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Abstract. In this paper we use a surface evolution model for construction of minimal surfaces with given boundary curves. The initial surface topologically equivalent to a desired minimal surface is evolved by mean curvature flow. To improve the quality of the mesh we propose an area-oriented tangential redistribution of the grid points. We derive the numerical scheme and present several numerical experiments.

1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to present a surface evolution technique for computing minimal surfaces employing the mean curvature flow as an evolution model. The mean curvature flow is enriched with suitable tangential velocity in order to redistribute the mesh points along the surface. The work is based on ideas developed in the paper [21]. The area-oriented tangential redistribution for surfaces with boundary and its application for computing the minimal surfaces is new and forms the main contribution of the paper.

The mean curvature flow was originally proposed as a model for description of the evolution of the interfaces in multiphase physical models [27]. Since minimal surfaces (surfaces with zero mean curvature) are the critical points for the mean curvature flow, one can use the mean curvature flow as a tool for constructing minimal surfaces with given boundary curve(s). Such surfaces are used, e.g., in architecture [15]. The problem of finding a minimal surface with given boundary curve(s) is called the Plateau problem, named after the Belgian physicist J.A.F. Plateau [29] who made experimental studies of soap films. Algorithms based on the mean curvature flow have also been developed in the field of digital image processing because of the ”regularizing effect” due to its parabolic nature [1, 7, 20].

Two basic approaches are used for solving manifold evolution problems (including mean curvature flow of surfaces in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \)), the Lagrangian approach that evolves
the manifold directly [9, 2, 21, 11] and the Eulerian (level set) approach that, in
general, considers the \( n \)-dimensional manifold as a level set of a function of \( n + 1 \)
variables [12, 7, 30, 28]. This work follows the Lagrangian approach.

The numerical methods for solving evolution models are usually based on a
finite element method [9, 10, 2] or a finite volume method [19, 15, 21]. In this
work we deal with a finite volume method.

Various techniques for tangential redistribution of points have been developed
for curves evolving in two dimensions [14, 17, 22, 23, 3, 31, 5], three dimensions
[13, 25] or on 2D surfaces [24, 6]. A lot of work has been done for surfaces
evolving in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) [2, 16, 26]. In this paper we generalize a technique for closed
surfaces designed in [21] to surfaces with boundary.

The text of the paper is organized in several sections. In section 2 we introduce
the mathematical model being the mean curvature flow equipped with an area-
oriented tangential redistribution. In the section 3 we state a discretization of
the mathematical model by a finite volume method. In section 4 we demonstrate
the performance of the method by constructing several minimal surfaces.

2. Mathematical model

Let \( F^0 : X \to Y \) be a smooth immersion of a \( m \)-dimensional Riemannian mani-
fold \( (X,g_X) \) into \( n \)-dimensional Riemannian manifold \( (Y,g_Y) \), \( m \leq n \). The evolution
of \( X^0 = F^0(X) \) is a one-parameter family of immersions \( F : X \times [0,t_f] \to Y \).
Given a fixed point \( x \in X \), the map \( x \mapsto F(x) = F(x,.) \), is a smooth curve on \( Y \).
Let \( v^t(x) \) denote the vector tangential to the curve at the point \( F^t(x) = F(x,t) \)
(see Fig. 1), where the map \( F^t : X \to Y \) represents a selected immersion from
the whole family of immersions. The map \( v : X \times [0,t_f] \to TY \), where \( TY \) is the
tangent bundle of \( Y \), represents the velocity field of the evolution. Thus, the map
\( F \) is a solution of the equation

\[
\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} = v.
\]

The evolution equation (1) is coupled with an initial condition \( F(x,0) = F^0(x) \)

\[\text{Figure 1. Evolution of a manifold } X \text{ in a manifold } Y.\]
and, for a manifold $X$ with boundary, with a Dirichlet boundary condition
\begin{equation}
F(x,t) = F^0(x), \quad x \in \partial X, t \in [0, t_f]
\end{equation}
meaning the boundary is static. It is convenient to rewrite the velocity $v$ in the form
\begin{equation}
\partial_t F = v_N + v_T,
\end{equation}
where $v_N$ and $v_T$ are the velocities of the evolution in the normal and tangential direction to the immersed manifold $X^t = F^t(X)$ respectively (Fig. 1). Whereas the normal velocity $v_N$ has an effect on the position and the shape of the immersed manifold $X^t$, the tangential velocity $v_T$ only moves the points along $X^t$. In the discrete setting, the tangential velocity $v_T$ can be designed to control the distribution of the mesh vertices, which becomes crucial in numerical computations. An inappropriate placement of the mesh vertices can lead to unacceptable errors or even to a crash of the computation process.

The special type of the evolution model (3) is the mean curvature flow of surfaces with boundary in $\mathbb{R}^3$. That means, $X$ is a two-dimensional manifold with boundary and $Y = \mathbb{R}^3$ with standard Euclidean metric tensor $g_Y$. The position vector $F(x,t)$ satisfies the evolution model
\begin{equation}
\partial_t F = HN
\end{equation}
with $F(x,0) = F^0(x), \quad x \in X$
\begin{equation}
F(x,t) = F^0(x), \quad x \in \partial X, t \in [0, t_f]
\end{equation}
which means the flow is driven by the normal velocity $v_N = HN$, where $H(x,t)$ and $N(x,t)$ are respectively the mean curvature and the unit normal of the surface $X^t = F^t(X)$ at the point $x \in X$, see Fig. 2. The quantity $h = HN$ is the mean curvature vector. Using the formula $h = \triangle_{g_Y} F$ (see e.g. [18]) we can rewrite the model (4) to the form
\begin{equation}
\partial_t F = \triangle_{g_Y} F
\end{equation}
with $F(x,0) = F^0(x), \quad x \in X$
\begin{equation}
F(x,t) = F^0(x), \quad x \in \partial X, t \in [0, t_f].
\end{equation}
The symbol $\Delta_{g_F}$ denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator associated with the metric tensor $g_F = (F^t)^* g_Y$ induced by the immersion $F^t$, where $(F^t)^*$ denotes the pullback by $F^t$. To simplify the notation we usually omit the time index $t$ if $g_F^t$ is a subscript (as in Laplace-Beltrami operator in (5)). The mean curvature flow may be regarded as a sort of geometric heat equation. On the other hand, the mean curvature flow is not really equivalent to a heat equation, since the Laplace-Beltrami operator evolves with the surface itself.

2.1. The area-oriented tangential redistribution

In our problem only the normal velocity $v_N = HN$ is given. Thus we can enrich the model (5) with a suitable tangential velocity $v_T$ in order to control the area density (defined below) of the discretized evolving manifold.

(6) \[ \partial_t F = \Delta_{g_F} F + v_T. \]

In following we state the tangential velocity $v_T$ which strives to achieve uniform area density distribution.

On the manifold $X$ we have the metric $g_X$ and the measure $\xi$ induced by $g_X$. The metric tensor $g_F$ induces another measure $\chi_F$ on $X$. These two measures are related by the following formula

(7) \[ d\chi_F = G^t d\xi, \]

where the map $G^t$ is called the volume density of $F^t$ in general, and in case of evolving surfaces we will call it area density. The evolution of the immersion $F^t$ results in the evolution of the area density. According to [4], the map $G^t$ satisfies the following equation

(8) \[ \partial_t G = -g_Y(v_N, h) + \text{div}_{g_F} w_T) G, \]

where $w_T$ is the tangential vector field on $X$ and the operator $\text{div}_{g_F}$ represents the divergence on $X$ associated to the induced metric $g_F$. The vector field $v_T$ on $X^t \subset Y$ is obtained as $v_T = F^t w_T$, i.e. the pushforward of $w_T$ along $F^t$. In case of a manifold with static boundary, the normal component of the tangential velocity $w_T$ vanishes on the boundary, i.e.

(9) \[ g_F(w_T, \nu)|_{\partial X} = 0. \]

In [21] there are several area-oriented redistributions proposed. We use the asymptotically uniform redistribution which satisfies $\frac{G^t(x)}{A^t} \xrightarrow{t \to \infty} C$, where $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $A^t$ denotes the global area of $X$ measured by the measure $\chi_F$. Using the ideas developed in the paper [21] one gets the condition for $w_T$

(10) \[ \text{div}_{g_F} w_T = g_Y(v_N, h) - (g_Y(v_N, h))_\chi + \left( C \frac{A}{G} - 1 \right) \omega, \]

where $\langle . \rangle_\chi$ denotes the mean over $X$ with respect to the measure $\chi$. Now we assume that $w_T$ is a gradient field

(11) \[ w_T^t = \nabla_{g_F} \psi^t, \]
where $\psi^t : X \to R$ is a potential of vector field $w^t_T$. Under this assumption, we get the following equation for $\psi^t$

(12) $\triangle_{g^t} \psi = g_Y(v_N, h) - (g_Y(v_N, h))\chi + \left(\frac{CA}{G} - 1\right) \omega.$

In order to guarantee the uniqueness of $\psi^t$, the equation (12) is accompanied with an appropriate condition. In this paper we consider manifolds with a static boundary, for which (9) holds. Since velocity $w_T$ has the form (11), we have

(13) $g_F(\nabla_{g^t} \psi, \nu)|_{\partial X} = 0,$

which is a natural Neumann boundary condition for $\psi^t$. Additionally, to ensure the uniqueness of $\psi^t$, we prescribe the value $\psi^t(P) = 0$ in one selected point $P \in X$.

3. Numerical scheme

In this section we discretize the mathematical model formulated above. The section 3.1 states the cotangent scheme which is a widely used method for computing the numerical solution of the mean curvature flow. In section 3.2 we present a discretization of the tangential velocity.

3.1. Discretization of the mean curvature flow

To discretize the model (6) in the time domain, we apply a semi-implicit approach. The time derivative is approximated by a finite difference and the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the tangential velocity are taken from the previous time step. If $\tau$ is the time step, $N = t_f/\tau$ is the number of time steps, $t^n = n\tau$ and $F^n = F(\cdot, t^n)$, we obtain

(14) $\frac{F^n - F^{n-1}}{\tau} = \triangle_{F^{n-1}} F^n + v^n_T^{-1}$

for $n = 1, \ldots, N$, where the symbol $\triangle_{F^{n-1}}$ denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator from the previous time step with respect to the metric $g_{F^{n-1}}$ induced by $F^{n-1}$.

The space discretization is performed using a finite volume method. We approximate the manifold $X$ by a triangular mesh with vertices $x_i, i = 1, \ldots, n_V$. The triangulation of $X$ induces the triangulation of the evolving manifold $X^n = F^n(X)$ with vertices $F^n_i = F^n(x_i), i = 1, \ldots, n_V$. The finite volumes $V_i, i = 1, \ldots, n_V$ are constructed by the barycentric subdivision of the triangulation of $X$. To obtain the equation for an internal vertex $F^n_i \notin \partial X^n$, one integrates the formula (14) over the finite volume $V_i$. On the left-hand side we get

(15) $\int_{V_i} \frac{F^n - F^{n-1}}{\tau} d\chi_{F^{n-1}} \approx A_i^{n-1} \frac{F^n_i - F^{n-1}_i}{\tau}$

where $A_i^{n-1} = \chi_{F^{n-1}}(V_i)$ denotes the area of the finite volume $V_i$, and $F^n(x)$ was approximated by its value in the vertex $x_i$, thus $F^n(x) \approx F^n_i$. For the the
Laplace-Beltrami term on the right-hand side we have (see [19] for more details)

\[ \int_{V_i} \nabla F_n \cdot d\chi_{F_n-1} \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} \left( \cot \theta_{i,p,1}^{n-1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}^{n-1} \right) (F_{i,p}^{n-1} - F_{i}^{n-1}), \]

with \( m_i \) denoting the number of neighbouring vertices of the vertex \( F_{i}^{n} \), and where \( \theta_{i,0,1}^{n-1} = \theta_{i,m_i,1}^{n-1} \). The angles \( \theta_{i,p,1}^{n-1}, \theta_{i,p,2}^{n-1} \) are denoted in Fig. 3.

For the tangential velocity term we use the following approximation

\[ \int_{V_i} v_{T,i}^{n-1} d\chi_{F_n-1} \approx A_{i}^{n-1} v_{T,i}^{n-1} \]

where \( v_{T,i}^{n-1} \) is the tangential velocity of the vertex \( F_{i}^{n-1} \). Collecting the terms together we obtain the formula

\[ a_{i}^{n-1} F_{i}^{n} + \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} b_{i,p}^{n-1} F_{i,p} = F_{i}^{n-1} + \tau v_{T,i}^{n-1} \]

for \( n = 1, \ldots, N \) and each \( i \) such that \( F_{i}^{n} \notin \partial X^n \), and where

\[ a_{i}^{n-1} = 1 + \frac{\tau}{2A_{i}^{n-1}} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} (\cot \theta_{i,p,1}^{n-1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}^{n-1}) \]

\[ b_{i,p}^{n-1} = -\frac{\tau}{2A_{i}^{n-1}} (\cot \theta_{i,p-1,1}^{n-1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}^{n-1}) \]

for \( p = 1, \ldots, m_i \). The Dirichlet boundary condition (2) is realized trivially as

\[ F_{i}^{n} = F_{i}^{n-1}. \]

The equations (17), (18) form a system of \( nV \) linear equations for the unknowns \( F_{i}^{n}, i = 1, \ldots, nV \). The initial positions of the vertices \( F_{i}^{0} \) are given by the initial condition, i.e. \( F_{i}^{0} = F^{0}(x_i) \).
The mean curvature vector $h^{n-1}_i$ at the point $F^{n-1}_i$ is approximated using cotangent formula (16)

$$h^{n-1}_i = \frac{1}{2A^{n-1}_i} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} \left( \cot \theta^{n-1}_{i,p-1,1} + \cot \theta^{n-1}_{i,p,2} \right) \left( F^{n-1}_{i,p} - F^{n-1}_i \right).$$

Remark: For simplicity, we fix the boundary points in this paper using (18). In some cases a tangential motion along the boundary may be desirable, since it could improve the mesh quality. On the other hand, it can deform the boundary. There is no deformation in regions where the boundary curve is a line segment, however, the problems arise in regions where the boundary is curved. This is because the approximation of the tangential velocity is not purely tangential and can move the vertices slightly off the curves on which they should be situated. If the boundary has corners, they has to be treated separately because the corners should not move at all. The redistribution along the boundary can be a topic for a further research.

3.2. Discretization of the tangential velocity

In this section we propose a discretization of the equation (12) for surfaces with boundary. To simplify the notation, we omit the time index in some equations. All quantities are taken from the $(n-1)$-th time step. Applying the finite volume technique we integrate (12) over a finite volume $V_i$. The left-hand side for an internal finite volume $V_i$ ($F^n_i \notin \partial X^n$) reads

$$\int_{V_i} \triangle F^{n-1}_i \psi^{n-1} d\chi_{F^{n-1}} \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} \left( \cot \theta^{n-1}_{i,p-1,1} + \cot \theta^{n-1}_{i,p,2} \right) \left( \psi^{n-1}_{i,p} - \psi^{n-1}_i \right).$$

For a boundary finite volume $V_i$ (Fig. 4) the integration gives

$$\int_{V_i} \triangle F^{n-1}_i \psi d\chi \approx \int_{\partial V_i} g_{F^{n-1}_i} (\nabla F^{n-1}_i, \nu) dH_X = \int_{\partial V_i \cap \partial X} g_{F^{n-1}_i} (\nabla F^{n-1}_i, \nu) dH_X$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} \left[ \cot \theta_{i,p,2} (\psi_{i,p} - \psi_i) + \cot \theta_{i,p,1} (\psi_{i,p+1} - \psi_i) \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \cot \theta_{i,1,2} (\psi_{i,1} - \psi_i) + \cot \theta_{i,m_i-1,1} (\psi_{i,m_i} - \psi_i) \right]$$

$$+ \sum_{p=2}^{m_i-1} \left( \cot \theta_{i,p,2} + \cot \theta_{i,p-1,1} \right) (\psi_{i,p} - \psi_i).$$

(21)

where the symbol $\nabla F^{n-1}_i$ denotes the gradient w.r.t. the metric tensor $g_{F^{n-1}_i}$. Since the boundary of the surface is static, we have $v_N = 0$ for boundary vertices. Thus we can use the following approximation of the first term on the right-hand side in (12)

$$\int_{V_i} g_Y (v_N, h) d\chi_F \approx A_i g_Y (v_{N,i}, h_i) = \begin{cases} A_i H^2_i & \text{if } F^n_i \notin \partial X^n \\ 0 & \text{if } F^n_i \in \partial X^n \end{cases}$$

(22)
Figure 4. A boundary finite volume.

where \( H_i = h_i \cdot N_i \), where \( N_i \) denotes the normal to the surface at the point \( F_i \).

The approximation of the second term follows

\[
\int_{V_i} (g_Y(v_N, h)) \chi F \approx A_i (g_Y(v_N, h)) \chi F \approx A_i \sum_{j,F \in \partial X} H^2_j A_j.
\]

where \( A = \sum_{i=1}^{n_V} A_i \). Note that the sum in (23) runs over the internal vertices only. For a proper approximation of the last term we introduce an angular size \( \mu_i \) of a finite volume \( V_i \) and a reduced number of mesh vertices \( n_* \) as follows

\[
\mu_i = \frac{\alpha_i}{2\pi}, \quad n_*^V = \sum_{i=1}^{n_V} \mu_i.
\]

For an internal vertex we define \( \alpha_i = 2\pi \), resulting in \( \mu_i = 1 \), and, for a boundary vertex, \( \alpha_i \) is the angle between vectors \( \overrightarrow{F_i F_{i,1}} \) and \( \overrightarrow{F_i F_{i,m}} \), see Fig. 4. Now we need to approximate the area density \( G^{n-1}_i \). Since the total surface area \( A^{n-1} \) can be computed in two ways

\[
A^{n-1} = \int_X \chi F^{n-1} \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n_V} \chi F^{n-1}(V_i),
\]

\[
A^{n-1} = \int_X G(x, t^{n-1}) d\xi \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n_V} G^{n-1}_i \xi(V_i),
\]

we have \( G^{n-1}_i = \frac{\chi F^{n-1}(V_i)}{\xi(V_i)} \). We do not have any conditions imposed on the measure \( \xi \), thus we can set \( \xi(X) = \frac{1}{C} \) and

\[
\xi(V_i) = \mu_i \frac{\xi(X)}{n_*^V} = \mu_i \frac{\mu_i}{C n_*^V}.
\]
The approximation of the area density follows
\[ G_i^{n-1} = \frac{\chi(F_{n-1}(V_i))}{\xi(V_i)} = \frac{C n_i V_i}{\mu_i} A_i^{n-1} \]

Finally the approximation of the integral over the last term in (12) is given by
\[ (25) \quad \int_{V_i} \left( \frac{CA_i}{G} - 1 \right) \omega d\chi^{n-1} \approx A_i^{n-1} \left( \frac{A_i^{n-1} \mu_i}{n_i V_i A_i^{n-1}} - 1 \right) \omega. \]

Now we put the approximations (20), (21), (22), (23) and (25) together to obtain the system of equations for \( \psi_i^n \).

**Internal vertices**

\[ (26) \quad \hat{a}_i \psi_i + \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} \hat{b}_{i,p} \psi_{i,p} = H_i^2 - \frac{1}{A} \sum_{j,F_j \in \partial X} H_j^2 A_j + \left( \frac{A}{n_i V_i} - 1 \right) \omega \]

for \( i \) such that \( F_i \) is an internal vertex, where
\[ \hat{a}_i = -\frac{1}{2A_i} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} (\cot \theta_{i,p,1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}) \]
\[ \hat{b}_{i,p} = \frac{1}{2A_i} (\cot \theta_{i,p-1,1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}) \]

for \( p = 1, \ldots, m_i \), with \( \theta_{i,0,1}^{n-1} = \theta_{i,m_i,1}^{n-1} \).

**Boundary vertices**

\[ (27) \quad \hat{a}_i \psi_i + \sum_{p=1}^{m_i} \hat{b}_{i,p} \psi_{i,p} = -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{j,F_j \in \partial X} H_j^2 A_j + \left( \frac{A \mu_i}{n_i V_i A_i} - 1 \right) \omega \]

for \( i \) such that \( F_i \) is a boundary vertex, where
\[ \hat{a}_i = -\frac{1}{2A_i} \sum_{p=1}^{m_i-1} (\cot \theta_{i,p,1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}), \]
\[ \hat{b}_{i,1} = \frac{1}{2A_i} \cot \theta_{i,1,2}, \]
\[ \hat{b}_{i,p} = \frac{1}{2A_i} (\cot \theta_{i,p-1,1} + \cot \theta_{i,p,2}) \quad \text{for } p = 2, \ldots, m_i - 1, \]
\[ \hat{b}_{i,m_i} = \frac{1}{2A_i} \cot \theta_{i,m_i-1,1}. \]

To make the solution unique, we prescribe the value of \( \psi_i^n, n = 0, \ldots, N \) in one selected point, e.g. \( \psi_i^n = 0, n = 0, \ldots, N \) (in practice we modify the system (26), (27) by replacing corresponding \( i = 1 \) equation with \( \psi_1 = 0 \)).

To calculate the tangential velocity \( v_{i-1}^{n-1} \) from \( \psi_i^{n-1} \) we use the formulas stated in the paper [21].
4. Numerical experiments

In all experiments in this section we construct an approximation of a minimal surface with given boundary curve. The initial condition is set as a surface with the same topology as the desired minimal surface. In our implementation the BiCGStab (BiConjugate Gradient Stabilized) method [32] was used to solve the systems (17) and (26), (27).

In the first experiment we deal with a roof-like surface. Authors of [21] consider the length-oriented redistribution along specific network curves, here we use the area-oriented redistribution. In the initial condition all points are situated in the $xy$-plane except the points on two of the boundary curves, see Fig. 5, top left. The mesh consist of $n_V = 144$ grid points. Parameters were set to $t_f = 1$, $\tau = 0.01$, $\omega = 50$. We performed the experiments both without any tangential redistribution (Fig. 5) and then with tangential redistribution (Fig. 6). Looking at the figures we observe higher quality mesh of the final minimal surface in case when tangential redistribution is included.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{roof_no_redist.png}
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{roof_redist.png}
\caption{The evolution of a roof-like surface with no tangential redistribution. The selected time steps are $n = 0, 5, 30, 100$.}
\end{figure}

In the second experiment we construct the approximation of the catenoid which is a minimal surface stretched between two coaxial circles lying in parallel planes. The initial condition is a cylinder (Fig. 7) with boundary circles $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ defined parametrically as

$$\Gamma_{1,2}(u) = (\cos u, \sin u, \pm \frac{4}{5} \log 2), \quad u \in (0, 2\pi).$$

(28)

We set the parameters to $t_f = 3$, $\omega = 50$. In this experiment we dealt with two different settings of the time step $\tau$. First, with constant $\tau = 0.04$ for all meshes in
Fig. 6. The evolution of a roof-like surface with tangential redistribution. The selected time steps are $n = 0, 5, 30, 100$.

Fig. 7. The discretization of the cylinder, from left to right: $n_V = 80, 288, 1088, 4224$.

Fig. 8. The approximation of the catenoid with $n_V = 288$ vertices in the final time $t_f$.

Fig. 7, and second, with coupling $\tau \sim h^2$ natural for parabolic problems. The final approximation of the catenoid with $n_V = 288$ is plotted in Fig. 8. The catenoid with the boundary curves (28) is a surface of revolution given by the formula (in cylindrical coordinates $r, z$)

\begin{equation}
    r(z) = \frac{4}{5} \cosh \left( \frac{5}{4} z \right),
\end{equation}

with $z \in [-\frac{4}{5} \log 2, \frac{4}{5} \log 2]$. The knowledge of the exact solution allows us to calculate the error of the approximation of the catenoid in the final time $t_f$

$$L_2\text{-error} = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{nV} \left( \sqrt{(F_{i,x}^N)^2 + (F_{i,y}^N)^2 - r(F_{i,z}^N)^2} \chi_{F^N} (V_i) \right)^2 \right]^\frac{1}{2},$$

where $(F_{i,x}^N, F_{i,y}^N, F_{i,z}^N)$ denote the coordinates of the vertex $F_i^N$. We also study the experimental order of convergence (EOC) calculated as follows

$$\text{EOC} = \log_2 \left( \frac{L_2\text{-error}_{h/2}}{L_2\text{-error}_h} \right),$$

where $L_2\text{-error}_h$ is the $L_2$-error for a mesh with characteristic edge length $h$. The results are presented in Tab. 1 and Tab. 2. In the tables, "F-iter" and "ψ-iter" are the total numbers of iterations of the BiCGStab method needed to solve the systems (17) and (26), (27) respectively. Comparing Tab. 1 (constant time step $\tau = 0.04$) and Tab. 2 (coupling $\tau \sim h^2$) we observe that, for this experiment, no refinement of the time step is needed to achieve the same accuracy. The number of iterations per time step is higher for the experiment in Tab. 1, however, the total number of iterations is lower, which results in shorter computation time. Looking at the EOC in Tab. 1 and Tab. 2 we see that the method is second order accurate.

In the third experiment we construct a perturbed catenoid to demonstrate that the method works properly also in the case when the parts of the boundary curve are not convex and even not piecewise planar. The initial condition plotted in Fig. 9 was created by shifting the boundary vertices of the cylinder with $nV = 288$ vertices shown in Fig. 7. The boundary curves $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ are given by parametric expressions (in cylindrical coordinates $(r, \phi, z)$)

$$\Gamma_1(u) = (r(u), \phi(u), z(u)) = \left( 1 + 0.2 \sin^2(3u), u, -\frac{4}{5} \log 2 \right),$$

$$\Gamma_2(u) = (r(u), \phi(u), z(u)) = \left( 1, u, \frac{4}{5} \log 2 + 0.2 \sin^2(2u) \right),$$

where $(r, \phi, z)$ are the cylindrical coordinates.
Figure 9. The cylinder with $n_V = 288$ with shifted boundary vertices. Highlighted curves are the boundary curves $\Gamma_1$ (bottom, red) and $\Gamma_2$ (top, green).

Figure 10. A perturbed catenoid in the last time step $n = 300$. Left, no tangential redistribution. Right, asymptotically uniform tangential redistribution with $\omega = 50$.

where $u \in (0, 2\pi)$, see Fig. 9. We set the final time $t_f = 3$ and time step $\tau = 0.01$. The minimal surfaces for both the case with no tangential redistribution as well as with asymptotically uniform redistribution with $\omega = 50$ are plotted in Fig. 10.

Figure 11. Left, Schwarz P surface. Right, Costa’s minimal surface.

In the next experiment we create a minimal surface topologically equivalent to the Schwarz P surface (Fig. 11, left). What we construct is not precisely the Schwarz P surface, since Schwarz P surface is a solution to a different problem, the
so-called free boundary problem, where (a part of) the boundary curve is restricted to lie on a given plane instead of being a prescribed curve. The boundary is free to choose its position on the bounding plane. The boundary curves of the Schwarz P surface resemble circles but are not perfect circles. The initial condition in our

![Figure 12. The evolution of the cube with holes into "Schwarz P surface". The first row is the initial condition, the second row corresponds to the evolution with no tangential redistribution, and third row represents the case with tangential redistribution. The selected time steps are $n = 5, 30, 100$.](image)

experiment is a cube with edge length 2 and a circular hole with diameter 1 in the middle of each side. The mesh consists of $n_V = 973$ grid points. The parameters we chose are $t_f = 1$, $\tau = 0.01$, $\omega = 50$. The evolution is plotted in Fig. 12. We see that the tangential redistribution helps primarily in the regions of initially high mean curvature (near the corners of the cube).
In the last experiment we construct a minimal surface with topology of the Costa's surface [8] (see Fig. 11, right). The initial condition with $n_V = 1438$ grid points is plotted in Fig. 13.

**Figure 13.** Initial condition for construction of the "Costa's surface". Highlighted curves are boundary curves $\Gamma_1$ (middle, red), $\Gamma_2$ (bottom, green) and $\Gamma_3$ (top, blue).

**Figure 14.** Constructed "Costa's surface" from several viewing angles.
The boundary $\Gamma = \partial X^0$ consists of three curves $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3$, where

\begin{align*}
\Gamma_1(u) &= (4 \cos u, 4 \sin u, 0), \\
\Gamma_2(u) &= (2.25 \cos u, 1.5 \sin u, -1.5), \\
\Gamma_3(u) &= (1.5 \cos u, 2.25 \sin u, 1.5),
\end{align*}

with $u \in (0, 2\pi)$ for all curves. The parameters were set to $t_f = 1.5, \tau = 0.01, \omega = 5$. In Fig. 14 we see the final approximation of the minimal surface. The Fig. 15 shows the mesh in detail. In the middle of the figure we see a vertex with $m_i = 10$ with neighbouring triangles with quite acute angles. In order to improve the quality of the mesh near such high-valence vertices it is inevitable to use operations changing the mesh topology, e.g. edge flipping, edge contraction or edge splitting. This can be a topic for a further research.

**Conclusion**

We presented a surface evolution model with an area-oriented tangential redistribution of points suitable for computing minimal surfaces with given boundary curves. We derived the numerical scheme and performed several numerical experiments to test the performance of the method. Using the model, we constructed approximations of minimal surfaces with given boundary curves.

There are several issues left for a further research. We considered only the area density for designing the tangential velocity, which gives satisfying results in many applications. However, we do not control the shape of mesh triangles which would be necessary in some cases. A tangential redistribution of vertices along the boundary curves could be included to improve the mesh quality. Incorporation of mesh topology changing operations to eliminate high-valency vertices could also improve the performance of the method. Further, it could be useful to examine other choices of the angular size $\mu_i$. For sake of generality, the method could be extended from triangular meshes to general polygonal meshes.
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