



Erratum to "An isoperimetric inequality for a nonlinear eigenvalue problem"

Gisella Croce, Antoine Henrot, Giovanni Pisante

► To cite this version:

Gisella Croce, Antoine Henrot, Giovanni Pisante. Erratum to "An isoperimetric inequality for a nonlinear eigenvalue problem". *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 2015, 32 (2), pp.485-487. 10.1016/j.anihpc.2014.04.006 . hal-01302640

HAL Id: hal-01302640

<https://hal.science/hal-01302640>

Submitted on 14 Apr 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ERRATUM TO "AN ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY FOR A NONLINEAR EIGENVALUE PROBLEM"

GISELLA CROCE, ANTOINE HENROT AND GIOVANNI PISANTE

Recently it came to our attention that our proof proposed in [1] about the minimizing set of the eigenvalue

$$(1) \quad \lambda^{p,q}(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\|\nabla v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}}{\|v\|_{L^q(\Omega)}}, v \neq 0, v \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} |v|^{q-2} v \, dx = 0 \right\}$$

among the bounded open sets $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ of given volume is not correct. Indeed the argument that we used to write the Euler-Lagrange equation in Theorem 6 cannot be applied. More precisely in the last paragraph of the proof we need to test the minimality with the function $u + t_n(\varphi + c_{t_n})$ which is not in $W_0^{1,p}$ but merely constant on the boundary.

The statement of Theorem 1 in [1] is not true for every p, q satisfying

$$(2) \quad 1 < p < \infty \text{ and } \begin{cases} 2 \leq q < p^*, & \text{if } 1 < p < N \\ 2 \leq q < \infty, & \text{if } p \geq N \end{cases}$$

as remarked also by Nazarov in [3]¹. For a correct statement we should replace $\lambda^{p,q}(\Omega)$ in [1] by

$$(3) \quad \lambda_{per}^{p,q}(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\|\nabla v\|_{L^p(\Omega)}}{\|v\|_{L^q(\Omega)}}, v \neq 0, v \in W_{per}^{1,p}(\Omega), \int_{\Omega} |v|^{q-2} v \, dx = 0 \right\}$$

where $W_{per}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ stands for the set of $W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ functions with constant boundary value. As in [2] for the case $p = q = 2$, $\lambda_{per}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ is minimized by the union of two equal balls for every p, q satisfying (2).

The proof goes exactly as in [1], up to these modifications:

- (1) In Theorem 5 one needs to use the Schwarz symmetrization on $\Omega_+ = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > c\}$ and $\Omega_- = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) < c\}$, where c is the value of the eigenfunction u at $\partial\Omega$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J60, 35P30, 47A75, 49R50, 52A40.

Key words and phrases. Shape optimization, eigenvalues, symmetrization, Euler equation, shape derivative.

¹Nazarov considers the following test functions on domains Ω given by union of balls B_+, B_- of radii R_+, R_- . Let v be the restriction to one ball of the eigenfunction realizing $\lambda^{p,q}(B_+ \cup B_-)$. For $x \mapsto c_+ v\left(\frac{R_{1/2} x}{R_+}\right) \chi_{B_+} - c_- v\left(\frac{R_{1/2} x}{R_-}\right) \chi_{B_-}$ (where $c_+, c_- \geq 0$, $c_+^{q-1} R_+^N = c_-^{q-1} R_-^N$ and $2R_{1/2}^N = \frac{|\Omega|}{\omega_N}$) one has

$$\lambda^{p,q}(B_+ \cup B_-) \leq \frac{\|\nabla v\|_{L^p(B_{1/2})}}{\|v\|_{L^q(B_{1/2})}} R_{1/2}^{1-\frac{N}{p}+\frac{N}{q}} \frac{\left[c_+^p R_+^{N-p} + c_-^p R_-^{N-p}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\left[c_+^q R_+^N + c_-^q R_-^N\right]^{\frac{1}{q}}}.$$

Then he finds an explicit value \hat{q} such that, for $q > \hat{q}$, a simple first order analysis shows that the last function of (R_+, R_-) does not attain its minimum value in $(R_{1/2}, R_{1/2})$. This proves that the minimizing set is not given by a pair of two equal balls.

- (2) Theorem 7 is no longer true in general for this eigenvalue, nevertheless we can prove Theorem 8 in a similar way. There are two differences in the proof:
- (a) we have to deal with the boundary condition which is not standard when performing the domain derivative;
 - (b) even when the optimal domain has a multiple first eigenvalue, we can still deduce that the derivative of any eigenfunction has to vanish. For this we use the existence of directional derivatives along with the minimality of the eigenvalue.
- (3) The ordinary differential equation satisfied by the radial component w of u_1 , that is,

$$- \left[(p-1)z''(t) + \frac{N-1}{t}z'(t) \right] |z'(t)|^{p-2} = [\lambda_{per}^{p,q}(\Omega)]^p \|u\|_{L^q(\Omega)}^{p-q} |z(t)|^{q-2} z(t),$$

implies that if $\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu_1} = 0$ then $u_1 = 0$ on the boundary. Therefore the proof of Theorem 9 is valid.

We end this erratum with a remark about $\lambda^{p,q}(\Omega)$. For q small enough, it turns out that the eigenfunction of $\lambda_{per}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ seems to be symmetric and satisfies $u = 0$ on the boundary (at this time, we are only able to prove it for $q = p$).² In this case, our result about $\lambda^{p,q}(\Omega)$ still holds, since

$$\lambda^{p,q}(\Omega) \geq \lambda_{per}^{p,q}(\Omega) \geq \lambda_{per}^{p,q}(B \cup B) = \lambda^{p,q}(B \cup B)$$

where the last equality is due to the fact that if u is an eigenfunction of $\lambda_{per}^{p,q}(\Omega)$ satisfying $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, then u is an eigenfunction of $\lambda^{p,q}(\Omega)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Croce, A. Henrot and G. Pisante. An isoperimetric inequality for a nonlinear eigenvalue problem. *Annales de l'IHP (C) Non Linear Analysis*, 29(1):21–34, 2012.
- [2] A. Greco and M. Lucia. Laplacian eigenvalues for mean zero functions with constant Dirichlet data. *Forum Mathematicum*, 20(5):763–782, 2008.
- [3] A. I. Nazarov. On symmetry and asymmetry in a problem of shape optimization. *arXiv:1208.3640*, 2012.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES APPLIQUÉES DU HAVRE, UNIVERSITÉ DU HAVRE, 25, RUE PHILIPPE LEBON, 76063 LE HAVRE (FRANCE), INSTITUT ÉLIE CARTAN NANCY, UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE-CNRS-INRIA, B.P. 70239, 54506 VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY (FRANCE), DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, SECONDA UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI NAPOLI, VIA VIVALDI, 43, 81100 CASERTA (ITALY)

E-mail address: gisella.croce@univ-lehavre.fr, antoine.henrot@univ-lorraine.fr, giovanni.pisante@unina2.it

²Indeed, let $u = u_1(|x - x_1|)\chi_{B_1} + u_2(|x - x_2|)\chi_{B_2}$ be an eigenfunction of $\lambda = \lambda_{per}^{p,q}(B_1 \cup B_2)$ and w be the solution to

$$- \left[(p-1)w''(t) + \frac{N-1}{t}w'(t) \right] |w'(t)|^{p-2} = |w(t)|^{q-2}w(t), \quad w(0) = 1, \quad w'(0) = 0.$$

Let $\alpha_i = u(x_i)$ and $w_{\alpha_i}(t) = \alpha_i w(c(\alpha_i)t)$, where $c(\alpha) = \frac{\lambda \|u\|_{L^q}^{1-q/p}}{|\alpha|^{1-\frac{q}{p}}}$, for $\alpha \neq 0$. Then it is not difficult to prove that $u_i = w_{\alpha_i}(|x - x_i|)$. Since u is constant on the boundary, in the case $q = p$ one has $\alpha_1 w(\lambda R_1) = \alpha_2 w(\lambda R_2)$. Assuming w.l.o.g. that $u = c \geq 0$ on the boundary, we get $w(\lambda R_1) = 0 = w(\lambda R_2)$ since $\alpha_1 > 0 > \alpha_2$.