersects $L(T_0)$ is a compact interval with its boundary in ∂W , then K_2 is not everywhere tangent to $L(T_0)$, which implies u is not identically zero; by the maximum principle, u must change sign in a neighborhood of any of the points in $L(T_0) \cap (\Sigma \times \{t_0\})$. Since $L(T_0)$ is stable and is recurrent for Brownian motion by Assertion 2.3, then every bounded non-zero Jacobi function on $L(T_0)$ has constant sign by the main theorem in [5], which is a contradiction. This contradiction finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1. $\square$

References

- [1] R. Hardt and L. Simon. Boundary regularity and embedded minimal solutions for the oriented Plateau problem. *Ann. of Math.*, 110:439–486, 1979. MR0554379, Zbl 0457.49029.
- [2] D. Hoffman, J.H.S. de Lira, and H. Rosenberg. Constant mean curvature surfaces in $M^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 358(2):491–507, 2006. (electronic).
- [3] N. Korevaar, R. Kusner, W. H. Meeks III, and B. Solomon. Constant mean curvature surfaces in hyperbolic space. *American J. of Math.*, 114:1–43, 1992. MR1147718, Zbl 0757.53032.
- [4] N. Korevaar, R. Kusner, and B. Solomon. The structure of complete embedded surfaces with constant mean curvature. *J. Differential Geom.*, 30:465–503, 1989. MR1010168, Zbl 0726.53007.
- [5] M. Manzano, J. Pérez, and M. M. Rodríguez. Parabolic stable surfaces with constant mean curvature. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 42:137–152, 2011. MR2819632, Zbl 1228.53009.
- [6] L. Mazet. Cylindrically bounded constant mean curvature surfaces in $\mathbb{H}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367:5329–5354, 2015.
- [7] W. H. Meeks III, P. Mira, J. Pérez, and A. Ros. Constant mean curvature spheres in homogeneous 3-manifolds. Work in progress.
- [8] W. H. Meeks III, J. Pérez, and A. Ros. Stable constant mean curvature surfaces. In *Handbook of Geometrical Analysis*, volume 1, pages 301–380. International Press, edited by Lizhen Ji, Peter Li, Richard Schoen and Leon Simon, ISBN: 978-1-57146-130-8, 2008. MR2483369, Zbl 1154.53009.
- [9] W. H. Meeks III and S. T. Yau. Topology of three-dimensional manifolds and the embedding problems in minimal surface theory. *Ann. of Math.*, 112:441–484, 1980. MR0595203 (83d:53045), Zbl 0458.57007.
- [10] W. H. Meeks III and S. T. Yau. The existence of embedded minimal surfaces and the problem of uniqueness. *Math. Z.*, 179:151–168, 1982. MR0645492, Zbl 0479.49026.

WILLIAM H. MEEKS III, MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST, MA 01003

E-mail address: profmeeks@gmail.com

PABLO MIRA, DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSIDAD POLITÉCNICA DE CARTAGENA, E-30203 CARTAGENA, MURCIA, SPAIN.

E-mail address: pablo.mira@upct.es

JOAQUÍN PÉREZ, DEPARTMENT OF GEOMETRY AND TOPOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF GRANADA, 18001 GRANADA, SPAIN

E-mail address: jperez@ugr.es