RWTHAACHEN

RHEINISCH-WESTFÄLISCHE TECHNISCHE HOCHSCHULE AACHEN

Institut für Mathematik

Capillary surfaces and floating bodies

by

J. Bemelmans

G.P. Galdi

M. Kyed

Institute for Mathematics, RWTH Aachen University

Templergraben 55, D-52062 Aachen
Germany

Capillary surfaces and floating bodies

Josef Bemelmans · Giovanni P. Galdi · Mads Kyed

Abstract   We investigate capillary surfaces with boundary components on a floating body. The unknowns of this problem, the free surface and the position and orientation of the floating body are determined by minimizing the corresponding energy; besides gravitation and cohesion forces, we consider also adhesion between the fluid and both the wall of the container and the floating body. Existence of a solution is shown in the class of Caccioppoli sets under suitable restrictions on the data, as well as for surfaces that are graphs of real functions.

1 Introduction

We consider a cylindrical container $G := \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+$, where Ω is a bounded, simply connected domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$; G is partially filled with some liquid of density ρ. A rigid body $\mathcal{B}$ whose density ρ_0 is smaller than ρ is floating on the liquid, and it is assumed that the interface between the liquid and the air above is governed by surface tension. Besides the gravitational force,

J. Bemelmans (✉)
Institut für Mathematik, RWTH Aachen University, 52056 Aachen, Germany
e-mail: bemelmans@instmath.rwth-aachen.de

G. P. Galdi
Department of Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science,
University of Pittsburgh, 15261 Pittsburgh, PA, USA
e-mail: galdi@engr.pitt.edu

M. Kyed
Department Mathematik, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg,
91058 Erlangen, Germany
e-mail: kyed@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

there is adhesion between the fluid and both the outer wall of the container and the floating body. We then look for configurations in which these forces are in equilibrium; the unknowns are the position of the floating body and the capillary surface, and they are determined by a variational problem for the energy.

A special version of this problem has been studied in [1]; as [1] is part of an investigation of free-boundary problems for the Navier–Stokes equations, we allowed only for contact angles of $\pi/2$ because in domains with edges of this type solutions to the Navier–Stokes equations are regular up to the boundary. Such a contact angle occurs only if there is no adhesion energy. In the present paper, we prove the existence of capillary surfaces under the standard assumptions, in particular with non-vanishing adhesion energy.

In Sect. 2, we study the energy functional for the case that the region occupied by the fluid is a Caccioppoli set. Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the rigid body, and let $\mathcal{B}(c, R) := \{y = c + Rx; \ x \in \mathcal{B}\}$ where $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$ denotes a translation and $R = R(d, \alpha) \in SO(3)$ describes a rotation with respect to some axis with direction d, $\|d\| = 1$, about some angle α. The quantities c and R are restricted by requiring that the floating body is contained in G, i.e $\mathcal{B}(c, R) \subseteq G$; $\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ is assumed to be a closed set. If we denote the domain occupied by the fluid by E, we have $E \subseteq G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ and $\mathscr{L}^3(E) = V_0$ where V_0 is the volume of the Lebesgue measurable set E. The energy functional then reads

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; E) := \sigma \int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R)} |D\varphi_E| + \kappa \int\limits_{\partial G} \varphi_E \, d\sigma + \kappa_0 \int\limits_{\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)} \varphi_E \, d\sigma$$
$$+ \rho g \int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R)} x_3 \varphi_E \, dx + \rho_0 g \int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(c, R)} x_3 dx, \tag{1}$$

where

$$\int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R)} |D\varphi_E| := \sup \left\{ \int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R)} \varphi_E \, \mathrm{div} \, g \, dx : g \in C_c^1 \left(G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R); \mathbb{R}^3 \right), \ \|g\|_{C^0} \leq 1 \right\}$$

denotes the total variation of the characteristic function φ_E of E; σ is the coefficient of surface tension. The integrals $\int_{\partial G} \varphi_E \, d\sigma$ and $\int_{\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)} \varphi_E \, d\sigma$ denote the area of the wetted part of the container's boundary ∂G and the boundary $\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ of the floating body, respectively; the corresponding coefficients of the adhesion energy are κ and κ_0; their relative size with respect to σ determines the contact angles. The last two integrals in (1) represent the gravitational energy of the fluid and of the floating body; g is the gravitational constant. We prove that there is a minimizing configuration $(\mathcal{B}(c, R), E)$ to (1); concerning the data σ, κ and κ_0, we make no further restrictions than in the classical capillary problem without floating bodies. The functional $\mathcal{F}(c, R; E)$ is to be minimized in the class

$$\mathcal{C} = \big\{ (c, R; E) : c \in \mathbb{R}^3, \ R \in SO(3) \text{ such that } \mathcal{B}(c, R) \subseteq G;$$
$$E \subset G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R) \text{ measurable with } \mathcal{L}^3(E) = V_0 \big\}. \tag{2}$$

In Sect. 3, we formulate the variational problem in the class of graphs. The body $\mathcal{B}$ is assumed to be strictly convex such that the non-wetted part of its boundary can be described by a graph; also the capillary surface is assumed to be a graph which is certainly appropriate in our case because of the influence of the gravitational force. Archimedes' principle characterizes the position of the floating body by an equilibrium condition. In the presence of capillary and adhesion forces, the first variation of the energy leads to an equilibrium of forces that act

on $\mathcal{B}$, where the resultant of the surface forces is a vector field on the contact line that is tangential to the capillary surface. This result was first proved by McCuan [4] in the general case of parametric surfaces and deformable bodies.

The existence theorem requires more restrictions on the data compared to the variational problem in the class of Caccioppoli sets. This more special solution allows, however, to prove regularity of the minimizer as well as geometrical properties, in particular that the upper part of ∂B that is not wetted is a simply connected set. These results are contained in Sect. 4.

2 Existence of solutions: the general case

We first prove that the infimum of the energy functional $\mathcal{F}(c, R; E)$ from (1) is attained for some configuration $(c_0, R_0; E_0)$ from $\mathcal{C}$, which is defined in (2). In [1], we adopted the variational method for Caccioppoli sets to the case that a floating body is involved. If also adhesion energy is part of the functional it is well known that only the sum of surface and adhesion energy, $\sigma \int_G |D\varphi_E| + \kappa \int_{\partial G} \varphi_E \, d\sigma$, is lower semi-continuous with respect to L^1-convergence; the integral over ∂G is generally not lower semi-continuous by itself. To prove semi-continuity, one uses the estimate of Emmer [2]

$$\int_{\partial G} u \, d\sigma \leq \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{G(\varepsilon)} |Du| + C_\varepsilon \int_{G(\varepsilon)} |u|, \tag{3}$$

which holds for functions $u \in BV(G).G(\varepsilon)$ is a strip near the boundary, and L denotes the Lipschitz constant of ∂G. In our problem, we consider $G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ instead of G; then, the boundary need not be Lipschitz continuous even if ∂G and $\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ are smooth because the rigid body $\mathcal{B}$ might touch the boundary ∂G of the container. Hence, we must prove Emmer's lemma (3) for this case.

In the analog of (3), we require $\partial \Omega$ to be of class C^2 and $\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ to have a projection $P(c, R)$ into Ω such that the curvature of $\partial P(c, R)$ is larger than the curvature of $\partial \Omega$:

$$\min_{R \in SO(3)} \min_{x' \in \partial P(c,R)} K(\partial P(c, R), x') > \max_{x' \in \partial \Omega} K(\partial \Omega, x'),$$

where $K(\gamma, x')$ denotes the curvature of a curve γ at some point $x' \in \gamma$. If then $\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ touches ∂G it does so in a single point y_0. In a neighborhood U_{ε_0} of y_0, we can describe the boundaries ∂G and $\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ by the graphs of the functions

$$y_3 = \omega(y_1, y_2) \quad \text{and} \quad y_3 = \beta(y_1, y_2), \ (y_1, y_2) \in A_{\varepsilon_0} \subseteq E$$

where $(y_1, y_2) \equiv y'$ are cartesian coordinates with center $y'_0 = (0, 0)$ in the tangent plane at y_0. We have $\beta(y') > \omega(y')$ for all y' in the domain A_{ε_0} where σ and ω are defined except for $y' = (0, 0)$.

Local strips between $\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ and ∂G around y_0 can be defined by

$$\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c, R) := \bigcup_{0 < \delta < \varepsilon} \beta^*(\delta) \quad \text{and} \quad G^*_\varepsilon := \bigcup_{0 < \delta < \varepsilon} \omega^*(\delta)$$

where

$$\beta^*(\delta) = \left\{ y = (y', y_3) \colon y_3 = \beta(y') - \delta\tau(y'), \ y' \in A_{\varepsilon_0} \right\}$$
$$\omega^*(\delta) = \left\{ y = (y', y_3) \colon y_3 = \omega(y') + \delta\tau(y'), \ y' \in A_{\varepsilon_0} \right\}$$

with

$$\tau(y') := \begin{cases} \dfrac{\beta(y') - \omega(y')}{3\,\varepsilon} & \text{if } \beta(y') - \omega(y') \leq 3\,\varepsilon \\ 1 & \text{if } \beta(y') - \omega(y') \geq 3\,\varepsilon \end{cases}$$

These sets replace the neighborhoods $G(\varepsilon)$ of constant thickness in Emmer's proof of (3).

Lemma 2.1 *Let ∂G and $\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ touch in a single point y_0 as described above. Then, there holds for $u \in BV(G \backslash \mathcal{B}(c, R))$.*

$$\int_{\partial G \cap U_{\varepsilon_0}} u \, d\sigma \; \leq \; \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{G_\varepsilon^*} |Du| + C_\varepsilon \int_{G_\varepsilon^*} |u| \, dx \qquad (4)$$

$$\int_{\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R) \cap U_{\varepsilon_0}} u \, d\sigma \; \leq \; \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^*(c, R)} |Du| + C_\varepsilon \int_{\mathcal{B}_\varepsilon^*(c, R)} |u| \, dx \qquad (5)$$

Here, L is an upper bound for $|D\omega|$ and $|D\beta|$ in A_{ε_0}.

Remark 2.2 **(i)** As we assume that $\partial \mathcal{B}$ and ∂G are regular surfaces, we can make L small by covering ∂G and $\partial \mathcal{B}$ by small open sets. Hence, the value of L is no extra restriction for σ and κ or κ_0 in the existence theorem.
(ii) Away from the point of contact, the original proof of Emmer can be applied because there $G \setminus \partial B(c, R)$ has a smooth boundary.

Proof To $u \in BV(G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c, R))$ we consider the trace u_δ on the surface $\omega^*(\delta)$ for some $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$. Then,

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon_0}} u \, d\sigma \; \leq \; \int_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon_0}} |u - u_\delta| \, d\sigma + \int_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon_0}} |u_\delta| \, d\sigma \qquad (*)$$

with $\Gamma_{\varepsilon_0} = \partial G \cap U_{\varepsilon_0}$, and we estimate the difference $|u - u_\delta|$ by $|Du|$:

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon_0}} |u - u_\delta| \, d\sigma = \int_{A_{\varepsilon_0}} \left| u\left(y', \omega(y')\right) - u\left(y', \omega(y') + \delta\tau(y')\right) \right| \cdot \sqrt{1 + |D\omega(y')|^2} \, dy'$$

$$\leq \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{A_{\varepsilon_0}} \int_{\omega(y')}^{\omega(y') + \delta\tau(y')} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial y_3}(y', t) \right| dt \, dy'$$

$$\leq \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{G_\varepsilon^*} |Du|$$

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\epsilon_0}} |u_\delta(y)| \, d\sigma = \int_{A_{\varepsilon_0}} \left| u\left(y', \omega(y') + \delta\tau(y')\right) \right| \sqrt{1 + |D\left(\omega(y') + \delta\tau(y')\right)|^2} \, dy'$$

$$+ \int_{A_{\varepsilon_0}} \left| u\left(y', \omega(y') + \delta\tau(y')\right) \right| \left[\sqrt{1 + |D\omega(y')|^2} \right.$$

$$\left. - \sqrt{1 + |D(\omega(y') + \delta\tau(y'))|^2} \right] dy'$$

Integration with respect to δ gives $\int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |u|\,dy$ for the first integral and $C \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |u|\,dy$ for the second term. We now integrate $(*)$ with respect to $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ and obtain

$$\varepsilon \int_{\Gamma_{\varepsilon 0}} u \, d\sigma \ \leq \ \varepsilon \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |Du| + C \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |u| \, dx,$$

which proves (4). The case (5) can be handled in the same way. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 2.3 *Assume that $\partial\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ and ∂G touch in at most one point, and let σ, ρ, ρ_0, κ, κ_0 be constants with $\rho > \rho_0 > 0, \sigma > 0$ and $\sigma - |\kappa|\sqrt{1 - L^2} < 0, \sigma - |\kappa_0|\sqrt{1 + L^2} > 0$. Then, there exists an element $(c_0, R_0; E_0) \in \mathcal{C}$, such that*

$$\mathcal{F}(c_0, R_0, E_0) \ \leq \ \mathcal{F}(c, R; E) \ \ for \ all \ \ (c, R; E) \in \mathcal{C}. \tag{6}$$

Proof We first show that $\mathcal{F}(c, R; E)$ is bounded from below on $\mathcal{C}$. The gravitational energies are clearly positive; for the adhesion terms we have

$$\kappa_0 \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}(c,R)} \varphi_E \, d\sigma, \geq \ - |\kappa_0| \, |\partial\mathcal{B}| \ > \ -\infty$$

and, if $\partial\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ and ∂G touch in a point y_0,

$$\kappa \int_{\partial G \cap U_{\varepsilon 0}} \varphi_E \, d\sigma \ \geq \ - |\kappa|\sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |D\varphi_E| - |\kappa| \ C_\varepsilon \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} \varphi_E \, dx,$$

which follows from Lemma 2.1.

For the part of the boundary that lies outside of $U_{\varepsilon 0}$ (and that may be all of ∂G if $\partial\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ and ∂G do not touch at all), we have from Sect. 3

$$\kappa \int_{\Gamma \backslash U_{\varepsilon 0}} \varphi_E \, d\sigma \geq -|\kappa|\sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{G(\varepsilon) \backslash U_{\varepsilon 0}} |D\varphi_E| - C'_\varepsilon \int_{G(\varepsilon) \backslash U_{\varepsilon 0}} \varphi_E \, dx$$

with

$$G(\varepsilon) = \{x \in G : \operatorname{dist}(x, \Gamma) < \varepsilon\}.$$

The first term is majorized by $\sigma \int_{G \backslash \mathcal{B}(c, R)} |D\varphi_E|$ because of the assumption on the data, and the second one remains finite because of $\int_{G^*_\varepsilon} \varphi_E \, dx \leq \mathcal{L}^3(E) = V_0$.

Therefore, there exists a constant c_0 such that

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; E) \ \geq \ c_0 \ > \ -\infty \ \forall \, (c, R; E) \in \mathcal{C},$$

and a minimizing sequence $\{(c_n, R_n; E_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ from $\mathcal{C}$:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{F}(c_n, R_n; E_n) \ = \ m_0 \ \equiv \ \inf_{(c, R; E) \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{F}(c, R; E).$$

We claim that this sequence is bounded:

$$|c_n| + |R_n| + \| \varphi_{E_n} \|_{BV} \leq C \quad \forall \, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We may assume that

$$\mathcal{F}(c_n, R_n; E_n) \ \leq \ m_0 + 1 \quad \forall \, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and because of $\rho g \int_G x_3 \, \varphi_{E_n} \, dx \geq 0$, $\rho_0 g \int_{\mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} x_3 \, dx \geq 0$ and $|\kappa_0 \int_{\partial \mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} \varphi_{E_n} \, d\sigma|$ $\leq c_1$ we have

$$\sigma \int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} |D\varphi_{E_n}| + \kappa \int\limits_{\partial G} \varphi_{E_n} \, d\sigma \leq m_0 + 1 + c_1.$$

Using (4) again we get

$$\left(\sigma - |\kappa| \sqrt{1 + L^2} \right) \int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} |D\varphi_{E_n}| \leq m_0 + 1 + c_1 + C_\varepsilon \cdot V_0.$$

Because of the assumption on σ and κ and the volume constraint this gives

$$\| \varphi_{E_n} \|_{L^1(G)} + \int\limits_{G \setminus \mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} |D\varphi_{E_n}| \leq C.$$

The area integral can be written in the form

$$\int\limits_G |D\varphi_{E_n}| - \int\limits_{\partial \mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} \varphi_{E_n} \, d\sigma,$$

which gives

$$\| \varphi_{E_n} \|_{L^1(G)} + \int\limits_G |D\varphi_{E_n}| \leq C.$$

The values of R_n belong to a compact set, hence R_n is bounded independently of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The x_1- and the x_2 component of c_n is bounded by diam Ω, and the x_3-component is bounded because of

$$\rho_0 g \int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} x_3 \, dx \leq m_0 + 1,$$

and, thus, we have shown that the minimizing sequence $\{(c_n, R_n; E_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded:

$$|c_n| + |R_n| + \| \varphi_{E_n} \|_{BV(G)} \leq C \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This implies that there is a subsequence, which we again denote by $\{(c_n, R_n, E_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ that converges for $n \to \infty$:

$$c_n \to c_0, \ R_n \to R_0, \ \varphi_{E_n} \to \varphi_{E_0} \ \text{in} \ L^1(G).$$

In the last steps of the proof, we show that $\mathcal{F}$ is lower semi-continuous with respect to this minimizing sequence.

The integral $\rho_0 g \int_{\mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)} x_3 \, dx$ is continuous because $\mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)$ converges uniformly to $\mathcal{B}(c_0, R_0)$ for $n \to \infty$. The integrand $x_3 \varphi_{E_n}(x)$ in the term that represents the gravitational energy of the fluid is non-negative, and therefore the integral is lower semi-continuous according to Fatou's lemma.

In order to compare the traces of φ_{E_n} and φ_{E_0} on the boundary of the rigid body, we set

$$\widetilde{E}_n := T_n E_n,$$

where T_n is the rigid motion that maps $\mathcal{B}(c_n, R_n)$ onto $\mathcal{B}(c_0, R_0)$; $\widetilde{E}_n$ is generally not an element of $\mathcal{C}$, but $(\varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n} - \varphi_{E_0})$ restricted to $\partial\mathcal{B}(c_0, R_0)$ can be estimated by (5). For the area energy

$$\mathscr{A}(c, R; E) := \sigma \int_{G\setminus\mathcal{B}(c,R)} |D\varphi_E| + \kappa \int_{\partial G} \varphi_E \, d\sigma + \kappa_0 \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}(c,R)} \varphi_E \, d\sigma$$

we get using

$$\kappa_0 \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}(c_0,R_0)} \varphi_{E_0} \, d\sigma - \kappa_0 \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}(c_n,R_n)} \varphi_{E_n} \, d\sigma = \kappa_0 \int_{\partial\mathcal{B}(c_0,R_0)} \varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n} \, d\sigma$$

and then (5) again:

$$\mathscr{A}(c_0, R_0; R_0) - \mathscr{A}(c_n, R_n; E_n)$$

$$\leq \sigma \int_{G\setminus(\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)\cup G^*_\varepsilon)} |D\varphi_{E_0}| + \sigma \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |D\varphi_{E_0}| + \sigma \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |D\varphi_{E_0}|$$

$$- \sigma \int_{G\setminus(\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_n,R_n)\cup G^*_\varepsilon)} |D\varphi_{E_n}| - \sigma \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_n,R_n)} |D\varphi_{E_n}| - \sigma \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |D\varphi_{E_n}|$$

$$+ |\kappa|\sqrt{1+L^2} \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |D(\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{E_n})| + |\kappa| \, C_\varepsilon \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{E_n}| \, dx$$

$$+ |\kappa_0|\sqrt{1+L^2} \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |D(\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n})| + |\kappa_0| \, C_\varepsilon \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n}| \, dx.$$

Now we have

(i) $\left(|\kappa|\sqrt{1+L^2} - \sigma\right) \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |D\varphi_{E_n}| \leq 0 \, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ because of the assumptions on the data.

(ii) $|\kappa| C_\varepsilon \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{E_n}| \, dx \to 0, n \to \infty$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

(iii) $\int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n}| \, dx \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |\varphi_{E_0} - \varphi_{E_n}| \, dx + \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |\varphi_{E_n} - \varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n}| \, dx$,
and both integrals converge to zero for $n \to \infty$.

(iv) $\int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon} |D\varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n}| = \mathcal{H}^2(\partial\widetilde{E}_n \cap \mathcal{B}^*(c_0, R_0))$; the Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^2$ is invariant under rigid motions, and therefore we have $\mathcal{H}^2(T_n(\partial E_n) \cap \mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0, R_0)) = \mathcal{H}^2(T_n^{-1}(T_n(\partial E_n) \cap \mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0, R_0))) = \mathcal{H}^2(\partial E_n \cap \mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_n, R_n))$ which gives $|\kappa_0|\sqrt{1+L^2} \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |D\varphi_{\widetilde{E}_n}| - \sigma \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_n,R_n)} |D\varphi_{E_n}| \leq 0$.

(v) The integrals $\sigma \int_{\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |D\varphi_{E_0}|$ and $\sigma \int_{G^*_\varepsilon} |D\varphi_{E_0}|$ are of order $O(\varepsilon)$.

(vi) $\int_{G\setminus\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_0,R_0)} |D\varphi_{E_0}| \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{G\setminus\mathcal{B}^*_\varepsilon(c_n,R_n)} |D\varphi_{E_n}|$ has been proved in [1].

Using (i)–(vi) in the inequality for $\mathscr{A}(c, R; E)$, we obtain the lower semi-continuity of $\mathcal{F}$, and this concludes the proof of Theorem 2.3. $\qquad\square$

3 Existence of solutions in the class of graphs

We now investigate capillary surfaces Σ in the presence of floating bodies under the assumption that both Σ and the upper part of $\partial\mathcal{B}(c, R)$ are graphs of real functions u and h, respectively; we use the same notation as in [1]. If we assume that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(0, R)$ is strictly convex, there is a smallest number $\alpha = \alpha(R)$ such that

$$\partial\mathcal{B}_\alpha \equiv \partial\mathcal{B}(0, R) \cap \{x : x_3 > \alpha(R)\}$$

can be written as the graph of a real function $\overline{h} : B(\alpha) \to \mathbb{R}$, where $B(\alpha)$ is the projection of $\partial\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ onto the x'-plane. We assume that there is another number $h_0(R) > \alpha(R)$, such that

$$vol\ (\mathcal{B}(0, R) \cap \{x : x_3 > h_0(R)\}) = \frac{1}{3}\ vol\ (\mathcal{B})$$

and define $B(h_0) := \{x' \in B(\alpha) : \overline{h}(x') > h_0\}$, $C(h_0) := \partial B(h_0)$.
   Then, we can define the function $h : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(x') := \begin{cases} \overline{h}(x'), & x' \in B(h_0) \\ h_0, & x' \in \Omega \setminus \overline{B(h_0)}. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

This function enters the variational problem as an obstacle. The surface Σ is assumed to be the graph of a real function $\overline{u} : \Omega \setminus B(h) \to \mathbb{R}$ where $B(h) \subseteq B(h_0)$ is the projection of the dry part of $\partial\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ into the x'-plane, which means that $\Gamma := \text{graph } h(\gamma)$, is the contact line where $h(x') = \overline{u}(x')$, $x' \in \gamma$, holds. In order to work with functions that are defined on the whole domain Ω, we set

$$u(x') := \begin{cases} \overline{u}(x'), & x' \in \Omega \setminus \overline{B(h)} \\ \overline{h}(x'), & x' \in B(h). \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

With these quantities, the energy (1) is of the form

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) = \sigma \int_\Omega \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} + \sigma \int_{B(h_0) \cap \{u>h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2}\ dx' - \sigma \int_{B(h_0)} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2}\ dx'$$

$$+\kappa_0 \left\{ |\partial\mathcal{B}| + \int_{\mathcal{B}(h_0) \cap \{u>h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2}\ dx' - \int_{B(h_0)} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2}\ dx' \right\}$$

$$+\kappa \int_{\partial\Omega} u\ d\sigma + \frac{\rho g}{2} \int_\Omega u^2\ dx' - (\rho - \rho_0)\ g \int_{\mathcal{B}(c, R)} x_3\ dx \tag{9}$$

where h and h_0 depend on c and R. The first integral is defined for $u \in BV(\Omega)$, which means

$$\int_\Omega \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} := \sup \left\{ \int_\Omega g_3 + u \left(\frac{\partial g_1}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial g_2}{\partial x_3} \right) dx' : \right.$$

$$\left. g = (g_1, g_2, g_3) \in C_c^1\ (\Omega; \mathbb{R}^3),\ \|\ g\ \|_{C^0(\Omega)} \le 1 \right\}.$$

If u is a smooth function with $u > h_0$, the first three integrals equal $\int_{\Omega \cap \{u>h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} dx'$ and this is the area of the capillary surface; the quantities in brackets equal the area of the wetted part $\Sigma_\mathcal{B}$ of $\partial\mathcal{B}(c, R)$. We look for minimizers in the class

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ (c, R; u) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times SO(3) \times BV(\Omega) : \mathcal{B}(c, R) \subseteq G; \right.$$

$$\left. \int_\Omega u(x')\ dx' = V_0 + vol(\mathcal{B}),\ u(x') \ge h(x')\ \text{a.e. in}\ \Omega \right\}. \tag{10}$$

In this setup, we can calculate the first variation of $\mathcal{F}$; variations of u lead to the Euler–Lagrange equations

$$\sigma \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}}\right) = \rho g u + \lambda \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \overline{B(h)} \tag{11}$$

and the boundary conditions

$$\frac{Du \cdot n}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}} = -\frac{\kappa}{\sigma} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \tag{12}$$

$$\frac{1 + Du \cdot Dh}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2} \cdot \sqrt{1+|Dh|^2}} = -\frac{\kappa_0}{\sigma} \quad \text{on } \gamma. \tag{13}$$

Remark 3.1 For the proof of (13), we assume that u is smooth up to the contact line, and therefore the surface energy and the adhesion energy can be written in the form

$$I_1(u) + I_2(u) = \sigma \int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \sqrt{1+|Du|^2} \, dx' + \kappa_0 \int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \sqrt{1+|Dh|^2} \, dx'.$$

we consider only these two integrals because the rest of the energy terms will not be affected by the variations that determine the contact angle. For the contact line $\Gamma = \{(x', x_3) \in \partial \mathcal{B}(c, R) : x_3 = u(x')\}$, we have $u(x') = h(x') \; \forall x' \in \gamma$, and hence the normal to γ is

$$n(x_0') = -\frac{D(u - h)(x_0')}{|D(u - h)(x_0')|}.$$

Curves that lie in a neighborhood of γ can be described as $\gamma_\delta = \{x' \in \Omega : x' = x_0' + \delta n(x_0'), \, x_0 \in \gamma\}$. A variation $u(x') + \varepsilon \varphi(x')$ of u meets $\partial \mathcal{B}(c, R)$ in some curve near Γ, and it is given by $u(x') + \varepsilon \varphi(x') = h(x') \; \forall x' \in \gamma_\delta$, where $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon, x_0')$ will be determined by $u(x_0' + \delta(\varepsilon, x_0') n(x_0')) + \varepsilon\varphi(x_0' + \delta(\varepsilon, x_0') n(x_0')) = h(x_0' + \delta(\varepsilon, x_0') n(x_0'))$ which leads to

$$u(x_0') + \delta(\varepsilon, x_0') Du(x_0') \cdot n(x_0') + \varepsilon\varphi(x_0') = h(x_0') + \delta(\varepsilon, x_0') Dh(x_0') \cdot n(x_0') + o(\varepsilon)$$

for $|\varepsilon|$ small; therefore, we get

$$\delta(\varepsilon, x_0') = -\frac{\varepsilon \cdot \varphi(x_0')}{D(u - h)(x_0') \cdot n(x_0')}.$$

The first variation of I_1 is

$$\delta I_1(u, \varphi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \left\{ \int\limits_{\{u + \varepsilon\varphi > h\}} \sqrt{1+|D(u + \varepsilon\varphi)|^2} \, dx' - \int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \sqrt{1+|Du|^2} \, dx' \right\}$$

with

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \sqrt{1+|D(u + \varepsilon\varphi)|^2} - \sqrt{1+|Du|^2} \, dx' \longrightarrow \int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \frac{Du \cdot D\varphi}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}} \, dx'$$

$$= -\int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \operatorname{div}\left(\frac{Du}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}}\right) \varphi \, dx' + \oint\limits_{\gamma} \frac{Du \cdot n}{\sqrt{1+|Du|^2}} \varphi \, ds$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\int\limits_{\{u + \varepsilon\varphi > h\}} - \int\limits_{\{u > h\}} \right) \sqrt{1 + |D(u + \varepsilon\varphi)|^2} \, dx'$$

$$= \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \oint_\gamma \int_0^{\delta(\varepsilon, x_0')} \sqrt{1 + |D(u + \varepsilon\varphi)(x_0' + tn(x_0'))|^2} \, dt \, ds$$

$$\longrightarrow \oint_\gamma \sqrt{1 + |D(u + \varepsilon\varphi)(x_0' + \delta(\varepsilon, x_0') n(x_0'))|^2}\Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \cdot \delta'(\varepsilon, x_0')|_{\varepsilon=0} ds$$

$$= \oint_\gamma \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} \cdot \left(\frac{-\varphi}{D(u-h) \cdot n} \right) ds.$$

In the same way, we get

$$\delta I_2(u, \varphi) = \kappa_0 \oint_\gamma \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} \cdot \left(\frac{-\varphi}{D(u-h) \cdot n} \right) ds.$$

Finally

$$\sigma \oint_\gamma \frac{Du \cdot n}{\sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}} \cdot \varphi \, ds + \sigma \oint_\gamma \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} \cdot \left(-\frac{\varphi}{D(u-h) \cdot n} \right) ds$$

$$+ \kappa_0 \oint_\gamma \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} \cdot \left(-\frac{\varphi}{D(u-h) \cdot n} \right) ds = 0$$

for all $\varphi \in C^0(\gamma)$ gives the equation for the contact angle:

$$\sigma \left\{ \frac{Du \cdot n}{\sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}} - \frac{\sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}}{D(u-h) \cdot n} \right\} + \kappa_0 \frac{-\sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2}}{D(u-h) \cdot n} = 0$$

which implies

$$\sigma \left\{ -|Du|^2 + Du \cdot Dh + 1 - |Du|^2 \right\} + \kappa_0 \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} = 0$$

and thus

$$\frac{(Du, -1)}{\sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}} \cdot \frac{(Dh, -1)}{\sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2}} = -\frac{\kappa_0}{\sigma}$$

which means that $-\frac{\kappa_0}{\sigma} = \cos\vartheta$ gives the contact angle between the capillary surface and the floating body.

The contact angle from (13) is restricted to some interval $[0, \vartheta_0]$ with $\vartheta_0 < \pi$. This means that the tangent of graph u ranges between being parallel to the tangent of graph h (because of $u \geq h$) and pointing in the x_3-direction (because Σ is a graph). Therefore, κ_0 must be restricted, too:

$$-\frac{\kappa_0}{\sigma} \equiv \cos\alpha_0 \geq -\frac{|Dh(R; x')|}{\sqrt{1 + |Dh(R; x')|^2}} \quad \forall \, x' \in B(h_0), \ R \in SO(3); \quad (14)$$

with this condition on the data, we can perform variations $T(x) = e + d \wedge x$ of the position and orientation of $\mathcal{B}(c, R)$, that is of $h(c, R; x')$, and get from [1] Theorem 3.2 the equilibrium condition

$$\oint_{\Gamma} E \cdot N \, ds + pg \int_{\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}} - E \cdot N_{\mathcal{B}} \, x_3 \, d\sigma - \rho_0 g \ (e + d \wedge x_s)_3 \ vol(\mathcal{B}) = 0 \qquad (15)$$

with $E \cdot N$, the component of the variation E that is normal to the contact line Γ and tangent to graph (u), $N_{\mathcal{B}}$ the normal $\partial \mathcal{B}$ and x_s the center of gravity of $\mathcal{B}(c, R)$.

Theorem 3.2 *For $G, h = h(c, R)$, and $\sigma, \rho_0, \rho, \kappa_0, \kappa$ as above with $\sigma > |\kappa|$ the variational problem*

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) \to \min \quad in \ \mathcal{C} \qquad (16)$$

has a solution $(c_0, R_0; u_0) \in \mathcal{C}$.

Proof **(i)** $\mathcal{F}(c, R; u)$ is bounded from below on $\mathcal{C}$, because $\kappa \int_{\partial G} u \, d\sigma$ can be estimated by Emmer's Lemma (3) and the condition on κ. As $|\partial \mathcal{B}|$ is finite, the adhesion term $\kappa_0 \{ |\partial \mathcal{B}| - \int_{B(h_0) \cap \{u > h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} \, dx' + \int_{B(h_0)} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} \, dx' \}$ can be estimated for any κ_0.

(ii) Any minimizing sequence $\{(c_n, R_n; u_n)\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{F}(c_n, R_n; u_n)$ $= m_0 := \inf\{\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) : (c, R; u) \in \mathcal{C}\}$. It is bounded: $|c_n| + |R_n| + ||u_n||_{BV(\Omega)} \leq C \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. This is known for $\mathcal{E}(c, R; u)$; the adhesion energy can be treated as in **(i)**.

(iii) A sequence $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ that is bounded in $BV(\Omega)$ has a subsequence which converges in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then, $\mathcal{F}$ is lower semi-continuous for a minimizing sequence $\{(c_n, R_n; u_n)\}$ with $u_n \to u_0$ in $L^1(\Omega)$, $n \to \infty$, and this proves the existence of a minimizer. $\quad \square$

Remark 3.3 Also in this setup, the floating body can touch the wall of the container. But as we are working with real functions u that satisfy $u \geq h_0$ on $\partial \Omega$ and a possible point of contact lies below $\{x_3 = h_0\}$ it does not affect u at all. Additional considerations in Emmer's Lemma are therefore not necessary.

4 Boundedness, regularity, and geometrical properties of the solution

We first prove that a minimizer u to the variational problem (16) is essentially bounded. In order to show regularity of the solutions, we have to make sure that u does not touch the obstacle h_0, that is, $u(x') > h_0$ a.e. in $\Omega_0 := \Omega \setminus \overline{B(h_0)}$, because then the usual variations of u lie in $\mathcal{C}$, and therefore, the standard methods from regularity theory for the mean curvature equation apply. Finally we show that the set $\{x' \in \Omega : u(x') = h(x')\}$ is simply connected.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $(c, R; u)$ be a solution to the variational problem*

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) \to \min \quad in \ \mathcal{C}. \qquad (17)$$

Then, there exists a constant C, such that

$$u(x') \leq C \ a.e. \ in \ \Omega.$$

Proof For $\kappa = \kappa_0 = 0$, the result was proved in [1], Lemma 5.1 by using the comparison function

$$v_{t,\varepsilon}(x') = \begin{cases} \min\left(u(x'), t\right) + \varepsilon & \text{for } x' \in \{u > h\} \\ u(x') & \text{for } x' \in \Omega \setminus \{u > h\}, \end{cases}$$

where ε was chosen to be

$$\varepsilon = \frac{1}{|\{u > h\}|} \int_{A(t)} u - t \, dx', \quad A(t) := \{x' \in \Omega \colon u(x') > t\}.$$

Because of this $v_{t,\varepsilon}$ satisfies the volume constraint and therefore belongs to $\mathcal{C}$. This implies

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) \leq \mathcal{F}\left(c, R; v_{t,\varepsilon}\right), \tag{18}$$

in particular for large values of t, and from this inequality it was deduced that there is a $t^* > 0$ such that the measure of $A(t^*)$ vanishes, which means that u is essentially bounded.

The adhesion energy of the body $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$\kappa_0 \left\{ |\partial \mathcal{B}| + \int_{B(h_0) \cap \{u > h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} \, dx' - \int_{B(h_0)} \sqrt{1 + |Dh|^2} \, dx' \right\},$$

and this quantity remains unchanged if we replace u by $v_{t,\varepsilon}$. Hence, this term does not affect inequality (18).

To control the adhesion energy of the walls of the container, we have to compare $\kappa \int_{\partial\Omega} u \, d\sigma$ and $\kappa \int_{\partial\Omega} v_{t,\varepsilon} \, d\sigma$. Then, we get

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} v_{t,\varepsilon} \, d\sigma = \int_{\partial\Omega \setminus \overline{\{u > h_0\}}} v_{t,\varepsilon} \, d\sigma + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\}} v_{t,\varepsilon} \, d\sigma$$

$$= \int_{\partial\Omega \setminus \overline{\{u > h_0\}}} u \, d\sigma + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\}} \min(u, t) + \varepsilon \, d\sigma$$

$$= \int_{\partial\Omega \setminus \overline{\{u > h_0\}}} u \, d\sigma + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\} \cap A(t)} t + \varepsilon \, d\sigma + \int_{[\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\}] \setminus A(t)} u + \varepsilon \, d\sigma.$$

Recalling the choice of ε, we obtain:

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} u \, d\sigma - \int_{\partial\Omega} v_{t,\varepsilon} \, d\sigma = -\varepsilon \left[|\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\} \cap A(t)| \right.$$

$$+ |[\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\}] \setminus A(t)| \left. \right] + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\} \cap A(t)} u - t \, d\sigma$$

$$= -\frac{|\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\}|}{|\{u > h\}|} \int_{A(t)} u - t \, dx' + \int_{\partial\Omega \cap A(t)} u - t \, d\sigma.$$

We now apply Emmer's lemma to the second term and get

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} u \, d\sigma - \int_{\partial\Omega} v_{t,\varepsilon} \, d\sigma \geq -\frac{|\partial\Omega \cap \{u > h_0\}|}{|\{u > h\}|} \int_{A(t)} u - t \, dx'$$

$$- \sqrt{1 + L^2} \int_{A(t)} |Du| - C \int_{A(t)} (u - t) \, dx'.$$

If we use this inequality in (18) and proceed with the other terms as in the proof of Lemma 5.1 from [1], we arrive at the same inequality (33) from [1], only with a different constant. The rest of the proof follows then again from [3], pp. 211–213. □

Lemma 4.2 *Let $(c, R; u)$ be a solution to the variational problem*

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) \rightarrow \min \quad \text{in } \mathcal{C}. \tag{19}$$

For the coefficients in the energy, we assume

$$|\kappa|, |\kappa_0| < \sigma \ll \rho g$$

in case κ or κ_0 are negative. Then, there holds

$$u(x') > h_0 \quad \text{a.e. on } \Omega_0.$$

Proof For κ and $\kappa_0 \geq 0$ the proof from [1], Lemma 5.2, applies because if the graph of u is cutoff at some height t, the parts of $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial\mathcal{B}$ that are wetted according to the function $\min(u, t)$ have smaller area than before and hence the adhesion energy decreases because of $\kappa, \kappa_0 \geq 0$. If κ or κ_0 is negative, we therefore cut off u only locally such that the adhesion energy is not affected. As this cannot be done in such a way that the area of u decreases, we must compensate a possible increase in the surface energy by an appropriate change in the gravitational energy. And this can be achieved if $\sigma/\rho g$ is sufficiently small. We now assume the proposition of the lemma not to be true, which means that there is a set $A \subseteq \Omega_0$ of positive measure such that $u(x') = h_0 \, \forall\, x' \in A$. As in [1], we distinguish several cases.

  (i) There is a $\delta > 0$, such that

$$u(x') > h_0 + \delta$$

for all x' of some subset of $\partial\Omega$ that has positive measure. Then, the boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}\left(\dfrac{Dw}{\sqrt{1 + |Dw|^2}}\right) = 0 \ \text{ in } \ \Omega_0 \\ w = h_0 \ \text{ on } \ C(h_0), \ w = \min(u, h_0 + \delta) \ \text{ on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

admits a unique regular solution w_δ, if δ is small enough. This solution satisfies the strong maximum principle

$$h_0 < w_\delta(x') < h_0 + \delta \forall\, x' \in \Omega_0,$$

and therefore,

$$u_\delta := \min(u, w_\delta)$$

satisfies $u_\delta(x') > h_0$, a.e., on Ω_0. Because w_δ minimizes the area locally we have

$$\int_{\{u < w_\delta\}} \sqrt{1 + |Du_\delta|^2} \, dx < \int_{\{u < w_\delta\}} \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}.$$

We now change u_δ such that it includes the same volume as u and hence belongs to $\mathcal{C}$. Let s be a real number such that

$$\int_{A(s)} u(x') - s \, dx' = 2 \cdot V_\delta,$$

where $V_\delta := \int_{\{u < w_\delta\}} w_\delta - u \, dx'$.

Then, we choose $\varphi \in C_c^1(A(s))$ such that $\int_{A(s)} \varphi(x')\,dx' = 1$. We have $u_{\delta,t}(x') \equiv u_\delta(x') - t\varphi(x') = u(x')$ for all $x' \in \partial\Omega \cup C(h)$, and the adhesion energy remains the same when we consider $u - t\varphi$ instead of u. With $t = V_\delta$ we have $\int_\Omega u_\delta - t\varphi\,dx' = \int_\Omega u\,dx'$, and for the area we get

$$\int_{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(u - t\varphi)|^2}\,dx'$$

$$= \int_{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}\,dx' - t \int_{A(t)} \frac{Du \cdot D\varphi}{\sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}}\,dx' + O\left(t^2\right)$$

hence,

$$\int_{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(u - t\varphi)|^2}\,dx' \leq \int_{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}} \sqrt{1 + |Du|^2}\,dx' + V_\delta \int_{A(s)} |D\varphi|.$$

The change in the gravitational energy is, up to the constant $\frac{\rho g}{2}$:

$$\int_{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}} u^2 - h^2\,dx' - \int_{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}} (u - t\varphi)^2 - h^2\,dx'$$

$$= \int_{A(s)} u^2 - (u - t\varphi)^2\,dx' + \int_{\Omega_0 \cap \{u < w_\delta\}} u^2 - w_\delta^2\,dx'.$$

We have

$$\int_{\Omega_0 \cap \{u < w_\delta\}} u^2 - w_\delta^2\,dx' = \int_{\Omega_0 \cap \{u < w_\delta\}} (u + w_\delta)(u - w_\delta)\,dx'$$

$$\geq \min_{\Omega_0 \cap \{u < w_\delta\}} (u + w_\delta) \cdot \int_{\Omega_0 \cap \{u < w_\delta\}} u - w_\delta\,dx' \geq -2h_0\,V_\delta,$$

and in the same way

$$\int_{A(s)} u^2 - (u - t\varphi)^2\,dx' \geq 2s \cdot V_\delta,$$

such that we get for the total energy

$$\mathcal{F}(R, c; u) - \mathcal{F}\left(R, c; u_{\delta,t}\right) \geq -\sigma \cdot V_\delta \cdot C + \frac{\rho g}{2}(2s - 2h_0)V_\delta > 0,$$

and this is a contradiction to u being a minimizer of $\mathcal{F}$.

(ii) There is a $\delta > 0$, such that

$$u(x') > h_0 + \delta$$

for all x' of some subset of $C(h_0)$ that has positive measure. As in [1], Lemma 5.2, we construct a function w_δ that minimizes $\int_{\Omega_0} \sqrt{1 + |Dw|^2}$ among all functions in $BV(\Omega_0)$ with boundary data $w = u$ on $\partial\Omega_0$. We then correct the comparison function such that it satisfies the volume constraint; this can be done as in **(i)** above.

(iii) If $u(x') > h_0 + \delta$ holds on subsets of positive measure of $C(h_0)$ and of $\partial\Omega$, then we can argue as in **(i)**. Therefore, it remains to consider the case that $u(x') = h_0$ on all of $C(h_0)$ and $\partial\Omega$.

(iv) Now assume that $u(x') \equiv h_0$ on $\Omega_0 \cup C(h_0) \cup \partial\Omega$. Then, u cannot be minimizing because the function $u_{\alpha,t}$ has less energy, where $u_{\alpha,t}$ is constructed in the following way. We choose $\alpha \ll 1$ and set $u_\alpha := \min(u, h_0 + \alpha)$. Then, u_α is not an element of $\mathcal{C}$ because its volume exceeds that of u by $V_\alpha = \int_{\{u_\alpha > u\}} u_\alpha - u \, dx'$. Hence, we correct u_α as in part **(i)** of the proof, and then, $\mathcal{F}(u_{\alpha,t}) < \mathcal{F}(u)$ follows as before.

(v) If $u = h_0$ on $C(h_0) \cup \partial\Omega$, but not identically h_0 on Ω_0, we can use the fact that u is a minimizer with respect to variations that have compact support in Ω_0. Then, the adhesion energy is not affected, and we can therefore proceed as in [1], Lemma 5.2, (iv). □

Lemma 4.3 *Let $(c, R; u)$ be a solution of*

$$\mathcal{F}(c, R; u) \to \min \text{ in } \mathcal{C}. \tag{20}$$

(i) *If $\kappa_0 \leq 0$, and if $\mathcal{B}$ is not completely wetted, that is, the set $\{x' \in B(h_0) : u(x') = h(x')\}$ has positive measure, then u is regular: $u \in C^{2+\alpha}(\Omega \cap \{u > h\}) \cap C^{1+\alpha}(\overline{\Omega \cap \{u > h\}})$. Furthermore, u meets the body $\mathcal{B}$ under a constant angle ϑ with $\cos \vartheta = -\kappa_0/\sigma$, and the boundary γ of $\Omega \cap \{u > h\}$ is locally a $C^{1+\alpha}$-curve.*
(ii) *If $|Du(x')| < \infty$ for all $x' \in \gamma$ then the set $\Omega \cap \{u > h\}$ is connected, or equivalently the non-wetted part of $\partial\mathcal{B}$ is simply connected.*

Proof The condition on the coincidence set implies that the capillary surface meets the body $\mathcal{B}$. Then, the boundary γ is locally a $C^{1+\alpha}$-curve according to the regularity theorem of Taylor [5]. This result is proved for any κ_0 with $|\kappa_0| < \sigma$ in the context of geometric measure theory, and hence the set E that is occupied by the fluid may be any Caccioppoli set E and not necessarily the subgraph $U := \{x \in G : h(x') < x_3 < u(x')\}$ of some function $u \in BV(\Omega)$.

We now restrict the adhesion coefficient κ_0 in such a way that the corresponding contact angle ϑ with $\cos \vartheta = -\kappa_0/\sigma$ can be realized in the class of graphs. If we have a priori no knowledge about the curve Γ in which $\partial\mathcal{B}$ and Σ meet, the vertex of $\partial\mathcal{B}$ might be a point of Γ and consequently the normal to $\partial\mathcal{B}$ at that element of Γ points into the x_3-direction. Then, Σ can only be a graph if $\kappa_0 \leq 0$ because then ϑ ranges between 0 and $\pi/2$. If it is known that the normal vectors in points of Γ make an angle φ with the x_3-direction that is larger or equal to some $\varphi_0 > 0$ then one can allow for a contact angle between 0 and $\frac{\pi}{2} + \varphi_0$, and consequently the lemma holds also for the corresponding positive values of κ_0.

If **(ii)** were not true, there would be an open set $M \subset\subset B(h_0)$ with $u(x') > h(x') \, \forall \, x' \in M$ and $u(x') = h(x') \, \forall \, x \in \partial M$. Then, there would exist at least one point $x'_0 \in M$ such that

$$h(x'_0) \leq h(x') \, \forall \, x' \in \overline{M}. \tag{*}$$

Clearly x'_0 must lie on the boundary ∂M, because for $x'_0 \in M$ there would be some point $x'_1 = x'_0 - \varepsilon \, Dh(x'_0)$ which lies in M for ε small enough and for which $h(x'_1) < h(x'_0)$ holds. This follows from the fact that h is strictly concave and therefore $Dh(x'_0) \neq 0$. In such a point $x'_0 \in \partial M \equiv \gamma$ the tangent vector τ to the curve $\Gamma = \text{graph } h(\gamma)$ satisfies $\tau_3(x'_0) = 0$. Let $x' = x'(t), |t| < \varepsilon$, be a representation of the curve γ with $x'(0) = x'_0$. Then, $x(t) = (x'(t), h(x'(t))), |t| < \varepsilon$, describes Γ locally around $x_0 = (x'_0, h(x'_0))$. Because of (*) we have in particular

$$h(x'(0)) \leq h(x'(t)) \, \forall \, t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon),$$

hence

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} h\left(x'(t)\right)_{|t=0} = Dh\left(x'_0\right) \cdot \frac{d}{dt} x'(t)_{|t=0}$$
$$\equiv \tau_\varepsilon(x_0).$$

Now let $n = n(x'_0)$ be the direction perpendicular to γ and pointing into M. Then, $h_n(x'_0) := Dh(x'_0) \cdot n(x'_0) > 0$ and because of $u_\tau(x'_0) = h_\tau(x'_0) = 0$ we have

$$u_n\left(x'_0\right) = -\frac{1}{h_n(x'_0)} < 0.$$

This is, however, a contradiction to $u(x') > h(x') \ \forall x' \in M$, and the lemma is proved. □

References

1. Bemelmans, J., Galdi, G.P., Kyed, M.: Fluid flows around floating bodies, I: the hydrostatic case. J. Math. Fluid Mech. **14**, 751–770 (2012)
2. Emmer, M.: Esistenza, unicità e regolarità nelle superfici de equilibrio nei capillar. Ann. Univ. Ferrara Sez. VII (N.S.) **18**, 79–94 (1973)
3. Massari, U., Miranda, M.: Minimal Surfaces of Codimension One. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984)
4. McCuan, J.: A variational formula for floating bodies. Pac. J. Math. **231**(1), 167–191 (2007)
5. Taylor, J.: Boundary regularity for solutions to various capillarity and free boundary problems. Commun. Partial Differ. Equ. **2**, 323–357 (1977)

Reports des Instituts für Mathematik der RWTH Aachen

[1] Bemelmans J.: *Die Vorlesung "Figur und Rotation der Himmelskörper" von F. Hausdorff, WS 1895/96,* Universität Leipzig, S 20, März 2005

[2] Wagner A.: *Optimal Shape Problems for Eigenvalues,* S 30, März 2005

[3] Hildebrandt S. and von der Mosel H.: *Conformal representation of surfaces, and Plateau's problem for Cartan functionals,* S 43, Juli 2005

[4] Reiter P.: *All curves in a C^1-neighbourhood of a given embedded curve are isotopic,* S 8, Oktober 2005

[5] Maier-Paape S., Mischaikow K. and Wanner T.: *Structure of the Attractor of the Cahn-Hilliard Equation,* S 68, Oktober 2005

[6] Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *On rectifiable curves with L^p bounds on global curvature: Self–avoidance, regularity, and minimizing knots,* S 35, Dezember 2005

[7] Bandle C. and Wagner A.: *Optimization problems for weighted Sobolev constants,* S 23, Dezember 2005

[8] Bandle C. and Wagner A.: *Sobolev Constants in Disconnected Domains,* S 9, Januar 2006

[9] McKenna P.J. and Reichel W.: *A priori bounds for semilinear equations and a new class of critical exponents for Lipschitz domains,* S 25, Mai 2006

[10] Bandle C., Below J. v. and Reichel W.: *Positivity and anti-maximum principles for elliptic operators with mixed boundary conditions,* S 32, Mai 2006

[11] Kyed M.: *Travelling Wave Solutions of the Heat Equation in Three Dimensional Cylinders with Non-Linear Dissipation on the Boundary,* S 24, Juli 2006

[12] Blatt S. and Reiter P.: *Does Finite Knot Energy Lead To Differentiability?,* S 30, September 2006

[13] Grunau H.-C., Ould Ahmedou M. and Reichel W.: *The Paneitz equation in hyperbolic space,* S 22, September 2006

[14] Maier-Paape S., Miller U.,Mischaikow K. and Wanner T.: *Rigorous Numerics for the Cahn-Hilliard Equation on the Unit Square,* S 67, Oktober 2006

[15] von der Mosel H. and Winklmann S.: *On weakly harmonic maps from Finsler to Riemannian manifolds,* S 43, November 2006

[16] Hildebrandt S., Maddocks J. H. and von der Mosel H.: *Obstacle problems for elastic rods,* S 21, Januar 2007

[17] Galdi P. Giovanni: *Some Mathematical Properties of the Steady-State Navier-Stokes Problem Past a Three-Dimensional Obstacle,* S 86, Mai 2007

[18] Winter N.: *$W^{2,p}$ and $W^{1,p}$-estimates at the boundary for solutions of fully nonlinear, uniformly elliptic equations,* S 34, Juli 2007

[19] Strzelecki P., Szumańska M. and von der Mosel H.: *A geometric curvature double integral of Menger type for space curves,* S 20, September 2007

[20] Bandle C. and Wagner A.: *Optimization problems for an energy functional with mass constraint revisited,* S 20, März 2008

[21] Reiter P., Felix D., von der Mosel H. and Alt W.: *Energetics and dynamics of global integrals modeling interaction between stiff filaments,* S 38, April 2008

[22] Belloni M. and Wagner A.: *The ∞ Eigenvalue Problem from a Variational Point of View,* S 18, Mai 2008

[23] Galdi P. Giovanni and Kyed M.: *Steady Flow of a Navier-Stokes Liquid Past an Elastic Body,* S 28, Mai 2008

[24] Hildebrandt S. and von der Mosel H.: *Conformal mapping of multiply connected Riemann domains by a variational approach,* S 50, Juli 2008

[25] Blatt S.: *On the Blow-Up Limit for the Radially Symmetric Willmore Flow,* S 23, Juli 2008

[26] Müller F. and Schikorra A.: *Boundary regularity via Uhlenbeck-Rivière decomposition,* S 20, Juli 2008

[27] Blatt S.: *A Lower Bound for the Gromov Distortion of Knotted Submanifolds,* S 26, August 2008

[28] Blatt S.: *Chord-Arc Constants for Submanifolds of Arbitrary Codimension,* S 35, November 2008

[29] Strzelecki P., Szumańska M. and von der Mosel H.: *Regularizing and self-avoidance effects of integral Menger curvature,* S 33, November 2008

[30] Gerlach H. and von der Mosel H.: *Yin-Yang-Kurven lösen ein Packungsproblem,* S 4, Dezember 2008

[31] Buttazzo G. and Wagner A.: *On some Rescaled Shape Optimization Problems,* S 17, März 2009

[32] Gerlach H. and von der Mosel H.: *What are the longest ropes on the unit sphere?,* S 50, März 2009

[33] Schikorra A.: *A Remark on Gauge Transformations and the Moving Frame Method,* S 17, Juni 2009

[34] Blatt S.: *Note on Continuously Differentiable Isotopies,* S 18, August 2009

[35] Knappmann K.: *Die zweite Gebietsvariation für die gebeulte Platte,* S 29, Oktober 2009

[36] Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *Integral Menger curvature for surfaces,* S 64, November 2009

[37] Maier-Paape S., Imkeller P.: *Investor Psychology Models,* S 30, November 2009

[38] Scholtes S.: *Elastic Catenoids,* S 23, Dezember 2009

[39] Bemelmans J., Galdi G.P. and Kyed M.: *On the Steady Motion of an Elastic Body Moving Freely in a Navier-Stokes Liquid under the Action of a Constant Body Force,* S 67, Dezember 2009

[40] Galdi G.P. and Kyed M.: *Steady-State Navier-Stokes Flows Past a Rotating Body: Leray Solutions are Physically Reasonable,* S 25, Dezember 2009

[41] Galdi G.P. and Kyed M.: *Steady-State Navier-Stokes Flows Around a Rotating Body: Leray Solutions are Physically Reasonable*, S 15, Dezember 2009

[42] Bemelmans J., Galdi G.P. and Kyed M.: *Fluid Flows Around Floating Bodies, I: The Hydrostatic Case*, S 19, Dezember 2009

[43] Schikorra A.: *Regularity of $n/2$-harmonic maps into spheres*, S 91, März 2010

[44] Gerlach H. and von der Mosel H.: *On sphere-filling ropes*, S 15, März 2010

[45] Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *Tangent-point self-avoidance energies for curves*, S 23, Juni 2010

[46] Schikorra A.: *Regularity of $n/2$-harmonic maps into spheres (short)*, S 36, Juni 2010

[47] Schikorra A.: *A Note on Regularity for the n-dimensional H-System assuming logarithmic higher Integrability*, S 30, Dezember 2010

[48] Bemelmans J.: *Über die Integration der Parabel, die Entdeckung der Kegelschnitte und die Parabel als literarische Figur*, S 14, Januar 2011

[49] Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *Tangent-point repulsive potentials for a class of non-smooth m-dimensional sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Part I: Smoothing and self-avoidance effects*, S 47, Februar 2011

[50] Scholtes S.: *For which positive p is the integral Menger curvature $\mathcal{M}_p$ finite for all simple polygons*, S 9, November 2011

[51] Bemelmans J., Galdi G. P. and Kyed M.: *Fluid Flows Around Rigid Bodies, I: The Hydrostatic Case*, S 32, Dezember 2011

[52] Scholtes S.: *Tangency properties of sets with finite geometric curvature energies*, S 39, Februar 2012

[53] Scholtes S.: *A characterisation of inner product spaces by the maximal circumradius of spheres*, S 8, Februar 2012

[54] Kolasiński S., Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *Characterizing $W^{2,p}$ submanifolds by p-integrability of global curvatures*, S 44, März 2012

[55] Bemelmans J., Galdi G.P. and Kyed M.: *On the Steady Motion of a Coupled System Solid-Liquid*, S 95, April 2012

[56] Deipenbrock M.: *On the existence of a drag minimizing shape in an incompressible fluid*, S 23, Mai 2012

[57] Strzelecki P., Szumańska M. and von der Mosel H.: *On some knot energies involving Menger curvature*, S 30, September 2012

[58] Overath P. and von der Mosel H.: *Plateau's problem in Finsler 3-space*, S 42, September 2012

[59] Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *Menger curvature as a knot energy*, S 41, Januar 2013

[60] Strzelecki P. and von der Mosel H.: *How averaged Menger curvatures control regularity and topology of curves and surfaces*, S 13, Februar 2013

[61] Hafizogullari Y., Maier-Paape S. and Platen A.: *Empirical Study of the 1-2-3 Trend Indicator*, S 25, April 2013

[62] Scholtes S.: *On hypersurfaces of positive reach, alternating Steiner formulæ and Hadwiger's Problem*, S 22, April 2013

[63] Bemelmans J., Galdi G.P. and Kyed M.: *Capillary surfaces and floating bodies*, S 16, Mai 2013