

A note on the maximization of the first Dirichlet eigenvalue for perforated planar domains

Manuel Dias

December 2022

Abstract

In this work we prove that given an open bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with a C^2 boundary, there exists $\epsilon := \epsilon(\Omega)$ small enough such that for all $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ the maximum of $\{\lambda_1(\Omega - B_\delta(x)) : B_\delta \subset \Omega\}$ is never attained when the ball is close enough to the boundary. In particular it is not obtained when $B_\delta(x)$ is touching the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

1 Introduction

Consider the Dirichlet eigenvalue problem, in a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, given by:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $-\Delta$ admits a purely discrete spectrum $0 < \lambda_1(\Omega) < \lambda_2(\Omega) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_i(\Omega) \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is a simple eigenvalue, and as a consequence there exists a unique associated positive normalized eigenfunction u_Ω .

In this paper, we study the maximization problem

$$\max_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\delta} \lambda_1(\Omega - B), \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{B}_δ is the set of balls $B_\delta(x)$ of fixed radius $\delta > 0$ such that $B_\delta(x) \subset \Omega$. It follows from the work of Flucher [5] that, for every point $x \in \Omega$, there exists some radius R_x such that $B_{R_x}(x) \subset \Omega$, and:

$$\lambda_1(\Omega - B_r(x)) = \lambda_1(\Omega) + u_\Omega^2(x) \frac{2\pi}{-\log(r/R_x)} + o(\log^{-1}(r)) \quad \text{as } r \downarrow 0. \quad (3)$$

This result hints that the maximum of (2) is attained at a ball $B_\delta(x)$ where x is the maximum of u_Ω . However, since R_x in (3) depends on the choice of x , we can't compare uniformly $\lambda_1(\Omega - B_r(x))$ using this asymptotic formula. In particular it doesn't allow us to consider small balls that are close to the boundary, since $B_r(x)$ must be contained in the bigger ball $B_{R_x}(x) \subset \Omega$.

The first results regarding the maximum of (2) were obtained when Ω is a ball $B_R(0)$. In [11], Ramm and Shivakumar proved that the maximum of (2) is attained when $B_\delta(x)$ is concentric with $B_R(0)$. The result was generalized to higher dimensions by Kesavan in [9]. Regarding higher eigenvalues, in [4], El Soufi and Kiwan proved that the maximum of $\lambda_2(B_R(0) - B_\delta(x))$ is attained when the balls are concentric. In the case where Ω is a convex set, or presents some symmetry, Harrell, Kurata and Kröger proved in [8] that the maximizer is not attained when the ball touches the boundary. Still in the case where Ω is a ball $B_R(0)$, in another recent paper [3] by Chorwadwala and Roy, the authors showed that the maximizer K of $\lambda_1(B_R(0) - K)$, for sets K with dihedral symmetry and $K \subset B_R(0)$, must share some symmetry with $B_R(0)$.

Similar problems regarding other types of eigenvalues can be found in the literature. One of them relates to predator-prey systems, where the authors are led to consider shape optimization problem with mixed Dirichlet-Neumann conditions, see [10, 1]. Another setting one can consider is Dirichlet-Steklov conditions, which lead to different eigenvalues. For results of this kind see for instance [6, 10]




Figure 1: Ball touching parabolic boundary

In this work we assume that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ has a C^2 boundary, and we study:

$$\lambda_1(\Omega - B_\delta(x))$$

for balls $B_\delta(x) \subset \Omega$, close to the boundary. We notice that since $\partial\Omega$ is C^2 , if the radius δ of the ball $B_\delta(x)$, is small enough, then for all $P \in \partial\Omega$, there exists $x \in \Omega$ such that $B_\delta(x) \subset \Omega$ and $\partial B_\delta(x)$ is touching $\partial\Omega$ at the point P .

This also implies that there exists a tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$,

$$V_d := \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < d\}, \quad (4)$$

for $d > 0$ small enough, such that for all $p \in V_d$ there exists a unique $z(p) \in \partial\Omega$ such that:

$$\min_{y \in \partial\Omega} \text{dist}(p, y) = \text{dist}(p, z(p)), \quad (5)$$

and $p - z(p)$ is colinear with the normal at $z(p) \in \partial\Omega$. This is not true for $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundaries for $\alpha \in]0, 1[$. Now define:

$$\text{dist}_{\min}(A, B) := \inf\{\text{dist}(p, B) : p \in A\},$$

where A and B are two sets of \mathbb{R}^2 .

In this work, we prove the following

Theorem 1. *Given a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with C^2 boundary, there exists $\epsilon := \epsilon(\Omega) > 0$ such that for any $\delta \in]0, \epsilon[$, if $p \in \Omega$ satisfies $B_\delta(p) \subset \Omega$ and*

$$\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial\Omega, B_\delta(p)) < \delta^2 \quad (6)$$

then there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $B_\delta(p + tv) \subset \Omega$ for small $t > 0$ and

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \lambda_1(B_\delta(p + tv)) > 0. \quad (7)$$

In particular $B_\delta(p)$ is not a solution of (2).

More precisely, we will show that (6) implies that $z(p) \in \partial\Omega$ is well defined, and v is the unit vector from $z(p)$ to p . With this choice, equation (7) implies that minimizing balls of radius small enough, must be searched away from the boundary.

Given p and $\delta > 0$, let v from Theorem 1 be given by e_y (we can always make a rotation of the domain since this does not change the eigenvalues or eigenfuntions). This entire work will rely on the Hadamard's formula, found in [7, Theorem 2.5.1]. In particular we will show that it implies that the formula (7) can be written as

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \lambda_1(B_\delta(p + te_y)) = \int_{\partial B_\delta(p)} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1, \quad (8)$$

where $u_{\delta,p}$ is the normalized first Dirichlet eigenfunction of $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$. To conclude we will prove that

$$\int_{\partial B_\delta(p)} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 > 0. \quad (9)$$

under the conditions of Theorem 1.

The first section is some preliminaries of this work. We state some of the main theorems used from references, and how we will use them. We also show some generic properties of the first eigenfunctions $u_{\delta,p} \in H_0^1(\Omega - B_\delta(p))$ that are independent of p and δ , such as bounds on the eigenvalues, and bounds on the eigenfunctions.

The next sections of the proof will rely in dividing $\partial B_\delta(p)$ in three different pieces C_θ^+ , C_θ^- , A_θ given by (17), (18), (19) and estimating the integral (9), restricted to each of these set. The plan of the proof will be to analyse blowups given by:

$$\bar{u}_n(x, y) := \frac{u_n(\delta_n(x, y) + p_n)}{\delta_n}. \quad (10)$$

for suitably chosen p_n and δ_n given by a contradiction argument. These will converge to a positive harmonic function $v : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the set:

$$K := \{y > -1\} - B_1(0). \quad (11)$$

Given a fixed θ , we will use regularity theory to compare \bar{u}_n in the sets C_θ^+ and A . This is possible because these will correspond to smooth parts of K . On the other hand we will not be able to use regularity theory to study the integral in the set C_θ^- , since this is close to a singularity of the set K . We will need the following regularity theorems

The second section is devoted to proving an integral bound for $u_{\delta,p}$ such that one can prove that the blowup limits of the sequences (10) are non-trivial. This will be done by obtaining a lower bound on integrals of $u_{\delta,p}$ in specific sets, by comparing to harmonic functions. It will also take advantage of the fact that for the first eigenfunction u_Ω of the set Ω , there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that:

$$\min_{z \in \partial\Omega} \frac{\partial u_\Omega(z)}{\partial \nu} \geq \Lambda.$$

This is true by application of Höpf's lemma, and the fact that $u_\Omega \in C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. Also for small balls $B_\delta(p)$ close enough to the boundary then the eigenfunctions $u_{\delta,p} \in H^1(\Omega - B_\delta(p))$ will be close in H^1 to u_Ω . Thus using regularity theory, for a set in the interior $V \Subset \Omega$ the functions $u_{\delta,p}$ and u_Ω will also be close in the $C^0(V)$ norm. This will then be used to create harmonic functions that are below $u_{\delta,p}$ and allow non-trivial lower bounds that are preserved under blowups.

The third section is devoted to proving an upper bound for the integral:

$$\left| \int_{C_\theta^-} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right)^2 \langle e_y, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^1 \right|,$$

which does not come directly from the blowup argument. The upper bound on this integral will be obtained by choosing θ small enough, and a choice of distance $d := \text{dist}_{\min}(p, \partial\Omega)$, such that there exists $C > 0$ independent of δ and p such that:

$$\left| \int_{C_\theta^-} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right)^2 \langle e_y, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq C\delta\theta^2. \quad (12)$$

This will be done by taking advantage of the proximity of the balls $B_\delta(p)$, to the boundary $\partial\Omega$, in particular using the geometric fact that the height of a ball is quadratic with the angle θ , when θ is close to zero.

Finally the penultimate section is divided into two subsections. In the first one we prove that if δ is small enough and $\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_\delta(p), p) < \delta^2$, then:

$$\int_A \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right)^2 \langle e_y, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

This is done through a contradiction, and use of a blowup argument on the sequence (10) and use of regularity theory. The blow up will be done along balls $B_{\delta_n}(p_n)$ satisfying:

$$\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_{\delta_n}(p_n), \partial\Omega) < \delta_n^2,$$

obtaining in the limit, a positive harmonic function $v : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Properties of this harmonic function are studied. In particular for the side integrals, one is interested in studying $\frac{\partial v}{\partial\theta}$. In particular the one will prove that for $x > 0$ then:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial\theta}(x, y) \geq 0$$

By use of Höpf's lemma, we would then have that:

$$\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial\theta\partial\nu}(x, y) > 0,$$

from which we would be able to conclude that the side integrals for the function v are positive, and so must also be for the sequence u_n .

By use of the fact that $\frac{\partial v}{\partial\theta}$ is harmonic, to prove it is positive for $x > 0$, one can reduce the question to proving that it is positive in an arc:

$$\partial B_R(0) \cap \{x > 0, y > -1\},$$

and this R can be as big as one wants. Thus to study $\frac{\partial v}{\partial\theta}$, one uses a blowdown of the harmonic function v . Given a sequence $R_n \rightarrow \infty$ one considers:

$$v_n(x, y) := \frac{1}{R_n}v(R_n(x, y) + (-1, 0)).$$

One can prove that this sequence will converge to a linear function given by αy , for some $\alpha \geq 0$. Again using regularity theory, for $z \in \partial B_{R_n}$, we will have that $\nabla v(z)$ will be close to αe_y , if R_n is big. With this we conclude that if $Z_n = \partial(B_{R_n} \cap \{x > 0, y > -1\})$ then

$$\lim_n \inf_{(x,y) \in Z_n} \frac{\partial v(x, y)}{\partial\theta} \geq 0$$

from which one can conclude the desired positivity of $\frac{\partial v}{\partial\theta}$.

The second subsection is devoted to proving that there exists $c > 0$ and $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that for $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $p \in \Omega$ satisfying $\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_\delta(p), \partial\Omega) < \delta^2$, then:

$$\int_{C_\delta^+} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial\nu} \right) \geq c\theta\delta. \quad (14)$$

This will be done again by contradiction, using a blowup argument with limit v which is a nontrivial positive harmonic function. Then through use of Höpf's lemma and regularity theory we will be able to arrive at a contradiction, concluding (14). We will use formulas (12), (13) and (14) to prove (9).

Acknowledgements

The author is supported by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) via the Odysseus programme Geometric and analytic properties of metric measure spaces with spectral curvature constraints, with applications to manifold learning (G0DBZ23N). Special thanks to professor Hugo Tavares for helping with the writing at an initial stage, and David Tewodrose for helping with the writing and revisions of the final work.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

- $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ a bounded open connected set with C^2 boundary.

- $u_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the normalized first Dirichlet eigenfunction of Ω .

Given $\delta > 0$ and $p \in \Omega$ such that $B_\delta(p) \subset \Omega$, let

- $\lambda_{\delta,p}$ be the first eigenvalue of $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$.
- $u_{\delta,p}$ the first normalized Dirichlet eigenfunction of $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$.
- $V_d = \{x \in \Omega : d(x, \partial\Omega) < d\}$.
- $\text{dist}_{\min}(A, B) = \inf\{\text{dist}(p, B) : p \in A\}$, tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$.
- $C_\theta^+ = \left\{z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : \frac{\langle z-p, e_y \rangle}{|z-p|} \geq \cos(\theta)\right\}$.
- $C_\theta^- = \left\{z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : \frac{\langle z-p, e_y \rangle}{|z-p|} \leq -\cos(\theta)\right\}$.
- $A_\theta = \left\{z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : -\cos(\theta) \leq \frac{\langle z-p, e_y \rangle}{|z-p|} \leq \cos(\theta)\right\}$.
- $K = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > -1\} - B_1(0)$.
- $z : V_d \rightarrow \partial\Omega$ gives unique point such that $\min_{y \in \partial\Omega} \text{dist}(p, \partial\Omega) = \text{dist}(p, z(p))$.
- $Q_{\delta,\theta,p} := \{(x, y) \in \Omega - B_\delta(p) : -\delta \sin(\theta) \leq x \leq \delta \sin(\theta); \quad -\tilde{C}\delta^2 \leq y \leq d_{\delta,p} + \delta - \delta \cos(\theta)\}$.
- $P_{M,\delta,d}(p) := \{(x, y) : (y - (p_y + \delta)) \geq M(x - p_x)^2 \text{ and } (y - (p_y + \delta)) \leq \frac{3}{2}d\}$.
- $\text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p) := P_{M,\delta,d}(p) \cap \{(y - (p_y + \delta)) = \frac{3}{2}d\}$,
- $Q_\delta(p) := [p_x - \delta, p_x + \delta] \times [p_y, p_y + 2\delta]$.
- $\overline{Q}_\delta(p) := [p_x - \delta, p_x + \delta] \times [p_y + \frac{3}{2}\delta, p_y + 2\delta]$
- $\mathbb{H} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > 0\}$

2.2 Hadamard's formula

Theorem 2. [7, Theorem 2.5.1] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open connected bounded subset with C^2 boundary. Given V a smooth vector field, and $\Phi(t) := Id_{\mathbb{R}^N} + tV$, define $\Omega_t := \Phi(t)(\Omega)$. Let $u_t \in H_0^1(\Omega_t)$ be the first eigenfunction of the Dirichlet Laplacian such that $\|u_t\|_{L^2(\Omega_t)} = 1$. Then $\lambda_1(\Omega_t)$ is differentiable at $t = 0$ and:*

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \lambda_1(\Omega_t) = - \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \right)^2 \langle V, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}.$$

where ν is the exterior normal.

Consider balls of small enough radius such that $B_\delta(p) \Subset V_d$. Let V be a vector field such that $V = \frac{p-z(p)}{|p-z(p)|}$ in a neighborhood a neighborhood of $\partial B_\delta(p)$, and $V = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$. By taking $\Phi(t) = Id_{\mathbb{R}^2} + tV$, we have that:

$$\Phi(t)(\Omega - B_\delta(p)) = \Omega - B_\delta(p + t \frac{p-z(p)}{|p-z(p)|}).$$

By a simple rotation we can assume that $\frac{p-z(p)}{|p-z(p)|}$ is the vector e_y (Throughout the proof we make this assumption, since the rotation does not change the eigenvector). Then we have by Hadamard's formula

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \lambda_1(\Phi(t)(\Omega - B_\delta(p))) = \int_{\partial B_\delta(p)} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right)^2 \langle e_y, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_{\partial B_\delta(p)} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1, \quad (15)$$




Figure 2: Image of decomposition of the circle

where ν is the exterior normal to $\partial B_\delta(p)$ (which is interior to $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$). The equality above follows since $u_{\delta,p}|_{\partial B_\delta(p)} = 0$, thus $\nabla u_{\delta,p}(x) = \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu}(x)\nu$ for $x \in \partial B_\delta(p)$. As such we have that for $x \in \partial B_\delta(p)$

$$\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}(x) = |\nabla u(x)| \langle e_y, \nu \rangle = \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu}(x) \right) \langle e_y, \nu \rangle. \quad (16)$$

Given an angle $\theta \in]0, \frac{\pi}{2}[$, define the sets given by

$$C_\theta^+ := \left\{ z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : \frac{\langle z - p, e_y \rangle}{|z - p|} \geq \cos(\theta) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

$$C_\theta^- := \left\{ z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : \frac{\langle z - p, e_y \rangle}{|z - p|} \leq -\cos(\theta) \right\}, \quad (18)$$

$$A_\theta := \left\{ z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : -\cos(\theta) \leq \frac{\langle z - p, e_y \rangle}{|z - p|} \leq \cos(\theta) \right\}. \quad (19)$$

an image of these is provided by figure (2). The study of the integral (15) will be done by restricting it to each of these and prove the positivity there.

2.3 Elliptic regularity

Theorem 3. *Let $V \Subset W \subset \Omega$ be open sets. There exists $C = C(V, W, m)$ such that for all $v \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfying:*

$$-\Delta v = f \text{ in } W,$$

then:

$$\|v\|_{H^m(V)} \leq C(\|f\|_{H^{m-2}(W)} + \|v\|_{L^2(W)}).$$

This first regularity theorem is the most classical version of an interior regularity theorem. This will be used to derive some bounds for $u_{\delta,p}$ in the interior of the set $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$ far from the boundary.

Theorem 4. [12][Theorem 2.14] *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, and $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfy:*

$$-\Delta u(x) = g(x)$$

for $x \in \Omega$. Then $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,1}(V)} \leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})$$

for $V \Subset \Omega$ where $C = C(\text{dist}_{min}(V, \partial\Omega))$.

Theorem 5. [12, Theorem 2.17] Let $B_1^+ = \{(x, y) \in B_1(0) : y \geq 0\}$ and $u \in L^\infty(B_1^+)$ such that:

$$-\Delta u(x) = g(x)$$

for $x \in B_1^+$. Assume also that $u|_{\{y=0\}} = 0$ in the Sobolev trace sense. Then:

$$\|D^2 u\|_{L^\infty(B_{\frac{1}{4}}^+)} \leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty(B_1^+)} + \|g\|_{L^\infty(B_1^+)}).$$

These other two theorems will be used for analysing the blowup sequence (10) and its limit both close to $\partial B_1(0)$ and in the interior of K (given by (11)).

2.4 Other results

Using properties of how the complementary Hausdorff distance relates to the continuity of eigenvalues (see for instance [2, Sections 4.6, 4.7]), we know that the function:

$$(\delta, p) \in]0, \epsilon[\times \Omega \mapsto \lambda_{\delta, p} := \lambda_1(\Omega - B_\delta(p))$$

is continuous. With this we can prove the first lemma.

Lemma 6. *There exists $\epsilon > 0$, small enough and $C > 0$, such that for all $\delta < \epsilon$ and $p \in \Omega$ satisfying $B_\delta(p) \subset \Omega$, then $\lambda_{\delta, p} = \lambda_1(\Omega - B_\delta(p)) < C$.*

Lemma 7. *If we extend $u_{\delta, p}$ by zero to $\mathbb{R}^2 - \Omega$, then:*

$$-\Delta u_{\delta, p} \leq \lambda_{\delta, p} u_{\delta, p} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where we extend $u_{\delta, p}$ by zero to $\mathbb{R}^2 - \Omega$.

Lemma 8. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for $\delta < \epsilon$ and p such that $B_\delta(p) \subset \Omega$, then:*

$$\|u_{\delta, p}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Proof. From Lemma 6 we conclude that $u_{\delta, p}$ is uniformly bounded in $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Also that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$-\Delta u_{\delta, p} \leq C u_{\delta, p}.$$

By use of a Brezis-Krato argument, we derive uniform $L^\infty(\Omega)$ bounds. □

We will call the family of eigenfunctions:

$$\mathcal{F}_\delta = \{u_{\delta, p} : B_\delta(p) \subset \Omega, u_{\delta, p} \text{ first eigenfunction of } \Omega - B_\delta(p)\} \quad (20)$$

Now we will estimate the derivatives of the eigenfunctions $u_{\delta, p}$ close to the boundary. For this we will use a comparison principle, and compare with the solution $v_\Omega \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ of the problem:

$$-\Delta v_\Omega = 1.$$

This solution satisfies $v_\Omega \geq 0$ in Ω . Also this solution is regular, in particular it is Lipschitz continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$, thus there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$ we have:

$$|v_\Omega(x) - v_\Omega(y)| \leq L|x - y|.$$

Lemma 9. *There exists $C > 0$ such that for all $\delta < \epsilon$ and $u_{\delta, p} \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$, $x \in \Omega$ and $y \in \partial\Omega$ then:*

$$|u_{\delta, p}(x) - u_{\delta, p}(y)| = |u_{\delta, p}(x)| \leq C|y - x|.$$

In particular for all $x \in \Omega$:

$$|u_{\delta, p}(x)| \leq C \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6 and 8 there exists C such that for all $u_{\delta,p} \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$:

$$-\Delta u_{\delta,p} \leq C.$$

Thus $-\Delta u_{\delta,p} \leq C = -C\Delta v_\Omega$ in $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$. Since $Cv_\Omega|_{\Omega - B_\delta(p)} \geq 0 = u_{\delta,p}|_{\Omega - B_\delta(p)}$, by the maximum principle we conclude that:

$$u_{\delta,p} \leq Cv_\Omega.$$

From this, if $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $x \in \Omega$ then:

$$|u_{\delta,p}(x)| \leq C|v_\Omega(x)| = C|v_\Omega(x) - v_\Omega(y)| \leq CL|x - y|.$$

□

We remind of the definition of V_d given by (4). We will use the above Theorem 3 to conclude the following lemma:

Lemma 10. *For every $\epsilon > 0$ and $d > 0$, there exists $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ such that, if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$ then:*

$$\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{C^1(\Omega - V_d)} \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Given $d > 0$, we suppose that $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\frac{d}{2}}$. This implies that $u_{\delta,p}$ satisfies the equation:

$$-\Delta u_{\delta,p} = \lambda_{\delta,p} u_{\delta,p} \quad \text{in } \Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}}.$$

Using Theorem 3 inductively, for each m , there exists C depending on d and m , such that:

$$\|u_{\delta,p}\|_{H^m(\Omega - V_d)} \leq C(\lambda_{\delta,p}\|u_{\delta,p}\|_{H^{m-2}(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})} + \|u_{\delta,p}\|_{L^2}).$$

By Lemma 6, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that, if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$, then $\lambda_{\delta,p} < C$. Using this fact and induction, we conclude that there exists $C > 0$ depending on d and m such that:

$$\|u_{\delta,p}\|_{H^m(\Omega - V_d)} \leq C. \tag{21}$$

Again using Theorem 3, since:

$$-\Delta(u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega) = \lambda_{\delta,p} u_{\delta,p} - \lambda_1(\Omega) u_\Omega \quad \text{in } \Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}},$$

there exists C depending on d and m , such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{H^m(\Omega - V_d)} &\leq C(\|\lambda_{\delta,p} u_{\delta,p} - \lambda_1(\Omega) u_\Omega\|_{H^{m-2}(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})} + \|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})}) \\ &\leq C((\lambda_{\delta,p} - \lambda_1(\Omega))\|u_{\delta,p}\|_{H^{m-2}(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})} + \lambda_1(\Omega)\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{H^{m-2}(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})} + \|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})}). \end{aligned}$$

We can use induction on this argument and equation (21), we can conclude that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\frac{d}{2}}$, there exists $\overline{C} = \overline{C}(d, m)$ such that:

$$\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{H^m(\Omega - V_d)} \leq \overline{C}((\lambda_{\delta,p} - \lambda_1(\Omega)) + \|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{L^2(\Omega - V_{\frac{d}{2}})}). \tag{22}$$

Now we notice that by the results in [2, Sections 4.6, 4.7], if

$$\delta_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \text{dist}(\partial\Omega, B_{\delta_n}(p_n)) \rightarrow 0,$$

since the complementary Hausdorff difference:

$$\mathcal{H}^c(\Omega, \Omega - B_{\delta_n}(p_n)) \rightarrow 0$$

then:

$$\|u_n - u_\Omega\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus for all $0 < \epsilon$, there exists $0 < \tilde{\rho} < \min\{\frac{d}{2}, \tilde{\delta}\}$ small enough, such that if:

$$B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}},$$

then

$$\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{H^1(\Omega)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2C}, \quad \lambda_{\delta,p} - \lambda_1(\Omega) < \frac{\epsilon}{2C}, \quad \delta < \tilde{\delta}.$$

From equation (22) we conclude:

$$\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{H^m(\Omega - V_d)} \leq \epsilon.$$

so for m big enough the Sobolev embedding will imply that:

$$\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{C^1(\Omega - V_d)} \leq \epsilon,$$

so for ϵ small enough the proof follows. \square

Lemma 11. *There exists $\tilde{d} > 0$, such that for every $0 < d < \tilde{d}$, there exists $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ such that, if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, and $x \in V_{2d} - V_d$ then:*

$$u_{\delta,p}(x) \geq \frac{\Lambda d}{8},$$

and

$$\Lambda = \min_{x \in \partial\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u_\Omega}{\partial \nu}(x) \right| > 0$$

where $u_\Omega \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ is the first eigenfunction of the set Ω .

Proof. By Höpf's Lemma, since Ω is C^2 , for all $p \in \partial\Omega$ we have that:

$$\left(\frac{\partial u_\Omega}{\partial \nu} \right) (p) > 0.$$

Since $u_\Omega \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that:

$$\Lambda = \min_{x \in \partial\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial u_\Omega}{\partial \nu}(x) \right| > 0.$$

Since $u_\Omega \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, there exists $\tilde{d} > 0$ small enough such that, for every $d < \tilde{d}$:

$$u_\Omega(x) \geq \frac{\Lambda \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)}{2}$$

for all $x \in V_{2d}$. In particular for $x \in V_{2d} - V_d$ we have:

$$u_\Omega(x) \geq \frac{\Lambda d}{2}. \tag{23}$$

Now we use Lemma 10 to conclude that there exists $\tilde{\rho} > 0$, such that if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, and $u_{\delta,p} \in H_0^1(\Omega - B_\delta(p))$ is the first eigenfunction of $\Omega - B_\delta(p)$, then:

$$\|u_{\delta,p} - u_\Omega\|_{L^\infty(\Omega - V_d)} \leq \frac{\Lambda d}{4}. \tag{24}$$

Using equations (23) and (24) implies that for $x \in V_{2d} - V_d$ we have:

$$u_{\delta,p}(x) \geq \frac{\Lambda d}{4}$$

concluding the proof. \square

Lemma 12. For all $C > 0$, there exist $\tilde{\theta} > 0$ and $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that for all $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$, $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$, if $x > 0$ satisfies:

$$x^2 \leq C\delta^4\theta^4 + C\delta\theta^2x \quad \Rightarrow \quad x < 2C\delta\theta^2, \quad (25)$$

$$x^2 \leq C\delta^4 + C\delta x \quad \Rightarrow \quad x < 2C\delta. \quad (26)$$

Proof. We choose $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that for all $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ then $C\delta^2 < C^2$. If $x > 2C\delta\theta^2$ and $\delta^2 < \frac{1}{C}$, then:

$$x^2 - C\delta\theta^2x = x(x - C\delta\theta^2) > C^2\delta^2\theta^4 > C\delta^4\theta^4$$

and so

$$x^2 > C\delta^4\theta^4 + C\delta\theta^2x.$$

Thus if inequality (25) is satisfied, then $x < 2C\delta\theta^2$.

On the other hand if $x > 2C\delta$ then:

$$x(x - C\delta) > 2C^2\delta^2.$$

If $\delta^2 < 2C$ then:

$$x(x - C\delta) > 2C^2\delta^2 > C\delta^4,$$

and so $x^2 \leq C\delta^4 + C\delta x$ can not be satisfied. This proves the second part of the statement. \square

3 Upper bound of bottom integral

This section is devoted to proving the following proposition:

Proposition 13. There exist $\theta_0 := \theta_0(\Omega) > 0$ and $C = C(\theta_0)$ such that for all $\theta < \theta_0$ there exists $\tilde{\delta} := \tilde{\delta}(\Omega, \theta_0, \theta) > 0$ such that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\text{dist}(B_\delta(p), \partial\Omega) < \delta^2$ given the set:

$$C_\theta^- := \{z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : \langle \nu_z, e_y \rangle < -\cos(\theta)\}, \quad (27)$$

then:

$$\left| \int_{C_\theta^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq C\delta\theta^2.$$

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that the interior unit normal at $z(p)$ is e_y and that $z(p) = (0, 0)$. Also by the fact that the boundary is C^2 , there exists a \tilde{C} and $\tilde{C} > 0$ independent of p , such that for all $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$:

$$[-\delta, \delta] \times [-\delta, \delta] \cap \Omega - B_\delta(p) \subset [-\delta, \delta] \times [-\tilde{C}\delta^2, \delta], \quad (28)$$

and that the interior normal ν_z for $z \in \partial\Omega \cap [-\delta, \delta] \times [-\delta, \delta]$ satisfies:

$$\langle \nu_z, e_y \rangle > 0. \quad (29)$$

Let:

$$d_{\delta,p} := \text{dist}(\partial\Omega, B_\delta(p)).$$

Define the set:

$$Q_{\delta,\theta,p} := \{(x, y) \in \Omega - B_\delta(p) : -\delta \sin(\theta) \leq x \leq \delta \sin(\theta); \quad -\tilde{C}\delta^2 \leq y \leq d_{\delta,p} + \delta - \delta \cos(\theta)\}.$$

Notice that if $\theta_0 > 0$ is small enough, if $\theta < \theta_0$, then:

$$1 - \cos(\theta) < 2\theta^2.$$

If $d_{\delta,p} < \delta^2$ this implies that:

$$Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \subset [-\delta \sin(\theta), \delta \sin(\theta)] \times [-\tilde{C}\delta^2, \delta^2 + \delta 2\theta^2]. \quad (30)$$




Figure 3

Claim 14. *There exist $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$ then:*

$$\left| \int_{C_\theta^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq 2 \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \cap \{x = -\delta \sin(\theta)\}} |\nabla u_{\delta,p}|^2 dy + 2 \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \cap \{x = \delta \sin(\theta)\}} |\nabla u_{\delta,p}|^2 dy.$$

Let $S_1 = \{x = -\delta \sin(\theta)\} \cap Q_{\delta,\theta,p}$ and $S_2 = \{x = \delta \sin(\theta)\} \cap Q_{\delta,\theta,p}$. Using integration by parts we obtain that:

$$\lambda_{\delta,p} \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} u_{\delta,p} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} = - \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} \operatorname{div} \left(\nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \right) u_{\delta,p} \quad (31)$$

$$= \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} \left\langle \nabla \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \right), \nabla u_{\delta,p} \right\rangle - \int_{S_1 \cup S_2} u_{\delta,p} \left\langle \nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}, \nu \right\rangle. \quad (32)$$

Since $-\operatorname{div} \left(\nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \right) = \lambda_{\delta,p} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}$, applying integration by parts again to (32), we obtain:

$$\lambda_{\delta,p} \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} u_{\delta,p} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} = \lambda_{\delta,p} \int_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} u_{\delta,p} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} + \int_{\partial Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nu \rangle - \int_{S_1 \cup S_2} u_{\delta,p} \langle \nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}, \nu \rangle,$$

equivalently:

$$\int_{\partial Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nu \rangle - \int_{S_1 \cup S_2} u_{\delta,p} \langle \nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}, \nu \rangle = 0 \quad (33)$$

We have that:

$$\partial Q_{\delta,\theta,p} = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup C_\theta^- \cup (Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \cap \partial \Omega).$$

When ν is the exterior normal to $\partial \Omega$ at $(Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \cap \partial \Omega)$, we know there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that, if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$, then equation (29) is satisfied. This implies that since $u_{\delta,p}$ is positive that:

$$\langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nu \rangle \leq 0, \quad \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}(x, y) \geq 0 \quad \forall (x, y) \in Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \cap \partial \Omega.$$

Thus we conclude that:

$$\int_{(Q_{\delta,\theta,p} \cap \partial \Omega)} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nu \rangle \leq 0. \quad (34)$$

If ν_z is the exterior normal of $Q_{\delta,\theta,p}$, then for $z \in S_1$, we have that:

$$\left\langle \nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}, \nu_z \right\rangle = - \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta,p}}{\partial x \partial y},$$

and for $z \in S_2$:

$$\left\langle \nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y}, \nu_z \right\rangle = \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta,p}}{\partial x \partial y}.$$




Figure 4: Image of $Q_{\delta, \theta, p}$

Since:

$$-\int_{S_1 \cup S_2} u_{\delta, p} \langle \nabla \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y}, \nu \rangle = \int_{S_1} u_{\delta, p} \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y \partial x} dy - \int_{S_2} u_{\delta, p} \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y \partial x} dy$$

and

$$\int_{\partial Q_{\delta, \theta, p}} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \langle \nabla u_{\delta, p}, \nu \rangle = \int_{C_{\theta}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} - \int_{S_1} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} dy + \int_{S_2} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} dy + \int_{(Q_{\delta, \theta, p} \cap \partial \Omega)} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \langle \nabla u_{\delta, p}, \nu \rangle$$

substituting inequality (34) in (33) we obtain:

$$0 \leq -\int_{C_{\theta}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \leq \int_{S_1} \left(u_{\delta, p} \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y \partial x} - \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} \right) dy + \int_{S_2} \left(-u_{\delta, p} \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y \partial x} + \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} \right) dy.$$

Applying integration by parts in the 1 dimensional integrals in S_i , we also have that:

$$\int_{S_i} u_{\delta, p} \frac{\partial^2 u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y \partial x} dy = [u_{\delta, p} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x}]_{\partial S_i} - \int_{S_i} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} dy = -\int_{S_i} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} dy$$

since for $z \in \partial S_i$, $u_{\delta, p}(z) = 0$. From this we obtain

$$-\int_{C_{\theta}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \leq -2 \int_{S_1} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} dy + 2 \int_{S_2} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} dy.$$

If $\tilde{\theta} < \frac{\pi}{2}$, and $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$, then $\int_{C_{\theta}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \leq 0$, and so we have:

$$\left| \int_{C_{\theta}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq 2 \int_{Q_{\delta, \theta, p} \cap \{x = -\delta \sin(\theta)\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy + 2 \int_{Q_{\delta, \theta, p} \cap \{x = \delta \sin(\theta)\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy,$$

finishing the proof.

Claim 15. *There exist $\tilde{\theta} > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$, there exists $\tilde{\delta}(\theta, \Omega)$ such that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\text{dist}(B_{\delta}(p), \partial \Omega) < \delta^2$, then:*

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, \theta, p}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 \leq C \delta^2 \theta^4$$

Consider a non-negative function $\phi \in C^\infty$ such that:

$$\phi|_{Q_{\delta,\theta,p}} = 1, \quad 0 \leq \phi \leq 1$$

$$\text{supp}(\phi) \subset [-2\delta \sin(\theta), 2\delta \sin(\theta)] \times [-2\delta \sin(\theta), 2\delta \sin(\theta)], \quad (35)$$

$$|\nabla\phi| \leq \frac{C}{\delta\theta}. \quad (36)$$

By testing $u_{\delta,p}$ with $u_{\delta,p}\phi^2 \in H_0^1(\Omega - B_\delta(p))$ we obtain:

$$\int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla u_{\delta,p} \rangle \phi^2 = \int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla(u_{\delta,p}\phi^2) \rangle - 2 \int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla\phi \rangle u_{\delta,p}\phi \leq \lambda_{\delta,p} \int u_{\delta,p}^2 \phi^2 + 2 \int |\nabla u_{\delta,p}| |\nabla\phi| u_{\delta,p}\phi. \quad (37)$$

There exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$, $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$ such that if $\text{dist}(B_\delta(p), \partial\Omega) < \delta^2$, then equation (30) is satisfied, and from (35), we conclude that for any $z \in \text{supp}(\phi) \cap \Omega - B_\delta(p)$ we have that:

$$\text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega) \leq \tilde{C}\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2. \quad (38)$$

In particular we have that:

$$|\text{supp}(\phi) \cap \Omega - B_\delta(p)| \leq (4\delta\theta)(\tilde{C}\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2). \quad (39)$$

since $|\sin(\theta)| < \theta$, and:

$$\text{supp}(\phi) \cap \Omega - B_\delta(p) \subset [-2\delta \sin(\theta), 2\delta \sin(\theta)] \times [-\tilde{C}\delta^2, \delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2].$$

By Lemma 9 and equation (38), there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $z \in \text{supp}(\phi) \cap \Omega - B_\delta(p)$ we have:

$$u_{\delta,p}(z) \leq C(\tilde{C}\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2). \quad (40)$$

Using Lemma 6 and equations (39) and (40), we conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\lambda_{\delta,p} \int u_{\delta,p}^2 \phi^2 \leq C(\tilde{C}\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2)^3 4\delta\theta. \quad (41)$$

With the above and equation (36), we also have that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\int |\nabla\phi|^2 u_{\delta,p}^2 \leq C \frac{4\delta\theta(\tilde{C}\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2)^3}{(\delta\theta)^2} \leq C \frac{(\tilde{C}\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta^2)^3}{(\delta\theta)}.$$

Now choose $\tilde{\delta}$ small enough depending on θ such that $\tilde{\delta} < \theta^2$. If $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$, then we have that for some $C > 0$:

$$\int |\nabla\phi|^2 u_{\delta,p}^2 \leq C \frac{\delta^3 \theta^6}{\delta\theta} \leq C\delta^2 \theta^5 \leq C\delta^2 \theta^4. \quad (42)$$

for $\theta < 1$. Substituting (41) and (42) in (37) implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla u_{\delta,p} \rangle \phi^2 &\leq C(\delta^2 + 2\delta\theta)^3 2\delta\theta + 2 \left(\int |\nabla u_{\delta,p}|^2 \phi^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\nabla\phi|^2 u_{\delta,p}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C\delta^4 \theta^4 + C\delta\theta^2 \left(\int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla u_{\delta,p} \rangle \phi^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Let $x = \left(\int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla u_{\delta,p} \rangle \phi^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then we have that:

$$x^2 \leq C\delta^4 \theta^4 + C\delta\theta^2 x.$$

By Lemma 12, there exists $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\tilde{\delta}$ such that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$ such that:

$$\left(\int \langle \nabla u_{\delta,p}, \nabla u_{\delta,p} \rangle \phi^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2C\delta\theta^2.$$

This finishes the proof.

Claim 16. Let $\tilde{\delta}(\theta, \Omega)$ be the constant from Claim 15. There exist $\theta_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ (independent of θ and δ) such that, for all $\theta \in]0, \theta_0[$ and $\delta < \tilde{\delta}(\theta, \Omega)$, there exists $\tilde{\theta} \in]\theta, 2\theta[$ such that:

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, \tilde{\theta}, p} \cap \{x = -\delta \sin(\tilde{\theta})\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy \leq C\delta\theta^2;$$

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, \tilde{\theta}, p} \cap \{x = \delta \sin(\tilde{\theta})\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy \leq C\delta\theta^2;$$

Let:

$$g(s) := \int_{Q_{\delta, 2\theta} \cap \{x=s\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy.$$

Then:

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, 2\theta}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 = \int_{-\delta \sin(2\theta)}^{\delta \sin(2\theta)} g(s) ds.$$

For $\delta < \tilde{\delta}(\theta, \Omega)$, by Lemma 15, there exists $C > 0$ independent of δ and θ such that

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, 2\theta}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 = \int_{-\delta \sin(2\theta)}^{\delta \sin(2\theta)} g(s) ds \leq C\delta^2\theta^4.$$

Thus we have that:

$$|\{s \in [-\delta \sin(2\theta), \delta \sin(2\theta)] : g(s) \geq C\delta\theta^2\}| \leq \delta\theta^2.$$

Thus if θ_0 is small enough, by a measure argument (since $|\delta \sin(\theta), \delta \sin(2\theta)| \geq \frac{1}{4}\theta > \delta\theta^2$ for small θ_0), there must exist $\tilde{\theta} \in]\theta, 2\theta[$ such that:

$$g(\delta \sin(\tilde{\theta})) \leq C\delta\theta^2; \quad g(-\delta \sin(\tilde{\theta})) \leq C\delta\theta^2.$$

This shows the claim.

To conclude the proof of Proposition 13, by Claim 16, there exist θ_0 and $C > 0$, such that for all $\theta < \theta_0$ and $\delta < \tilde{\delta}(\Omega, 2\theta)$, there exists $\tilde{\theta} \in]\theta, 2\theta[$, such that:

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, \tilde{\theta}} \cap \{x = -\delta \sin(\tilde{\theta})\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy \leq C\delta\theta^2,$$

$$\int_{Q_{\delta, \tilde{\theta}} \cap \{x = \delta \sin(\tilde{\theta})\}} |\nabla u_{\delta, p}|^2 dy \leq C\delta\theta^2.$$

Applying Claim 14 we conclude:

$$\left| \int_{C_{\tilde{\theta}}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq 4C\delta\theta^2$$

Since $\theta < \tilde{\theta}$ we have:

$$\left| \int_{C_{\tilde{\theta}}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq \left| \int_{C_{\tilde{\theta}}^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \right| \leq 4C\delta\theta^2$$

concluding the proof. □

4 Non trivial integral for Blowup

Let $p = (p_x, p_y) \in \Omega$. For any $M, \delta, d > 0$, we define:

$$P_{M, \delta, d}(p) := \left\{ (x, y) : (y - (p_y + \delta)) \geq M(x - p_x)^2 \text{ and } (y - (p_y + \delta)) \leq \frac{3}{2}d \right\},$$




Figure 5: Image of $\text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p)$ and $P_{M,\delta,d}(p)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p) &:= P_{M,\delta,d}(p) \cap \left\{ (y - (p_y + \delta)) = \frac{3}{2}d \right\}, \\ Q_\delta(p) &:= [p_x - \delta, p_x + \delta] \times [p_y, p_y + 2\delta], \\ \overline{Q}_\delta(p) &:= [p_x - \delta, p_x + \delta] \times [p_y + \frac{3}{2}\delta, p_y + 2\delta]. \end{aligned}$$

For this section we will need the following fact regarding sets with C^2 boundary.

Lemma 17. *There exists $\tilde{d} > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that, for all $d < \tilde{d}$, if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\frac{d}{4}}$, and the interior normal at the point $z(p) \in \partial\Omega$ is given by e_y , then:*

$$\text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p) \subset V_{2d} - V_d.$$

The aim of this section is to prove the following:

Proposition 18. *There exists $M, \tilde{d} > 0$ such that for all $d < \tilde{d}$, there exist $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$ and $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ such that if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, then*

$$\tilde{\sigma}\delta^4 \leq \int_{\overline{Q}_\delta(p)} u_{\delta,p}^2, \quad (43)$$

Proof. Given $M, \delta, d > 0$ consider $v_{\delta,p,d} \in H^1(P_{M,\delta,d}(p))$ the smooth solution in $P_{M,\delta,d}(p)$ and satisfying the boundary conditions:

$$\Delta v_{\delta,p,d} = 0, \quad \text{on } P_{M,\delta,d}(p) \quad (44)$$

$$v_{\delta,p,d} = 0, \quad \text{on } \{(y - (p_y + \delta)) = M(x - p_x)^2\} \quad (45)$$

$$v_{\delta,p,d}(x, y) = \frac{\Lambda d}{8} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2M}{3d}}(x - x_0)\right), \quad \text{on } \text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p).$$

Claim 19. *There exist $M, \tilde{\rho} > 0$ such that if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, then:*

$$v_{\delta,p,d} \leq u_{\delta,p} \quad \text{on } P_{M,\delta,d}(p) \quad (46)$$

Notice that due to Lemma 11, given $\tilde{d} > d > 0$, we can choose $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ such that if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, then:

$$v_{\delta,p,d}|_{\text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p)} \leq \frac{\Lambda d}{8} \leq u_{\delta,p}|_{\text{Top}_{M,\delta,d}(p)}.$$

Thus

$$v_{\delta,p,d}|_{\partial P_{M,\delta,d}(p)} \leq u_{\delta,p}|_{\partial P_{M,\delta,d}(p)}$$

and

$$-\Delta(u_{\delta,p} - v_{\delta,p,d}) \geq 0$$

in $P_{M,\delta,d}(p)$, and so by maximum principles, we conclude that:

$$v_{\delta,p,d}|_{P_{M,\delta,d}(p)} \leq u_{\delta,p}|_{P_{M,\delta,d}(p)}. \quad (47)$$

We fix such a $d > 0$ for the rest of this section.

Since $P_{M,\delta,d}(p)$ is simply a translation of $P_{M,d} = P_{M,d}(0,0)$, and if $v : P_{M,d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the harmonic function having the boundary conditions above, we have that $v_{\delta,p,d}$ is a translation of v , that is

$$v_{\delta,p,d}(z) = v(z - (p_x, p_y + \delta)). \quad (48)$$

Claim 20. For $M, \tilde{d}, \tilde{\rho}$ as in Claim 19 and $d < \tilde{d}$, there exist $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$ and $\tilde{\rho} > 0$, such that if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, then:

$$\int_{P_{M,\delta,d}(p) \cap Q_\delta(p)} v_{\delta,p,d}^2 \geq \tilde{\sigma} \delta^4.$$

By the observation of equation (48), we only need to prove that there exists $\tilde{\sigma} > 0$ such that:

$$\int_{P_{M,d}} v^2 \geq \tilde{\sigma} \delta^4.$$

We can apply Höpf's Lemma to conclude that there exists $c > 0$, depending on M and d such that:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial y}(0,0) \geq c. \quad (49)$$

Using C^2 continuity of v in $P_{M,d}$ close to $(0,0)$, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ small enough, such that for $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$, we have that:

$$\inf_{z \in P_{M,d} \cap [-\delta, \delta]^2} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y}(z) \geq \frac{c}{2}. \quad (50)$$

With this, for $(x_0, y_0) \in P_{M,d}(p) \cap [-\delta, \delta]^2$ satisfying $y_0 \geq \frac{\delta}{2}$, we obtain using (50):

$$v(x_0, y_0) = \int_{Mx_0^2}^{y_0} \frac{\partial v(x_0, y)}{\partial y} dy \geq \frac{c}{2}(y_0 - Mx_0^2) \geq \frac{c}{2}\left(\frac{\delta}{2} - Mx_0^2\right). \quad (51)$$

Choose $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ small enough satisfying $M\tilde{\delta} < \frac{1}{4}$, such that for $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $x_0 \in [-\delta, \delta]$ we have:

$$Mx_0^2 \leq M\delta^2 \leq M\tilde{\delta}\delta \leq \frac{\delta}{4}, \quad (52)$$

Using (51) and (52) we conclude that for $(x_0, y_0) \in [-\delta, \delta] \times [\frac{1}{2}\delta, \delta]$:

$$v(x_0, y_0) \geq \frac{c\delta}{8}. \quad (53)$$

Since $P_{M,d}(p)$ is a parabola, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ small enough such that for all $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $x < \delta$, we have:

$$Mx^2 < \frac{1}{2}\delta,$$

that is

$$[-\delta, \delta] \times [\frac{1}{2}\delta, \delta] \subset P_{M,d}(p) \cap [-\delta, \delta]^2. \quad (54)$$

Using (53) and (54), we conclude that there exists $\tilde{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{c^2}{16} = \frac{c^2}{32} > 0$, such that:

$$\int_{Q_\delta(p)} v_{\delta,p,d}^2 = \int_{[-\delta, \delta] \times [\frac{1}{2}\delta, \delta]} v^2 \geq \tilde{\sigma} \delta^4.$$

There exists $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ small enough such that, if $B_\delta(p) \subset V_{\tilde{\rho}}$, then $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and equation (47) is satisfied.

Applying Claims 19 and 20, we directly obtain (43). \square




Figure 6: Image of $Q_\delta(p)$ and $\overline{Q}_\delta(p)$

5 Blow Up Argument

This section is divided in two subsections. The first one is dedicated to prove a positivity result for the side integrals (13), that is in the set (19). This is done by a contradiction argument, by constructing a blowup and studying it to achieve contradiction. In the first subsection most of the blowup construction is done. In the second section one proves a result about the top integral in (14), also by contradiction using the blowup.

5.1 Side Integrals

Let $\theta_0 \in]0, \frac{\pi}{2}[$ be a given angle, and define the sets:

$$A_1 := \{z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : -\cos(\theta_0) < \langle z - p, e_y \rangle < \cos(\theta_0); \langle z - p, e_x \rangle > 0\};$$

$$A_2 := \{z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : -\cos(\theta_0) < \langle z - p, e_y \rangle < \cos(\theta_0); \langle z - p, e_x \rangle < 0\}.$$

In this section, we will prove the following theorem:

Proposition 21. *There exists $\tilde{\theta}_0 > 0$ such that for all $\theta_0 < \tilde{\theta}_0$, there exists $\tilde{\epsilon} := \tilde{\epsilon}(\Omega, \theta_0)$, such that if:*

$$\delta < \tilde{\epsilon}; \quad \text{dist}_{\min}(B_\delta(p), \partial\Omega) < \delta^2,$$

then:

$$\int_{A_1} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq 0,$$

$$\int_{A_2} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta,p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq 0.$$

To prove this, we will proceed by contradiction. So we suppose there exists a sequence $u_n := u_n$ such that for all n we have:

$$\int_{A_1} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 < 0; \quad \delta_n \rightarrow 0; \quad d_n := \text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_{\delta_n}(p_n), \partial\Omega) < \delta_n^2. \quad (55)$$

We consider a blowup of this sequence given by:

$$\bar{u}_n(x) := \frac{u_n}{\delta_n}(\delta_n x + p_n). \quad (56)$$

We suppose without loss of generality for all the section that $p_n = 0$ and that $e_y = \frac{p_n - z(p_n)}{|p_n - z(p_n)|}$, where $z(p)$ is defined in section 2.1. Recall that the set K defined by equation (11).

Lemma 22. *There exists a non-trivial $v \in H_{loc}^1(K)$ such that up to a subsequence:*

$$\bar{u}_n \rightharpoonup_{H_{loc}^1(K)} v.$$

Moreover, v is harmonic in K , $v \geq 0$, $v|_{\partial K} = 0$. For any $K' \Subset \text{int}(K)$ compactly contained, there exists $C = C(K')$ such that:

$$\sup_n \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_{L^2(K')} \leq C,$$

and for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_n \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0))} < +\infty$$

Proof. First we notice that the sets $\frac{1}{\delta_n}(\Omega - B_{\delta_n}(p_n))$ will converge to K due to hypothesis (55) and the fact that $\partial\Omega$ is C^2 . In particular for any compact set $K' \subset \text{int}(K)$, there exists N big enough such that for all $n > N$ we have:

$$K' \subset \frac{1}{\delta_n}(\Omega - B_{\delta_n}(p_n)).$$

Also we prove that:

$$\sup_n \|\bar{u}_n\|_{H^1(K')} < +\infty.$$

This will prove that there exists $v \in H_{loc}^1(K)$, and a subsequence such that $u_n \rightharpoonup_{H_{loc}^1(K)} v$.

By Lemma 9, since $z(p_n) \in \partial\Omega$, there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\bar{u}_n(x) = \frac{u_n}{\delta_n}(\delta_n x + p_n) \leq \frac{1}{\delta_n} C |\delta_n x + (p_n - z(p_n))| \leq C|x| + 2C,$$

where we use the fact that $|p_n - z(p_n)| \leq 2\delta_n$ for n big enough. This implies that \bar{u}_n is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(K')$ and so it also is in $L^2(K')$ since it is compact.

Now we will prove that for all $K' \subset K$, there exists a subsequence such that:

$$\sup_n \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_{L^2(K')} < +\infty.$$

To prove this we consider a test function $\phi \in C_c^\infty(K)$ such that for some $C > 0$:

$$\phi|_{K'} = 1; \quad |\nabla \phi| \leq C; \quad 0 \leq \phi \leq 1, \quad |\{\phi > 0\}| < C.$$

Thus considering the rescaling $\phi_n(x) := \phi(x/\delta_n)$ we have that:

$$|\nabla \phi_n| \leq \frac{C}{\delta_n}; \quad |\{\phi_n > 0\}| = |\{\phi > 0\}| \delta_n^2 \leq C \delta_n^2 \quad (57)$$

Now we test the equation of u_n against $u_n \phi_n^2$ to obtain:

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_n|^2 \phi_n^2 dx = \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \int_{\Omega} u_n^2 \phi_n^2 dx - 2 \int_{\Omega} \langle \nabla u_n, \nabla \phi_n \rangle u_n \phi_n dx \quad (58)$$

$$\leq \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \int_{\Omega} u_n^2 \phi_n^2 dx + 2 \|\phi_n \nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_n \nabla \phi_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad (59)$$

where in the last inequality we used Hölder's inequality. Now by the conditions of ϕ_n in (57), Lemma 6 and Lemma 9, there exists some $C > 0$ such that, for all $z \in \{\phi_n u_n > 0\}$ we have $u_n(z) \leq C\delta_n$, $\lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \leq C$ and (57) are satisfied, and so we conclude that there exists $M = \max\{C^3, C^{\frac{5}{2}}\} > 0$ such that:

$$\lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \int_{\Omega} u_n^2 \phi_n^2 dx \leq C^2 \delta_n^2 |\{\phi_n > 0\}| \leq C^3 \delta_n^4 \leq M \delta_n^4;$$

$$\|u_n \nabla \phi_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq |\{\phi_n > 0\}|^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\{\phi_n > 0\})} \|\nabla \phi_n\|_{L^\infty(\{\phi_n > 0\})} \leq C^{\frac{5}{2}} \delta_n \leq M \delta_n.$$

Thus by setting $x_n = \|\phi_n \nabla u_n\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and substituting in (59) the previous inequalities, we obtain:

$$x_n^2 \leq M \delta_n^4 + M \delta_n x_n.$$

From this inequality, the fact that $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and Lemma 12, there exists $N > 0$ big enough such that, for all $n > N$:

$$\int_{\delta_n K'} |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq x_n^2 \leq (2M \delta_n)^2.$$

Now we have that:

$$\int_{K'} |\nabla \bar{u}_n|^2 = \frac{1}{\delta_n^2} \int_{\delta_n K'} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx \leq \frac{(2M \delta_n)^2}{\delta_n^2} \leq (2M)^2,$$

proving the uniform bound.

This implies that there exists $v \in H_{loc}^1(K)$ and a subsequence \bar{u}_n , (which we leave with the same label), such that:

$$\bar{u}_n \rightharpoonup_{H_{loc}^1(K)} v.$$

Since $\bar{u}_n \geq 0$ this implies $v \geq 0$. Also since $\bar{u}_n \in H_0^1(\frac{1}{\delta_n}(\Omega - B_{\delta_n}(p_n)))$ this implies that:

$$v|_{\partial K} = 0.$$

To prove the harmonicity of v , let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(K)$. For n big enough, we have that $\text{supp}(\psi) \subset \frac{1}{\delta_n}(\Omega - B_{\delta_n}(p_n))$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K \langle \nabla v, \nabla \psi \rangle dx &= \lim_n \int \langle \nabla \bar{u}_n, \nabla \psi \rangle dx = - \lim_n \int \Delta \bar{u}_n \psi dx \\ &= - \lim_n \delta_n \int \Delta u_n(\delta_n x + p_n) \psi(x) dx = \lim_n \delta_n \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \int u_n(\delta_n x + p_n) \psi(x) dx \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$, $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty}$ and λ_{δ_n, p_n} is uniformly bounded by Lemma 8 and 6 and ψ has compact support.

Finally we prove that v is non-trivial. By Lemma 20, there exists $\sigma > 0$, such that:

$$\int_{\bar{Q}_{\delta_n}(p_n)} u_n^2 \geq \sigma \delta_n^3.$$

This implies that:

$$\int_{\frac{1}{\delta_n} \bar{Q}_{\delta_n}(p_n)} \bar{u}_n^2 \geq \sigma.$$

We have that the sets:

$$\frac{1}{\delta_n} \bar{Q}_{\delta_n}(p_n)$$

are exactly equal to:

$$[-1, 1] \times \left[\frac{3}{2}, 2\right] \subset \text{int}(K).$$

Thus by the weak convergence in $H^1([-1, 1] \times [\frac{3}{2}, 2])$, we have that u_n converges strongly in $L^2([-1, 1] \times [\frac{3}{2}, 2])$ we conclude:

$$\int_{[-1, 1] \times [\frac{3}{2}, 2]} v^2 = \lim_n \int_{[-1, 1] \times [\frac{3}{2}, 2]} \bar{u}_n^2 \geq \sigma > 0.$$

□

Lemma 23. *There exists $C > 0$ such that the function v from Lemma 22 satisfies*

$$|v(x, y)| \leq C(y + 1), \quad v(x, y) = v(-x, y). \quad (60)$$

for all $(x, y) \in K$

Proof. First we prove the inequality. Let $(x, y) \in K$ be an interior point. For n big enough we have that $(x, y) \in \frac{1}{\delta_n}\Omega$. The tangent space at $z(p_n)$ is $T_{z(p_n)}\partial\Omega = \{(x, y) : y = -|z(p_n) - p_n|\}$.

Since the boundary Ω is C^2 , there exists $\tilde{C} > 0$ (independent of (x, y)), and a point $(\delta_n x, y_n) \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\text{dist}((\delta_n x, y_n), T_{z(p_n)}\partial\Omega) < \tilde{C}|x|^2\delta_n^2$, that is $|y_n + |z(p_n) - p_n|| \leq \tilde{C}|x|^2\delta_n^2$. We also notice that $|z(p_n) - p_n| = \delta_n + O(\delta_n^2)$.

We can use this boundary point and use Lemma 9 to conclude

$$\bar{u}_n(x, y) = \frac{u(\delta_n(x, y))}{\delta_n} \leq \frac{C}{\delta_n}|\delta_n(x, y) - (\delta_n x, y_n)| \leq \frac{C|\delta_n y + |z(p_n) - p_n| - (y_n + |z(p_n) - p_n|)}{\delta_n} \quad (61)$$

$$\leq C|y + 1| + CO(\delta_n) + C\tilde{C}|x|^2\delta_n. \quad (62)$$

and so taking the limit we conclude that

$$v(x, y) \leq C|y + 1|. \quad (63)$$

We now prove the symmetry property. Given a radius R consider the sets given by:

$$V_{1,R} := K \cap B_R(0, -1) \cap \{x > 0\}$$

$$V_{2,R} := K \cap B_R(0, -1) \cap \{x < 0\}$$

We now consider the function $f : V_{1,R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by:

$$f(x, y) := v(x, y) - v(-x, y).$$

Notice that by the definition of this function we have:

$$f|_{\partial V_{1,R} - \partial B_R(0, -1)} = 0.$$

The function is harmonic in $V_{1,R}$ and by Lemma 23, there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$|f(x, y)| \leq 2C|(x, y) - (0, -1)| \leq 2CR \quad (64)$$

for $(x, y) \in \partial B_R(0, -1) \cap K$. Now define the sets given by

$$F := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\langle (x, y + 1), e_x \rangle}{|(x, y + 1)|}; \quad -\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\langle (x, y + 1), e_y \rangle}{|(x, y + 1)|} \right\}$$

$$F' := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \geq 0; \quad y \geq -1\} \subset F.$$

We have that F is a cone at the point $(0, -1)$ with an angle $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2} + 2\frac{\pi}{6} < \pi$ since $\cos(\frac{\pi}{6}) = \frac{1}{2}$. Let $h : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the positive harmonic function given by:

$$h(r, \theta) = r^\gamma g(\theta),$$

where:

$$g \geq 0; \quad g\left(-\frac{\pi}{6}\right) = g\left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{6}\right) = 0.$$

and r and θ are the radius and angle measured from the point $(0, -1)$. Also since $\alpha < \pi$ we have that $\gamma > 1$. We have that $c = \min_{\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]} g(\theta) > 0$. Now define the function given by:

$$\bar{h}_R(r, \theta) := \frac{2C}{R^{\gamma-1}c} h(r, \theta),$$

which satisfies

$$\bar{h}_R(r, \theta)|_{F' \cap \partial B_R(-1,0)} = \frac{2CR^\gamma g(\theta)}{R^{\gamma-1}c} \geq 2CR \geq |f(x, y)|.$$

Thus we conclude that $-\bar{h}_R|_{\partial V_{1,R}} \leq f|_{\partial V_{1,R}} \leq \bar{h}_R|_{\partial V_{1,R}}$. Since both of these are harmonic, by maximum principle we have that:

$$-\bar{h}_R(z) \leq f(z) \leq \bar{h}_R(z).$$

for all $z \in V_{1,R}$. Since $\gamma > 1$, we have that $\bar{h}_R \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on compact sets as $R \rightarrow \infty$, and thus $f = 0$ proving that $v(x, y) = v(-x, y)$. \square

Lemma 24. *Let $w = (\frac{3}{2}, 0)$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of n such that:*

$$\sup_n |\nabla \bar{u}_n(w)| \leq C.$$

Proof. We start by noticing that for n big enough, the ball $B_{\frac{1}{4}}(w)$ is contained in the domain of \bar{u}_n . Now define the function given by:

$$v_n(z) := \bar{u}_n(z) - \bar{u}_n(w) - \langle \nabla \bar{u}_n(w), z - w \rangle.$$

We have that:

$$\Delta v_n(z) = -\delta_n^2 \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \bar{u}_n(z) \leq 0.$$

Thus if we define:

$$\varphi_n(r) := \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{\partial B_r(w)} v_n d\mathcal{H}^1$$

then:

$$\varphi_n'(r) := \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{B_r(w)} \Delta v_n d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq 0.$$

Since $v_n(0) = 0$ this implies that:

$$\int_{\partial B_r(w)} v_n d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq 0 \tag{65}$$

for all $r \in]0, \frac{1}{4}[$. After a rotation, we assume without loss of generality that $\nabla \bar{u}_n(w) = -\alpha_n(1, 0)$. We then have that:

$$\frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x}(w) = 0.$$

Also we have that:

$$-\Delta \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x}(z) = \delta_n^2 \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial x}(z)$$

By Lemma 22, since $B_{\frac{1}{4}}(w) \subset \text{int}(K)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{1}{4}}(w))} \leq C$$

From Holder's inequality we then conclude that for $r \in]0, \frac{1}{4}[$:

$$\|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_{L^1(B_r(w))} \leq \|\chi_{B_r(w)}\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{1}{4}}(w))} \|\nabla \bar{u}_n\|_{L^2(B_{\frac{1}{4}}(w))} \leq Cr. \tag{66}$$

Now define:

$$\phi_n(r) := \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{\partial B_r(w)} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} d\mathcal{H}^1.$$

Using (66) and Lemma 6, we conclude:

$$|\phi_n'(r)| = \left| \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{B_r(w)} \Delta \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} \right| \leq \frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{B_r(w)} \delta_n^2 \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \left| \frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial x} \right| \leq \delta_n^2 \frac{Cr}{r|\partial B_1|} \leq C|\partial B_1| \delta_n^2,$$

replacing C by $C|\partial B_1|^2$ if necessary. Since $\nabla v_n(w) = 0$, integrating the previous equation, we have for all $r \in]0, \frac{1}{4}[$:

$$\frac{1}{|\partial B_r|} \int_{\partial B_r(w)} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} d\mathcal{H}^1 = \phi_n(r) \leq C\delta_n^2 |\partial B_1| r = C\delta_n^2 |\partial B_r|.$$

Thus we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_r(w)} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} &= \int_0^r \left(\int_{\partial B_s(w)} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} \mathcal{H}^1 \right) ds \leq \int_0^r \left(\frac{|\partial B_s|}{|\partial B_s|} \int_{B_s(w)} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} \mathcal{H}^1 \right) ds \\ &= \int_0^r (C\delta_n^2 |\partial B_s|^2) ds = \frac{C\delta_n^2 |\partial B_1|^2}{3} r^3. \end{aligned}$$

Using integration by parts we also have that:

$$\int_{B_r(w)} \frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x} = \int_{\partial B_r(w)} v_n(z) (\nu_x)_z d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq \frac{C\delta_n^2 |\partial B_1|^2}{3} r^3. \quad (67)$$

Summing equations (65) and (67) we obtain:

$$\int_{\partial B_r(w)} v_n(z) (1 + (\nu_x)_z) d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq \frac{C\delta_n^2 |\partial B_1|^2}{3} r^3,$$

where $(\nu_x)_z = \frac{(z-w)_x}{|z-w|}$, is the x coordinate of the outer normal ν of $\partial B_{|z-w|}(w)$ at z . Also since \bar{u}_n are positive in $B_{\frac{1}{2}}(w)$ we have:

$$v_n(z) \geq -\bar{u}_n(w) - \langle \nabla \bar{u}_n, z-w \rangle = -\bar{u}_n(w) + \alpha_n (z-w)_x.$$

Defining $a_n = \bar{u}_n(w)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta_n^2 |\partial B_1|^2}{3} r^3 &\geq \int_{\partial B_r(w)} (-a_n + \alpha_n (z-w)_x) \left(1 + \frac{(z-w)_x}{|z-w|} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \\ &= \int_{\partial B_r(w)} -a_n + \alpha_n \frac{(z-w)_x^2}{|z-w|} d\mathcal{H}^1 = -a_n |\partial B_r| + \alpha_n \frac{r |\partial B_r|}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used symmetry of $(z-w)_x$ in $\partial B_r(w)$. Since this is true for all $n \in \mathbb{R}$, since $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and $a_n = \bar{u}_n(w)$ is uniformly bounded by Lemma 22, if $\alpha_n = |\nabla \bar{u}_n(w)| \rightarrow \infty$ the inequality above cannot hold, thus there exists $C > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$|\nabla \bar{u}_n(w)| \leq C,$$

concluding the proof. \square

We can apply Theorem 5 to conclude the following

Lemma 25. *Let v be the function from Lemma 22 and define the subset of K :*

$$V := \{(x, y) \in B_2(0) - B_1(0) : y \geq -\cos(\theta_0)\}.$$

Then:

$$\|\nabla \bar{u}_n - \nabla v\|_{L^\infty(V)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Using theorem 5 and a change of variables, since:

$$-\Delta \bar{u}_n = \lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \delta_n \bar{u}_n$$

we can conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that in the set V we have:

$$\|D^2 \bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(V)} \leq C \left(1 + \|\bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2(0)-B_1(0))} + \|\lambda_{\delta_n, p_n} \delta_n \bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2(0)-B_1(0))} \right). \quad (68)$$




Figure 7

Also, by Lemma 22 we can conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|\bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2(0)-B_1(0))} \leq 2C$. Thus $\|D^2\bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(V)}$ is uniformly bounded. Now given the point $w = (\frac{3}{2}, 0) \in V$, by Lemma 24 we can conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$|\nabla\bar{u}_n(w)| \leq C. \quad (69)$$

for all n . Combining (68) and (69) we can conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\|\nabla\bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(V)} \leq C. \quad (70)$$

From (68), by Sobolev inequalities, we know that \bar{u}_n are uniformly Lipschitz in V , and by (70) we know that they are also uniformly bounded in V . Thus using Ascoli-Arzelà's Theorem, there exists a subsequence $\nabla\bar{u}_n$ (which we leave with the same label) such that it converges uniformly in V (and by unicity of limits it must be ∇v). From the convergence above and by Lemma 22 we conclude that:

$$\|\nabla\bar{u}_n - \nabla v\|_{L^\infty(V)} \rightarrow 0,$$

finishing the proof. \square

Now we construct a blowdown sequence from the function v . Let $R_n > 2$ be a sequence such that $R_n \rightarrow +\infty$.

We will construct the following blowdown sequence of the harmonic function v , given by:

$$\tilde{v}_n(x, y) := \frac{1}{R_n}v(R_n(x, y) + (0, -1)).$$

Lemma 26. *There exist $\tilde{v} : \{(x, y) : y \geq 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:*

$$\|\nabla\tilde{v}_n - \nabla\tilde{v}\|_{L^\infty(B_2(0)-(B_1(0) \cup \{y > 0\}))} \rightarrow 0,$$

and some $\alpha \geq 0$ such that:

$$\tilde{v}(x, y) = \alpha y.$$

Proof. Let $D := B_3(0) - (B_1(0) \cup \{y > 0\})$.

By Theorem 5, since v is harmonic, we can conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\|D^2\tilde{v}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2 \cap D)} \leq C(1 + \|\tilde{v}_n\|_{L^\infty(D)}). \quad (71)$$

Also using Lemma 22 we can conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{v}_n\|_{L^\infty(D)} \leq 2C$, and so $\|D^2\tilde{v}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2 \cap D)}$ is uniformly bounded. Also given the point $w = (\sqrt{3}/2, \sqrt{3}/2) \in B_2^+(0) - B_1(0)$, since \tilde{v}_n

are positive and harmonic, we can do a proof similar to Lemma 24, to conclude that there exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_n |\nabla \tilde{v}_n(w)| \leq C. \quad (72)$$

From equation (72) and the uniform bound of $\|D^2 \tilde{v}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2^+(0) - B_1(0))}$ we must have that ∇v_n must converge in the uniform topology in $B_2^+(0) - B_1(0)$. Generalizing this argument, substituting $B_1(0)$ by $B_\epsilon(0)$ a smaller ball, we can also conclude that:

$$\tilde{v}_n \rightarrow_{H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{H})} \tilde{v}$$

where \tilde{v} is harmonic in the upper half plane \mathbb{H} and $\tilde{v}|_{\partial\mathbb{H}} = 0$. From Lemma 23 we have that $\tilde{v}_n(x, y) \leq Cy$. Thus, since \tilde{v} is positive and it satisfies a bound $\tilde{v}(x, y) \leq Cy$, from the fact it is harmonic, we can conclude that:

$$\tilde{v}(x, y) = \alpha y$$

for some $\alpha \geq 0$. From the uniform convergence of the gradients the proof follows. \square

Lemma 27. *Let v be the function from Lemma 22. We must have that:*

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(x, y) \geq 0$$

for $x > 0$ and $(x, y) \in K$ defined in equation (11).

Proof. By Lemma 23, we must have:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(0, y) = 0.$$

Also since v is positive, and $v(x, -1) = 0$, for $x > 0$ we must have:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(x, -1) \geq 0.$$

Also for $(x, y) \in \partial B_1(0)$ we have:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(x, y) = 0.$$

Given the sequence $R_n \rightarrow \infty$, define:

$$D_n := \{x \geq 0\} \cap \{y \geq -1\} \cap B_{\frac{3}{2}R_n}(0) - B_1(0).$$

If we prove that:

$$\lim_n \inf_{(x,y) \in \partial B_{\frac{3}{2}R_n}(0) \cap \{y \geq -1; x \geq 0\}} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta} \geq 0$$

since $\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}$ is harmonic we conclude that:

$$\inf_{(x,y) \in D_n} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(x, y) \geq 0, \quad (73)$$

for all n . From Lemma 26 there exists $\alpha \geq 0$ such that we have that:

$$\|\nabla v - \alpha e_y\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_{\frac{3}{2}R_n}(0) \cap \{y > -1\})} = \|\nabla \tilde{v}_n - \alpha e_y\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_{\frac{3}{2}}(0, \frac{1}{R_n}) \cap \{y > 0\})} \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus in particular:

$$\left\| \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta} - \alpha \langle e_y, \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \rangle \right\|_{L^\infty(\partial B_{\frac{3}{2}R_n}(0) \cap \{y > -1\})} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\langle e_y, \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \rangle \geq 0$ for points (x, y) with $x > 0$, we conclude:

$$\lim_n \inf_{(x,y) \in \partial B_{R_n}(0) \cap \{y \geq -1; x \geq 0\}} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}(x, y) \geq 0.$$

Thus we conclude equation (73) is satisfied for all n . and because $R_n \rightarrow \infty$, this concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 28. *There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for*

$$z \in A'_1 := \{(x, y) \in \partial B_1(0) : -\cos(\theta_0) \leq \langle (x, y), e_y \rangle \leq \cos(\theta_0); x \geq 0\}$$

we have:

$$\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \theta \partial \nu}(z) \geq \gamma.$$

Proof. Using Höpf's Lemma, Lemma 27 and the fact that v is non-trivial (which implies $\frac{\partial v}{\partial \theta}$ is non-trivial), we conclude that for $(x, y) \in \partial B_1(0)$ with $x > 0$ we must have:

$$\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \nu \partial \theta}(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \theta \partial \nu}(x, y) > 0.$$

Thus using C^2 continuity in the set A'_1 , we conclude that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $(x, y) \in \{(x, y) \in \partial B_1(0) : -\cos(\theta_0) \leq \langle (x, y), e_y \rangle \leq \cos(\theta_0); x \geq 0\}$ we have:

$$\frac{\partial^2 v}{\partial \theta \partial \nu}(x, y) \geq \gamma.$$

□

Now we conclude the proof Proposition 21.

Proof. By Lemma 28 we conclude that in the set A'_1 , there exists $c > 0$ such that:

$$\int_{A'_1} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 = \int_{A'_1} \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} \right)^2 \langle e_y, \nu \rangle d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq c > 0.$$

This is the case since $\left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu}\right)^2$ increases as θ increases and $\langle e_y, \nu \rangle$ is an odd function in θ .

By the convergence from Lemma 25, we conclude that for $n \geq N$ where N is big enough we have:

$$\int_{A'_1} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 > 0 \tag{74}$$

but this implies that

$$\int_{A_1} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 > 0$$

in contradiction with the initial hypothesis (55). This concludes the proof reaching contradiction. □

5.2 Top Integral Lower Bound

In this section we prove the following proposition:

Proposition 29. *If $\theta \in]0, \frac{\pi}{2}[$, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ and $c > 0$ depending only on Ω such that if $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_\delta(p), \partial \Omega) < \delta^2$ then:*

$$\int_{C_{\theta, \delta}^+(p)} \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \right) \left(\frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq c\theta\delta$$

where:

$$C_{\theta, \delta}^+(p) = \left\{ z \in \partial B_\delta(p) : \frac{\langle z - p, e_y \rangle}{|z - p|} \geq \cos(\theta) \right\}.$$

and ν is the exterior normal to $B_\delta(p)$.

Proof. The proof will be done by contradiction as in the section for the side integrals. Thus we suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence $\theta_n \in]0, \frac{\pi}{2}[$, $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ and p_n such that $\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_{\delta_n}(p_n), \partial\Omega)$ satisfying:

$$\frac{1}{\theta_n \delta_n} \int_{C_{\theta_n, \delta_n}^+(p_n)} \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \right) \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial y} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \rightarrow 0. \quad (75)$$

By considering the blowup given by:

$$\bar{u}_n(x) := \frac{u_n}{\delta_n}(\delta_n x + p_n),$$

we can use Lemmas 22 and 25 to conclude there exists $v : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ harmonic in K such that:

$$\|\nabla v - \nabla \bar{u}_n\|_{L^\infty(B_2^+(0) - B_1(0))} \rightarrow 0 \quad (76)$$

where $K = \{(x, y) : y \geq -1\} - B_1(0)$. By 22 v , is a non-trivial positive harmonic function, thus by Höpf's Lemma, we conclude there exists $c > 0$ such that:

$$\sup_{z \in B_1^+(0)} |\nabla v(z)| \geq c > 0 \quad (77)$$

Using (76) and (77), for n big enough we have that:

$$\sup_{z \in C_{\theta_n, \delta_n}^+(p_n)} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial \nu}(z) \geq \frac{c}{2}.$$

This implies that for n big enough there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that:

$$\frac{1}{\theta_n \delta_n} \int_{C_{\theta_n, \delta_n}^+(p_n)} \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \right) \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial y} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 = \frac{1}{\theta_n} \int_{C_{\theta_n, 1}(0)} \left(\frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial \nu} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \bar{u}_n}{\partial y} \right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \quad (78)$$

$$\geq \frac{(c/2)^2}{\theta_n} \int_{C_{\theta_n, 1}(0)} \langle e_y, \nu_z \rangle d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq \alpha > 0. \quad (79)$$

We have that (79) contradicts the hypothesis (75), which concludes the proof. \square

6 Conclusion of Theorem

Now we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof. Let $c > 0$ be the constant from Proposition 29 and $C > 0$ the constant from Proposition 13. Choose $\theta > 0$ such that:

$$C\theta^2 < c\theta.$$

By Propositions 29 and 13 choose $\tilde{\delta} = \tilde{\delta}(\Omega, \theta)$ small enough such that for $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ and $\text{dist}_{\min}(\partial B_\delta(p), \partial\Omega) < \delta^2$ we have:

$$\int_{C_\theta^+} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq c\delta\theta; \quad (80)$$

$$\int_{C_\theta^-} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq -C\delta\theta^2. \quad (81)$$

Also for $A = \partial B_\delta(p) - (C_\theta^+ \cup C_\theta^-)$, by Proposition 21 there exists $\tilde{\delta}(\theta, \Omega)$ small enough such that for $\delta < \tilde{\delta}$ then:

$$\int_A \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq 0. \quad (82)$$

Combining equation (80), (81) and (82) we conclude that:

$$\int_{\partial B_\delta(p)} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial u_{\delta, p}}{\partial y} d\mathcal{H}^1 \geq \delta(c\theta - C\theta^2) > 0,$$

concluding the proof. \square

References

- [1] Bedr'Eddine Ainseba and Sebastian Anița. “Internal stabilizability for a reaction–diffusion problem modeling a predator–prey system”. In: *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications* 61.4 (2005), pp. 491–501. ISSN: 0362-546X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2004.09.055>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0362546X04004596>.
- [2] Dorin Bucur and Giuseppe Buttazzo. “Variational Methods in Shape Optimization Problems”. In: *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Application* (Jan. 2005).
- [3] Anisa M. H. Chorwadwala and Souvik Roy. *How to place an obstacle having a dihedral symmetry centered at a given point inside a disk so as to optimize the fundamental Dirichlet eigenvalue*. 2017. DOI: 10.48550/ARXIV.1707.01368. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.01368>.
- [4] Ahmad El Soufi and Rola Kiwan. “Where to place a spherical obstacle so as to maximize the second Dirichlet eigenvalue”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 7.5 (2008), pp. 1193–1201.
- [5] M. Flucher. “Approximation of Dirichlet Eigenvalues on Domains with Small Holes”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 193.1 (1995), pp. 169–199. ISSN: 0022-247X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmaa.1995.12280>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022247X85712280>.
- [6] Nunzia Gavitone et al. “An isoperimetric inequality for the first Steklov–Dirichlet Laplacian eigenvalue of convex sets with a spherical hole”. In: *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 320.2 (Dec. 2022), pp. 241–259. DOI: 10.2140/pjm.2022.320.241. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.2022.320.241>.
- [7] Antoine Henrot. *Extremum Problems for Eigenvalues of Elliptic Operators*. Springer Science & Business Media, Jan. 2006. ISBN: 978-3-7643-7705-2. DOI: 10.1007/3-7643-7706-2.
- [8] Evans M. Harrell II, Pawel Kröger, and Kazuhiro Kurata. “On the Placement of an Obstacle or a Well so as to Optimize the Fundamental Eigenvalue”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 33.1 (2001), pp. 240–259. DOI: 10.1137/S0036141099357574. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036141099357574>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0036141099357574>.
- [9] S. Kesavan. “On two functionals connected to the Laplacian in a class of doubly connected domains”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* 133.3 (2003), pp. 617–624. DOI: 10.1017/S0308210500002560.
- [10] Dario Mazzoleni, Benedetta Pellacci, and Gianmaria Verzini. “Asymptotic spherical shapes in some spectral optimization problems”. In: *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 135 (2020), pp. 256–283.
- [11] Alexander Ramm and Pappur Shivakumar. “Inequalities for the minimal eigenvalue of the Laplacian in an annulus”. In: *Mathematical Inequalities & Applications* 1.4 (1998), pp. 559–563. DOI: 10.7153/mia-01-54.
- [12] Georg Weiss et al. “Regularity of Free Boundaries in Obstacle-Type Problems”. In: *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung* 115 (Sept. 2013). DOI: 10.1365/s13291-013-0064-4.