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#### Abstract

We give a classification of the translation hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature or constant Gauss-Kronecker curvature in Euclidean space or LorentzMinkowski space. We also characterize the minimal translation hypersurfaces in the upper half-space model of hyperbolic space.


## 1. Introduction

In $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, a surface is called a translation surface if it is given by an immersion

$$
X: U \subset \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3}: \quad(x, y) \mapsto(x, y, f(x)+g(y))
$$

where $z=f(x)+g(y)$ and $f$ and $g$ are smooth functions. One of the famous examples of minimal surfaces in 3-dimensional Euclidean space is a Scherk's minimal translation surface. In fact, Scherk [10] showed in 1835 that except the planes, the only minimal translation surfaces are the surfaces given by

$$
z=\frac{1}{c} \log \left|\frac{\cos c y}{\cos c x}\right|
$$

where $c$ is a nonzero constant. This surface is called a Scherk's minimal translation surface. In 1991, Dillen et al. [3] generalized this result to higher-dimensional Euclidean space. (See also [11].) A hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is called a translation hypersurface if $M$ is a graph of a function

$$
f: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}: \quad\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \mapsto f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)
$$

where $f_{i}$ is a smooth function of one real variable for $i=1,2, \ldots, n$. More precisely, they proved

Theorem ([3]). Let $M$ be a minimal translation hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then $M$ is either a hyperplane or $M=\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's minimal translation surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.
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Scherk's minimal translation surface in 3-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ was generalized to translation surfaces with constant mean curvature or constant Gaussian curvature in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ by Liu [7]. In particular, he proved

Theorem ([7]). Let M be a translation surface with constant Gaussian curvature $K$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Then $M$ is congruent to a cylinder, and hence $K \equiv 0$.

In Section 2 we generalize these previous results to translation hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature or constant Gauss-Kronecker curvature in Euclidean space and Lorentz-Minkowski space. In particular, we prove the following theorems.

Theorem 1.1. Let $M$ be a translation hypersurface with constant mean curvature $H$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then $M$ is congruent to a cylinder $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a constant mean curvature surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. In particular, if $H=0$, then $M$ is either a hyperplane or $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's minimal translation surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.

Theorem 1.2. Let $M$ be a translation hypersurface with constant Gauss-Kronecker curvature $G K$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then $M$ is congruent to a cylinder, and hence $G K \equiv 0$.

One may ask the similar problems for translation hypersurfaces in the upper half-space model of hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$. Recently López [8] proved that there is no minimal translation surface of type I in $\mathbb{H}^{3}$. (See Section 3 for the definition of translation hypersurface of type I or type II in hyperbolic space.) In Section 3, we prove an analogue of López's result for higher-dimensional cases in hyperbolic space as follows:

Theorem 1.3. There is no minimal translation hypersurface of type I in $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$.
Furthermore we characterize the minimal translation surfaces of type II in $\mathbb{H}^{3}$. (See Theorem 3.3.)

## 2. Translation hypersurface with constant curvature in Euclidean space and Lorentz-Minkowski space

Theorem 2.1. Let $M$ be a translation hypersurface with constant mean curvature $H$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then $M$ is congruent to a cylinder $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a constant mean curvature surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. In particular, if $H=0$, then $M$ is either a hyperplane or $M=\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's minimal translation surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$.

Proof. Let a translation hypersurface $M$ be an immersion given by

$$
X: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}: \quad\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right),
$$

where $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)$ and each $f_{i}$ is a smooth function for $i=1, \ldots, n$. One can easily see that the unit normal vector $N$ and the mean curvature $H$ are given by

$$
N=\frac{\left(-f_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots,-f_{n}^{\prime}, 1\right)}{\sqrt{1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}}}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(1+\sum_{j \neq i}^{n} f_{j}^{\prime 2}\right) f_{i}^{\prime \prime}}{n\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{3 / 2}} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively. Since $M$ has constant mean curvature $H$, differentiating the equation (2.1) with respect to $x_{1}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(1+\sum_{j=2}^{n} f_{j}^{\prime 2}\right) f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}+2 f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}\left(\sum_{j=2}^{n} f_{j}^{\prime \prime}\right)}{n\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{1 / 2}}=3 n H f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Differentiate the equation (2.2) with respect to $x_{2}$, and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(2 f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}+2 f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{1 / 2}=3 n H f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now suppose that $f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. Then the equation (2.3) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
2\left(\frac{f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}}+\frac{f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime}}\right)\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{1 / 2}=3 n H \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}$ is a nonconstant function of a variable $x_{1}$ or $x_{2}$ from the assumption that $f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. If each $f_{i}^{\prime}$ is constant for $i=3,4, \ldots, n$, then

$$
f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+f_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)+a_{3} x_{3}+\cdots+a_{n} x_{n}
$$

where each $a_{i}$ is constant for $i=3,4, \ldots, n$. This implies that $M$ is congruent to a cylinder $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a constant mean curvature surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. If $f_{k}^{\prime}$ is not a constant function for some $k=3,4, \ldots, n$, then one sees that $H$ must vanish from the above equation (2.4). As mentioned in the introduction, by the result of Dillen et al. [3], one sees that a minimal translation hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is either a hyperplane or $M=\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's minimal translation surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Hence we conclude that $M$ is a hyperplane or $M=\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's minimal translation surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. Otherwise, if $f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime}=0$, then it follows that either $f_{1}$ or $f_{2}$ is linear, that is,

$$
f_{1}=a_{1} x_{1}+b_{1} \quad \text { or } \quad f_{2}=a_{2} x_{2}+b_{2}
$$

where $a_{i}$ and $b_{i}$ are constants for $i=1,2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $f_{1}=a_{1} x_{1}+b_{1}$. It immediately follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
X\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) & =\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+f_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, a_{1} x_{1}+b_{1}+f_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)\right) \\
& =x_{1}\left(1,0, \ldots, 0, a_{1}\right)+\left(0, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}, b_{1}+f_{2}\left(x_{2}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that $M$ is a cylinder. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.
Let $\mathbb{L}^{n+1}$ be the $(n+1)$-dimensional Lorentz-Minkowski space, that is, the real vector space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ endowed with the Lorentz-Minkowski metric

$$
d s^{2}=d x_{1}^{2}+\cdots+d x_{n}^{2}-d x_{n+1}^{2}
$$

and $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n+1}$ are the canonical coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We say that a vector $v \in$ $\mathbb{L}^{n+1} \backslash\{0\}$ is spacelike, timelike or lightlike if $|v|^{2}=\langle v, v\rangle$ is positive, negative or zero, respectively. The zero vector 0 is spacelike by convention. A hyperplane in $\mathbb{L}^{n+1}$ is said to be spacelike, timelike or lightlike if the normal vector of the hyperplane is timelike, spacelike, or lightlike, respectively. An immersed hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{L}^{n+1}$ is called spacelike if every tangent hyperplane of $M$ is a spacelike. We define a spacelike translation hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{L}^{n+1}$ as follows:

DEFINITION 2.2. A spacelike hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{L}^{n+1}$ is called a spacelike translation hypersurface if it is given by an immersion

$$
X: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{L}^{n+1}: \quad\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)
$$

where $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)$ and each $f_{i}$ is a smooth function for $i=1, \ldots, n$.

In the above definition, a function $f$ should satisfy that $|\nabla f|<1$ since $M$ is a spacelike hypersurface in $\mathbb{L}^{n+1}$. Applying the similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.1 we can also obtain a similar result in the Lorentz-Minkowski space as follows:

Theorem 2.3. Let $M$ be a spacelike translation hypersurface with constant mean curvature $H$ in $\mathbb{L}^{n+1}$. Then $M$ is congruent to a cylinder $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a constant mean curvature surface in $\mathbb{L}^{3}$. In particular, if $H=0$, then $M$ is either a hyperplane or $M=\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's maximal spacelike translation surface in $\mathbb{L}^{3}$.

REMARK 2.4. A spacelike hypersurface with vanishing mean curvature is called a maximal spacelike hypersurface. Kobayashi [5] gave various examples of maximal
spacelike surfaces in $\mathbb{L}^{3}$ including Scherk's maximal spacelike translation surface. In 1976, Cheng and Yau [2] proved that the only entire solutions to the maximal spacelike hypersurface equation are linear. Even though there is no entire maximal spacelike graph by the result of Cheng and Yau, one has many kinds of maximal spacelike graphs locally. However Theorem 2.3 implies that the only nontrivial maximal spacelike translation hypersurface is locally $M=\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$, where $\Sigma$ is a Scherk's maximal spacelike translation surface in $\mathbb{L}^{3}$.

Scherk's minimal translation surface in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ was generalized to translation surfaces with constant Gaussian curvature in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ by Liu [7]. In the following, we generalize his result to higher-dimensional Euclidean space.

Theorem 2.5. Let M be a translation hypersurface with constant Gauss-Kronecker curvature $G K$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then $M$ is congruent to a cylinder, and hence $G K \equiv 0$.

Proof. Let a translation hypersurface $M$ be an immersion given by

$$
X: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}: \quad\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)
$$

where $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)$ and each $f_{i}$ is a smooth function for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Then it follows that the unit normal vector $N$ and the Gauss-Kronecker curvature $G K$ are given by

$$
N=\frac{\left(-f_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots,-f_{n}^{\prime}, 1\right)}{\sqrt{1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}}}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
G K=\frac{f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \cdots f_{n}^{\prime \prime}}{\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{(n+2) / 2}}, \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively. Differentiating the equation (2.5) with respect to $x_{1}$ and using the assumption that the Gauss-Kronecker curvature $G K$ is constant, we get

$$
0=f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \cdots f_{n}^{\prime \prime}\left[f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)-(n+2) f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime 2}\right]
$$

Suppose that $f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \cdots f_{n}^{\prime \prime}=0$. Then one of $f_{i}$ 's is linear for $i=2, \ldots, n$, which implies that $M$ is congruent to a cylinder. Therefore one may assume that $f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \cdots f_{n}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. Thus one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)=(n+2) f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime 2} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the left-hand side of the equation (2.6), $1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}$ is a nonconstant function of variables $x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}$ since $f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \cdots f_{n}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. However the right-hand side is a function of variable $x_{1}$. Hence we obtain that $f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime} \equiv 0$ and $f_{1}^{\prime \prime} \equiv 0$, which means that $f_{1}$ is linear. Therefore we conclude that $M$ is congruent to a cylinder.

## 3. Minimal translation hypersurfaces in hyperbolic space

Anderson [1] gave many examples of minimal surfaces with various topological types in the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{n}$ using geometric measure theory. Later by solving the minimal surface equation in the hyperbolic space, many examples of minimal surfaces in the 3 -dimensional hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{3}$ have been found in $[4,6,9]$. In order to search Scherk's minimal translation hypersurfaces in the hyperbolic space, we consider the upper half-space model of the $n$-dimensional hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{n}$, that is, $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}=$ $\left\{\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}: x_{n}>0\right\}$ equipped with the hyperbolic metric

$$
d s^{2}=\frac{d x_{1}^{2}+\cdots+d x_{n}^{2}}{x_{n}^{2}}
$$

Note that unlike in Euclidean space, the coordinates $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}$ are interchangeable, but not for the coordinate $x_{n}$ in $\mathbb{H}^{n}$. Motivated by this observation, we give the following definition of translation hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$. It should be mentioned that López [8] gave the same definition when $n=2$.

Definition 3.1. A hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ is called a translation hypersurface of type I if it is given by an immersion $X: U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1}$ satisfying

$$
X\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)\right),
$$

where each $f_{i}$ is a smooth function on $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Similarly a hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{H}^{n+1}$ is called a translation hypersurface of type II if it is given by an immersion $X: U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1}$ satisfying

$$
X\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-1}, f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right), x_{n}\right) .
$$

Let $M$ be a hypersurface in the upper half-space model of $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$. If we denote by $N_{h}$ a unit normal vector field on $M$ with respect to the hyperbolic metric in $\mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1}$, then a unit normal vector field $N$ on $M$ with respect to the Euclidean metric is given by

$$
N=\frac{N_{h}}{x_{n+1}} .
$$

Moreover, if we denote by $H_{h}$ and $H_{e}$ the hyperbolic and Euclidean mean curvature on $M$ respectively, then it is well-known that

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{h}=x_{n+1} H_{e}+N_{n+1}, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N_{n+1}$ is the $(n+1)$-th component of the unit normal vector $N$.
Contrary to the Euclidean case, it was proved that there is no minimal translation surface of type I in $\mathbb{H}^{3}$ by López [8]. We prove an analogue for higher-dimensional cases in the following.

Theorem 3.2. There is no minimal translation hypersurface of type I in $\mathbb{H}^{n+1}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove this theorem for $n \geq 3$ because the case when $n=2$ was done by López [8]. Let $M$ be a translation hypersurface of type I which is given by an immersion

$$
X: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1}: \quad\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \mapsto\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}, f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)\right)
$$

where $f\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)=f_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)+\cdots+f_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)$ and each $f_{i}$ is a smooth function for $i=1, \ldots, n$. Then it follows from the equation (3.1) that

$$
H_{h}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}\right) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(1+\sum_{j \neq k}^{n} f_{j}^{\prime 2}\right) f_{k}^{\prime \prime}}{\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{3 / 2}}+\frac{n}{\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right)^{1 / 2}} .
$$

Since $M$ is minimal, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}\right)\left[\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(1+\sum_{j \neq k}^{n} f_{j}^{\prime 2}\right) f_{k}^{\prime \prime}\right]=-n\left(1+\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{i}^{\prime 2}\right) . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that $f_{i}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$ for each $i=1, \ldots, n$. To see this, suppose first that $f_{i}^{\prime \prime} \equiv 0$ for each $i=1, \ldots, n$. Then while the left-hand side of the equation (3.2) vanishes, the right-hand side cannot be zero. Thus $f_{i}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Now suppose that $f_{j}^{\prime \prime} \equiv 0$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then $f_{j}=a x_{j}+b$, where $a$ and $b$ are constants. Note that $a \neq 0$ since $M$ is a graph. While the right-hand side of the equation (3.2) has a degree 0 in the variable $x_{j}$, the left-hand side has a degree 1 in the variable $x_{j}$, which is a contradiction. Hence this proves our claim.

We now have three possibilities as follows:
CASE (1): $\quad f_{i}^{\prime \prime \prime} \equiv 0$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$.
CASE (2): $\quad f_{i}^{\prime \prime \prime} \equiv 0$ for some $i$ and $f_{j}^{\prime \prime \prime} \neq 0$ for some $j$.
CASE (3): $\quad f_{i}^{\prime \prime \prime} \neq 0$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$.
For Case (1), $f_{i}^{\prime \prime}=$ constant $\neq 0$ for each $i=1, \ldots, n$, by our above claim. So each $f_{i}$ is a quadratic polynomial. The right-hand side of the equation (3.2) has a degree 2 in the variable $x_{i}$. Because the left-hand side has the same degree, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{l \neq i}^{n} f_{l}^{\prime \prime} \equiv 0 . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the equation (3.3) holds for each $i=1, \ldots, n$, one can obtain that

$$
f_{1}^{\prime \prime}=\cdots=f_{n}^{\prime \prime} \equiv 0
$$

which is impossible. For Case (2), we may assume that $f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime} \equiv 0$ and $f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime} \neq 0$ without loss of generality. Since $f_{1}$ is a quadratic polynomial, the right-hand side of the equation (3.2) has a degree 2 in the variable $x_{1}$. Hence we see that

$$
f_{2}^{\prime \prime}+\cdots+f_{n}^{\prime \prime} \equiv 0
$$

Therefore we get

$$
f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}=\cdots=f_{n}^{\prime \prime \prime} \equiv 0
$$

which is a contradiction to our assumption that $f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime} \neq 0$. For Case (3), differentiating the equation (3.2) with respect to $x_{1}, x_{2}$ and $x_{3}$, we get

$$
f_{1}^{\prime}\left(f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime}+f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)+f_{2}^{\prime}\left(f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}+f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)+f_{3}^{\prime}\left(f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}+f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)=0
$$

Since $f_{i}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$ by the assumption, dividing both sides of the above equation by $f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{f_{1}^{\prime \prime}}\left(\frac{f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime}}+\frac{f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime}}\right)+\frac{1}{f_{2}^{\prime \prime}}\left(\frac{f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime}}+\frac{f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}}\right)+\frac{1}{f_{3}^{\prime \prime}}\left(\frac{f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}}+\frac{f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime}}\right)=0 . \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Differentiation of the above equation with respect to $x_{1}$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime} /\left(f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{\left(1 / f_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\prime}}=-\frac{f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime} /\left(f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime}\right)+f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime} /\left(f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime}\right)}{1 / f_{2}^{\prime \prime}+1 / f_{3}^{\prime \prime}}=c_{1} \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{1}$ is a constant. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}=c_{1} f_{1}^{\prime}+d_{1} f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime} \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d_{1}$ is a constant. Similarly one can get

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}=c_{2} f_{2}^{\prime}+d_{2} f_{2}^{\prime} f_{2}^{\prime \prime} \\
& f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime}=c_{3} f_{3}^{\prime}+d_{3} f_{3}^{\prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime} \tag{3.7}
\end{align*}
$$

where $c_{i}$ and $d_{i}$ are constants for $i=2,3$. Using the equations (3.5) and (3.7), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime} /\left(f_{1}^{\prime} f_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{\left(1 / f_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\prime}}=-\frac{\left(d_{2}+d_{3}\right) f_{2}^{\prime \prime} f_{3}^{\prime \prime}+c_{2} f_{3}^{\prime \prime}+c_{3} f_{2}^{\prime \prime}}{f_{2}^{\prime \prime}+f_{3}^{\prime \prime}}=c_{1} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the above equation (3.8) and the assumption that $f_{i}^{\prime \prime \prime} \neq 0$ for all $i=1, \ldots, n$, we see that

$$
c_{2}=c_{3} \quad \text { and } \quad d_{2}+d_{3}=0
$$

From the similar arguments, it follows that

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
c_{1}=c_{2} & \text { and } & d_{1}+d_{2}=0 \\
c_{1}=c_{3} & \text { and } & d_{1}+d_{3}=0 .
\end{array}
$$

Combining these relations, we can conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{1}=c_{2}=c_{3}=c \quad \text { and } \quad d_{1}=d_{2}=d_{3}=0 . \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

From the equations (3.4), (3.6), (3.7), and (3.9), one can get that

$$
c\left(f_{1}^{\prime \prime}+f_{2}^{\prime \prime}+f_{3}^{\prime \prime}\right)=0
$$

Since $f_{i}^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$ for each $i=1, \ldots, n$ by the assumption, one sees that $c=0$, that is,

$$
f_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}=f_{2}^{\prime \prime \prime}=f_{3}^{\prime \prime \prime}=0,
$$

by the equation (3.6), (3.7), and (3.9). However this is a contradiction. Therefore we obtain the desired conclusion.

In [8], López proved that the only minimal translation surfaces of type II in $\mathbb{H}^{3}$ were totally geodesic planes. However there is a gap in his proof which leads to wrong conclusion. Nevertheless, using his arguments, we characterize the minimal translation surfaces of type II in $\mathbb{H}^{3}$ as follows:

Theorem 3.3. Let $M \subset \mathbb{H}^{3}$ be a minimal translation surface of type II given by the parametrization $X(x, z)=(x, f(x)+g(z), z))$. Then the functions $f$ and $g$ are as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(x)=a x+b, \\
& g(z)=\sqrt{1+a^{2}} \int \frac{c z^{2}}{\sqrt{1-c^{2} z^{4}}} d z
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a, b$, and $c$ are constants.

Proof. Since the Euclidean mean curvature $H_{e}$ on $M$ and the third component $N_{3}$ of a unit normal vector field on $M$ with respect to the Euclidean metric are given by

$$
H_{e}=-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(1+g^{\prime 2}\right) f^{\prime \prime}+\left(1+f^{\prime 2}\right) g^{\prime \prime}}{\left(1+f^{\prime 2}+g^{\prime 2}\right)^{3 / 2}}
$$

and

$$
N_{3}=\frac{g^{\prime}}{\sqrt{1+f^{\prime 2}+g^{\prime 2}}},
$$

respectively, the hyperbolic mean curvature $H_{h}$ on $M$ is given by

$$
H_{h}=-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(1+g^{\prime 2}\right) f^{\prime \prime}+\left(1+f^{\prime 2}\right) g^{\prime \prime}}{\left(1+f^{\prime 2}+g^{\prime 2}\right)^{3 / 2}} z+\frac{g^{\prime}}{\sqrt{1+f^{\prime 2}+g^{\prime 2}}}
$$

from the equation (3.1). Since $M$ is minimal, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
z\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{1+f^{\prime 2}}+\frac{g^{\prime \prime}}{1+g^{\prime 2}}\right)=2 g^{\prime} \frac{1+f^{\prime 2}+g^{\prime 2}}{\left(1+f^{\prime 2}\right)\left(1+g^{\prime 2}\right)} \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Differentiating the above equation with respect to $x$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
z\left(\frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{1+f^{\prime 2}}\right)^{\prime}=-4 \frac{f^{\prime} f^{\prime \prime}}{\left(1+f^{\prime 2}\right)^{2}} \frac{g^{\prime 3}}{1+g^{\prime 2}} \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

First suppose that $f^{\prime} f^{\prime \prime}=0$. Then $f(x)=a x+b$ for some constants $a$ and $b$. The equation (3.10) says that

$$
z g^{\prime \prime}=\frac{2 g^{\prime}\left(1+a^{2}+g^{\prime 2}\right)}{\left(1+a^{2}\right)}
$$

Solving this ordinary differential equation with respect to $z$, we obtain

$$
g(z)=\sqrt{1+a^{2}} \int \frac{c z^{2}}{\sqrt{1-c^{2} z^{4}}} d z
$$

where $c$ is a constant.
Now suppose that $f^{\prime} f^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. Then by the equation (3.11) one sees that

$$
\frac{\left(f^{\prime \prime} /\left(1+f^{\prime 2}\right)\right)^{\prime}}{-4 f^{\prime} f^{\prime \prime} /\left(1+f^{\prime 2}\right)^{2}}=\frac{g^{\prime 3}}{z\left(1+g^{\prime 2}\right)}=d
$$

where $d$ is a constant. If $d=0$, then $f=m x+n$ and $g=$ constant, which is impossible by our assumption that $f^{\prime} f^{\prime \prime} \neq 0$. If $d \neq 0$, then one can obtain a contradiction by applying López's arguments as in [8].

REMARK 3.4. Note that if $c=0$ in the Theorem 3.3, then the minimal translation surface can be parametrized as

$$
X(x, z)=(x, a x+b+m, z)
$$

where $a, b$, and $m$ are constants. This surface is a vertical Euclidean plane which is a totally geodesic plane in $\mathbb{H}^{3}$.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank the referee(s) for the valuable comments and suggestions. This research was supported by the Sookmyung Women's University Research Grants 2011.

## References

[1] M.T. Anderson: Complete minimal varieties in hyperbolic space, Invent. Math. 69 (1982), 477-494.
[2] S.Y. Cheng and S.T. Yau: Maximal space-like hypersurfaces in the Lorentz-Minkowski spaces, Ann. of Math. (2) 104 (1976), 407-419.
[3] F. Dillen, L. Verstraelen and G. Zafindratafa: A generalization of the translation surfaces of Scherk, Differential Geometry in honor of Radu Rosca, K.U.L. (1991), 107-109.
[4] B. Guan and J. Spruck: Hypersurfaces of constant mean curvature in hyperbolic space with prescribed asymptotic boundary at infinity, Amer. J. Math. 122 (2000), 1039-1060.
[5] O. Kobayashi: Maximal surfaces in the 3-dimensional Minkowski space $L^{3}$, Tokyo J. Math. 6 (1983), 297-309.
[6] F.-H. Lin: On the Dirichlet problem for minimal graphs in hyperbolic space, Invent. Math. 96 (1989), 593-612.
[7] H. Liu: Translation surfaces with constant mean curvature in 3-dimensional spaces, J. Geom. 64 (1999), 141-149.
[8] R. López: Minimal translation surfaces in hyperbolic space, Beitr. Algebra Geom. 52 (2011), 105-112.
[9] R. Sa Earp and E. Toubiana: Existence and uniqueness of minimal graphs in hyperbolic space, Asian J. Math. 4 (2000), 669-693.
[10] H.F. Scherk: Bemerkungen über die kleinste Fläche innerhalb gegebener Grenzen, J. Reine Angew. Math. 13 (1835), 185-208.
[11] L. Verstraelen, J. Walrave and S. Yaprak: The minimal translation surfaces in Euclidean space, Soochow J. Math. 20 (1994), 77-82.

[^0]
[^0]:    Department of Mathematics Sookmyung Women's University Hyochangwongil 52, Yongsan-ku Seoul, 140-742
    Korea
    e-mail: kseo@sookmyung.ac.kr
    http://sookmyung.ac.kr/~kseo

