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#### Abstract

Symmetry properties of solutions to elliptic quasilinear equations have been widely studied in the context of Dirichlet boundary conditions. We show that, in the context of Robin boundary conditions, the symmetry property á la Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg does not hold in dimension $n \geq 2$, even for superharmonic functions, and we provide an explicit example.
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## 1 Introduction

The task of proving symmetries of solutions to quasilinear or nonlinear PDEs that reflect the symmetries of the domain has interested many authors. In this context, the classical result by Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg, contained in the celebrated paper [11, Theorem 1], is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1 (Gidas-Ni-Nirenberg symmetry result). Let $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be such that $f=f_{1}+f_{2}$, where $f_{1}$ is a locally Lipschitz function and $f_{2}$ is non decreasing. Then, any positive solution $u \in C^{2}(\bar{B})$ to the problem

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u=f(u) & \text { in } B,  \tag{1}\\ u=0 & \text { on } \partial B\end{cases}
$$

where $B$ is a ball of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ of radius $R$, has to be radial and

$$
\frac{\partial u}{\partial r}<0, \quad \text { for } 0<r<R
$$

In order to prove this result the authors make use of the method of moving planes, first introduced by Aleksandrov in [1], and then applied by Serrin in [19] in the context of PDEs.

In the case $n=2$, Lions in [13] gives an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1, that allows considering weaker smoothness assumptions on $f$ and $u$, under the additional hypothesis $f \geq 0$. The technique used in [13] relies on the Schwartz symmetrization, the isoperimetric inequality and the Pohozaev identity. His techniques were applied and generalized in [12] to the context of the $n$-Laplacian, and, eventually, in [18] to the solutions to $p$-Laplace equation for any $p$, in any dimension $n \geq 2$.

The result contained in [11] is a milestone in proving symmetry results: in the linear case see, for instance, $[4,3,10,17]$ and, for the symmetry results in the case of the $p$-Laplace operator, we refer to $[2,8,9,7]$. In all the afore-mentioned papers, it is possible to prove the radiality of positive solution to (1) either under the regularity hypothesis on $f$ stated in Theorem 1.1 (using the moving plane method as in [11]) or under the assumption $f \geq 0$ (with symmetrization techniques as in $[13,18,12]$ ). For a sign changing $f$, the Lipschitz continuity property cannot be relaxed to Hölder continuity, as remarked in [11, Section 2.3]. Indeed, in this case, the authors find a solution to (1) that is not radially symmetric, see also [6] for the $p$-Laplacian case.

The aim of the present work is to study the behaviour of the solution to the Robin problem

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta u=f(u) & \text { in } B  \tag{2}\\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}+\beta u=0 & \text { on } \partial B\end{cases}
$$

whenever $\beta$ is a positive parameter. Up to our knowledge, in the literature, there are few results dealing with symmetry properties of the solutions to differential equations with Robin boundary conditions. For instance, in [5], the authors consider the following problem

$$
\begin{cases}-\varepsilon^{2} \Delta u=f(u)-u & \text { in } B  \tag{3}\\ \varepsilon \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}+\beta u=0 & \text { on } \partial B\end{cases}
$$

where $\varepsilon>0, f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, of the form $f=f_{1}-f_{2}$ for $t \geq 0$, with $f_{1}, f_{2} \geq 0$, satisfying some structural growth conditions (for the precise details see [5, Section 1]). Under these assumptions, it is possible to prove the existence of a positive solution to (3) by making use of the Palais-Smale condition and the mountain pass Lemma. The authors show that there exists a $\beta_{*}>1$, such that, for $\beta>\beta_{*}$, the least energy solution has the maximum in the center of the ball, while, for $\beta \leq \beta_{*}$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the least energy solution has the maximum near the boundary, and, consequently, it cannot be radially symmetric. For completeness sake, we recall that the case $\beta=0$, i.e. the Neumann problem, and the case $\beta=+\infty$, i.e the Dirichlet problem, have been studied, for instance, respectively, in $[15,14]$ and [16]. Moreover, these results hold in the more general case of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ bounded and smooth, as well as the one proved in [5] for the Robin boundary conditions.

In Theorem 2.1, we show that in the one dimensional case the symmetry result for the solution to (2) holds under the standard hypotheses of Gidas, Ni, Nirenberg and the additional hypothesis $f \geq 0$. On the other hand, this is not the case for $n \geq 2$, as pointed out in Corollary 3.2:

In dimension $n \geq 2$, there exists a positive superharmonic function $\varphi$ that is a solution to (2) and that is not radially symmetric.

So, the main novelty of our paper is that we have found a non radial solution to problem (2) when the nonlinearity $f$ is positive and this solution is explicit (see Theorem 3.1).

## 2 One dimensional case: the symmetry holds.

We start by analysing the one dimensional case.
Theorem 2.1. Let $R>0$ and let $I=]-R, R\left[\right.$ be the open ball of radius $R$. Let $\left.u \in C^{2}([-R, R]]\right)$ be a solution to

$$
\begin{cases}-u^{\prime \prime}=f(u) & \text { in } I, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(x)+\beta u(x)=0 & \text { in } x= \pm R\end{cases}
$$

where $\beta>0$. Let us assume that $f$ satisfies the following assumptions:
(i). $f \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}, f$ is not identically zero in $u(I)$,
(ii). $f=f_{1}+f_{2}$, where $f_{1}$ is locally Lipschitz in $\mathbb{R}$ and $f_{2}$ is non decreasing.

Then, $u(x)=u(-x)$ for all $x \in[-R, R]$. Moreover,

$$
u^{\prime}(x)<0, \quad x \in[0, R] .
$$

Proof. We divide the proof in two steps. In the first step, we prove that the function $u$ is strictly positive and, in the second one, we prove that we can apply the result contained in Theorem 1.1.

Step 1. We start by proving that $u>0$ in $[-R, R]$. Since $u^{\prime \prime} \leq 0, u^{\prime}$ is non increasing in $]-R, R[$, so the minimum of $u$ on $[-R, R]$ is achieved either in $-R$ or in $R$. Let us denote by $x_{m}$ the minimum point of $u$ in $[-R, R]$. From the Robin boundary conditions, we have that

$$
-\beta u\left(x_{m}\right)=\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}\left(x_{m}\right) \leq 0,
$$

and, as a consequence, $u \geq 0$ in $[-R, R]$.

Now we want to prove that $u>0$ in $[-R, R]$. By contradiction, we assume that $u\left(x_{m}\right)=0$. If $x_{m}=-R$, the Robin boundary conditions imply

$$
0=\beta u(-R)=-\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(-R)=u^{\prime}(-R) \geq u^{\prime}(x), \quad \forall x \in I
$$

where we have observed that $u^{\prime}$ is non increasing. This implies that also $u$ is a non increasing function, so $-R$ should be both a minimum and a maximum. This is not possible, since $u$ should be constant and this contradicts the hypothesis $f \not \equiv 0$ in $u(I)$. Therefore, we have that $x_{m}=R$ and, arguing as before, we have

$$
0=-\beta u(R)=\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu}(R)=u^{\prime}(R) \leq u^{\prime}(x), \quad \forall x \in I
$$

So $u$ is a non decreasing function, the point $R$ is both a minimum and a maximum and we get a contradiction as before.

Step 2. We prove now that $u(R)=u(-R)$. Let us assume by contradiction that $u(R) \neq u(-R)$. Without loss of generality, we can suppose $u(R)<u(-R)$. As a consequence of Step 1, the function $u$ is strictly increasing in a neighborhood of the point $-R$, so, by the continuity of $u$, there exists $y \in I$ such that $u(y)=u(-R)$. Therefore, the following quantity is well defined

$$
\lambda:=\inf \{t \in I: u(t)=u(-R)\}
$$

and $\lambda>-R$. Moreover, the continuity of $u$ also implies $u(\lambda)=u(-R)$ and $u(x)>u(-R)$ in $(-R, \lambda)$.
We define now the function $v:=u-u(-R)$, that is a positive solution to

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta v=\tilde{f}(v) & \text { in }(-R, \lambda) \\ v=0 & \text { in } x=-R, x=\lambda\end{cases}
$$

where $\tilde{f}(v)=f(v+u(R))$. So we can use Theorem 1.1 in the interval $(-R, \lambda)$. We have that $u$ is symmetric with respect to the line $x=2^{-1}(\lambda-R)$ and, as a consequence, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d u}{d \nu}(-R)=-\frac{d u}{d x}(-R)=\frac{d u}{d x}(\lambda)<0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (4) and the fact that $u^{\prime}$ is non increasing, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta u(R)=-\frac{d u}{d \nu}(R)=-\frac{d u}{d x}(R) \geq-\frac{d u}{d x}(\lambda)=-\frac{d u}{d \nu}(-R)=\beta u(-R) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u(R) \geq u(-R) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

that is a contradiction.
From Step 1 and 2, we have that the funtion $v=u-u(R)$ is a positive solution to

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta v=\tilde{f}(v) & \text { in } I \\ v=0 & \text { in } x= \pm R\end{cases}
$$

So we can conclude by using Theorem 1.1.

We do not know if the hypotheses $i$ ) $i i$ ) on the function $f$ are the optimal ones to obtain the symmetry result. Nevertheless, we will show in Remark 3.1, in the next session, that the assumption $f \geq 0$ cannot be removed.

## 3 Counterexample: symmetry breaking in dimension $n \geq 2$

In the following, we will denote by $|\cdot|$ the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$.
Theorem 3.1. Let $B_{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}, n \geq 2$, be the ball centered at the origin with radius $R$, let $\beta$ be a positive constant and let $x_{0} \neq 0$ in $B_{R}$. Then, there exists a the positive function $\varphi \in C^{\infty}\left(\overline{B_{R}}\right)$ that is a non radial function in $B_{R}$ (i.e. $\left.\varphi(x) \neq \varphi(|x|)\right)$ and it is a solution to

$$
\begin{cases}-\Delta \varphi=f(\varphi) & \text { in } B_{R}  \tag{7}\\ \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}+\beta \varphi=0 & \text { on } \partial B_{R}\end{cases}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)=c_{1} t\left[c_{2} t^{\frac{1}{\beta R}}+c_{3} t^{\frac{2}{\beta R}}\right], \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $c_{1}, c_{3}>0, c_{2} \in \mathbb{R}$ defined as follows:

$$
c_{1}=2 \beta R, \quad c_{2}=-2(\beta R+1)+n, \quad c_{3}=2(\beta R+1) \alpha^{2}, \quad \alpha^{2}=R^{2}-\left|x_{0}\right|^{2}
$$



Figure 1: Construction of the function $\varphi$

Proof. We define the following quantities (see Figure 1):

- $a:=\left|x_{0}\right|$,
- $\alpha^{2}:=R^{2}-a^{2}>0$.

We show the existence of a positive function $\varphi(x)=\varphi\left(\left|x-x_{0}\right|\right)=\varphi(r)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}+\beta \varphi=0 \quad \text { on } \quad \partial B_{R} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\nu$ is the unit outer normal to $\partial B_{R}$. Let us fix $x \in \partial B_{R}$. Being

$$
\nabla(\varphi(x))=\varphi^{\prime}(r) \frac{x-x_{0}}{r}, \quad \nu(x)=\frac{x}{R}
$$

the Robin boundary conditions (9) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{\prime}(r) \frac{x-x_{0}}{r} \cdot \frac{x}{R}+\beta \varphi(r)=0 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denoting, now, by $\theta$ the angle between the vectors $x_{0}$ and $x$, we have the following relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\cos (\theta)=\frac{R^{2}+a^{2}-r^{2}}{2 a R} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, from (10) and (11), recalling that $\alpha^{2}=R^{2}-a^{2}$, we have

$$
\frac{\varphi^{\prime}(r)}{r R}\left(R^{2}-R a \cos (\theta)\right)+\beta \varphi(r)=\frac{\varphi^{\prime}(r)}{2 r R}\left(r^{2}+\alpha^{2}\right)+\beta \varphi(r)=0
$$

and, therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\varphi^{\prime}(r)}{\varphi(r)}=-(2 \beta R) \frac{r}{r^{2}+\alpha^{2}} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Integrating (12), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(r)=\frac{c}{\left(r^{2}+\alpha^{2}\right)^{\beta R}} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we choose $c=1$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi^{\prime}(r) & =-\frac{2 \beta R r}{\left(r^{2}+\alpha^{2}\right)^{\beta R+1}} \\
\varphi^{\prime \prime}(r) & =-(-\beta R-1) \frac{4 \beta R r^{2}}{\left(r^{2}+\alpha^{2}\right)^{\beta R+2}}-\frac{2 \beta R}{\left(r^{2}+\alpha^{2}\right)^{\beta R+1}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and, consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta \varphi & =-\varphi^{\prime \prime}(r)-\frac{n-1}{r} \varphi^{\prime}(r)= \\
& =\frac{2 \beta R}{\left(r^{2}+\alpha^{2}\right)^{\beta R+1}}\left[n-2(\beta R+1)+(\beta R+1) \frac{2 \alpha^{2}}{r^{2}+\alpha^{2}}\right] \\
& =2 \beta R \varphi(r)^{\frac{1}{\beta R}+1}\left[n-2(\beta R+1)+2(\beta R+1) \alpha^{2} \varphi(r)^{\frac{1}{\beta R}}\right] \\
& =f(\varphi(r)),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f$ is the function defined in (8). So, we have proved the desired claim, since we have found a non radial function of the form $\varphi(x)=\varphi\left(\left|x-x_{0}\right|\right)=\varphi(r)$, defined in (13), that satisfies (7).

As a consequence of Theorem 3.1, we obtain the following Corollary.
Corollary 3.2. Let $n \geq 2$. There exists a positive superharmonic function $\varphi$ that is a solution to (2) and that is not radially symmetric.

Proof. In the case $n=2$, the right-hand side of (8) becomes

$$
f(t)=4 \beta R t\left(-\beta R t^{\frac{1}{\beta R}}+\alpha^{2}(1+\beta R) t^{\frac{2}{\beta R}}\right) .
$$

We notice that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t) \geq 0, \quad \text { if } t \geq\left(\frac{\beta R}{\alpha^{2}(1+\beta R)}\right)^{\beta R} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

so the function $f \circ \varphi$ is positive if $\varphi$ satisfies (14) for all $x \in B_{R}$, and this follows by imposing the following geometric constraint

$$
\beta \leq \frac{R-a}{R(R+a)}
$$

If $n \geq 3$, we can choose the constant $c_{2} \geq 0$, by imposing the condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta \leq \frac{n-2}{2 R} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, under these assumptions, we have that $f(t) \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$.
Therefore, we can see that, by imposing the geometrical constraints (14) and (15) respectively for $n=2$ and $n \geq 3$, the function $\varphi$ defined in (13) is an example of positive superharmonic function, that is non radial and that satisfies (7).

We conclude with a remark for the one dimensional case.
Remark 3.1. The function $\varphi$ defined in Theorem 3.1, in the case $n=1$, satisfies the problem

$$
\begin{cases}-\varphi^{\prime \prime}=f(\varphi) & \text { in }(-R,+R)  \tag{16}\\ \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \nu}+\beta \varphi=0 & \text { in } x= \pm R\end{cases}
$$

We note that $\varphi \in C^{\infty}([-R, R])$ and $f$ is a locally Lipschitz function, but, $f$ does not satisfy the hypothesis $i)$, that is the positiveness. Indeed, by straightforward computations, we obtain that $f \circ \varphi$ is a sign changing function in $\varphi([-R,+R])$ for every $\beta>0$ and $R>a>0$.
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