MINIMIZING CONES ASSOCIATED WITH ISOPARAMETRIC FOLIATIONS

ZIZHOU TANG AND YONGSHENG ZHANG

Abstract

Associated with isoparametric foliations of unit spheres, there are two classes of minimal surfaces – minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and focal submanifolds. By virtue of their rich structures, we find new series of minimizing cones. They are cones over focal submanifolds and cones over suitable products among these two classes. Except in low dimensions, all such cones are shown minimizing.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	4
3. Cones over focal submanifolds	6
3.1. Curvature criterion of Lawlor	7
3.2. Case for $g = 4$	10
3.3. Cases for $g = 3$ and 6	12
4. Cones over products of focal submanifolds	12
4.1. Minimal product	13
4.2. For normal radius	14
4.3. Existence of vanishing angles	17
4.4. Comparison between ϕ and $2\theta_0$	18
4.5. Extension to the multiple case	20
4.6. To include $g = 2$	22
5. Cones over products of minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and mixed type	23
Appendix	26
References	28

Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C40, 53C38, 49Q15.

Key words and phrases. Isoparametric foliation, minimizing cone, minimal product, Lawlor's curvature criterion.

Received May 22, 2019.

1. Introduction

Minimizing hypercones have fascinating originations and active developments in geometric measure theory, for example, the pioneering works: Fleming [Fle62], De Giorgi [DG65], Almgren [Alm66], Simons [Simns68], Bombieri-De Giorgi-Giusti [BDGG69] for solving the celebrated Bernstein problem.

Many types of homogeneous minimizing hypercones beyond Simons cones were discovered by Lawson in [Law72]. Later [Sims74, Sims73] added that $C_{2,4}$ over minimal Clifford torus $S^2\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\right) \times S^4\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\right) \subset S^7(1)$ is minimizing (also see [Zha16]) whereas $C_{1,5}$ is only stably minimal. Although lots of examples had been found, a complete list of homogeneous minimizing hypercones remained unknown until the important work of Lawlor [Law91]. Rather than in the entire Euclidean space, Lawlor searched for a structure similar to the characterization foliation of a minimizing hypercone discovered by Hardt-Simon [HS85] in certain angular neighborhood of the cone under consideration.

More flexible than homogeneous foliations are the isoparametric ones. In 1985, Ferus and Karcher [FK85] successfully constructed the characterization foliation for almost all minimal isoparametric hypercones of OT-FKM type (see §2 below or [OT76, FKM81] for more details), and hence showed each of them minimizing. Thereafter, to figure out a complete classification of minimizing isoparametric hypercones became important in the subject. Based on the method of [FK85], an explicit list was given in [Wan94]. However, the arguments for strict minimality in his §9 were invalid due to the inaccurate Remark 9.17 on a correct formula in [HS85]. We shall give an alternative proof in §2.

Since a tangent cone (at some point) of an area-minimizing rectifiable current is itself area-minimizing (Theorem 5.4.3 in [Fed69], also see Theorem 35.1 and Remark 34.6 (2) in [Simn83]), the study of minimizing cones of higher codimensions is of equal importance. Besides minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces, another class of minimal submanifolds associated with isoparametric foliations are focal submanifolds. By the efforts of [Law91, Ker94, HKT00, Kan02, OS], cones over focal submanifolds of homogeneous isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 4, 6$ distinct principal curvatures and multiplicities $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ had been shown minimizing. In this paper, we shall consider cones over general focal submanifolds.

In §3, we establish

Theorem 1. *Cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 4$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

Remark 1.1. *Lots of them are inhomogeneous v.s. those equivariant minimizing cones constructed in [XYZ18]. It should be remarked that for some inhomogeneous isoparametric foliations their focal submanifolds can possibly be homogeneous. For details readers are referred to [FKM81].*

Remark 1.2. *For $g = 4, m_1 = m_2 = 2$, both $C(M_+)$ and $C(M_-)$, the cones over the focal submanifolds M_+ and M_- , are minimizing and of dimension 7 in $\mathbb{R}^{10}$. Moreover, since the vanishing angle is less than $\frac{\pi}{8} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\pi}{4}$, their union $C(M_+ \sqcup M_-)$ with either orientation combination is minimizing as well.*

Remark 1.3. *When M_t for $t = +$ or $-$ is nonorientable, $C(M_t)$ is minimizing in the sense of mod 2 (see [Zie62]). For $g = 4$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, k)$, M_+ is diffeomorphic to $V_2(\mathbb{R}^{k+2})$ and M_- is isometric to $S^1 \times S^{k+1}/\mathbb{Z}_2$ (see [TY13]). It can be proved without difficulty that the latter is orientable if and only if k is even.*

Our investigations for $g = 3$ and 6 lead to

Theorem 2. ([Ker94, Kan02, OS]) *Cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

Question. It will be interesting, for a complete classification, to ask whether cones over focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 4, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$ are minimizing. By Cartan, for $g = 3$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$, $M_{\pm}$ are both isometric to $\mathbb{R}P^2$ with constant Gaussian curvature; for $g = 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$, $M_{\pm}$ are diffeomorphic to $S^3 \times \mathbb{R}P^2$ (see, for example, [Miy13]).

Further, we consider the minimal products of minimal submanifolds in §4 and gain

Theorem 3. *Cones over the minimal products of focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 4, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

Theorem 4. *Cones, of dimension no less than 10, over the minimal products of focal submanifolds are area-minimizing.*

We continue to study cones over products among focal submanifolds and minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces. In particular, we show

Theorem 5. *Cones, of dimension no less than 37, over the minimal products among focal submanifolds and minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces are area-minimizing.*

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 we review some fundamental results related to the topic of our paper. In §3.1 we briefly go through the ideas of Lawlor's curvature criterion and apply it to cones over focal submanifolds in §3.2 and §3.3 for $g = 4$ and $g = 3, 6$ respectively. In §4, we first consider the minimal products of two focal submanifolds with $g = 3, 4, 6$, then the multiple case based on the observation Remark 4.1, and finally include $g = 2$ with the aid of Lawlor's results on cones over products purely of spheres. Extending §4, the last section is devoted to the case of products among minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and focal submanifolds. Our arguments heavily rely on the foliation structures.

2. Preliminaries

A closed (embedded) hypersurface M in the unit sphere $S^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called isoparametric, by E. Cartan, if it has constant principal curvatures. When M is isoparametric, so are its parallel hypersurfaces. In this way, a foliation of hypersurfaces appears with two exceptional leaves – focal submanifolds of higher codimensions. It is well known that there is one and only one minimal hypersurface among parallel isoparametric hypersurfaces of an isoparametric foliation.

Let ξ be a unit normal vector field along M , g the number of distinct principal curvatures of M , $\cot \theta_\alpha$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, g$; $0 < \theta_1 < \dots < \theta_g < \pi$) the principal curvatures with respect to ξ and m_α the multiplicity of $\cot \theta_\alpha$. By a purely topological method, Münzner proved an elegant result that g must be 1, 2, 3, 4 or 6 and $m_\alpha = m_{\alpha+2}$ (indices mod g). According to values of g , we have the followings.

$g = 1$. The foliation is trivial, namely given by level sets of a height function restricted to S^{n-1} with respect to a nonzero direction in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

$g = 2$. Regular leaves are of type $S^p \times S^{n-2-p}$ and the corresponding focal submanifolds are great spheres S^p and S^{n-2-p} .

$g = 3$. $m_1 = m_2 = m_3$ has to take values among 1, 2, 4 and 8. Cartan [Car39] showed that these are homogeneous foliations. Moreover, all the isoparametric hypersurfaces are precisely the tubes of constant radius over the standard Veronese embedding of $\mathbb{F}P^2$ for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}$ (quaternions), $\mathbb{O}$ (Cayley numbers) in S^4, S^7, S^{13}, S^{25} , respectively.

$g = 6$. $m_1 = m_2 = m$ by Münzner [Mün80] and m has to be 1 or 2 by Abresch [Abr83]. For $m = 1$, Dorfmeister and Neher [DN85] proved that the foliation is homogeneous. Very recently, Miyaoka [Miy13, Miy16] established the same conclusion for $m = 2$.

$g = 4$. By recent beautiful results of Cecil-Chi-Jensen [CCJ07] and Chi [Chi], the classification finally gets complete. Such a foliation must be either of OT-FKM type or homogeneous with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$ or $(4, 5)$. Here the OT-FKM type means that leaves of the foliation are given by

$$M_t = \mathbf{F}^{-1}(t) \bigcap S^{n-1} \quad \text{for } t \in [-1, +1]$$

where

$$\mathbf{F}(x) = \langle x, x \rangle^2 - 2 \sum_{i=0}^m \langle P_i x, x \rangle^2, \quad m \geq 1$$

for self-adjoint endomorphisms $P_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, for $i = 0, \dots, m$, with relation $P_i P_j + P_j P_i = 2\delta_{ij} \text{Id}$. Such structure exists only when $n = 2l$ and $l = k\delta(m)$ (see [FKM81]). Its multiplicities satisfy $(m_1, m_2) = (m, l - m - 1)$.

The first inhomogeneous foliation of OT-FKM type occurs when $(m_1, m_2) = (3, 4)$. For all other inhomogeneous foliations, $3 \leq m_1 < m_2$ and $m_1 + m_2 \geq 11$. Theorem 2 of [FK85] states that each inhomogeneous minimal isoparametric hypersurface M^* of OT-FKM type spans a minimizing hypercone

$$C(M^*) = \{tx : x \in M^* \text{ and } t \in [0, \infty)\}.$$

In fact their argument works for all minimal isoparametric hypersurface of OT-FKM type with $m_1 + m_2 \geq 11$.

Combined with the above classification theorem of isoparametric foliations, Theorem 2 of [FK85] and classification on homogeneous minimizing hypercones confirm the classification in [Wan94].

Theorem. ([Wan94]) Let M^* be a minimal isoparametric hypersurface in S^{n-1} with $g \geq 2$. Then $C(M^*)$ is minimizing if and only if $n \geq 4g$ and $(g, m_1, m_2) \neq (2, 1, 5)$ or $(4, 1, 6)$.

Here is a table of homogeneous minimal hypercones about their being minimizing, stable minimal, and unstable minimal, according to values of (g, m_1, m_2) (cf. [Law91, MO09, Zha16]).

(g, m_1, m_2)	Type of M^*	Strongest minimality of $C(M^*)$ among		
		Minimizing	Stable	Unstable
$g = 1$	S^{n-2}	✓		
$(2, p, n - 2 - p)$	$S^p \times S^{n-2-p}$	$n = 8, p \neq 1, 5;$ $n > 8$	$n = 8, p = 1, 5$	$n < 8$

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

(g, m_1, m_2)	Type of M^*	Strongest minimality of $C(M^*)$ among		
		Minimizing	Stable	Unstable
$(4, 1, p-2)$	$\frac{SO(p) \times SO(2)}{SO(p-2) \times \mathbb{Z}_2}$	$p > 8$	$p = 8$	$3 \leq p \leq 7$
$(4, 2, 2p-3)$	$\frac{S(U(p) \times U(2))}{SU(p-2) \times T^2}$	$p \geq 4$		$p = 2, 3$
$(4, 4, 4p-5)$	$\frac{Sp(p) \times Sp(2)}{Sp(p-2) \times Sp(1)^2}$	$p \geq 2$		
$(4, 4, 5)$	$\frac{U(5)}{SU(2) \times SU(2) \times T^1}$	✓		
$(4, 6, 9)$	$\frac{Spin(10) \cdot T}{SU(4) \cdot T}$	✓		
$(3, 1, 1)$	$\frac{SO(3)}{\mathbb{Z}_2 + \mathbb{Z}_2}$			✓
$(3, 2, 2)$	$\frac{SU(3)}{T^2}$			✓
$(3, 4, 4)$	$\frac{Sp(3)}{Sp(1)^3}$	✓		
$(3, 8, 8)$	$\frac{F_4}{Spin(8)}$	✓		
$(4, 2, 2)$	$\frac{SO(5)}{T^2}$			✓
$(6, 2, 2)$	$\frac{G_2}{T^2}$			✓
$(6, 1, 1)$	$\frac{SO(4)}{\mathbb{Z}_2 + \mathbb{Z}_2}$			✓

For a minimal isoparametric hypersurface M^* , by §4.3 of [Law91], Lawlor's criterion about $C(M^*)$ is not only sufficient but also necessary for its being minimizing. What is more, whenever the criterion applies, the cone becomes strictly area-minimizing automatically. Hence the next statement follows.

Proposition. ([Wan94]) Let M^* be a minimal isoparametric hypersurface in S^{n-1} . Then $C(M^*)$ is minimizing if and only if it is strictly area-minimizing.

3. Cones over focal submanifolds

It is well known that focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations are minimal submanifolds in spheres. They generate minimal cones. Based on their special second fundamental forms, we shall employ the curvature criterion of Lawlor.

To be self-contained, we briefly review Lawlor's method in §3.1. A proof of Theorem 1 will be given in §3.2. Along the same line, homogeneous cases for $g = 3$ and 6 will be discussed in §3.3.

3.1. Curvature criterion of Lawlor. Let us mention some notations and concepts.

Definition 3.1. Let B be a submanifold of dimension $k - 1$ in S^{n-1} and $C = C(B)$. Fix $p \in B$. Let N^{n-k} be the $(n - k)$ -dimensional great sphere which intersects B at p orthogonally. For $0 < \eta < \pi$, denote by $U_p(\eta)$ the open η -disk centered at p in N^{n-k} . Then $W_p(\eta) = C(U_p(\eta))$ is called the η -**normal wedge** through p . Conventionally, we leave out the origin, so that one can talk about “nonintersecting normal wedges”. We name $\bigcup_{p \in B} W_p(\eta)$ the η -**angle neighborhood** of C . The **normal radius** of C at p means the largest angular radius η for $W_p(\eta)$ intersecting C only in the ray $\overrightarrow{Op}$.

η -normal wedges of a cone

Since the characterization foliation for an area-minimizing hypercone in [HS85] has the property of homothety, so do its perpendicular integral curves (outside the origin). The latter naturally induces an area-nonincreasing projection for hypersurfaces to the cone. Instead, Lawlor looked for similar structure in some η -angular neighborhood of a minimal cone C rather than in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If the boundary of the neighborhood happens to be mapped to the origin under the projection, then one can send everything outside the neighborhood to the origin. In this way an area-nonincreasing projection can be produced. For higher codimensions, Lawlor considered the structure given by rotation of a suitable curve γ_p in each normal wedge $W_p(\eta)$ for $p \in B$. Positive homotheties of the surface rotated by γ_p are required to foliate the normal wedge. Under the assumption that elements of $\{W_p(\eta) : p \in B\}$ do not intersect each other, the existence of preferred area-nonincreasing projection in the η -angular neighborhood is equivalent to that the ordinary differential inequality:

$$\left(h(t) - \frac{t}{k}h'(t)\right)^2 + \left(\frac{h'(t)}{k}\right)^2 \leq \left(\det(I - th_{ij}^\nu)\right)^2, \quad h(0) = 1,$$

where $t = \tan(\theta)$ for $\theta \in [0, \eta)$ and the $(k-1) \times (k-1)$ matrix (h_{ij}^ν) means the second fundamental form of B at p for a unit normal ν in S^{n-1} , has a solution which can reach zero for each ν . Letting ν range over all unit normals at p , the requirement becomes that

$$(1) \quad \left(h(t) - \frac{t}{k} h'(t) \right)^2 + \left(\frac{h'(t)}{k} \right)^2 \leq (q(t))^2, \quad h(0) = 1,$$

or equivalently,

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{k}{t^2+1} \left(th - \sqrt{(t^2+1)q^2(t) - h^2} \right) &\leq h'(t) \\ &\leq \frac{k}{t^2+1} \left(th + \sqrt{(t^2+1)q^2(t) - h^2} \right), \quad h(0) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $q(t) = \inf_\nu \det(I - th_{ij}^\nu) = 1 + q_2 t^2 + \dots$, supports a solution which reaches zero. It can be seen that the solution $h_0(t)$ which attains zero fastest, if exists, must satisfy

$$(3) \quad h'_0(t) = \frac{k}{t^2+1} \left(th_0 - \sqrt{(t^2+1)q^2(t) - h_0^2} \right), \quad h_0(0) = 1.$$

Definition 3.2. Suppose $h_0(t)$ gets zero at $t = \tan(\theta_0(p))$. We call $\theta_0(p)$ the vanishing angle at p and $\theta_0 = \max_{p \in B} \theta_0(p)$ the vanishing angle of C .

θ_0 stands for the narrowest (uniform) size for the preferred area-nonincreasing projection. Hence, there will be two things to check to apply Lawlor's criterion:

1. There exists a finite vanishing angle θ_0 . Here we would like to remark that in general (1) and (3) may support no solutions which can touch zero.
2. The θ_0 -normal wedges do not intersect.

A technical point is how to control $q(t)$ in practice. Corollary 1.3.3 in [Law91] says that, for $\mathcal{M} = k-1 \geq 2$ and $t \in [0, \frac{1}{\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{M}}{\mathcal{M}-1}}]$,

$$(4) \quad \det(I - th_{ij}^\nu) \geq F(\alpha, t, \mathcal{M})$$

where

$$(5) \quad F(\alpha, t, \mathcal{M}) = \left(1 - \alpha t \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{M}-1}{\mathcal{M}}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\alpha t}{\sqrt{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{M}-1)}} \right)^{\mathcal{M}-1},$$

$$(6) \quad \alpha = \sup_\nu \|(h_{ij}^\nu)\| = \sup_\nu \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} (h_{ij}^\nu)^2}.$$

The inequality is sharp; for certain matrices, equality holds for all t . (For example, for the classical coassociative Lawson-Osserman cone in

$\mathbb{R}^7$, see [XYZ18].) Note that the expression $F(\alpha, t, \mathcal{M})$ is nonincreasing in $\mathcal{M}$. Limiting $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \infty$ leads to Corollary 1.3.4

$$(7) \quad \det(I - th_{ij}^\nu) \geq F(\alpha, t, k-1) > (1 - \alpha t)e^{\alpha t}.$$

Based on (4) and (7), Lawlor considered

$$(8) \quad h'(t) = \frac{k}{t^2 + 1} \left(th - \sqrt{(t^2 + 1)(F(\alpha, t, k-1))^2 - h^2} \right), \quad h(0) = 1;$$

$$(9) \quad h'(t) = \frac{k}{t^2 + 1} \left(th - \sqrt{(t^2 + 1)((1 - \alpha t)e^{\alpha t})^2 - h^2} \right), \quad h(0) = 1,$$

respectively. Let $\theta_F(p)$ and $\theta_c(p)$ be the corresponding vanishing angles. Then

$$\theta_0(p) \leq \theta_F(p) < \theta_c(p).$$

Lawlor gained the following table of upper bounds of vanishing angles for $\dim(C)$ and α^2 .

α^2	Dimension of C						α^2	Dimension of C			
	3	4	5	6	7	8		9	10	11	12
0.00	39.81	27.46	20.10	17.02	14.32	12.34	0.00	10.86	9.69	8.75	7.97
0.05	40.60	27.61	21.07	17.05	14.32	12.36	0.20	10.88	9.70	8.76	7.99
0.10	41.56	27.78	21.14	17.08	14.35	12.37	0.40	10.91	9.73	8.78	7.99
0.15	42.80	27.97	21.19	17.12	14.37	12.38	0.60	10.94	9.74	8.79	8.01
0.20	44.57	28.16	21.26	17.14	14.39	12.40	0.80	10.97	9.77	8.81	8.01
0.25	(50)	28.36	21.33	17.18	14.41	12.40	1.00	11.01	9.79	8.82	8.03
0.30	---	28.58	21.40	17.20	14.42	12.42	1.20	11.04	9.81	8.83	8.04
0.35	---	28.83	21.48	17.24	14.43	12.43	1.40	11.07	9.83	8.85	8.05
0.40	---	29.07	21.55	17.28	14.45	12.44	1.60	11.10	9.85	8.87	8.06
0.45	---	29.33	21.62	17.31	14.47	12.45	1.80	11.14	9.87	8.88	8.07
0.50	---	29.63	21.70	17.34	14.49	12.45	2.00	11.17	9.90	8.89	8.08
0.55	---	29.94	21.78	17.38	14.51	12.47	2.50	11.26	9.96	8.94	8.12
0.60	---	30.29	21.88	17.42	14.53	12.48	3.00	11.36	10.03	8.98	8.15
0.65	---	30.66	21.97	17.45	14.54	12.49	3.50	11.46	10.09	9.03	8.18
0.70	---	31.09	22.06	17.49	14.56	12.51	4.00	11.57	10.16	9.07	8.21
0.75	---	31.57	22.15	17.53	14.59	12.51	4.50	11.71	10.23	9.13	8.25
0.80	---	32.15	22.24	17.57	14.60	12.53	5.00	11.83	10.32	9.17	8.28
0.85	---	32.85	22.35	17.61	14.62	12.53	6.00	12.14	10.48	9.29	8.36
0.90	---	33.74	22.44	17.65	14.65	12.55	7.00	12.51	10.68	9.41	8.45
0.95	---	35.05	22.55	17.69	14.68	12.57	8.00	12.99	10.91	9.54	8.55
1.00	---	(41)	22.66	17.74	14.69	12.57	9.00	13.68	11.18	9.69	8.64
1.10	---	---	22.89	17.81	14.74	12.60	10.00	14.83	11.51	9.86	8.75
1.20	---	---	23.15	17.90	14.78	12.62	11.00	---	11.94	10.05	8.87
1.30	---	---	23.43	17.10	14.82	12.65	13.00	---	13.51	10.55	9.17
1.40	---	---	23.73	18.09	14.87	12.68	15.00	---	---	11.35	9.55
1.50	---	---	24.08	18.20	14.91	12.71	17.00	---	---	13.90	10.11
1.60	---	---	24.47	18.31	14.96	12.73	21.00	---	---	---	---
1.70	---	---	24.93	18.41	15.01	12.75	25.00	---	---	---	---
1.80	---	---	25.45	18.52	15.07	12.78	---	---	---	---	---
1.90	---	---	26.10	18.66	15.12	12.82	---	---	---	---	---
2.00	---	---	26.97	18.77	15.17	12.84	---	---	---	---	---
2.20	---	---	30.73	19.06	15.29	12.90	---	---	---	---	---
2.40	---	---	---	19.36	15.40	12.96	---	---	---	---	---
2.60	---	---	---	19.71	15.52	13.03	---	---	---	---	---
2.80	---	---	---	20.13	15.66	13.10	---	---	---	---	---
3.00	---	---	---	20.61	15.81	13.17	---	---	---	---	---
3.25	---	---	---	21.40	15.99	13.25	---	---	---	---	---
3.50	---	---	---	22.56	16.20	13.36	---	---	---	---	---
3.75	---	---	---	24.84	16.44	13.45	---	---	---	---	---
4.00	---	---	---	(***)	16.71	13.55	---	---	---	---	---
4.50	---	---	---	---	17.37	13.79	---	---	---	---	---
5.00	---	---	---	---	18.30	14.07	---	---	---	---	---
5.50	---	---	---	---	19.99	14.37	---	---	---	---	---
6.00	---	---	---	---	---	14.75	---	---	---	---	---
6.50	---	---	---	---	---	15.23	---	---	---	---	---
7.00	---	---	---	---	---	15.84	---	---	---	---	---
7.50	---	---	---	---	---	16.77	---	---	---	---	---
8.00	---	---	---	---	---	18.73	---	---	---	---	---
8.50	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
9.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Table of upper bounds of vanishing angles

Here are some notes for the table:

- The column for $\dim(C) = 12$ uses (9), while others rely on (8).
- The asterisk *** in the table indicates that a solution of the O.D.E exists in some interval $[0, \theta]$, but the vanishing angle based on the method does not exist in general.
- However, since the equality of (4) and (7) may not be attained, slots filled with “***” could still support actual vanishing angles.
- Values in parentheses are tentative, pending on more numerical analysis.

Generally, using (8) gives more accurate data. Nevertheless, (9) has a key advantage, Proposition 1.4.2 in [Law91]:

Let k be the dimension of a minimal cone under consideration, α explained in (6), and $\theta_c(k, \alpha)$ the vanishing angle for (9) depending on k and α . Then for any $\ell > k$,

$$(10) \quad \tan(\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{k}\alpha)) < \frac{k}{\ell} \tan(\theta_c(k, \alpha)).$$

One can use this property to estimate vanishing angles for $\dim(C) > 12$. Another useful property is the following monotonicity:

$$(11) \quad 0 < \theta_c(k, \alpha) < \theta_c(k, \beta) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \alpha < \beta$$

which comes from the monotonicity of $(1 - \alpha t)e^{\alpha t}$ in α . Similarly, one has $\theta_F(k, \alpha)$ for (8) and the monotonicity

$$(12) \quad 0 < \theta_F(k, \alpha) < \theta_F(k, \beta) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \alpha < \beta.$$

Now we are ready to proceed.

3.2. Case for $g = 4$. Let M_+ and M_- be focal submanifolds of an isoparametric foliation with $g = 4$. The main points of **Proof of Theorem 1** are:

1. $\frac{\pi}{4}$ -normal wedges of $C(M_+)$ (or $C(M_-)$) are nonintersecting.
2. In the isoparametric setting, θ_0 only depends on k, α and we can check everything merely at one point. If vanishing angle θ_0 exists and moreover is less than $\frac{\pi}{4}$, then the cone is minimizing.

3. Note that $\frac{\sqrt{x-2}}{x}$ is strictly decreasing when $x \geq 4$. So, for $\ell > k \geq 4$, we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{\ell-2}}{\ell} < \frac{\sqrt{k-2}}{k} \Rightarrow \sqrt{\ell-2} < \frac{\ell}{k} \sqrt{k-2}.$$

By (10), (11) and the table of upper bounds of vanishing angles, it follows that

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \tan(\theta_c(\ell, \sqrt{\ell-2})) &< \tan(\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{k} \sqrt{k-2})) < \frac{k}{\ell} \tan(\theta_c(k, \sqrt{k-2})) \\ (when \ell > k = 12) \quad &< \tan(\theta_c(12, \sqrt{10})) < \tan(9^\circ) < 1. \end{aligned}$$

4. Hence, $\theta_0 < \theta_c(k, \alpha) < 45^\circ$ for $k \geq 12$ and $\alpha^2 \leq k-2$. According to Lawlor's table, $0 < \theta_0 \leq \theta_F(k, \alpha) < 45^\circ$ for $7 \leq k \leq 11$ and $\alpha^2 \leq k-2$. Thus, when $k \geq 7$ and $\alpha^2 \leq k-2$,

$$(14) \quad 0 < \theta_0 < 45^\circ.$$

5. For $g = 4$, M_+ is of dimension $m_1 + 2m_2$, so $k_0 = \dim(C(M_+)) = m_1 + 2m_2 + 1$. A very delightful property of focal submanifolds is that, for a point p of M_+ and any unit normal ν at p to M_+ in the sphere, the second fundamental form for ν with respect to certain orthonormal basis of $T_x M_+$ is (cf. [CR85])

$$(15) \quad \begin{pmatrix} I_{m_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{m_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & O_{m_1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence

$$(16) \quad \alpha_0^2 = 2m_2 \implies \alpha_0 = \sqrt{2m_2} = \sqrt{k_0 - 1 - m_1} \leq \sqrt{k_0 - 2}.$$

Therefore, when $k_0 \geq 7$, by (16), (13) and (14), the curvature criterion applies and consequently $C(M_\pm)$ are minimizing.

6. When $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 2)$, (k, α^2) equals $(6, 4)$ for $C(M_+)$ and $(5, 2)$ for $C(M_-)$. The vanishing angle exists for the latter and $< 27^\circ$, whereas the former seems subtle because of encountering “(***)”. Using the fact $\inf_\nu \det(1 - th_{ij}^\nu) = (1+t)^2(1-t)^2$ instead of the control $F(2, t, 5)$, one can figure out that vanishing angle for the former exists and is less than 25° .

Thus, our proof of Theorem 1 is complete. $\square$

3.3. Cases for $g = 3$ and 6. In both cases, $m_1 = m_2 = m$. Theorem 2 states precisely the following.

Theorem 2'. For $(g, m) = (3, 2), (3, 4), (3, 8)$ or $(6, 2)$, cones over focal submanifolds are minimizing.

Proof. With respect to a unit normal vector at a point in a focal submanifold, the second fundamental form (shape operator) would be similar to (15). They are (cf. [CR85])

$$(17) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_4 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_4 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_8 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_8 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$(18) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3} \cdot I_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sqrt{3} \cdot I_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & O_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

respectively. Hence $(k, \alpha^2) = (5, \frac{4}{3}), (9, \frac{8}{3}), (17, \frac{16}{3})$ and $(11, \frac{40}{3})$. According to Lawlor's table and (10), vanishing angle θ_0 exists and $< 30^\circ$ for each of them. Namely, the θ_0 -normal wedges over the focal submanifold under consideration are nonintersecting. So the statement stands. q.e.d.

Remark 3.3. For $(g, m) = (3, 1)$, $(k, \alpha^2) = (3, \frac{2}{3})$ and $(g, m) = (6, 1)$, $(k, \alpha^2) = (6, \frac{20}{3})$, we cannot apply the estimate in the table.

4. Cones over products of focal submanifolds

We introduce the minimal product of two minimal submanifolds in spheres by illustration for focal submanifolds in §4.1. Detailed estimates for the normal radius and the vanishing angles are exhibited in §4.2 and §4.3 respectively. To apply the curvature criterion we make comparisons in §4.4. Since the minimal product can also be defined for multiple minimal submanifolds, considerations are given for that situation in §4.5. Finally, the case involving $g = 2$, for which focal submanifolds are geodesic spheres, is discussed in §4.6.

4.1. Minimal product. Given two focal submanifolds $f_1 : M_1^{k_1} \hookrightarrow S^{n_1}$ and $f_2 : M_2^{k_2} \hookrightarrow S^{n_2}$ for isoparametric foliations of unit spheres, with g_1, g_2 respectively, define an embedding $G : M \triangleq M_1^{k_1} \times M_2^{k_2} \rightarrow S^{n_1+n_2+1}$ by

$$(x, y) \mapsto (\lambda f_1(x), \mu f_2(y)), \quad \text{with } \lambda = \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu = \sqrt{\frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}}.$$

We write x and y short for $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(y)$. Together with $\eta_0 = (\mu x, -\lambda y)$, orthonormal bases $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n_1-k_1}\}$ and $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n_2-k_2}\}$ of $T_x^\perp M_1$ and $T_y^\perp M_2$ induce an orthonormal basis $\{(\sigma_1, 0), \dots, (\sigma_{n_1-k_1}, 0), (0, \tau_1), \dots, (0, \tau_{n_2-k_2}), \eta_0\}$ of the normal space of $G(M)$ at $P \triangleq (\lambda x, \mu y)$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+1}$.

Let A be the symbol of shape operators. Then $A_{(\sigma_i, 0)}, A_{(0, \tau_j)} : T_P M \rightarrow T_P M$, $A_{\sigma_i} : T_x M_1 \rightarrow T_x M_1$ and $A_{\tau_j} : T_y M_2 \rightarrow T_y M_2$ have the following relations:

$$A_{(\sigma_i, 0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda} A_{\sigma_i} & O \\ O & O \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$A_{(0, \tau_j)} = \begin{pmatrix} O & O \\ O & \frac{1}{\mu} A_{\tau_j} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Also note that there are three Levi-Civita connections

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} M & \hookrightarrow & S^{n_1+n_2+1} & \hookrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2+2} \\ \nabla & & \bar{\nabla} & & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

and, for tangent vector fields $X = (X_1, X_2)$ and $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$ around P , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A_{\eta_0} X, Y \rangle &= \langle \bar{\nabla}_X Y - \nabla_X Y, \eta_0 \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathcal{D}_X Y, \eta_0 \rangle \\ &= - \langle \mathcal{D}_X \eta_0, Y \rangle \\ &= - \langle \mathcal{D}_{(X_1, X_2)} (\mu x, -\lambda y), Y \rangle \\ &= \langle (-\frac{\mu}{\lambda} X_1, \frac{\lambda}{\mu} X_2), (Y_1, Y_2) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$A_{\eta_0} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\mu}{\lambda} I_{k_1} & O \\ O & \frac{\lambda}{\mu} I_{k_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\text{trace}(A_{\eta_0}) = 0$. These imply that G minimally embeds M into $S^{n_1+n_2+1}$. We call $G(M)$ the minimal product of M_1 and M_2 .

4.2. For normal radius. At $P = (\lambda x, \mu y) \in M$, let

$$N = (a_1 \xi_1 + a_0 \mu x, a_2 \xi_2 - a_0 \lambda y), \quad a_0, a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$$

where ξ_1 is a unit normal to M_1 at x in S^{n_1} and ξ_2 a unit normal to M_2 at y in S^{n_2} , such that $\omega \triangleq \|N\|$ attains the smallest (nonzero) for

$$Q = P + N \in \text{the cone } C(M).$$

Figure 1. Q and fake $\bar{Q}$

Let $\phi \triangleq \arctan \omega$. There are three possibilities to consider for smallest ω . If none of **(I)**, **(II)** and **(III)** below give a finite ω , we define $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$. Suppose $\phi < \frac{\pi}{2}$ (the actual situation for $g_1, g_2 \in \{3, 4, 6\}$). Then $Q = (a_1 \xi_1 + (a_0 \mu + \lambda)x, a_2 \xi_2 + (-a_0 \lambda + \mu)y)$.

(I). $a_1 \cdot a_2 \neq 0$.

Recall that ([CR85]) along any normal geodesic of M_1 in S^{n_1} , it takes length $\frac{\pi}{g_1}$ to arrive at its pairing focal submanifold. So before $\frac{2\pi}{g_1}$ it cannot get back to M_1 . The same holds for M_2 in S^{n_2} . As a consequence,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{a_1^2 + (a_0 \mu + \lambda)^2}{\lambda^2} = \frac{a_2^2 + (\mu - a_0 \lambda)^2}{\mu^2}; \\ \frac{a_0 \mu + \lambda}{a_1} = \cot \phi_1, \\ \frac{\mu - a_0 \lambda}{a_2} = \cot \phi_2, \end{array} \right. \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{where } \phi_1 \in \frac{2\pi}{g_1} \cdot \mathbb{Z}; \\ \text{where } \phi_2 \in \frac{2\pi}{g_2} \cdot \mathbb{Z}. \end{array}$$

Since $a_1 a_2 \neq 0$, it indicates that ϕ_1, ϕ_2 cannot belong to $\pi \cdot \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, we can have

$$\frac{a_1^2}{\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi_1} = \frac{a_2^2}{\mu^2 \sin^2 \phi_2} \triangleq t^2,$$

so that $a_1 = t\lambda \sin \phi_1$ and $a_2 = \pm t\mu \sin \phi_2$. Thus,

$$\begin{cases} a_0 \mu + \lambda = t\lambda \cos \phi_1 \\ \mu - a_0 \lambda = \pm t\mu \cos \phi_2 \end{cases}$$

and consequently, by the relation $\lambda^2 + \mu^2 = 1$, we have

$$(19) \quad \begin{cases} 1 = t(\lambda^2 \cos \phi_1 \pm \mu^2 \cos \phi_2), \\ a_0 = t\lambda\mu(\cos \phi_1 \mp \cos \phi_2). \end{cases}$$

Now

$$\omega^2 = a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_0^2 = t^2[\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi_1 + \mu^2 \sin^2 \phi_2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 (\cos \phi_1 \mp \cos \phi_2)^2],$$

which, together with (19), produces

$$(20) \quad \omega^2(\lambda^2 \cos \phi_1 \pm \mu^2 \cos \phi_2)^2 = [\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi_1 + \mu^2 \sin^2 \phi_2 + \lambda^2 \mu^2 (\cos \phi_1 \mp \cos \phi_2)^2].$$

By adding $(\lambda^2 \cos \phi_1 \pm \mu^2 \cos \phi_2)^2$ to both sides of (20), we have

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\omega^2 + 1)(\lambda^2 \cos \phi_1 \pm \mu^2 \cos \phi_2)^2 \\ &= [\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi_1 + \mu^2 \sin^2 \phi_2 + \lambda^2 \cos^2 \phi_1 + \mu^2 \cos^2 \phi_2] \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

To seek for the smallest ω , we consider the chance

$$(22) \quad \omega^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 |\cos \frac{2\pi}{g_1}| + \mu^2 |\cos \frac{2\pi}{g_2}|} \right)^2 - 1.$$

Notice that $g_1, g_2 \in \{3, 4, 6\}$. By ranges of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 ,

$$(23) \quad \omega^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}} \right)^2 - 1 = 3.$$

Remark. In fact, when $g_1 = g_2 = 4$, (22) generates infinity. However, in this case, the realizable (28) below asserts the finiteness of $\tan^2 \phi$.

(II). $a_1 \neq 0, a_2 = 0$. (Similar for $a_1 = 0, a_2 \neq 0$.)

We have two restrictions

$$\begin{cases} \frac{a_1^2 + (a_0 \mu + \lambda)^2}{\lambda^2} = \frac{(\mu - a_0 \lambda)^2}{\mu^2}, \\ \frac{a_0 \mu + \lambda}{a_1} = \cot \phi_1, \end{cases} \quad \text{where } \phi_1 \in \frac{2\pi}{g_1} \cdot \mathbb{Z}.$$

As argued in **(I)**, ϕ_2 cannot belong to $\pi \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ and assume

$$(24) \quad \frac{a_1^2}{\lambda^2 \sin^2 \phi_1} = \frac{(\mu - a_0 \lambda)^2}{\mu^2} \triangleq t^2,$$

so that

$$(25) \quad \begin{cases} a_1 = t\lambda \sin \phi_1, \\ \mu - a_0 \lambda = \pm t\mu. \end{cases}$$

Similarly,

$$(26) \quad a_0 \mu + \lambda = t\lambda \cos \phi_1$$

and

$$(27) \quad (\omega^2 + 1)(\lambda^2 \cos \phi_1 \pm \mu^2)^2 = 1.$$

Again, for the smallest ω , we focus on the likelihood

$$(28) \quad \omega^2 = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 |\cos \frac{2\pi}{g_1}| + \mu^2} \right)^2 - 1.$$

By the range of ϕ_1 ,

$$(29) \quad \omega^2 \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2} \right)^2 - 1.$$

(III). $a_1 = a_2 = 0$.

In this case, $Q = ((a_0 \mu + \lambda)x, (-a_0 \lambda + \mu)y) \in C(M)$ which implies

$$(30) \quad \frac{(a_0 \mu + \lambda)^2}{\lambda^2} = \frac{(\mu - a_0 \lambda)^2}{\mu^2}.$$

Recall that $\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}}$ and $\mu = \sqrt{\frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}}$. It is not hard to see that, only when $\lambda \neq \mu$, there is a finite solution

$$a_0 = \frac{2\sqrt{k_1 k_2}}{k_1 - k_2},$$

and possibly

$$(31) \quad \omega^2 = \frac{4k_1 k_2}{(k_1 - k_2)^2}.$$

Hence, taking the possible occurrence of fake $\overline{Q}$ in Figure 1 into account, $\tan^2 \phi$ is no less than, by definition, the smallest quantity in (23), (29) and (31).

4.3. Existence of vanishing angles. Let ξ_1, ξ_2 be unit normals to M_1 and M_2 at x and y in S^{n_1} and S^{n_2} , and A_{ξ_1}, A_{ξ_2} the corresponding shape operators respectively. Set

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_1 &= (\xi_1, 0), \\ \eta_2 &= (0, \xi_2), \\ \eta_0 &= (\mu x, -\lambda y).\end{aligned}$$

Then, for a unit normal $\varsigma \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^2 c_i \eta_i$ with $\sum_{i=0}^2 c_i^2 = 1$, the shape operator A_ς of M at $(\lambda x, \mu y)$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda}(-c_0\mu I_{k_1} + c_1 A_{\xi_1}) & O \\ O & \frac{1}{\mu}(c_0\lambda I_{k_2} + c_2 A_{\xi_2}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since M_1 and M_2 are minimal, $\text{trace}(A_{\xi_1}) = 0$ and $\text{trace}(A_{\xi_2}) = 0$. Set $S \triangleq \dim(M) = k_1 + k_2$. It follows that

$$(32) \quad \|A_\varsigma\|^2 = c_0^2 S + c_1^2 \frac{S}{k_1} \|A_{\xi_1}\|^2 + c_2^2 \frac{S}{k_2} \|A_{\xi_2}\|^2.$$

Observations from (15), (17) and (18) show that (same for $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\text{if } M_i \text{ corresponds to } g = 3, & \quad \text{then } \|A_{\xi_i}\|^2 = \frac{k_i}{3}; \\ \text{if } M_i \text{ corresponds to } g = 4, & \quad \text{then } \|A_{\xi_i}\|^2 \leq k_i - 1; \\ \text{if } M_i \text{ corresponds to } g = 6, & \quad \text{then } \|A_{\xi_i}\|^2 = \frac{4}{3}k_i.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by expression (32), we always have

$$(33) \quad \|A_\varsigma\|^2 \leq \frac{4}{3}S.$$

For $S = 8, 9$ or 10 and $\alpha^2 \leq \frac{4}{3}S$, vanishing angle $\theta_F(S+1, \alpha)$ exists according to Lawlor's table and the fact that $\theta_F(9, \sqrt{\frac{32}{3}}) < 18^\circ$.

When $S \geq 11$, we seek for the existence of vanishing angle θ_c . Note that, when the dimension of a cone equals 12 , Lawlor's table confirms the existence of θ_c for $\alpha^2 \leq 19$. Recall (10): for $\ell > k$

$$(34) \quad \tan(\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{k}\alpha)) < \frac{k}{\ell} \tan(\theta_c(k, \alpha)).$$

Since $\frac{x^2}{x-1}$ is strictly increasing for $x \geq 2$, one can find that, when $\ell > k \geq 2$,

$$(35) \quad \frac{(\frac{\ell\alpha}{k})^2}{\ell-1} = \frac{\ell^2\alpha^2}{k^2(\ell-1)} > \frac{\alpha^2}{k-1}.$$

Take $(k, \alpha^2) = (12, 19)$ and fix $\ell > 12$. Then $\theta_c(12, \sqrt{19})$ in the latter term of (34) exists, and so does $\theta_c(\ell, \frac{\ell}{12}\sqrt{19})$. By monotonicity (11), if $\tilde{\alpha}^2 \leq (\frac{\ell\sqrt{19}}{12})^2$, $\theta_c(\ell, \tilde{\alpha})$ exists. In particular, according to (35), the existence of $\theta_c(\ell, \tilde{\alpha})$ for $\tilde{\alpha}^2 = \frac{4}{3}(\ell-1) < \frac{19}{11}(\ell-1) < (\frac{\ell\sqrt{19}}{12})^2$ is guaranteed. As a result, $\theta_c\left(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}S}\right)$ exists for $S \geq 11$.

Hence, θ_F and θ_0 always exist for $S \geq 8$.

4.4. Comparison between ϕ and $2\theta_0$. If we can get

$$(\star) \quad 2\theta_0 < \phi$$

by the relation given at the end of §4.2, then the curvature criterion applies and the corresponding cone is area-minimizing.

For our purpose, let us make some observations about ϕ . By Appendix, it follows that

$$(36) \quad \min\left\{3, \frac{4k_1k_2}{(k_1-k_2)^2}\right\} > \min\left\{\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2}\right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 + \mu^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1\right\}.$$

Assume that $k_1 \leq k_2$ from now on. One can see that

$$\left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 + \mu^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}}\right)^2 - 1 \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2}\right)^2 - 1.$$

Hence,

$$\tan^2 \phi \geq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \mu^2}\right)^2 - 1,$$

and therefore

$$(37) \quad \cos \phi \leq 1 - \frac{k_1}{2S}.$$

Remark 4.1. Since t in §4.2 is allowed to be negative, our computations include the possibility of fake $\overline{Q}$. It implies that the upper bound $1 - \frac{k_1}{2S}$ is in fact uniform for $|\cos \phi_i|$ where ϕ_i corresponds to any intersection point (if existed other than $\pm P$) of the submanifold $G(M_1 \times M_2)$ and a great circle perpendicular to it through P .

Now we can prove a weak version of Theorem 3.

Theorem 3'. *Cones over the minimal products of two focal submanifolds of isoparametric foliations with $g = 3, 4, 6$ and $(m_1, m_2) \neq (1, 1)$ are area-minimizing.*

Proof. Note that $4 \leq k_1 \leq k_2$ in the case. Since $\theta_F(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}}S)$ exists for $S \geq 8$, we have, by (4), (5), (8), (12) and (33), that

$$(38) \quad \tan \theta_0 \leq \tan \theta_F(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}}S) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{4}{3}}S} \sqrt{\frac{S}{S-1}} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{S-1}}.$$

Then

$$\tan 2\theta_0 < \frac{4\sqrt{3(S-1)}}{4S-7}.$$

According to

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \tan^2 \phi &\geq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{k_1}{2S}} \right)^2 - 1 \geq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{4}{2S}} \right)^2 - 1 \\ &= \frac{4(S-1)}{(S-2)^2} > \frac{3(S-1)}{(S-\frac{7}{4})^2} > \tan^2 2\theta_0, \end{aligned}$$

we have $(\star)$ and thus complete the proof. $\square$

Let us assume $S \geq 11$ and figure out when $(\star)$ holds. Note that

$$\tan \left[\theta_c(12, \sqrt{\frac{44}{3}}) \right] < \tan 9.55^\circ < 0.1683.$$

Combined with (34), (35) and (11), the existence of $\theta_c(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}}S)$ leads to

$$(40) \quad \tan \theta_0 < \tan \left[\theta_c(S+1, \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}}S) \right] < \frac{12}{S+1} \tan \left[\theta_c(12, \sqrt{\frac{44}{3}}) \right].$$

Then

$$\tan 2\theta_0 < \frac{2 \cdot \frac{12}{S+1} \cdot 0.1683}{1 - \left(\frac{12}{S+1} \cdot 0.1683 \right)^2}.$$

Hence, with the agreement that $k_1 \leq k_2$, it is sufficient to see when (41)

$$\tan^2 \phi \geq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{k_1}{2S}} \right)^2 - 1 \geq \left(\frac{2 \cdot \frac{12}{S+1} \cdot 0.1683}{1 - \left(\frac{12}{S+1} \cdot 0.1683 \right)^2} \right)^2 > \tan^2 2\theta_0 ,$$

or equivalently,

$$(42) \quad \left(k_1 S - \frac{k_1^2}{4} \right) [(S+1)^2 - (12 \cdot 0.1683)^2]^2 - \left(S - \frac{k_1}{2} \right)^2 [24(S+1) \cdot 0.1683]^2 \geq 0.$$

Based on the analysis, we get a weak version of Theorem 4.

Theorem 4'. *Cones, of dimension no less than 10, over the minimal products of two focal submanifolds with $g = 3, 4, 6$ are area-minimizing.*

Proof. When $k_1 \geq 4$, a proof is given in that of Theorem 3. Consider now that $k_1 = 2$ and 3. To determine the sign of polynomial (42), we run the following codes in Mathematica:

```
F[S_, k1_] := {k1*S - k1^2/4} ((S+1)^2 - (12*0.1683)^2)^2 - (S - k1/2)^2 (24 (S+1) * 0.1683)^2
Solve[F[S, 2] == 0, S]
Solve[F[S, 3] == 0, S]
{{S -> -1.25327 - 0.975824 i}, {S -> -1.25327 + 0.975824 i}, {S -> 0.981136}, {S -> 1.00653}, {S -> 5.17643}}
{{S -> -1.28445 - 1.11279 i}, {S -> -1.28445 + 1.11279 i}, {S -> 1.31889}, {S -> 1.71919 - 1.45711 i}, {S -> 1.71919 + 1.45711 i}}
```

and it can be seen that, whenever $S \geq 11$ for (40), we have (42) hold.

Let us check the cases of $S = 9, 10$ for $k_1 = 2$ (which can imply the cases for $k_1 = 3$). By Lawlor's table, $\theta_F(10, \sqrt{12}) < 13.51^\circ$ and $\theta_F(11, \sqrt{\frac{40}{3}}) < 11.35^\circ$. Then direct computations show that $\tan^2 \phi \geq (\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{9}})^2 - 1 > \tan^2 27.02^\circ$ and $\tan^2 \phi \geq (\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{10}})^2 - 1 > \tan^2 22.70^\circ$ respectively. So, $\phi > 2\theta_F$ and the proof gets complete. $\square$

4.5. Extension to the multiple case. In this subsection, we explain ideas of extending Theorem 3' and Theorem 4' to products of three focal submanifolds with restriction of each $g \in \{3, 4, 6\}$. Case involving more components can be similarly done by induction. In particular, Theorem 3 will be proved.

Given three focal submanifolds $f_1 : M_1^{k_1} \hookrightarrow S^{n_1}$, $f_2 : M_2^{k_2} \hookrightarrow S^{n_2}$ and $f_3 : M_3^{k_3} \hookrightarrow S^{n_3}$ for isoparametric foliations of unit spheres. Define $\tilde{G} : \tilde{M} \triangleq M_1^{k_1} \times M_2^{k_2} \times M_3^{k_3} \rightarrow S^{n_1+n_2+n_3+2}(1)$ by

$$(x, y, z) \mapsto (\lambda' f_1(x), \mu' f_2(y), \tau' f_3(z)), \text{ with}$$

$$\lambda' = \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2 + k_3}}, \quad \mu' = \sqrt{\frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2 + k_3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau' = \sqrt{\frac{k_3}{k_1 + k_2 + k_3}}.$$

Then $\tilde{G} : \tilde{M} \hookrightarrow S^{n_1+n_2+n_3+2}(1)$ is a minimal embedding, which follows from that

$$M_1 \times M_2 \times M_3 \cong (M_1 \times M_2) \times M_3, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{G}(x, y, z) = G(G(x, y), z)$$

where map G is given for two minimal submanifolds at the beginning of this section.

Let $\tilde{S} = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$. With the above understanding, it easily follows, from expressions (33) and (32), that the norm square of shape operator of $\tilde{M}$ at every point for any unit normal is no more than $\frac{4}{3}\tilde{S}$. Hence, vanishing angles $\tilde{\theta}_F$ and $\tilde{\theta}_0$ corresponding to that in §4.3 and those in proofs of Theorem 3' and Theorem 4' exist.

Without loss of generality, assume that $k_1 \leq k_2 \leq k_3$. Let ϕ and $\tilde{\phi}$ be the normal radii of $M_1 \times M_2$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+1}(1)$ and $\tilde{M}$ in $S^{n_1+n_2+n_3+2}(1)$ respectively. We stick to the notation $S = k_1 + k_2$. Set $\tilde{\lambda} = \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{S}}{S}}$ and $\tilde{\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{k_3}{\tilde{S}}}$. Then, applying the discussions of **(I)**, **(II)** and **(III)** to $(M_1 \times M_2) \times M_3$, we have, according to Appendix and Remark 4.1 (in §4.4), that

$$(43) \quad \begin{aligned} \tan^2 \tilde{\phi} &\geq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}^2 \cos \phi + \tilde{\mu}^2} \right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}^2 + \tilde{\mu}^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}^2 (1 - \frac{k_1}{2S}) + \tilde{\mu}^2} \right)^2 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we gain an inheritable relation

$$(44) \quad \cos \tilde{\phi} \leq 1 - \frac{k_1}{2\tilde{S}}$$

where the upper bound has the uniform property as in Remark 4.1. Based on the proofs of Theorem 3' and Theorem 4', it then follows correspondingly that

$$(45) \quad \tan^2 \tilde{\phi} \geq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{k_1}{2\tilde{S}}} \right)^2 - 1 > \tan^2 2\tilde{\theta}_F \geq \tan^2 2\tilde{\theta}_0.$$

The descendent (44) and the coupled property in Remark 4.1 are crucial for this procedure to be valid for the induction on the number of focal submanifolds.

4.6. To include $g = 2$. Due to the distinct behaviors of corresponding focal submanifolds, we save the discussions about $g = 2$ separately and accomplish the proof of Theorem 4 in this subsection. Since the case of products purely of spheres has been classified by [Law91], we only consider the mixed type. More explicitly, let $M_1^{k_1}, \dots, M_r^{k_r}$ be focal submanifolds in spheres corresponding to $g \in \{3, 4, 6\}$, and $N_1^{l_1}, \dots, N_s^{l_s}$ focal submanifolds for $g = 2$. Then $M = M_1^{k_1} \times \dots \times M_r^{k_r} \times N_1^{l_1} \times \dots \times N_s^{l_s}$ with $r, s \geq 1$ is what we are concerned about.

(A). $M = (M_1^{k_1} \times \dots \times M_r^{k_r}) \times N_1^{l_1}$. Namely $r \geq 1$ and $s = 1$. Denote by $\hat{\phi}$ the normal radius of the minimal submanifold M in the sphere. Assume that $k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_r$ and set $K = k_1 + \dots + k_r$. Then **(I)**, **(II)** and **(III)** give a lower bound

$$\min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\frac{K}{K+l_1}(1 - \frac{k_1}{2K}) + \frac{l_1}{K+l_1}} \right)^2 - 1, \frac{4Kl_1}{(K-l_1)^2} \right\}.$$

of $\tan^2 \hat{\phi}$. Although the last term of the following has no apparent geometric meaning in the current case, one can deduce from Remark .1 that

$$\tan^2 \hat{\phi} \geq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{k_1}{2(K+l_1)}} \right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{l_1+1}{K+l_1}} \right)^2 - 1 \right\}.$$

Therefore,

$$(46) \quad \tan^2 \hat{\phi} \geq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{\min \{k_1, 2(l_1+1)\}}{2(K+l_1)}} \right)^2 - 1.$$

(B). $M = (M_1^{k_1} \times \dots \times M_r^{k_r}) \times (N_1^{l_1} \times \dots \times N_s^{l_s})$ with $r \geq 1$ and $s \geq 2$. We use symbols ϕ_0 and $\hat{\phi}$ to represent the normal radii of minimal products $N_1^{l_1} \times \dots \times N_s^{l_s}$ and M in the corresponding spheres, respectively. Assume that $l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_s$ and set $L = l_1 + \dots + l_s$. Then, according to §5.1 of [Law91], $\phi_0 = \cos^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{2l_1}{L} \right)$. Also note that the minimal $N_1^{l_1} \times \dots \times N_s^{l_s}$ is symmetric about the origin. Hence, $\cos \phi_0 = 1 - \frac{2l_1}{L}$ has the uniform upper bound property mentioned in

Remark 4.1. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 (47) \quad & \tan^2 \hat{\phi} \\
 & \geq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\frac{K}{K+L}(1 - \frac{k_1}{2K}) + \frac{L}{K+L}} \right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{\frac{K}{K+L} + \frac{L}{K+L}(1 - \frac{2l_1}{L})} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \\
 & = \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{\min\{k_1, 4l_1\}}{2(K+L)}} \right)^2 - 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, by induction, the relation (32) can lead to the same result as (33) for M . Thus, by comparing (46) and (47) with (39), (41) and (45), we can include $g = 2$ in Theorem 4 under the same dimension assumption with no restriction on l_1 .

As a conclusion remark of this section, we point out that, if $M = M_1^{k_1} \times N_1^{l_1} \times \cdots \times N_s^{l_s}$ of $\dim(M) = 8$, the condition $k_1 \geq 4$ is sufficient for $C(M)$ to be minimizing in the corresponding Euclidean space.

5. Cones over products of minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and mixed type

In this section we shall consider the case of products of minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces following the ideas in §4 and Theorem 5 will be proved.

An important result of Münzner [Mün80] states that, in our notations in §2 for an isoparametric hypersurface of dimension d ,

$$(48) \quad \theta_\alpha = \theta_1 + \frac{\alpha - 1}{g} \pi, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \alpha \leq g.$$

Consequently, it follows that (for example, see [TY13]) for the unit normal vector field ξ towards M_+

$$(49) \quad d \cdot H = \sum_{\alpha=1}^g m_\alpha \cot \theta_\alpha = \begin{cases} m_1 g \cot(g\theta_1) & \text{for } g \text{ odd,} \\ \frac{m_1 g}{2} \cot \frac{g\theta_1}{2} - \frac{m_2 g}{2} \tan \frac{g\theta_1}{2} & \text{for } g \text{ even,} \end{cases}$$

where H represents the mean curvature. So for a minimal isoparametric hypersurface,

$$(50) \quad \theta_1 = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{2} & g = 1, \\ \arctan \sqrt{\frac{m_1}{m_2}} & g = 2, \\ \frac{\pi}{6} & g = 3, \\ \frac{1}{2} \arctan \sqrt{\frac{m_1}{m_2}} & g = 4, \\ \frac{\pi}{12} & g = 6. \end{cases}$$

Hence, the normal radius

$$(51) \quad \phi = \begin{cases} \pi & g = 1, \\ \min\{2\theta_1, \pi - 2\theta_1\} & g = 2, \\ \frac{\pi}{3} & g = 3, \\ \min\{2\theta_1, \frac{\pi}{2} - 2\theta_1\} & g = 4, \\ \frac{\pi}{6} & g = 6. \end{cases}$$

Alternatively,

$$(52) \quad \cos \phi = \begin{cases} 0 & g = 1, \\ 1 - \frac{2 \min\{m_1, m_2\}}{m_1 + m_2} & g = 2, \\ \frac{1}{2} & g = 3, \\ \sqrt{1 - \frac{\min\{m_1, m_2\}}{m_1 + m_2}} & g = 4, \\ \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & g = 6. \end{cases}$$

By $\sqrt{1 - \frac{\min\{m_1, m_2\}}{m_1 + m_2}} < 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\min\{m_1, m_2\}}{m_1 + m_2}$, it can be concluded that

$$(53) \quad \cos \phi \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2d}.$$

Next, we compute the pointwise norm square α^2 of the second fundamental form.

$$\begin{aligned}
 g = 1, \quad \alpha^2 &= 0, \\
 g = 2, \quad \alpha^2 &= m_1 \cot^2 \theta_1 + m_2 \tan^2 \theta_1 = m_2 + m_1 = d, \\
 g = 3, \quad \alpha^2 &= m_1 \left(\cot^2 \frac{\pi}{6} + \cot^2 \frac{3\pi}{6} + \cot^2 \frac{5\pi}{6} \right) = 6m_1 = 2d, \\
 g = 4, \quad \alpha^2 &= m_1 (\cot^2 \theta_1 + \tan^2 \theta_1) + m_2 (\cot^2(\theta_1 + \frac{\pi}{4}) + \tan^2(\theta_1 + \frac{\pi}{4})) \\
 &= m_1 \left(\frac{1 - 2 \cos^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \theta_1}{\cos^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \theta_1} \right) \\
 &\quad + m_2 \left(\frac{1 - 2 \cos^2(\theta_1 + \frac{\pi}{4}) \sin^2(\theta_1 + \frac{\pi}{4})}{\cos^2(\theta_1 + \frac{\pi}{4}) \sin^2(\theta_1 + \frac{\pi}{4})} \right) \\
 &= m_1 \left(\frac{4}{\sin^2 2\theta_1} - 2 \right) + m_2 \left(\frac{4}{\cos^2 2\theta_1} - 2 \right) \\
 &= m_1 \left(\frac{2m_1 + 4m_2}{m_1} \right) + m_2 \left(\frac{4m_1 + 2m_2}{m_2} \right) \\
 &= 6(m_1 + m_2) = 3d, \\
 g = 6, \quad \alpha^2 &= m_1 \left(\sum_{i=0}^5 \cot^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{12} + \frac{i\pi}{6} \right) \right) = 30m_1 = 5d.
 \end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$(54) \quad \alpha^2 = (g - 1)d \leq 5d.$$

Assume $M_1^{k_1}, \dots, M_s^{k_s}$ are minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces. Let $\hat{\phi}$ be the normal radius for the minimal product of $M_1 \times \dots \times M_s$, $\hat{\alpha}$ the pointwise maximal norm of the second fundamental form in unit normals, and $\hat{S} = \sum_{i=1}^s k_i$. Then, by (32) and (54),

$$(55) \quad \hat{\alpha}^2 \leq 5\hat{S}.$$

We follow the idea in proving Theorem 3. If the vanishing angle $\theta_F(\hat{S} + 1, \sqrt{5\hat{S}})$ exists, then similar to (38) we have

$$(56) \quad \tan \theta_0 \leq \tan \theta_F(\hat{S} + 1, \sqrt{5\hat{S}}) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{5\hat{S}}} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{S}}{\hat{S} - 1}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5(\hat{S} - 1)}},$$

and hence

$$(57) \quad \tan 2\theta_0 < \frac{2 \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{5(\hat{S} - 1)}}}{1 - \frac{1}{5(\hat{S} - 1)}} = \frac{2\sqrt{5(\hat{S} - 1)}}{5\hat{S} - 6}.$$

By the arguments in §4 and (53) (compared with (37)), we get

$$(58) \quad \tan^2 \hat{\phi} \geq \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{2\hat{S}}} \right)^2 - 1 = \frac{4\hat{S} - 1}{(2\hat{S} - 1)^2}.$$

It is not hard to check that for $\hat{S} \geq 5$, $\tan^2 \hat{\phi} > \tan^2 2\theta_0$.

Now, the question becomes when θ_F exists? According to (35) and (11), we focus on

$$(59) \quad \left(\frac{\sqrt{19}(\hat{S} + 1)}{12} \right)^2 \geq 5\hat{S},$$

with positive solutions $\hat{S} \geq 36$ which ensure the existence of θ_c (and hence that of θ_F). Therefore, cones, of dimension no less than 37, over minimal products of minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces are minimizing.

By our arguments and the same relations exhibited in (53) and (55), it is clear that cones, of dimension no less than 37, over minimal products among minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and focal submanifolds are minimizing.

Remark. The number 37 can be improved by more careful calculations. For instance, see the proof of Theorem 4. Also, one can reduce the number by restriction to a subset of minimal isoparametric hypersurfaces and focal submanifolds. There would be several combinations and certain refinements according to the upper bounds of maximal norm squares of second fundamental forms in unit normals.

Appendix

In §4.2 we figure out four quantity candidates to be a lower bound of $\tan^2 \phi$. To make arguments in §4.4, §4.5 and §4.6 simple, a proof of the following useful inequality is given here.

Proposition 1. *For $a, b > 0$ and $a \neq b$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4ab}{(a-b)^2} &> \min \left\{ \left(\frac{a+b}{b} \right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{a+b}{a} \right)^2 - 1 \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{a}{a+b}} \right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{b}{a+b}} \right)^2 - 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Assume $b > a > 0$. One has

$$4b^3 > 3b^3 > (b-a)^2(2b+a).$$

Hence,

$$\frac{4b}{(a-b)^2}a > \frac{2b+a}{b^2}a = \left(\frac{a+b}{b}\right)^2 - 1.$$

Similarly, for $a > b > 0$, it follows that

$$\frac{4a}{(a-b)^2}b > \frac{2a+b}{a^2}b = \left(\frac{a+b}{a}\right)^2 - 1.$$

□

Remark .1. For integers $p, q \geq 1$ and $p \neq q$, the above inequality can be improved to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4pq}{(p-q)^2} &\geq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{p+q}{q-1}\right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{p+q}{p-1}\right)^2 - 1 \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{p+1}{p+q}}\right)^2 - 1, \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{q+1}{p+q}}\right)^2 - 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we think of a nonzero number divided by zero as infinity. More precisely, when $p > q \geq 1$,

$$\frac{4pq}{(p-q)^2} \geq \left(\frac{p+q}{p-1}\right)^2 - 1 = \left(\frac{1}{1-\frac{q+1}{p+q}}\right)^2 - 1,$$

with equality if and only if $q = 1$.

Acknowledgments. We thank Professor Gary Lawlor for permission of using his graph and table from [Law91], Professors Michael Kerckhove, Chiakuei Peng, Yuanlong Xin and Doctor Chao Qian for their interests and useful comments, and the referees for kind suggestions. The second author wishes to sincerely thank Professor Leon Simon for many helpful explanations about [HS85], Professor H. Blaine Lawson, Jr. for drawing our attention to [Law91], and Max-Planck Institute for Mathematics at Bonn for hospitality. This work was sponsored in part by the NSFC (Grant Nos. 11331002, 11871282, 11526048, 11601071), Nankai Zhide Foundation, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. 2412016KJ002), the SRF for ROCS, SEM and a Start-up Research Fund from Tongji University.

References

- [Abr83] U. Abresch, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four or six distinct principal curvatures*, Math. Ann. **264** (1983), 283–302, MR0714104, Zbl 0505.53027.
- [Alm66] F.J. Almgren, Jr., *Some interior regularity theorems for minimal surfaces and an extension of Bernstein's theorem*, Ann. Math. **84** (1966), 277–292, MR0200816, Zbl 0146.11905.
- [BDGG69] E. Bombieri, E. De Giorgi, and E. Giusti, *Minimal cones and the Bernstein problem*, Invent. Math. **7** (1969), 243–268, MR0250205, Zbl 0183.25901.
- [Car39] E. Cartan, *Sur des familles remarquables d'hypersurfaces isoparamétriques dans les espaces sphériques*, Math. Z. **45** (1939), 335–367, MR0000169, Zbl 0021.15603.
- [CCJ07] T.E. Cecil, Q.S. Chi, and G.R. Jensen, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures*, Ann. Math. **166** (2007), 1–76, MR2342690, Zbl 1143.53058.
- [CR85] T.E. Cecil and P.J. Ryan, *Tight and taut immersions of manifolds*, Research Notes in Math. 107, Pitman, London, 1985, MR0781126, Zbl 1331.53001.
- [Chi] Q.S. Chi, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures IV*, to appear in J. Diff. Geom.
- [DG65] E. De Giorgi, *Una estensione del teorema di Bernstein*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **19** (1965), 79–85, MR0178385, Zbl 0168.09802.
- [DN85] J. Dorfmeister and E. Neher, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces, case $g=6$, $m=1$* , Comm. Algebra **13** (1985), 2299–2368, MR0807479, Zbl 0578.53041.
- [Fed69] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1969, MR0257325, Zbl 0176.00801.
- [FK85] D. Ferus and H. Karcher, *Non-rotational minimal spheres and minimizing cones*, Comment. Math. Helv. **60** (1985), 247–269, MR0800005, Zbl 0566.53052.
- [FKM81] D. Ferus, H. Karcher, and H.F. Münzner, *Cliffordalgebren und neue isoparametrische Hyperflächen*, Math. Z. **177** (1981), 479–502, MR0624227, Zbl 0443.53037.
- [Fle62] W.H. Fleming, *On the oriented Plateau problem*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo **11** (1962), 69–90, MR0157263, Zbl 0107.31304.
- [HS85] R. Hardt and L. Simon, *Area minimizing hypersurfaces with isolated singularities*, J. Reine. Angew. Math. **362** (1985), 102–129, MR0809969, Zbl 0577.49031.
- [HKT00] D. Hirohashi, T. Kanno, and H. Tasaki, *Area-minimizing of the cone over symmetric R -space*, Tsukuba J. Math. **24** (2000), 171–188, MR1791338, Zbl 0991.53033.
- [Kan02] T. Kanno, *Area-minimizing cones over the canonical embedding of symmetric R -spaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51** (2002), 89–125, MR1896158, Zbl 1035.53072.
- [Ker94] M. Kerckhove, *Isolated orbits of the adjoint action and area-minimizing cones*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **121** (1994), 497–503, MR1196166, Zbl 0804.49031.
- [Law91] G.R. Lawlor, *A sufficient criterion for a cone to be area-minimizing*, Vol. 446, Mem. of the Amer. Math. Soc., 1991, MR1073951, Zbl 0745.49029.

- [Law72] H.B. Lawson, Jr., *The equivariant Plateau problem and interior regularity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **173** (1972), 231–249, MR0308905, Zbl 0279.49043.
- [MO09] H. Ma and Y. Ohnita, *On Lagrangian submanifolds in complex hyperquadrics and isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres*, Math. Z. **261** (2009), 749–785, MR2480757, Zbl 1165.53037.
- [Miy13] R. Miyaoka, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with $(g, m) = (6, 2)$* , Ann. Math. **177** (2013), 53–110, MR2999038, Zbl 06146417.
- [Miy16] ———, *Errata of “Isoparametric hypersurfaces with $(g, m) = (6, 2)$ ”*, Ann. Math. **183** (2016), 1057–1071, MR3488743, Zbl 1343.53050.
- [Mün80] H.F. Münzner, *Isoparametric hyperflächen in sphären, I and II*, Math. Ann. **251**, **256** (1980, 1981), 57–71, MR0583825, Zbl 0417.53030; 215–232, MR0620709, Zbl 0438.53050.
- [OS] S. Ohno and T. Sakai, *Area-minimizing cones over minimal embeddings of R -spaces*, *arXiv:1507.02006*.
- [OT76] H. Ozeki and M. Takeuchi, *On some types of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres II*, Tohoku Math. J. **28** (1976), 7–55, MR0690588, Zbl 0359.53012.
- [Sims74] P. Simoes, *On a class of minimal cones in $\mathbb{R}^n$* , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1974), 488–489, MR0331197, Zbl 0303.28021.
- [Sims73] ———, *A class of minimal cones in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 8$, that minimize area*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1973, MR2940437.
- [Simn83] L. Simon, *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*, Proc. Centre Math. Anal. Austral. Nat. Univ., Vol. 3, 1983, MR0756417, Zbl 0546.49019.
- [Simns68] J. Simons, *Minimal varieties in riemannian manifolds*, Ann. Math. **88** (1968), 62–105, MR0233295, Zbl 0181.49702.
- [Wan94] Q.M. Wang, *On a class of minimal hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^n$* , Math. Ann. **298** (1994), 207–251, MR1256617, Zbl 0804.53086.
- [TY13] Z.Z. Tang and W.J. Yan, *Isoparametric foliation and Yau conjecture on the first eigenvalue*, J. Differential Geom. **94** (2013), 521–540, MR3080491, Zbl 1277.53058.
- [XYZ18] X.W. Xu, L. Yang, and Y.S. Zhang, *New area-minimizing Lawson-Osserman cones*, Adv. Math. **330** (2018), 739–762, MR3787556, Zbl 1393.53051.
- [Zha16] Y.S. Zhang, *On Lawson’s area-minimizing hypercones*, Acta Math. Sinica-English Ser. **32** (2016), 1465–1476, MR3568077, Zbl 1365.53052.
- [Zie62] W.P. Ziemer, *Integral currents mod 2*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **105** (1962), 496–524, MR0150267, Zbl 0136.03603.

CHERN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS & LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN 300071, P. R. CHINA

E-mail address: zztang@nankai.edu.cn

CURRENT ADDRESS: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES & IAS, TONGJI UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200092, P. R. CHINA

E-mail address: yongsheng.chang@gmail.com