



HAL
open science

A Faber-Krahn inequality with drift

Francois Hamel, Nikolai Nadirashvili, Emmanuel Russ

► **To cite this version:**

Francois Hamel, Nikolai Nadirashvili, Emmanuel Russ. A Faber-Krahn inequality with drift. 2006.
hal-00087322

HAL Id: hal-00087322

<https://hal.science/hal-00087322>

Preprint submitted on 23 Jul 2006

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.

A Faber-Krahn inequality with drift

François Hamel ^a, Nikolai Nadirashvili ^b and Emmanuel Russ ^a

^a Université Aix-Marseille III, LATP, Faculté des Sciences et Techniques, Case cour A
Avenue Escadrille Normandie-Niemen, F-13397 Marseille Cedex 20, France

^b CNRS, LATP, CMI, 39 rue F. Joliot-Curie, F-13453 Marseille Cedex 13, France
francois.hamel@univ.u-3mrs.fr, nicolas@cmi.univ-mrs.fr, emmanuel.russ@univ.u-3mrs.fr

Abstract

Let Ω be a bounded $C^{2,\alpha}$ domain in \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1$), Ω^* be the open Euclidean ball centered at 0 having the same Lebesgue measure as Ω , $\tau \geq 0$ and $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau$. If $\lambda_1(\Omega, \tau)$ denotes the principal eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta + v \cdot \nabla$ in Ω with Dirichlet boundary condition, we establish that $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$ where $e_r(x) = x/|x|$. Moreover, equality holds only when, up to translation, $\Omega = \Omega^*$ and $v = \tau e_r$. This result can be viewed as an isoperimetric inequality for the first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian with drift. It generalizes the celebrated Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality for the first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian.

1 Introduction and main results

Throughout all the paper, $n \geq 1$ denotes an integer in $\mathbb{N}^* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. By “domain”, we mean an open connected subset of \mathbb{R}^n , and we denote by \mathcal{C} the set of all bounded domains of \mathbb{R}^n which are of class $C^{2,\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. For any measurable subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $|A|$ stands for the standard n -dimensional Lebesgue measure of A . Throughout the paper, B_r^n denotes the open Euclidean ball of \mathbb{R}^n with center 0 and radius $r > 0$, and we set $\alpha_n = |B_1^n| = \pi^{n/2}/\Gamma(n/2 + 1)$. For $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, we define Ω^* as the ball $B_{(|\Omega|/\alpha_n)^{1/n}}$ having the same measure as Ω . Finally, if $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ and $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is measurable, $|v|$ will denote the Euclidean norm of v , and we say that $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ if $|v| \in L^\infty$, and write (somewhat abusively) $\|v\|_\infty$ instead of $\| |v| \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$.

If $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ denotes the first eigenvalue of the Laplace operator $-\Delta$ with Dirichlet boundary condition (Dirichlet Laplacian), in an open bounded smooth set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, it is well-known that $\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*)$ and that the inequality is strict unless Ω is a ball. Since $\lambda_1(\Omega^*)$ can be explicitly computed, this result provides the classical Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality, which states that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq |\Omega|^{-2/n} \alpha_n^{2/n} j_{n/2-1,1}^2, \quad (1.1)$$

where $j_{m,1}$ the first positive zero of the Bessel function J_m . Moreover, equality in (1.1) is attained if and only if Ω is a ball. This result was first conjectured by Rayleigh (1894/1896) for $n = 2$ ([34] vol. I, pp. 339-345), and proved independently by Faber ([16], 1923) and Krahn ([23], 1925) for $n = 2$, and by Krahn for all n in [24] (1926; see [25] for the English translation).

Many other optimization results for the eigenvalues of the Dirichlet Laplacian have been proved. For instance, the minimum of $\lambda_2(\Omega)$ among open bounded sets $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with given Lebesgue measure is achieved by the union of two identical balls (this result is attributed to Szegő, see [31]). Very few things seem to be known about optimization problems for the other eigenvalues, see [14, 19, 31, 32, 39].

Various optimization results are known about functions of the eigenvalues. For instance, the Payne-Pólya-Weinberger conjecture (see [30]) on the ratio of the first two eigenvalues was proved by Ashbaugh and Benguria ([2]), in any dimension n : namely, for any bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda_2(\Omega)/\lambda_1(\Omega) \leq \lambda_2(\Omega^*)/\lambda_1(\Omega^*)$, and the equality is attained only when Ω is a ball. The same result was also extended in [2] for elliptic operators in divergence form with definite weight. We also refer to [3, 4, 6, 9, 15, 21, 22, 26, 27, 30, 32] for further bounds or other optimization results for some eigenvalues or some functions of the eigenvalues in fixed or varying domains.

Other boundary conditions may also be considered. For instance, if $\mu_2(\Omega)$ is the first non-trivial eigenvalue of the Laplacian under Neumann boundary condition, $\mu_2(\Omega) \leq \mu_2(\Omega^*)$ and the equality is attained only when Ω is a ball (see [36] in dimension $n = 2$, and [38] in any dimension). Bounds or optimization results for other eigenvalues of the Laplacian under Neumann boundary condition ([30, 32, 36, 38], see also [7] for inhomogeneous problems), for Robin boundary condition ([12]) or for the Stekloff eigenvalue problem ([13]) have also been established.

We also mention another Rayleigh conjecture for the lowest eigenvalue of the clamped plate. If Ω is a smooth bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 , denote by $\Lambda_1(\Omega)$ the lowest eigenvalue of the operator Δ^2 , so that $\Delta^2 u_1 = \Lambda_1(\Omega)u_1$ in Ω with $u_1 = |\nabla u_1| = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $u_1 > 0$ in Ω . The second author proved in [28] that $\Lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \Lambda_1(\Omega^*)$ and that equality holds only when Ω is a ball (disk, in dimension 2). The analogous result was also established in \mathbb{R}^3 in [5], whereas the problem is still open in higher dimensions.

Very nice and much more complete surveys of all these topics and additional results can be found in [8, 19, 29] and the references therein.

All above problems concern self-adjoint operators. In the present paper, we focus on optimization problems for the first eigenvalue of the *non-self-adjoint* Laplace operator *with a drift* under Dirichlet boundary condition.

For any domain $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, for any $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, we call $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ the first eigenvalue of $L = -\Delta + v \cdot \nabla$ with Dirichlet boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$, and $\varphi_{\Omega, v}$ the corresponding (unique) positive eigenfunction with L^∞ -norm equal to 1. In the sequel, $\varphi_{\Omega, v}$ will be denoted by φ when the context makes clear what Ω and v are. Recall that the maximum principle holds for L , and, as a consequence, $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) > 0$ (see [11]). One has

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi + v \cdot \nabla\varphi = \lambda_1(\Omega, v)\varphi \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \varphi > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \varphi = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

Moreover, by standard elliptic estimates (see [1, 18]), $\varphi \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq p < +\infty$, whence, up to the choice of the continuous representant in the class of φ , $\varphi \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $0 \leq \beta < 1$. Recall also that if λ is any eigenvalue for the operator L , then either $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ or $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda) > \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$, and that, if ψ is any positive eigenfunction in Ω for L corresponding to the eigenvalue λ , then actually $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ and ψ and φ are proportional (see [11] again).

For all $x \neq 0$, set

$$e_r(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}.$$

Our main result is the following one:

Theorem 1.1 *For any dimension $n \geq 1$, any $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, any $\tau \geq 0$ and any $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau$,*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r). \quad (1.3)$$

Moreover, equality holds only when, up to translation, $\Omega = \Omega^$ and $v = \tau e_r$, namely when there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $(\Omega, v) = (x_0 + \Omega^*, \tau e_r(\cdot - x_0))$.*

Theorem 1.1 can then be viewed as a natural extension of the first Rayleigh conjecture to the Dirichlet Laplacian with drift in any dimension n .

A rough parabolic interpretation of Theorem 1.1 can be the following one: consider the evolution equation $u_t = \Delta u - v \cdot \nabla u$ in Ω , for $t > 0$, with Dirichlet boundary condition on $\partial\Omega$, and with an initial datum at $t = 0$. Roughly speaking, minimizing $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ (with given $|\Omega|$ and with $\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau$ can be interpreted as looking for the slowest exponential time-decay of the solution u . The best way to do that is to try to minimize the boundary effects, namely to have the domain as round as possible, and it is not unreasonable to say that the vector field $-v$ should as much as possible point inwards the domain to avoid the drift towards the boundary. Of course diffusion, boundary losses and transport phenomena take place simultaneously, but these heuristic arguments tend to lead to the optimal couple $(\Omega, -v) = (\Omega^*, -\tau e_r)$ (up to translation).

As a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following Faber-Krahn type inequality for the Dirichlet Laplacian with drift, which extends the classical Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality for the Dirichlet Laplacian. Namely we get a lower bound for $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$, which depends only on $|\Omega|$ and $\|v\|_\infty$:

Corollary 1.2 *For each $n \geq 1$, there exists a function $F_n : (0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$, defined by $F_n(m, \tau) = \lambda_1(B_{(m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}}^n, \tau e_r)$ such that, for any domain $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ and any $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$,*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq F_n(|\Omega|, \|v\|_\infty) \quad (1.4)$$

and equality holds if and only if, up to translation, $\Omega = \Omega^$ and $v = \|v\|_\infty e_r$.*

Remark 1.3 For fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $m > 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$, inequality (1.3) of Theorem 1.1 may be reformulated in the following way: $\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m, \|v\|_\infty \leq \tau} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \lambda_1(B, \tau e_r)$, where $B =$

$B_{(m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}}^n$. Since $\lambda_1(\Omega', v|_{\Omega'}) > \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ for all $\Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$, $\Omega' \subsetneq \Omega$ and $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ (see [11]), Theorem 1.1 yields at once

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega| \leq m, \|v\|_\infty \leq \tau} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \lambda_1(B, \tau e_r),$$

and the infimum is reached for and only for $\Omega = B$ and $v = \tau e_r$ (up to translation).

The above inequalities (1.3) and (1.4) can also be generalized to more general open sets Ω . First, one has $\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}', |\Omega| \leq m, \|v\|_\infty \leq \tau} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \lambda_1(B, \tau e_r)$, where \mathcal{C}' denotes the set of all open bounded subsets Ω of \mathbb{R}^n of class $C^{2,\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, with finite number (maybe not reduced to 1) of connected components (for $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}'$ and $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ is the minimum, over k , of the eigenvalues $\lambda_1(\Omega_k, v|_{\Omega_k})$, where the Ω_k 's are the connected components of Ω). Thus, inequalities (1.3) and (1.4) hold for $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}'$ and the case of equality holds only if, up to translation, $\Omega = B$ and $v = \tau e_r$.

Furthermore, for non-smooth and possibly unbounded Ω with finite measure, following [11], one can still define $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$, as $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \inf_{\Omega' \subset \Omega, \Omega' \in \mathcal{C}'} \lambda_1(\Omega', v|_{\Omega'})$. Since $F_n(m, \tau)$ is decreasing in both $m > 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$ (see Remark 2.8), inequalities (1.3) and (1.4) still hold.

Remark 1.4 Let us now discuss the behavior of $F_n(m, \tau)$ for large τ (see Section 4.1 for details). First, for all $m > 0$, $\tau^{-2} e^{\tau m/2} F_1(m, \tau) \rightarrow 1$ as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, and one even has

$$\exists C(m) \geq 0, \exists \tau_0 \geq 0, \forall \tau \geq \tau_0, \quad |\tau^{-2} e^{\tau m/2} F_1(m, \tau) - 1| \leq C(m) \tau e^{-\tau m/2}. \quad (1.5)$$

Moreover, for all $n \geq 2$ and $m > 0$, $F_n(m, \tau) > F_1(2(m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}, \tau)$ for all $\tau \geq 0$, and

$$-\tau^{-1} \log F_n(m, \tau) \rightarrow m^{1/n} \alpha_n^{-1/n} \text{ as } \tau \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (1.6)$$

In [17], with probabilistic arguments, Friedman proved some lower and upper logarithmic estimates, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, for the first eigenvalue of general elliptic operators $-a_{ij} \varepsilon^2 \partial_{ij} + b_i \partial_i$ with C^1 drifts $-b = -(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ pointing inwards on the boundary. Apart from the fact that the vector field e_r is not C^1 at the origin, the general result of Friedman would imply the asymptotics (1.6) for $\log F_n(m, \tau) = \log \lambda_1(B_{(m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}}^n, \tau e_r)$. For the sake of completeness, we give in Appendix (Section 4.1) a proof of (1.6) with elementary analytic arguments. There, we also prove the precise equivalent of $F_1(m, \tau)$ for large τ . However, giving an equivalent for $F_n(m, \tau)$ when τ is large and $n \geq 2$ is an open question.

The first step in the proof of Theorem 1.1, which has its own interest, is the optimization of $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ when Ω is a fixed domain and the L^∞ norm of v is controlled. Namely, for any $\tau \geq 0$, set

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \inf_{\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) \text{ and } \bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \sup_{\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau} \lambda_1(\Omega, v).$$

It turns out that this optimization problem also has a unique solution:

Theorem 1.5 *Let Ω be a domain in \mathcal{C} (of class $C^{2,\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$) and let $\tau \geq 0$ be fixed.*

- (a) There exists a unique vector field $\underline{v} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|\underline{v}\|_\infty \leq \tau$ such that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v})$ (> 0), and this field satisfies $|\underline{v}(x)| = \tau$ almost everywhere in Ω . Moreover, the corresponding principal eigenfunction $\underline{\varphi} = \varphi_{\Omega, \underline{v}}$ is of class $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\underline{v} \cdot \nabla \underline{\varphi} = -\tau |\nabla \underline{\varphi}|$ almost everywhere in Ω . The function $\underline{\varphi}$ is then a solution of the following nonlinear problem

$$-\Delta \underline{\varphi} - \tau |\nabla \underline{\varphi}| = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \underline{\varphi} \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (1.7)$$

Moreover, if ψ is a function of class $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\psi > 0$ in Ω , $\psi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $\|\psi\|_\infty = 1$ and if $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that (1.7) holds with ψ and μ instead of $\underline{\varphi}$ and $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, then $\psi = \underline{\varphi}$ and $\mu = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$.

- (b) There exists a unique vector field $\overline{v} \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|\overline{v}\|_\infty \leq \tau$ such that $\overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, \overline{v})$ (> 0), and this field satisfies $|\overline{v}(x)| = \tau$ almost everywhere in Ω . Moreover, the corresponding principal eigenfunction $\overline{\varphi} = \varphi_{\Omega, \overline{v}}$ is of class $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\overline{v} \cdot \nabla \overline{\varphi} = \tau |\nabla \overline{\varphi}|$ almost everywhere in Ω . The function $\overline{\varphi}$ is then a solution of the following nonlinear problem

$$-\Delta \overline{\varphi} + \tau |\nabla \overline{\varphi}| = \overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \overline{\varphi} \text{ in } \Omega. \quad (1.8)$$

Moreover, if ψ is a function of class $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $\psi > 0$ in Ω , $\psi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $\|\psi\|_\infty = 1$ and if $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that (1.8) holds with ψ and μ instead of $\overline{\varphi}$ and $\overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, then $\psi = \overline{\varphi}$ and $\mu = \overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$.

When Ω is a ball (up to translation, one assumes that it is centered at the origin), one can provide an explicit expression of \underline{v} and \overline{v} :

Theorem 1.6 Assume that $\Omega = B = B_R^n$ for some radius $R > 0$, and let $\tau \geq 0$ be fixed. Then $\underline{v} = \tau e_r$ and $\overline{v} = -\tau e_r$ where \underline{v} and \overline{v} are defined in Theorem 1.5. One therefore has:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \underline{\varphi} + \tau e_r \cdot \nabla \underline{\varphi} = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \underline{\varphi} & \text{in } B, \\ -\Delta \overline{\varphi} - \tau e_r \cdot \nabla \overline{\varphi} = \overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \overline{\varphi} & \text{in } B. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

Moreover, the functions $\underline{\varphi}$ and $\overline{\varphi}$ are radially decreasing in \overline{B} , which means that there are two decreasing functions $\underline{\phi}, \overline{\phi} : [0, R] \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ such that $\underline{\varphi}(x) = \underline{\phi}(|x|)$ and $\overline{\varphi}(x) = \overline{\phi}(|x|)$ for all $x \in \overline{B}$.

Remark 1.7 Notice that a corollary of Theorems 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6 is that, for all $\tau \geq 0$ and $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau)$, and equality holds only when Ω is a ball.

Let us now give a few additional comments about Theorems 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6. First, what happens for other optimization problems with analogous constraints? For a fixed domain $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, if we drop the condition $\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau$, one can prove that

$$\inf_{v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \inf_{\tau \geq 0} \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = 0, \quad \sup_{v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \sup_{\tau \geq 0} \overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = +\infty. \quad (1.10)$$

Actually, we prove in Lemmata 2.5 and 2.6 that the function $\tau \mapsto \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ (resp. $\tau \mapsto \overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$) is decreasing (resp. increasing) in $[0, +\infty)$. Therefore, (1.10) means that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \rightarrow 0$ and

$\bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$. The proof of first assertion (about the infimum) follows at once from formula (1.6): indeed, choose a ball B included in Ω , call x_0 its center, and let $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be such that $v(x) = \tau e_r(x - x_0)$ for all $x \in B$; one then has $0 < \lambda_1(\Omega, v) \leq \lambda_1(B, v|_B) = F_n(|B|, \tau) \rightarrow 0$ as $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$. For the proof of the other assertion, let $\tau > 0$ and define $v = \tau e_1$, where, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $e_1(x) = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Straightforward computations show that the function $\psi(x) = e^{-\tau x_1/2} \varphi_{\Omega, \tau e_1}(x)$, which is positive in Ω , satisfies $-\Delta \psi + (\tau^2/4)\psi = \lambda_1(\Omega, \tau e_1)\psi$ in Ω . From the characterization of the first eigenvalue, one concludes that $\lambda_1(\Omega, \tau e_1) = \tau^2/4 + \lambda_1(\Omega)$, where $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is the first eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian in Ω . This obviously implies the desired result.

Notice that, when $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is divergence free (in the sense of distributions), $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega, 0) = \lambda_1(\Omega)$ (indeed, multiply (1.2) by φ and integrate by parts). Thus, it immediately follows that $\inf_{\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau, \operatorname{div}(v)=0} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \lambda_1(\Omega)$ for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\tau \geq 0$. We also refer to [10] for a detailed analysis of the behavior of $\lambda_1(\Omega, A v)$ when $A \rightarrow +\infty$ and v is a fixed divergence free vector field in $L^\infty(\Omega)$.

Let now $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be fixed, call $\|v\|_\infty = \| |v| \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)}$, let Ω vary and define

$$\underline{\underline{\lambda}}(v, m) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m} \lambda_1(\Omega, v|_\Omega) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega| \leq m} \lambda_1(\Omega, v|_\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\bar{\lambda}}(v, m) = \sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m} \lambda_1(\Omega, v|_\Omega)$$

for each $m > 0$. Because of (1.11) below, there holds $\bar{\bar{\lambda}}(v, m) = +\infty$. On the other hand, $\underline{\underline{\lambda}}(v, m) \geq F_n(m, \|v\|_\infty)$. However, unlike $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ or $\bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, the infimum in $\underline{\underline{\lambda}}(v, m)$ may not be reached: indeed, let $(x_k)_{k \geq k_0}$ be a sequence of points in \mathbb{R}^n such that the balls $B_k = x_k + B_{(m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}}$ are pairwise disjoint and choose $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ so that $2^{-k_0} \leq \|v\|_\infty$, $v|_{B_k} = (\|v\|_\infty - 2^{-k}) e_r(\cdot - x_k)$ and $v = 0$ outside the balls B_k ; from Theorems 1.1, 1.6 and Lemma 2.5 below, one can easily check that, for each $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\Omega| \leq m$, $\lambda_1(\Omega, v|_\Omega) > \underline{\underline{\lambda}}(v, m) = F_n(m, \|v\|_\infty)$.

Consider now optimization problems (different from the one solved in Theorem 1.1) where both Ω and v vary. Let $m > 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$ be fixed. As was already mentioned in Remark 1.3,

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega| \leq m, \|v\|_\infty \leq \tau} \lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega| \leq m} \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r).$$

The optimization problem for $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ when $|\Omega| = m$ with a supremum instead of the infimum has the following solution:

Proposition 1.8 *One has*

$$\sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m} \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = +\infty, \tag{1.11}$$

whence $\sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m} \bar{\bar{\lambda}}(\Omega, \tau) = +\infty$.

The proof follows from a min-max formula for $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ given in [11] (see Section 4.2 in Appendix).

Open problem. Finally, we mention as an open problem the characterization of

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m} \bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$$

for given $m > 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$. As for the infimum of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ with the constraint $|\Omega| = m$, is the infimum of $\bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ achieved for the balls ?

We now turn to the strategy of the proof of our results. Remember first that the proof of the classical Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality (1.1) relies on two fundamental tools. The first one is a variational formulation of $\lambda_1(\Omega)$, which relies heavily on the symmetry of the Laplacian:

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) = \min_{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} u(x)^2 dx}. \quad (1.12)$$

The second ingredient of the proof is a spherical rearrangement argument, namely the Schwarz symmetrization of functions. Namely, if $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Schwarz spherical rearrangement of u is the nonnegative function $u^* : \Omega^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is radially non-increasing (which means, more precisely, that, if $R > 0$ is the radius of Ω^* , there exists a non-increasing function $v : [0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $u^*(x) = v(|x|)$ for all $x \in \Omega^*$) and satisfies

$$|\{x \in \Omega; |u(x)| > \lambda\}| = |\{x \in \Omega^*; u^*(x) > \lambda\}|$$

for all $\lambda > 0$. When $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, one has $u^* \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, $\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|u^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ and $\|\nabla u^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$ (see [33]). Inequality (1.1) follows immediately from (1.12) and these properties of u^* .

When $v \neq 0$, the operator $-\Delta + v \cdot \nabla$ is non-self-adjoint, and there is no simple variational formulation of its first eigenvalue such as (1.12) –min-max formulations of the pointwise type (see [11] and Section 4.2) or of the integral type (see [20]) certainly hold, but they do not seem to help in our context. Therefore, it seems impossible to adapt the “classical” proof to prove Theorem 1.1. However, the proof of Theorem 1.1 also relies on a new type of rearrangement argument, which is definitely different from the usual rearrangement of functions.

First, using essentially the maximum principle and the Hopf lemma, one establishes Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6. Once this is done, we are reduced to proving that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau)$ for all $\tau \geq 0$, and that equality holds only when Ω is a ball.

To that purpose, we consider the function $\underline{\varphi}$ satisfying (1.7), and define a suitable rearrangement of $\underline{\varphi}$, which is different from the spherical symmetrization mentioned before. Let us briefly explain what the idea of this rearrangement is. Denote by R the radius of Ω^* . For all $0 \leq a < 1$, define

$$\Omega_a = \{x \in \Omega, a < \underline{\varphi}(x) \leq 1\}$$

and define $\rho(a) \in (0, R]$ such that $|\Omega_a| = |B_{\rho(a)}^n|$. Define also $\rho(1) = 0$. The function $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, R]$ is decreasing, continuous, one-to-one and onto. Then, the rearrangement

of $\underline{\varphi}$ is the radially decreasing function $u : \Omega^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ vanishing on $\partial\Omega^*$ such that, for all $0 \leq a < 1$,

$$\int_{\Omega_a} \Delta \underline{\varphi}(x) dx = \int_{B_{\rho(a)}^n} \Delta u(x) dx.$$

The fundamental inequality satisfied by u , which is also the key point in the proof of Theorem 1.1, is the fact that, for all $x \in \overline{\Omega^*}$,

$$u(x) \geq \rho^{-1}(|x|) \tag{1.13}$$

(see Corollary 3.6 below). Strictly speaking, this fact is not completely correct, because the function $\underline{\varphi}$ is not regular enough, and we have to deal with suitable approximations of $\underline{\varphi}$. We refer to Section 3 for rigorous statements and proofs. Let us just mention that the proof of (1.13) relies, among other things, on the usual isoperimetric inequality in \mathbb{R}^n . From (1.13) and arguments involving the maximum principle and the Hopf lemma again, we derive the conclusion of Theorem 1.1.

Finally, using again the same construction and the isoperimetric inequality, we prove that equality in Theorem 1.1 is attained if, and only if, up to translation, $\Omega = \Omega^*$ and $v = \tau e_r$.

Remark 1.9 Notice that the proof of Theorem 1.1 given in Section 3 still works for $\tau = 0$ and then provides an alternative proof of the Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn inequality (1.1) for the Dirichlet Laplacian.

Outline of the paper. The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we show Theorem 1.5, Theorem 1.6 and various properties of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ and $\overline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. Using the previous results and the rearrangement argument briefly described above, we prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 3. Finally, we prove in Appendix the results mentioned in Remark 1.4 and Proposition 1.8.

2 Optimization problems in fixed domains

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Throughout this section, we fix $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ of class $C^{2,\alpha}$ with $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $\tau \geq 0$. The proof of Theorem 1.5 relies on the following comparison lemma:

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Assume that φ and ψ are functions in $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq p < +\infty$, vanishing on $\partial\Omega$, satisfying $\|\varphi\|_\infty = \|\psi\|_\infty$. Assume also that $\varphi \geq 0$ in Ω , $\psi > 0$ in Ω and*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\psi + v \cdot \nabla\psi \geq \mu\psi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta\varphi + v \cdot \nabla\varphi \leq \mu\varphi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then $\varphi = \psi$ in Ω .

Proof. Since ψ is not constant in Ω , the Hopf lemma yields $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\nu} < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, where, for all $x \in \partial\Omega$, $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\nu}(x) = \nabla\psi(x) \cdot \nu(x)$ and $\nu(x)$ denotes the outward normal unit vector at x . Since $\varphi \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $0 \leq \beta < 1$, $\varphi \geq 0$ in Ω and $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, it follows that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\gamma\psi > \varphi$ in Ω . Define

$$\gamma^* = \inf \{ \gamma > 0, \gamma\psi > \varphi \text{ in } \Omega \}.$$

One clearly has $\gamma^*\psi \geq \varphi$ in Ω , so that $\gamma^* > 0$. Define $w = \gamma^*\psi - \varphi$ and assume that $w > 0$ everywhere in Ω . Since

$$-\Delta w + v \cdot \nabla w - \mu w \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega \quad (2.1)$$

and $w = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, the Hopf maximum principle implies that $\frac{\partial w}{\partial\nu} < 0$. As above, this yields the existence of $\kappa > 0$ such that $w > \kappa\varphi$ in Ω , whence

$$\frac{\gamma^*}{1 + \kappa}\psi > \varphi \text{ in } \Omega.$$

This is a contradiction with the minimality of γ^* .

Thus, there exists $x_0 \in \Omega$ such that $w(x_0) = 0$ (i.e. $\gamma^*\psi(x_0) = \varphi(x_0)$). It follows from (2.1), the fact that $w \geq 0$ in Ω , $w(x_0) = 0$ and from the strong maximum principle, that $w = 0$ in Ω , which means that φ and ψ are proportional. Since they are non-negative in Ω and have the same L^∞ norm in Ω , one has $\varphi = \psi$, which ends the proof of Lemma 2.1. \square

We now turn to the proof of assertion (a) in Theorem 1.5 and begin with the existence of \underline{v} :

Lemma 2.2 *There exists $\underline{v} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|\underline{v}\|_\infty = \tau$ such that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v}) (> 0)$.*

Proof. In this proof, we write λ instead of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. Let $(v_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence of $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ functions with $\|v_k\|_\infty \leq \tau$ such that $\lambda_1(\Omega, v_k)$ converges to $\underline{\lambda}$, and, for all $k \geq 1$, set $\lambda_k = \lambda_1(\Omega, v_k)$ and $\varphi_k = \varphi_{\Omega, v_k}$. For all $k \geq 1$, one has

$$-\Delta\varphi_k + v_k \cdot \nabla\varphi_k = \lambda_k\varphi_k \text{ a. e. in } \Omega.$$

Since the v_k 's are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, since the φ_k 's are uniformly bounded in $L^p(\Omega)$ (say, $1 < p < +\infty$) and since the λ_k 's are bounded, the Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg estimates (see [1, 18]) show that the φ_k 's are uniformly bounded in $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for all $1 < p < +\infty$. Therefore, up to a subsequence, there exist φ belonging to $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq p < +\infty$ and to $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $0 \leq \beta < 1$, and a function $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that φ_k converges to φ weakly in $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ and strongly in $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, and $v_k \cdot \nabla\varphi_k$ converges to f for the *-weak topology of $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Observe that $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $\varphi \geq 0$ in Ω and $\|\varphi\|_\infty = 1$. Since, for all $k \geq 1$, $-\Delta\varphi_k \leq \lambda_k\varphi_k + \tau|\nabla\varphi_k|$ a. e. in Ω , one has

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi \leq \lambda\varphi + \tau|\nabla\varphi| \text{ a. e. in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta\varphi + f = \lambda\varphi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

It follows that $f \geq -\tau |\nabla\varphi|$ a. e. in Ω . For all $x \in \Omega$, define

$$\underline{v}(x) = \begin{cases} -\tau \frac{\nabla\varphi(x)}{|\nabla\varphi(x)|} & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Since φ is not constant, one has $\|\underline{v}\|_\infty = \tau$. Set $\mu = \lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v})$ and $\psi = \varphi_{\Omega, \underline{v}}$ (recall that $\psi \in W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq p < +\infty$). The very definition of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ yields that $\lambda \leq \mu$. Moreover,

$$-\Delta\varphi + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla\varphi = -\Delta\varphi - \tau |\nabla\varphi| \leq \lambda\varphi \leq \mu\varphi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega,$$

whereas $-\Delta\psi + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla\psi = \mu\psi$ a. e. in Ω , ψ is positive in Ω , φ is non-negative in Ω , $\varphi = \psi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\|\varphi\|_\infty = \|\psi\|_\infty = 1$. Lemma 2.1 therefore yields $\varphi = \psi$ in Ω . Thus,

$$\mu\varphi = -\Delta\varphi + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla\varphi \leq \lambda\varphi \leq \mu\varphi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega,$$

which means that $\lambda = \mu$, or, in other words, that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v})$. Lastly, $\lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v}) > 0$ as already underlined in Section 1. \square

To prove the ‘‘uniqueness’’ statement in Theorem 1.5, we first establish the following result:

Lemma 2.3 *Let $v_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|v_0\|_\infty \leq \tau$ such that $\lambda_1(\Omega, v_0) = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ and call $\varphi = \varphi_{\Omega, v_0}$. Then $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ (up to the choice of the continuous representant in the class of φ), $\|v_0\|_\infty = \tau$ and $v_0 \cdot \nabla\varphi = -\tau |\nabla\varphi|$ a. e. in Ω .*

Proof. Define, for all $x \in \Omega$,

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} -\tau \frac{\nabla\varphi(x)}{|\nabla\varphi(x)|} & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) = 0, \end{cases}$$

so that $\|v\|_\infty = \tau$ (indeed, φ is not constant in Ω). If $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$, one has $\lambda \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. Moreover, for $\psi = \varphi_{\Omega, v}$, one has

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi + v \cdot \nabla\varphi = -\Delta\varphi - \tau |\nabla\varphi| \leq -\Delta\varphi + v_0 \cdot \nabla\varphi = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\varphi \leq \lambda\varphi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta\psi + v \cdot \nabla\psi = \lambda\psi \text{ a. e. in } \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Since $\psi > 0$ in Ω , $\varphi > 0$ in Ω , $\psi = \varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\|\psi\|_\infty = \|\varphi\|_\infty = 1$, Lemma 2.1 ensures that $\psi = \varphi$. As a consequence, $\lambda = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, and $v_0 \cdot \nabla\varphi = -\tau |\nabla\varphi|$ a. e. in Ω . Therefore, since $\|v_0\|_\infty \leq \tau$ and φ is not constant, one gets $\|v_0\|_\infty = \tau$. Furthermore, up to the choice of the continuous representant in the class of φ , φ satisfies

$$-\Delta\varphi = \tau |\nabla\varphi| + \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\varphi \in C^{0,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega}),$$

hence $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ from Schauder estimates [18]. That ends the proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

The last result for the proof of Theorem 1.5 is the following one:

Lemma 2.4 Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, such that $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, $\varphi > 0$ in Ω , $\|\varphi\|_\infty = 1$ and

$$-\Delta\varphi - \tau|\nabla\varphi| = \lambda\varphi \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then $\lambda = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ and, if $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is such that $\|v\|_\infty = \tau$ and $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$, then $\varphi = \varphi_{\Omega, v}$.

Proof. Let $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\|v\|_\infty = \tau$ and $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ (such a v exists thanks to Lemma 2.2), and set $\psi = \varphi_{\Omega, v}$, so that

$$-\Delta\psi + v \cdot \nabla\psi = -\Delta\psi - \tau|\nabla\psi| = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\psi \text{ in } \Omega$$

from Lemma 2.3. Define also

$$w(x) = \begin{cases} -\tau \frac{\nabla\varphi(x)}{|\nabla\varphi(x)|} & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

One has $\|w\|_\infty = \tau$ and

$$-\Delta\varphi + w \cdot \nabla\varphi = -\Delta\varphi - \tau|\nabla\varphi| = \lambda\varphi \text{ in } \Omega,$$

so that, by uniqueness of the first eigenvalue and eigenfunction for $-\Delta + w \cdot \nabla$, one has $\varphi = \varphi_{\Omega, w}$ and $\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega, w) \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. As a consequence,

$$-\Delta\varphi + v \cdot \nabla\varphi \geq -\Delta\varphi - \tau|\nabla\varphi| = \lambda\varphi \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\varphi \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Another application of Lemma 2.1 shows that $\varphi = \psi = \varphi_{\Omega, v}$, and that $\lambda = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. \square

We now complete the

Proof of Theorem 1.5. The existence of \underline{v} and the identity $\underline{v} \cdot \underline{\varphi} = -\tau|\nabla\underline{\varphi}|$ in Ω have already been proved. Let v_1 and $v_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|v_1\|_\infty \leq \tau$, $\|v_2\|_\infty \leq \tau$ and $\lambda_1(\Omega, v_1) = \lambda_1(\Omega, v_2) = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. Note $\varphi_1 = \varphi_{\Omega, v_1}$ and $\varphi_2 = \varphi_{\Omega, v_2}$, so that $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, $v_1 \cdot \nabla\varphi_1 = -\tau|\nabla\varphi_1|$ and $v_2 \cdot \nabla\varphi_2 = -\tau|\nabla\varphi_2|$ a. e. in Ω by Lemma 2.3. Furthermore, $\|v_1\|_\infty = \|v_2\|_\infty = \tau$. One has

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi_1 + v_1 \cdot \nabla\varphi_1 = -\Delta\varphi_1 - \tau|\nabla\varphi_1| = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\varphi_1 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta\varphi_2 + v_2 \cdot \nabla\varphi_2 = -\Delta\varphi_2 - \tau|\nabla\varphi_2| = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\varphi_2 \text{ in } \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

Lemma 2.4 therefore shows that $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 := \varphi$, which yields $v_1(x) = v_2(x) = -\tau\nabla\varphi(x)/|\nabla\varphi(x)|$ almost everywhere in the set of $x \in \Omega$ such that $\nabla\varphi(x) \neq 0$. What remains to be proved is the fact that $\nabla\varphi(x) \neq 0$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$ (that will then imply the uniqueness of \underline{v} in Theorem 1.5 and the fact that $|\underline{v}(x)| = \tau$ almost everywhere in Ω). To that purpose, we recall that, for all $p \geq 1$ and all function $g \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $\nabla g = 0$ almost

everywhere in the set $\{x \in \Omega, g(x) = 0\}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, this observation applied with $\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}$ yields

$$\int_{\{\nabla \varphi = 0\}} \Delta \varphi(x) dx = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_i^2}(x) \mathbf{1}_{\{\nabla \varphi = 0\}}(x) dx = 0,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_E$ denotes the characteristic function of a set E . Therefore, since $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) > 0$, (2.2) ensures that

$$\int_{\{\nabla \varphi = 0\}} \varphi(x) dx = 0,$$

and since $\varphi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$, one has $|\{\nabla \varphi = 0\}| = 0$, which ends the proof of assertion (a) in Theorem 1.5.

The proof of assertion (b) is entirely similar, except for the proof of the existence of \bar{v} , for which we need to know a priori that, given $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\tau \geq 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $v \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying $\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau$, one has $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \leq C$. But this is true in virtue of Proposition 5.1 in [11], which yields the existence of some constant $C(\Omega, \tau) \geq 0$ such that $|\lambda_1(\Omega, v) - \lambda_1(\Omega, 0)| \leq C(\Omega, \tau) \|v\|_\infty$. \square

2.2 The case of a ball

This section is devoted to the

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Denote by $R > 0$ the radius of Ω , namely $\Omega = B_R^n$, and let $\varphi = \varphi_{\Omega, \underline{v}}$. Recall that

$$-\Delta \varphi - \tau |\nabla \varphi| = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \varphi \text{ in } \Omega,$$

thus, $\varphi \in C^{2,\beta}(\bar{\Omega})$ for all $0 \leq \beta < 1$ from Schauder estimates [18]. Let A be an orthogonal transformation in \mathbb{R}^n and $\psi = \varphi \circ A$. Easy computations show that ψ satisfies the same equation as φ , and Lemma 2.4 ensures that $\psi = \varphi$ in Ω . In other words, φ is radial, and we may define $u : [0, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $x \in \Omega$, $\varphi(x) = u(|x|)$. The function u is continuous in $[0, R]$, positive in $[0, R)$, its maximum in $[0, R]$ is 1 and $u(R) = 0$.

We claim that u is decreasing in $[0, R]$. First, there exists $r_0 \in [0, R)$ such that $u(r_0) = 1$. If $r_0 > 0$, since

$$-\Delta \varphi + \underline{v} \cdot \nabla \varphi = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \varphi > 0 \tag{2.3}$$

in $B_{r_0}^n$, the maximum principle shows that $\varphi(x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in B_{r_0}^n$, and therefore that $\varphi(x) = 1$ in $B_{r_0}^n$, which contradicts (2.3). Thus, $u(0) = \varphi(0) = 1$ and $u(r) < 1$ for all $0 < r \leq R$. Assume now that u is not decreasing in $[0, R]$. This means that there exist $0 \leq r_0 < r_1 \leq R$ such that $u(r_0) \leq u(r_1)$. Notice that $r_1 < R$, $0 < r_0$ and set $m = u(r_1) \in (0, 1)$. Since u is continuous, there exists $r_2 \in (0, r_0]$ such that $u(r_2) = m$ and $m < u(r) \leq 1$ for all $r \in [0, r_2)$. Since (2.3) holds in the spherical shell $U = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n; r_2 < |x| < r_1\}$, the maximum principle applied to φ in U shows that $\varphi(x) \geq m$ for all $x \in U$. If $\varphi(x_0) = m$ for some $x_0 \in U$, the the strong maximum principle implies that φ is constant in U and this is impossible because of (2.3). Therefore, $\varphi(x) > m$ in U , and Hopf lemma yields

$$u'(r_2) = \nabla \varphi(x) \cdot e_r(x) > 0$$

for all x with $|x| = r_2$. This contradicts the definition of r_2 .

Finally, u is decreasing in $[0, R]$ and Hopf lemma applied to (2.3) on the boundary of any ball B_r^n with $r \in (0, R]$ implies that $\nabla\varphi(x) \cdot e_r(x) < 0$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus \{0\}$. To sum up, $\nabla\varphi(x) = u'(|x|)e_r \neq 0$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus \{0\}$ and, for all $x \neq 0$,

$$\underline{v}(x) = -\tau \frac{\nabla\varphi(x)}{|\nabla\varphi(x)|} = \tau e_r(x)$$

from Lemma 2.3.

The argument for \bar{v} is completely similar, and this ends the proof of Theorem 1.6. \square

2.3 Further properties of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, $\bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ and $F_n(m, \tau)$

We prove here the continuity and monotonicity of the maps $\tau \mapsto \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ and $\tau \mapsto \bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ be fixed. Then the function $\tau \mapsto \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ is continuous and decreasing in $[0, +\infty)$.*

Proof. That this function is non-increasing follows at once from the definition of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. Let now $0 \leq \tau < \tau'$ be given. Under the notations of part (a) of Theorem 1.5, there is a (unique) $\underline{v} \in L^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v})$ and $\|\underline{v}\|_\infty \leq \tau$ (actually, $\|\underline{v}\|_\infty = \tau$). Since $\|\underline{v}\|_\infty < \tau'$, the uniqueness result in Theorem 1.5 yields $\lambda_1(\Omega, \underline{v}) > \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau')$. Therefore, the map $\tau \mapsto \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ is decreasing in $[0, +\infty)$.

Fix now $\tau \geq 0$, let $(\tau_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a sequence of non-negative numbers converging to τ and write $\lambda_k = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau_k)$. For each $k \geq 1$, Theorem 1.5 provides the existence of a function $\varphi_k \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ ($0 < \alpha < 1$ is so that Ω is of class $C^{2,\alpha}$) such that

$$-\Delta\varphi_k - \tau_k |\nabla\varphi_k| = \lambda_k \varphi_k \text{ in } \Omega \tag{2.4}$$

with $\varphi_k > 0$ in Ω , $\varphi_k = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\|\varphi_k\|_\infty = 1$. Observe that the sequence $(\lambda_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded (if $A > 0$ is such that $0 \leq \tau_k \leq A$ for all k , one has $0 < \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, A) \leq \lambda_k \leq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, 0)$) and therefore the φ_k 's are uniformly bounded in $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for all $1 \leq p < +\infty$ and then, again because of (2.4), the functions φ_k are uniformly bounded in $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$. Up to a subsequence, the sequence $(\lambda_k)_{k \geq 1}$ converges to $\lambda > 0$ and there exists a function $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, such that $(\varphi_k)_{k \geq 1}$ converges to φ strongly in $C^{2,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $0 \leq \beta < \alpha$. One therefore has

$$-\Delta\varphi - \tau |\nabla\varphi| = \lambda\varphi \text{ in } \Omega,$$

and $\varphi \geq 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$, $\|\varphi\|_\infty = 1$, $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Since $-\Delta\varphi \geq 0$ in Ω , the strong maximum principle yields $\varphi > 0$ in Ω . It follows from Lemma 2.4 that $\lambda = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$. Thus, the sequence $(\lambda_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is bounded and any converging subsequence of $(\lambda_k)_{k \geq 1}$ converges to $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, which shows that $\lambda_k \rightarrow \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ and ends the proof of Lemma 2.5. \square

Similarly, the following result holds

Lemma 2.6 *Let $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ be fixed. Then the function $\tau \mapsto \bar{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ is continuous and increasing in $[0, +\infty)$.*

The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 2.5, except that the function φ obtained in the end of the argument satisfies $-\Delta\varphi + \tau|\nabla\varphi| = \lambda\varphi$ in Ω . Setting

$$v(x) = \begin{cases} \tau \frac{\nabla\varphi(x)}{|\nabla\varphi(x)|} & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nabla\varphi(x) = 0, \end{cases}$$

one has $-\Delta\varphi + v \cdot \nabla\varphi \geq 0$ on Ω , and the strong maximum principle yields $\varphi > 0$ on Ω , and one concludes as in the proof of Lemma 2.5. \square

Remark 2.7 An immediate application of Proposition 5.1 in [11] yields that, for given $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, the map $v \mapsto \lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ is continuous as well (with respect to the L^∞ norm for v).

Remark 2.8 From Theorem 1.6 and Lemma 2.5, one gets that $F_n(m, \tau) = \lambda_1(B_{(m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}}, \tau e_r)$ is decreasing in τ . Furthermore, because of the strict monotonicity of the first eigenvalue with respect to the inclusion of the domains, $F_n(m, \tau)$ is decreasing in m as well.

Actually, the map $(m, \tau) \mapsto F_n(m, \tau)$ is continuous on $(0, +\infty) \times [0, +\infty)$. The proof of this fact is very similar to the one of Lemma 2.5.

3 Proof of the main Faber-Krahn type inequality

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. For the sake of clarity, we divide the proof into two parts : first, in Section 3.1, we prove that, for all $\tau \geq 0$ and $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$, there holds $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$ for all $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tau$. One recalls that Ω^* denotes the open Euclidean ball of \mathbb{R}^n with center 0 and such that $|\Omega^*| = |\Omega|$. Then, in Section 3.2, we discuss the case of equality.

3.1 Proof of inequality $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$

Let $\tau \geq 0$ and $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ be fixed, of class $C^{2,\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$. Let $R > 0$ be the radius of the ball Ω^* , namely $\Omega^* = B_R^n$ and $R = (|\Omega|/\alpha_n)^{1/n}$. Recall that e_r denotes the unit radial vector field: $e_r(x) = x/|x|$ for $x \neq 0$.

In order to prove the first part of Theorem 1.1, one shall show that $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$ for all $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tau$. Owing to the definition of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, it is then enough to prove that

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r).$$

From the characterization of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ in Theorem 1.5, let us call φ the unique solution of (1.7), such that $\varphi > 0$ in Ω , $\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1$ and $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Namely, the function φ , of class $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi = \tau|\nabla\varphi| + \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)\varphi =: f & \text{in } \Omega \\ \varphi > 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Furthermore, as already underlined in Section 1, $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$ is positive and, on $\partial\Omega = \{x \in \overline{\Omega}, \varphi(x) = 0\}$, $\nabla\varphi \neq 0$ from Hopf Lemma. Therefore, the continuous function f is positive in $\overline{\Omega}$ if $\tau > 0$. If $\tau = 0$, then f is continuous in $\overline{\Omega}$, positive in Ω , and it vanishes on $\partial\Omega$.

From Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, let us choose a sequence $(f_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of polynomial functions such that

$$f_k \rightarrow f \text{ in } C^0(\overline{\Omega}) \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

If $\tau > 0$, one can assume without loss of generality that $f_k > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\tau = 0$, setting $\tilde{f}_k = f_k - \min_{\overline{\Omega}} f_k + 1/(k+1)$ and renaming \tilde{f}_k as f_k , one still has that $f_k \rightarrow f$ uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$ and $f_k > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, call φ_k the unique solution in $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\varphi_k = f_k & \text{in } \Omega \\ \varphi_k = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The maximum principle implies that $\varphi_k > 0$ in Ω for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

We first work with a fixed k (large enough if necessary) and we will then pass to the limit as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ at the end of the proof.

Let first $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and let us introduce a few notations which will be used throughout this section. Call

$$M_k = \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \varphi_k(x)$$

and, for $a \in [0, M_k]$,

$$\Sigma_{k,a} = \{x \in \overline{\Omega}, \varphi_k(x) = a\}.$$

The function φ_k can be written as $\varphi_k = \varphi'_k + \varphi''_k$ where φ'_k is a polynomial function such that $-\Delta\varphi'_k = f_k$, and φ''_k is harmonic in Ω . Therefore, φ_k is analytic in Ω . On the other hand, Hopf lemma implies that $\frac{\partial\varphi_k}{\partial\nu} < 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ (ν is the outward unit normal on $\partial\Omega$), whence the set $\{x \in \overline{\Omega}, \nabla\varphi_k(x) = 0\}$ is included in some compact set $K_k \subset \Omega$. It then follows that the set

$$Z_k = \{a \in [0, M_k], \exists x \in \Sigma_{k,a}, \nabla\varphi_k(x) = 0\}$$

of the critical values of φ_k is finite ([35]) and can then be written as

$$Z_k = \{a_{k,1}, \dots, a_{k,m_k}\}$$

for some $m_k \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Observe also that $M_k \in Z_k$ and that $0 \notin Z_k$. One can then assume that $0 < a_{k,1} < \dots < a_{k,m_k} = M_k$.

The set $Y_k = [0, M_k] \setminus Z_k$ of the non critical values of φ_k is open relatively to $[0, M_k]$ and can be written as

$$Y_k = [0, M_k] \setminus Z_k = [0, a_{k,1}) \cup (a_{k,1}, a_{k,2}) \cup \dots \cup (a_{k,m_k-1}, M_k).$$

For all $a \in Y_k$, the hypersurface $\Sigma_{k,a}$ is of class C^2 and $|\nabla\varphi_k|$ does not vanish in $\Sigma_{k,a}$.

Therefore, in Y_k , the functions

$$\begin{cases} g_k : a \mapsto \int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|^{-1} d\sigma_{k,a}(y) \\ h_k : a \mapsto \int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} f_k(y) |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|^{-1} d\sigma_{k,a}(y) \\ i_k : a \mapsto \int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} d\sigma_{k,a}(y) \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

are continuous in Y_k , where $d\sigma_{k,a}$ denotes the surface measure on $\Sigma_{k,a}$ for $a \in Y_k$.

For all $a \in [0, M_k)$, let

$$\Omega_{k,a} = \{x \in \Omega, a < \varphi_k(x) \leq M_k\}$$

and $\rho_k(a) \in (0, R]$ be defined so that

$$|\Omega_{k,a}| = |B_{\rho_k(a)}^n| = \alpha_n \rho_k(a)^n,$$

where one recalls that α_n is the volume of the unit ball B_1^n . One extends the function ρ_k at M_k by $\rho_k(M_k) = 0$.

Lemma 3.1 *The function ρ_k is a continuous decreasing map from $[0, M_k]$ onto $[0, R]$.*

Proof. The function $\rho_k : [0, M_k] \rightarrow [0, R]$ is clearly decreasing since

$$|\{x \in \Omega, a < \varphi_k(x) \leq b\}| > 0$$

for all $0 \leq a < b \leq M_k$.

Furthermore, for all $a \in (0, M_k]$ and all $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $\frac{\partial^2 \varphi_k}{\partial x_i^2} = 0$ almost everywhere on the set where $\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial x_i} = 0$ as already mentioned in the proof of Theorem 1.5, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} \Delta \varphi_k(x) dx &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^2 \varphi_k}{\partial x_i^2}(x) \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial x_i} > 0\}}(x) \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_k = a\}}(x) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\Omega} \frac{\partial^2 \varphi_k}{\partial x_i^2}(x) \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial x_i} < 0\}}(x) \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_k = a\}}(x) dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

But, using the same observation again, $\mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial x_i} < 0\}}(x) \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_k = a\}}(x) = \mathbf{1}_{\{\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial x_i} > 0\}}(x) \times \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_k = a\}}(x) = 0$ for almost every $x \in \Omega$. As a consequence,

$$\int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} \Delta \varphi_k(x) dx = 0.$$

But $-\Delta \varphi_k = f_k$ and the continuous function f_k is positive in $\bar{\Omega}$. One then gets that $|\Sigma_{k,a}| = 0$ for all $a \in (0, M_k]$. Notice that $|\Sigma_{k,0}| = |\partial \Omega| = 0$ as well. Lastly, $\rho_k(0) = R$ and $\rho_k(M_k) = 0$.

Therefore, the function ρ_k is continuous in $[0, M_k]$. As a conclusion, ρ_k it is then a one-to-one and onto map from $[0, M_k]$ to $[0, R]$. \square

Lemma 3.2 *The function ρ_k is of class C^1 in Y_k and*

$$\forall a \in Y_k, \quad \rho'_k(a) = -(n\alpha_n\rho_k(a)^{n-1})^{-1}g_k(a),$$

where the function g_k is defined in (3.2).

Proof. Fix $a \in Y_k$. Let $\eta > 0$ be such that $[a, a + \eta] \subset Y_k$. For $t \in (0, \eta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_n(\rho_k(a+t)^n - \rho_k(a)^n) &= |\Omega_{k,a+t}| - |\Omega_{k,a}| = - \int_{\{a < \varphi_k(x) \leq a+t\}} dx \\ &= - \int_a^{a+t} \left(\int_{\Sigma_{k,b}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|^{-1} d\sigma_{k,b}(y) \right) db \end{aligned}$$

from the co-area formula. Hence,

$$\frac{\alpha_n(\rho_k(a+t)^n - \rho_k(a)^n)}{t} \rightarrow -g_k(a) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0^+$$

for all $a \in Y_k$, due to the continuity of g_k in Y_k . Similarly, one has that

$$\frac{\alpha_n(\rho_k(a+t)^n - \rho_k(a)^n)}{t} \rightarrow -g_k(a) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0^-$$

for all $a \in Y_k \setminus \{0\}$.

The conclusion of the lemma follows since $Y_k \subset [0, M_k)$, whence $\rho_k(a) \neq 0$ for all $a \in Y_k$. \square

The key-point in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the construction of some auxiliary functions u_k defined in Ω^* . For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the function u_k is obtained from φ_k by a special new type of symmetrization.

Remember that $\Omega^* = B_R^n$ and define first, for all $r \in (0, R]$,

$$v_k(r) = \frac{1}{n\alpha_n r^{n-1}} \int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}} \Delta \varphi_k(x) dx,$$

where $\rho_k^{-1} : [0, R] \rightarrow [0, M_k]$ denotes the reciprocal of the function ρ_k . Set $v_k(0) = 0$.

Lemma 3.3 *The function v_k is continuous in $[0, R]$, and negative in $(0, R]$.*

Proof. The continuity of v_k in $(0, R]$ is a consequence of Lemma 3.1 and the fact that $\Delta \varphi_k$ is continuous and thus bounded in $\overline{\Omega}$.

For $0 < r \leq R$, one has

$$|v_k(r)| \leq (n\alpha_n r^{n-1})^{-1} \|\Delta \varphi_k\|_\infty \alpha_n r^n = n^{-1} \|\Delta \varphi_k\|_\infty r,$$

thus v_k is continuous at 0 as well.

The negativity of v_k in $(0, R]$ follows from the negativity of $\Delta \varphi_k$ (in other words the positivity of f_k) in $\overline{\Omega}$ and the fact that $|\Omega_{k,a}| > 0$ for all $a \in [0, M_k)$. \square

For all $x \in \overline{\Omega^*}$, set

$$u_k(x) = - \int_{|x|}^R v_k(r) dr.$$

The function u_k is then radially symmetric in Ω^* , decreasing in the variable $|x|$, positive in Ω^* , vanishing on $\partial\Omega^*$ and, from Lemma 3.3 and the fact that $v_k(0) = 0$, u_k is of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$.

Call

$$E_k = \{x \in \overline{\Omega^*}, |x| \in \rho_k(Y_k)\}.$$

The set E_k is a finite union of spherical shells and from Lemma 3.1, it is open relatively to $\overline{\Omega^*}$ and can be written as

$$E_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, |x| \in (0, \rho_k(a_{k,m_k-1})) \cup \dots \cup (\rho_k(a_{k,2}), \rho_k(a_{k,1})) \cup (\rho_k(a_{k,1}), R]\}.$$

with $0 = \rho_k(a_{k,m_k}) = \rho_k(M_k) < \rho_k(a_{k,m_k-1}) < \dots < \rho_k(a_{k,1}) < R$. Notice that $0 \notin E_k$.

Lemma 3.4 *The function u_k is of class C^2 in E_k .*

Proof. By definition of u_k , it is enough to prove that the function

$$w_k : r \mapsto \int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}} \Delta\varphi_k(x) dx = - \int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}} f_k(x) dx$$

is of class C^1 in $\rho_k(Y_k)$ ($\subset (0, R]$).

Let r be fixed in $\rho_k(Y_k) = (0, \rho_k(a_{k,m-1})) \cup \dots \cup (\rho_k(a_{k,2}), \rho_k(a_{k,1})) \cup (\rho_k(a_{k,1}), R]$ and let $\eta > 0$ be such that $[r - \eta, r] \subset \rho_k(Y_k)$. For $t \in (0, \eta)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} w_k(r-t) - w_k(r) &= \int_{\{\rho_k^{-1}(r) < \varphi_k(x) \leq \rho_k^{-1}(r-t)\}} f_k(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\rho_k^{-1}(r)}^{\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)} \left(\int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} f_k(y) |\nabla\varphi_k(y)|^{-1} d\sigma_{k,a}(y) \right) da = \int_{\rho_k^{-1}(r)}^{\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)} h_k(a) da, \end{aligned}$$

where h_k is defined in (3.2). Since ρ_k^{-1} is of class C^1 in $\rho_k(Y_k)$ from Lemma 3.2 and since h_k is continuous in Y_k , it follows that

$$\frac{w_k(r-t) - w_k(r)}{-t} \rightarrow h_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))(\rho_k^{-1})'(r) = -\frac{n\alpha_n r^{n-1} h_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))}{g_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))} \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0^+.$$

The same limit holds as $t \rightarrow 0^-$ for all $r \in \rho_k(Y_k) \setminus \{R\}$. Therefore, the function w_k is differentiable in $\rho_k(Y_k)$ and

$$w_k'(r) = -\frac{n\alpha_n r^{n-1} h_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))}{g_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))} \text{ for all } r \in \rho_k(Y_k).$$

Since ρ_k^{-1} is continuous in $[0, R]$, and g_k and h_k are continuous in Y_k , the function w_k is of class C^1 in $\rho_k(Y_k)$. That completes the proof of Lemma 3.4. \square

The central argument is the following pointwise inequality satisfied by the ‘‘symmetrized’’ function u_k obtained from φ_k . This inequality has its own independent interest. Besides the definition of u_k , it uses the classical isoperimetric inequality.

Proposition 3.5 For all $x \in E_k$ and for all $\omega \geq 0$,

$$\Delta u_k(x) + \omega |\nabla u_k(x)| \geq \min_{y \in \Sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(|x|)}} (\Delta \varphi_k(y) + \omega |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|). \quad (3.3)$$

Furthermore, for any unit vector e of \mathbb{R}^n , the function

$$\begin{aligned} U_k &: [0, M_k] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ a &\mapsto u_k(\rho_k(a)e) \end{aligned}$$

is continuous in $[0, M_k]$, differentiable in Y_k , and

$$\forall a \in Y_k, \quad U'_k(a) \geq 1. \quad (3.4)$$

The first part of this proposition means that, for each $x \in E_k$ and $\omega \geq 0$, there is a point $y \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\varphi_k(y) = \rho_k^{-1}(|x|)$ and

$$\Delta u_k(x) + \omega |\nabla u_k(x)| \geq \Delta \varphi_k(y) + \omega |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|.$$

Before doing the proof of Proposition 3.5, let us first state the following

Corollary 3.6 For all $x \in \overline{\Omega^*}$,

$$u_k(x) \geq \rho_k^{-1}(|x|).$$

Proof. On the one hand, $Y_k = [0, a_{k,1}) \cup (a_{k,1}, a_{k,2}) \cup \dots \cup (a_{k,m_k-1}, M_k)$ and the function ρ_k is continuous in $[0, M_k]$, differentiable in Y_k (Lemmata 3.1 and 3.2) and $\rho_k(0) = R$. On the other hand, the function u_k is of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$, radially symmetric, $u_k(x) = 0$ as soon as $|x| = R$. Corollary 3.6 then follows from (3.4) and mean value theorem. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Fix $x \in E_k$ and $\eta > 0$ such that $\{y, |x| - \eta \leq |y| \leq |x|\} \subset E_k$. Call $r = |x|$. One has

$$\int_{\Sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| d\sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}(y) = - \int_{\partial \Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}} \frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial \nu}(y) d\sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}(y),$$

where ν denotes the outward unit normal to $\partial \Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}$ (note that $\frac{\partial \varphi_k}{\partial \nu} < 0$ on $\partial \Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}$ by definition of $\Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}$). Green-Riemann formula and the choice of u_k yield

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| d\sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}(y) &= - \int_{\Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}} \Delta \varphi_k(y) dy \\ &= -n\alpha_n r^{n-1} v_k(r) = n\alpha_n r^{n-1} |\nabla u_k(x)|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

In the sequel, let

$$S_{s,s'} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n, s < |z| < s'\}$$

be the spherical shell of \mathbb{R}^n between the radii s and s' , with $0 \leq s < s'$. Let t be any real number in $(0, \eta)$. A similar calculation as above gives

$$\int_{S_{r-t,r}} \Delta u_k(y) dy = \int_{\partial S_{r-t,r}} \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial \nu}(y) d\sigma(y) = n\alpha_n [r^{n-1}v_k(r) - (r-t)^{n-1}v_k(r-t)],$$

where $d\sigma$ and ν denote the superficial measure on $\partial S_{r-t,r}$ and the outward unit normal to $S_{r-t,r}$. By definition of v_k , one gets that

$$\int_{S_{r-t,r}} \Delta u_k(y) dy = \int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} \Delta \varphi_k(y) dy. \quad (3.6)$$

For $a \in [0, M_k)$, call

$$j_k(a) = \int_{\Omega_{k,a}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| dy.$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} [j_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r)) - j_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r-t))]^2 &= \left[\int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| dy \right]^2 \\ &\leq \left| \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)} \right| \times \int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| dy}{\left| \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)} \right|} &\leq A := \frac{\rho_k^{-1}(r-t) - \rho_k^{-1}(r)}{j_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r)) - j_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r-t))} \\ &\quad \times \frac{\int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|^2 dy}{\rho_k^{-1}(r-t) - \rho_k^{-1}(r)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

The first factor in the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to $1/i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ (where i_k is defined in (3.2)), from the co-area formula and the facts that i_k is continuous in $Y_k \ni \rho_k^{-1}(r)$ and ρ_k^{-1} is continuous in $[0, R]$. Similarly,

$$\frac{\int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|^2 dy}{\rho_k^{-1}(r-t) - \rho_k^{-1}(r)} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\Sigma_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| d\sigma_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}(y) = n\alpha_n r^{n-1} |\nabla u_k(x)|$$

from (3.5). Therefore,

$$A \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{n\alpha_n r^{n-1}}{i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))} |\nabla u_k(x)| \leq |\nabla u_k(x)| \quad (3.8)$$

from the isoperimetric inequality applied to $\Sigma_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} = \partial\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}$ and ∂B_r^n (namely, $n\alpha_n r^{n-1} \leq i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))$). As a consequence,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| dy}{\left| \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t)} \right|} \leq |\nabla u_k(x)|. \quad (3.9)$$

Let $\omega \geq 0$ be fixed and let $(\varepsilon_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers, such that $\varepsilon_l \rightarrow 0$ as $l \rightarrow +\infty$. It follows from (3.6) and (3.9) that there exists a sequence of positive numbers $t_l \in (0, \eta)$ such that $t_l \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\int_{\Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t_l)}} [\Delta \varphi_k(y) + \omega |\nabla \varphi_k(y)|] dy}{\left| \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t_l)} \right|} \\ & \leq \frac{\int_{S_{r-t_l,r}} \Delta u_k(y) dy}{\left| \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t_l)} \right|} + \omega (1 + \varepsilon_l) |\nabla u_k(x)|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Since u_k is radially symmetric and of class C^2 in E_k (Lemma 3.4), and since

$$\left| \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r-t_l)} \right| = |S_{r-t_l,r}|$$

for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the right-hand side of (3.10) converges to $\Delta u_k(x) + \omega |\nabla u_k(x)|$ as $l \rightarrow +\infty$.

On the other hand, since the function φ_k is of class $C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, (3.10) shows that there exists a sequence of points $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\overline{\Omega}$ such that $\varphi_k(y_l) \in [\rho_k^{-1}(r), \rho_k^{-1}(r-t_l)]$ and

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow +\infty} [\Delta \varphi_k(y_l) + \omega |\nabla \varphi_k(y_l)|] \leq \Delta u_k(x) + \omega |\nabla u_k(x)|.$$

Up to extraction of some subsequence, one can assume that $y_l \rightarrow y \in \overline{\Omega}$, with $\varphi_k(y) = \rho_k^{-1}(r)$ (namely $y \in \Sigma_{k,\rho_k^{-1}(r)}$) and

$$\Delta \varphi_k(y) + \omega |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| \leq \Delta u_k(x) + \omega |\nabla u_k(x)|.$$

That completes the proof of inequality (3.3).

For the proof of (3.4), let us first observe that the function U_k is differentiable in Y_k , from Lemma 3.2 and the fact that u_k is of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega}^*)$. Furthermore, since u_k is radially symmetric and decreasing with respect to the variable $|x|$ and since ρ_k is itself decreasing, it is enough to prove that

$$|\rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(|x|))| \times |\nabla u_k(x)| \geq 1$$

for all $x \in E_k$.

Fix $x \in E_k$ and use the same notations as above. It follows from (3.7) that, for $t \in (0, \eta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\leq A \times \frac{|\Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}|}{\int_{\Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| dy} \\
&= A \times \frac{\alpha_n [\rho_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))^n - \rho_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r-t))^n]}{\rho_k^{-1}(r) - \rho_k^{-1}(r-t)} \times \frac{\rho_k^{-1}(r) - \rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}{\int_{\Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)} \setminus \Omega_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r-t)}} |\nabla \varphi_k(y)| dy}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Since ρ_k^{-1} is continuous in $[0, R]$ and ρ_k is differentiable in $Y_k \ni \rho_k^{-1}(r)$, the second factor in the right-hand side of the above inequality converges to $n\alpha_n r^{n-1} \rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(r)) = -n\alpha_n r^{n-1} |\rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(r))|$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. On the other hand, as already underlined earlier in the proof, the third factor converges to $-1/i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. Together with (3.8), the limit as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ in (3.11) leads to

$$1 \leq \frac{n\alpha_n r^{n-1}}{i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))} \times |\rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(r))| \times |\nabla u_k(x)|. \tag{3.12}$$

The isoperimetric inequality yields $n\alpha_n r^{n-1} \leq i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))$, whence

$$1 \leq |\rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(r))| \times |\nabla u_k(x)|$$

and the proof of Proposition 3.5 is complete. \square

Lemma 3.7 *For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$-\Delta u_k - (\tau + \varepsilon) |\nabla u_k| \leq [\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] u_k \text{ in } E_k \tag{3.13}$$

for all $k \geq k_0$.

Proof. Let us first recall that φ is of class $C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and satisfies (3.1). As already underlined at the beginning of this section, $|\nabla \varphi|$ and φ are continuous nonnegative functions in $\overline{\Omega}$, which do not vanish simultaneously. There exists then $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla \varphi| + \varphi \geq \gamma > 0 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}.$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since

$$-\Delta \varphi_k = f_k \rightarrow f = \tau |\nabla \varphi| + \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \varphi = -\Delta \varphi \text{ as } k \rightarrow +\infty$$

uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$, standard elliptic estimates imply that $\varphi_k \rightarrow \varphi$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ in $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ for any $1 \leq p < +\infty$, whence $\varphi_k \rightarrow \varphi$ in $C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $\beta \in [0, 1)$. As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta \varphi_k + (\tau + \varepsilon) |\nabla \varphi_k| + [\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] \varphi_k &\xrightarrow{k \rightarrow +\infty} \Delta \varphi + (\tau + \varepsilon) |\nabla \varphi| + [\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] \varphi \\
&= \varepsilon (|\nabla \varphi| + \varphi)
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}$. But

$$\varepsilon(|\nabla\varphi| + \varphi) \geq \varepsilon\gamma > 0 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}$$

from the choice of γ . Therefore, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\Delta\varphi_k + (\tau + \varepsilon)|\nabla\varphi_k| + [\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] \varphi_k \geq 0 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega} \quad (3.14)$$

for all $k \geq k_0$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $k \geq k_0$ and let x be in E_k . From Proposition 3.5, there exists $y \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that $\varphi_k(y) = \rho_k^{-1}(|x|)$ and

$$\Delta u_k(x) + (\tau + \varepsilon)|\nabla u_k(x)| \geq \Delta\varphi_k(y) + (\tau + \varepsilon)|\nabla\varphi_k(y)|.$$

Thus,

$$\Delta u_k(x) + (\tau + \varepsilon)|\nabla u_k(x)| \geq -[\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] \varphi_k(y) = -[\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] \rho_k^{-1}(|x|) \quad (3.15)$$

from (3.14). Inequality (3.13) follows from Corollary 3.6 and the fact that $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon \geq 0$. \square

Lemma 3.8 *For all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, (\tau + \varepsilon)e_r) = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau + \varepsilon). \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough so that (3.13) holds. Let ψ be the solution (unique up to multiplication) of (1.9) with coefficient $\tau + \varepsilon$ instead of τ . Namely, $\psi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}^*)$ solves

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\Delta\psi - (\tau + \varepsilon)|\nabla\psi| = -\Delta\psi + (\tau + \varepsilon)e_r \cdot \nabla\psi & = \lambda_1(\Omega^*, (\tau + \varepsilon)e_r)\psi \\ & = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau + \varepsilon)\psi & \text{in } \Omega^* \\ \psi & > 0 & \text{in } \Omega^* \\ \psi & = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega^*. \end{array} \right. \quad (3.17)$$

Assume that the conclusion of Lemma 3.8 does not hold, namely assume that

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon < \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau + \varepsilon). \quad (3.18)$$

We shall argue as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 and compare u_k with ψ . Let us first point out that, from Hopf lemma, $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\nu}$ is negative and continuous on the compact $\partial\Omega^*$, where ν is the outward unit normal to $\partial\Omega^*$. Furthermore, ψ is (at least) of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega}^*)$ and is positive in Ω^* . On the other hand, the function u_k is (at least) of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega}^*)$. Therefore, there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall \eta \geq \eta_0, \quad u_k \leq \eta\psi \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}^*.$$

Call

$$\eta^* = \inf \{ \eta > 0, u_k \leq \eta\psi \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}^* \}.$$

The real number η^* is positive since $u_k > 0$ in Ω^* . There holds

$$u_k \leq \eta^*\psi \text{ in } \overline{\Omega}^*.$$

Two cases may then occur : either $u_k < \eta^*\psi$ in Ω^* , or $\min_{\Omega^*}(\eta^*\psi - u_k) = 0$. Let us first deal with

Case 1 : $u_k < \eta^*\psi$ in Ω^* . Since u_k is of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$, radially symmetric and decreasing with respect to the variable $|x|$, one has $e_r \cdot \nabla u_k = -|\nabla u_k|$ in $\overline{\Omega^*}$. It then follows from (3.13) and (3.18) that

$$-\Delta u_k + (\tau + \varepsilon)e_r \cdot \nabla u_k < \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau + \varepsilon)u_k \quad \text{in } E_k \cap \Omega^*$$

(remember that $u_k > 0$ in Ω^*).

Call $z = \eta^*\psi - u_k$. From the definition of ψ in (3.17), one gets that

$$-\Delta z + (\tau + \varepsilon)e_r \cdot \nabla z > \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau + \varepsilon)z \quad \text{in } E_k \cap \Omega^*. \quad (3.19)$$

But z is positive in Ω^* and it is of class $C^2(E_k)$ and of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$. Furthermore, z vanishes on $\partial\Omega^* = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, |x| = R\}$ and

$$E_k \cap \Omega^* \supset S_{\rho_k(a_{k,1}), R} = \{x, \rho_k(a_{k,1}) < |x| < R\},$$

with $\rho_k(a_{k,1}) < R$. Hopf lemma yields $\frac{\partial z}{\partial \nu} < 0$ on $\partial\Omega^*$. As in the beginning of the proof of this lemma, there exists then $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $z \geq \varepsilon' u_k$ in $\overline{\Omega^*}$ for all $\varepsilon' \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$. Hence, $u_k \leq \eta\psi$ in $\overline{\Omega^*}$ for all $\eta \geq \eta^*/(1 + \varepsilon_0)$. That contradicts the minimality of η^* and case 1 is ruled out.

Case 2 : the case where $\min_{\Omega^*}(\eta^*\psi - u_k) = \min_{\Omega^*} z = 0$ is itself divided into two subcases : either $\min_{\Omega^* \cap E_k} z = 0$, or $z > 0$ in $\Omega^* \cap E_k$ and there exists $y \in \Omega^* \setminus E_k$ such that $z(y) = 0$.

In the first subcase, since $E_k \cap \Omega^*$ is open and z , which satisfies (3.19), is nonnegative and vanishes at some point $x \in E_k \cap \Omega^*$, the strong maximum principle implies that z vanishes in the connected component of $E_k \cap \Omega^*$ containing x . That is impossible because of the strict inequality in (3.19).

Therefore, only the second subcase could occur. In that subcase, owing to the definition of E_k , $|y| = \rho_k(a_{k,i}) < R$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m_k\}$ and there is $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$S = S_{|y|, |y|+r_0} = \{y', |y| < |y'| < |y| + r_0\} \subset E_k \cap \Omega^*.$$

The function z is of class $C^2(S) \cap C^1(\overline{S})$, it is positive in S and vanishes at $y \in \partial S$. Furthermore, z satisfies (3.19) (at least) in S . Hopf lemma implies that $e_r \cdot \nabla z(y) > 0$, where $e_r = y/|y|$ if $y \neq 0$, and e_r may be any unit vector if $y = 0$. But z is of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega^*})$ and it has a minimum at $y \in \Omega^*$, whence $\nabla z(y) = 0$. This gives a contradiction.

Case 2 is then ruled out too and the proof of Lemma 3.8 is complete. \square

Proof of the inequality $\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$. Let us now complete the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.1. To do so, remember that the function $\omega \mapsto \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \omega)$ is continuous in \mathbb{R}_+ (see Section 2.3, Lemma 2.5). Therefore, passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in (3.16) yields

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau).$$

On the other hand, from Theorem 1.6, $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$. As a conclusion,

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, v) \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$$

for all $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tau$. That completes the proof of formula (1.3) in Theorem 1.1. \square

3.2 Characterization of the case of equality in (1.3)

We use in this section the same notations as in Section 3.1. Assume first that Ω is a ball, say with the origin as center (up to translation). In other words, assume that $\Omega = \Omega^*$. It follows from Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 that, for all $v \in L^\infty(\Omega^*)$ with $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega^*)} \leq \tau$, the equality $\lambda_1(\Omega^*, v) = \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r)$ holds only when $v = \tau e_r$.

Consider now the case where Ω is not a ball and call $R = (|\Omega|/\alpha_n)^{1/n}$ the radius of Ω^* . We shall prove that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, v) > \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r) = \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau)$$

for all $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \tau$. Owing to the definition of $\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau)$, it is enough to prove that

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) > \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau). \quad (3.20)$$

The proof is divided into several lemmata.

First, the isoperimetric inequality yields the existence of $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\text{area}(\partial\Omega) = \int_{\partial\Omega} d\sigma_{\partial\Omega}(y) \geq (1 + \beta)n\alpha_n R^{n-1}, \quad (3.21)$$

where the left-hand side is the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional area of $\partial\Omega$.

Call $d(x, \mathcal{A})$ the Euclidean distance of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. For all $\gamma > 0$, define

$$U_\gamma = \{x \in \overline{\Omega}, d(x, \partial\Omega) \leq \gamma\}$$

and for all $y \in \partial\Omega$, call $\nu(y)$ the outward unit normal to Ω . Since $\partial\Omega$ is of class C^2 , there exists $\gamma_1 > 0$ such that the segments $[y, y - \gamma_1\nu(y)]$ are included in $\overline{\Omega}$ and pairwise disjoint when y describes $\partial\Omega$ (thus, the ‘‘segments’’ $(y, y - \gamma_1\nu(y))$ describe the set $\{x \in \Omega, d(x, \partial\Omega) \leq \gamma_1\}$ as y describes $\partial\Omega$).

Lemma 3.9 *Let $\varphi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ solve (3.1) with $\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1$ and call*

$$m = \min_{y \in \partial\Omega} |\nabla\varphi(y)|.$$

Then $m > 0$ and there exists $\gamma_2 \in (0, \gamma_1]$ such that, for all $\gamma \in (0, \gamma_2]$, $|\nabla\varphi| \neq 0$ in U_γ , $\nabla\varphi(y - r\nu(y)) \cdot \nu(y) < 0$ for all $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in [0, \gamma]$, and $\varphi \geq \gamma m/2$ in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus U_\gamma$.

Proof. Let us first observe that $m > 0$ since φ is (at least) of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\nu}(y) = \nabla\varphi(y) \cdot \nu(y) < 0$ for all $y \in \partial\Omega$ (from Hopf lemma).

Assume that the conclusion of the lemma does not hold. Then there exists a sequence of positive numbers $(\gamma^l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow 0$ such that one of the three following cases occur : 1) either for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a point $x_l \in U_{\gamma^l}$ such that $\nabla\varphi(x_l) = 0$, 2) or for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there are a point $y_l \in \partial\Omega$ and a number $r_l \in [0, \gamma^l]$ such that $\nabla\varphi(y_l - r_l\nu(y_l)) \cdot \nu(y_l) \geq 0$, 3) or for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a point $x_l \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus U_{\gamma^l}$ such that $\varphi(x_l) < \gamma^l m/2$.

In the first case, after passing to the limit up to extraction of some subsequence, there would exist a point $x \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\nabla\varphi(x) = 0$. This is impossible. Similarly, in the second case, there would exist a point $y \in \partial\Omega$ such that $\nabla\varphi(y) \cdot \nu(y) \geq 0$, which is still impossible.

Assume that the third case occurs. Let $y_l \in \partial\Omega$ be such that

$$d_l := |x_l - y_l| = d(x_l, \partial\Omega) \geq \gamma^l > 0.$$

Up to extraction of some subsequence, one has $x_l \rightarrow x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $\varphi(x) \leq 0$ by passing to the limit as $l \rightarrow +\infty$ in the inequality $\varphi(x_l) < \gamma^l m/2$. Since $\varphi > 0$ in Ω , it follows that $x \in \partial\Omega$, whence $|x_l - y_l| \rightarrow 0$ and $y_l \rightarrow x$ as $l \rightarrow +\infty$. On the one hand, the mean value theorem implies that

$$\frac{\varphi(x_l) - \varphi(y_l)}{|x_l - y_l|} = \nabla\varphi(z_l) \cdot \frac{x_l - y_l}{|x_l - y_l|} \rightarrow -\nabla\varphi(x) \cdot \nu(x) = |\nabla\varphi(x)| \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow +\infty,$$

where z_l is a point lying on the segment between x_l and y_l (whence, $z_l \rightarrow x$ as $l \rightarrow +\infty$). On the other hand, since $\varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$,

$$\frac{\varphi(x_l) - \varphi(y_l)}{|x_l - y_l|} = \frac{\varphi(x_l)}{d_l} < \frac{\gamma^l m}{2\gamma^l} = \frac{m}{2}.$$

Hence, $|\nabla\varphi(x)| \leq m/2$ at the limit, which contradicts the definition and the positivity of m . \square

In the sequel, we use the same functions φ_k as in Section 3.1, together with the same sets $Z_k, Y_k, \Omega_{k,a}, \Sigma_{k,a}$ and functions ρ_k, u_k , etc.

Lemma 3.10 *There exist $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_0 > 0$ such that $[0, a_0] \subset Y_k$ for all $k \geq k_1$, and*

$$i_k(a) = \int_{\Sigma_{k,a}} d\sigma_{k,a}(y) = \text{area}(\Sigma_{k,a}) \geq \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) n\alpha_n R^{n-1}$$

for all $k \geq k_1$ and $a \in [0, a_0]$, where $\beta > 0$ is given in (3.21).

Proof. Let $\gamma_2 > 0$ be as in Lemma 3.9. By compactness of U_{γ_2} and $\partial\Omega$, and since φ is of class $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $|\nabla\varphi| \geq \delta$ in U_{γ_2} and $\nabla\varphi(y - r\nu(y)) \cdot \nu(y) \leq -\delta$ for all $y \in \partial\Omega$ and $r \in [0, \gamma_2]$.

Since $\varphi_k \rightarrow \varphi$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ (the convergence actually holds in $C^{1,\alpha'}(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $0 \leq \alpha' < 1$), there exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall k \geq k_1, \quad |\nabla\varphi_k| \geq \delta/2 > 0 \text{ in } U_{\gamma_2}, \quad \varphi_k \geq \gamma_2 m/4 > 0 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega} \setminus \overline{U_{\gamma_2}}$$

and

$$\forall k \geq k_1, \quad \forall y \in \partial\Omega, \quad \forall r \in [0, \gamma_2], \quad \nabla\varphi_k(y - r\nu(y)) \cdot \nu(y) \leq -\delta/2 < 0. \quad (3.22)$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed such that $k \geq k_1$. It especially follows that, for all $a \in [0, \gamma_2 m/8]$,

$$\Sigma_{k,a} = \{x \in \overline{\Omega}, \varphi_k(x) = a\} \subset U_{\gamma_2}, \quad (3.23)$$

whence $|\nabla\varphi_k| \neq 0$ everywhere on the C^2 hypersurface $\Sigma_{k,a}$. Thus,

$$[0, \gamma_2 m/8] \subset Y_k.$$

Furthermore, for all $y \in \partial\Omega$, the segment $[y, y - \gamma_2\nu(y)]$ is included in $\overline{\Omega}$ and there exists $\theta \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\varphi_k(y - \gamma_2\nu(y)) = \underbrace{\varphi_k(y)}_{=0} - \gamma_2\nu(y) \cdot \nabla\varphi_k(y - \theta\gamma_2\nu(y)) \geq \frac{\gamma_2\delta}{2};$$

more precisely, the function $\kappa : [0, \gamma_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $s \mapsto \varphi_k(y - s\nu(y))$ is differentiable and $\kappa'(s) \geq \delta/2$ for all $s \in [0, \gamma_2]$.

Call

$$a_1 = \min(\gamma_2 m/8, \gamma_2\delta/4) > 0.$$

It follows from the above calculation that, for all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$ and $y \in \partial\Omega$, there exists a unique point $\phi_{k,a}(y) \in [y, y - \gamma_2\nu(y)] \cap \Sigma_{k,a}$. Moreover, for such a choice of k and a , the map $\phi_{k,a}$ is one-to-one since the segments $[y, y - \gamma_2\nu(y)]$ are pairwise disjoint when y describes $\partial\Omega$ (because $\gamma_2 \in (0, \gamma_1]$). Lastly,

$$\Sigma_{k,a} = \{\phi_{k,a}(y), y \in \partial\Omega\} \quad (3.24)$$

from (3.23).

Let us now prove that the area of $\Sigma_{k,a}$ is close to that of $\partial\Omega$ for k large enough and $a \geq 0$ small enough. To do so, let us first represent $\partial\Omega$ by a finite number of $C^{2,\alpha}$ maps y^1, \dots, y^p (for some $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$) defined in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$, and for which

$$\partial_1 y^j(x') \times \dots \times \partial_{n-1} y^j(x') \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq p \text{ and } x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_\rho.$$

Here, $\mathcal{B} = \{x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}), |x'| < 1\}$ and $\partial_i y^j(x') = (\partial_{x_i} y_1^j(x'), \dots, \partial_{x_i} y_n^j(x'))$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, where $y^j(x') = (y_1^j(x'), \dots, y_n^j(x')) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The maps y^j are chosen so that

$$\partial\Omega = \{y^j(x'), x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}, 1 \leq j \leq p\}.$$

Fix $k \geq k_1$ and $a \in [0, a_1]$. For each $1 \leq j \leq p$, there exists then a map $t_{k,a}^j : \overline{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow [0, \gamma_2]$ such that

$$\varphi_k(y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x')\nu(y^j(x'))) = a \quad (3.25)$$

for all $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$, and $\Sigma_{k,a} = \{y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x')\nu(y^j(x')), x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$. From the arguments above, each real number $t_{k,a}^j(x')$ is then uniquely determined, and $t_{k,0}^j(x') = 0$.

Since the functions φ_k (say, for all $k \geq k_1$), y^j and $\nu \circ y^j$ (for all $1 \leq j \leq p$) are (at least) of class C^1 (respectively in $\overline{\Omega}$, $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$), it follows from implicit function theorem and (3.22) that the functions $t_{k,a}^j$ (for all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$, $1 \leq j \leq p$) and

$$h_{k,x'}^j : [0, a_1] \ni a \mapsto t_{k,a}^j(x')$$

(for all $k \geq k_1$, $1 \leq j \leq p$, $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$) are of class C^1 (respectively in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $[0, a_1]$). From the chain rule applied to (3.25), it is straightforward to check that, for all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$, $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$,

$$(h_{k,x'}^j)'(a) = \frac{-1}{\nu(y^j(x')) \cdot \nabla\varphi_k(y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x')\nu(y^j(x')))} \in (0, 2\delta^{-1}] \quad \text{from (3.22),}$$

whence

$$0 \leq t_{k,a}^j(x') = h_{k,x'}^j(a) \leq 2\delta^{-1}a \quad (3.26)$$

because $h_{k,x'}^j(0) = t_{k,0}^j(x') = 0$.

Similarly,

$$\partial_{x_i} t_{k,a}^j(x') = \frac{[\partial_i y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x') \partial_i (\nu \circ y^j)(x')] \cdot \nabla \varphi_k(y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x') \nu(y^j(x')))}{\nu(y^j(x')) \cdot \nabla \varphi_k(y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x') \nu(y^j(x')))} \quad (3.27)$$

for all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$, $1 \leq j \leq p$, $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. For all k , $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$, one has $\varphi_k(y^j(x')) = 0$, whence $\partial_i y^j(x') \cdot \nabla \varphi_k(y^j(x')) = 0$ (for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$). On the other hand, the functions φ_k converge (at least) in $C^{1,1/2}(\overline{\Omega})$ to φ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. As a consequence,

$$|\partial_i y^j(x') \cdot \nabla \varphi_k(y^j(x') - t_{k,a}^j(x') \nu(y^j(x')))| \leq C_1 \sqrt{t_{k,a}^j(x')}$$

for all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$, $1 \leq j \leq p$, $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and for some constant C_1 defined by

$$C_1 = \max_{1 \leq i' \leq n-1, 1 \leq j' \leq p, \xi \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}} |\partial_{i'} y^{j'}(\xi)| \times \sup_{k' \in \mathbb{N}, z \neq z' \in \Omega} \frac{|\nabla \varphi_{k'}(z) - \nabla \varphi_{k'}(z')|}{\sqrt{|z - z'|}} < +\infty.$$

Call now

$$C_2 = \max_{1 \leq j' \leq p, \xi \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}, 1 \leq i' \leq n-1} |\partial_{i'} (\nu \circ y^{j'}) (\xi)| \times \sup_{k' \in \mathbb{N}, z \in \overline{\Omega}} |\nabla \varphi_{k'}(z)| < +\infty.$$

Together with (3.27) and (3.22), the above arguments imply that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_{x_i} t_{k,a}^j(x')| &\leq 2\delta^{-1}(C_1 \sqrt{t_{k,a}^j(x')} + C_2 t_{k,a}^j(x')) \\ &\leq 2\delta^{-1}(C_1 \sqrt{2\delta^{-1}a} + 2C_2 \delta^{-1}a) \quad \text{from (3.26)} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$, $1 \leq j \leq p$, $x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

It follows that

$$\sup_{k \geq k_1, 1 \leq j \leq p, x' \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}, 1 \leq i \leq n-1} |\partial_{x_i} (t_{k,a}^j \nu \circ y^j)(x')| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } a \rightarrow 0, 0 \leq a \leq a_1. \quad (3.28)$$

On the other hand, there are some open sets U^1, \dots, U^p of \mathcal{B} such that

$$\text{area}(\partial\Omega) = \sum_{j=1}^p \int_{U^j} |\partial_1 y^j(x') \times \dots \times \partial_{n-1} y^j(x')| dx',$$

where the sets $\{y^j(x'), x' \in U^j\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$ are pairwise disjoint and, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are some measurable sets $V^1, \dots, V^p \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}}$ such that $\{y^j(x'), x' \in V^j, 1 \leq j \leq p\} = \partial\Omega$, $V^j \supset U^j$ and $\int_{\mathcal{B}} \mathbf{1}_{V^j \setminus U^j}(x') dx' \leq \varepsilon$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p$. Since all functions y^j and $t_{k,a}^j \nu \circ y^j$ (for

all $k \geq k_1$, $a \in [0, a_1]$, $1 \leq j \leq p$) are of class C^1 in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}$, since each function $\phi_{k,a}$ is one-to-one and since (3.24) holds, it follows that

$$\text{area}(\Sigma_{k,a}) = \sum_{j=1}^p \int_{U^j} |\partial_1(y^j - t_{k,a}^j \nu \circ y^j)(x') \times \cdots \times \partial_{n-1}(y^j - t_{k,a}^j \nu \circ y^j)(x')| dx'$$

for all $k \geq k_1$ and $a \in [0, a_1]$.

One concludes from (3.28) that

$$\sup_{k \geq k_1} |\text{area}(\Sigma_{k,a}) - \text{area}(\partial\Omega)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } a \rightarrow 0 \text{ with } 0 \leq a \leq a_1.$$

Because β in (3.21) is positive, there exists then $a_0 \in (0, a_1]$ such that

$$i_k(a) = \text{area}(\Sigma_{k,a}) \geq \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) n\alpha_n R^{n-1}$$

for all $k \geq k_1$ and $a \in [0, a_0]$.

That completes the proof of Lemma 3.10. \square

Lemma 3.11 *With the notations of Lemma 3.10, one has*

$$u_k(x) \geq \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) \rho_k^{-1}(|x|)$$

for all $k \geq k_1$ and $x \in \overline{\Omega^*}$ such that $\rho_k(a_0) \leq |x| \leq R$.

Proof. Fix $k \geq k_1$. From Lemma 3.10, one has $\overline{S_{\rho_k(a_0), R}} \subset E_k$. Fix any $x \in \overline{\Omega^*}$ such that $r = |x| \in [\rho_k(a_0), R]$ (notice that $0 < \rho_k(a_0) < R$ and $\rho_k^{-1}(r) \in [0, a_0]$). The calculations of the proof of Proposition 3.5, and especially inequality (3.12), imply that

$$1 \leq \frac{n\alpha_n r^{n-1}}{i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r))} \times |\rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(r))| \times |\nabla u_k(x)|.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} i_k(\rho_k^{-1}(r)) &= \int_{\Sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}} d\sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}(y) = \text{area}(\Sigma_{k, \rho_k^{-1}(r)}) \geq \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) n\alpha_n R^{n-1} \\ &\geq \left(1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\right) n\alpha_n r^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

from Lemma 3.10. Thus,

$$1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \leq |\rho_k'(\rho_k^{-1}(r))| \times |\nabla u_k(x)|.$$

The conclusion of Lemma 3.11 follows from the above inequality, as in the proof of Corollary 3.6. \square

Lemma 3.12 *There exist $k_2 \geq k_1$ and $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$u_k(x) \geq (1 + \eta) \rho_k^{-1}(|x|)$$

for all $k \geq k_2$ and $x \in \overline{\Omega^*}$.

Proof. Let e be any unit vector in \mathbb{R}^n and choose $k \geq k_1$. Let \tilde{u}_k be the function defined in $[0, R]$ by $\tilde{u}_k(r) = u_k(re)$ for all $r \in [0, R]$. This function is differentiable and decreasing in $[0, R]$. Furthermore, Proposition 3.5 and the fact that ρ_k^{-1} is decreasing in $[0, R]$ imply that

$$-\tilde{u}'_k(r) \geq -\frac{d}{dr}(\rho_k^{-1}(r))$$

for all $r \in \rho_k(Y_k) = (0, \rho_k(a_{k,m-1})) \cup \dots \cup (\rho_k(a_{k,2}), \rho_k(a_{k,1})) \cup (\rho_k(a_{k,1}), R]$. Finite Increment Theorem yields especially, as in the proof of Corollary 3.6,

$$u_k(re) - u_k(\rho_k(a_0)e) \geq \rho_k^{-1}(r) - a_0$$

for all $r \in [0, \rho_k(a_0)]$. Fix such a r in $[0, \rho_k(a_0)]$ (whence $\rho_k^{-1}(r) \in [a_0, M_k] \subset (0, M_k]$). One gets that

$$\frac{u_k(re)}{\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \geq 1 + \frac{u_k(\rho_k(a_0)e) - a_0}{\rho_k^{-1}(r)} \geq 1 + \frac{\beta a_0}{2\rho_k^{-1}(r)}$$

from Lemma 3.11.

But $\rho_k^{-1}(r) \leq M_k = \max_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi_k \rightarrow \max_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi = 1$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Hence, there exists $k_2 \geq k_1$ such that

$$u_k(re) \geq \left(1 + \frac{\beta a_0}{4}\right) \rho_k^{-1}(r)$$

for all $k \geq k_2$ and $r \in [0, \rho_k(a_0)]$. As in the proof of Corollary 3.6, the conclusion of Lemma 3.12 follows from the above inequality and from Lemma 3.11, with the choice

$$\eta = \min(\beta/2, \beta a_0/4) > 0$$

for instance. □

Conclusion. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$. From Lemma 3.12 and from (3.15), there exists $k_3 \geq k_2$ such that

$$-\Delta u_k(x) - (\tau + \varepsilon) |\nabla u_k(x)| \leq [\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon] \rho_k^{-1}(|x|) \leq \frac{\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon}{1 + \eta} u_k(x)$$

for all $x \in E_k$ and $k \geq k_3$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.8, one gets that

$$\frac{\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) + \varepsilon}{1 + \eta} \geq \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau + \varepsilon).$$

Passing to the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ in the above inequality yields

$$\underline{\lambda}(\Omega, \tau) \geq (1 + \eta) \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau) > \underline{\lambda}(\Omega^*, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega^*, \tau e_r) (> 0).$$

That completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

4 Appendix

4.1 Behavior of $F_n(m, \tau)$ for large τ

This section is devoted to the proof of the results mentioned in Remark 1.4.

First, to prove (1.5), fix $m > 0$ and $\tau \geq 0$, set $\Omega = (-R, R)$ with $2R = m$, and denote

$$\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega, \tau e_r)$$

and $\varphi = \varphi_{\Omega, \tau e_r}$. Theorem 1.6 ensures that φ is an even function, decreasing in $[0, R]$ and Theorem 1.5 yields

$$-\varphi''(r) + \tau\varphi'(r) = \lambda\varphi(r) \text{ for all } 0 \leq r \leq R,$$

with $\varphi(R) = 0$, $\varphi > 0$ in $(-R, R)$ and $\varphi'(0) = 0$. For all $s \in [0, \tau R]$, define $\psi(s) = \varphi(s/\tau)$, so that ψ satisfies the equation

$$-\psi''(s) + \psi'(s) = \frac{\lambda}{\tau^2}\psi(s) \text{ for all } 0 \leq s \leq \tau R,$$

with $\psi(\tau R) = 0$ and $\psi'(0) = 0$. Notice that λ depends on τ , but since, for all $\tau \geq 0$, $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_1((-R, R), 0)$, there exists $\tau_0 > 0$ such that $\tau^2 \geq 4\lambda$ for all $\tau \geq \tau_0$, and we will assume that $\tau \geq \tau_0$ in the sequel. The function ψ can be computed explicitly: there exist $A, B \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for all $0 \leq s \leq \tau R$,

$$\psi(s) = Ae^{\mu_+ s} + Be^{\mu_- s},$$

where $\mu_{\pm} = (1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 4\lambda/\tau^2})/2$. Using the boundary values of ψ and ψ' , one obtains after straightforward computations:

$$\lambda = \frac{\tau^2}{4} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda}{\tau^2}} \right)^2 e^{-\sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda}{\tau^2}} \tau R}.$$

Since λ remains bounded when $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, it is then straightforward to check that $\lambda \sim \tau^2 e^{-\tau R}$ when $\tau \rightarrow +\infty$, and that (1.5) follows.

We now turn to the proof of assertion (1.6). Let $n \geq 2$, $m > 0$, $\tau \geq 0$ and $\Omega = B_R^n$ be such that $|\Omega| = m$, so that one has $R = (m/\alpha_n)^{1/n}$ and $F_n(m, \tau) = \lambda_1(\Omega, \tau e_r)$. We first claim that

$$F_n(m, \tau) > F_1(2R, \tau).$$

Indeed, write

$$\lambda = \lambda_1(\Omega, \tau e_r) \text{ and } \varphi_n = \varphi_{\Omega, \tau e_r}.$$

Similarly, $F_1(2R, \tau) = \lambda_1((-R, R), \tau e_r)$, and we denote $\mu = \lambda_1((-R, R), \tau e_r)$ and $\varphi_1 = \varphi_{(-R, R), \tau e_r}$. As before, define $\psi_n(y) = \varphi_n(y/\tau)$ for all $y \in \tau\overline{\Omega} = \overline{B_{\tau R}^n}$ and $\psi_1(r) = \varphi_1(r/\tau)$ for

all $r \in [-\tau R, \tau R]$. Finally, since ψ_n is radial, let $u_n : [0, \tau R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\psi_n(y) = u_n(|y|)$ for all $y \in \tau\bar{\Omega} = \overline{B_{\tau R}^n}$. One has

$$\begin{cases} -u_n''(r) - \frac{n-1}{r}u_n'(r) + u_n'(r) = \frac{\lambda}{\tau^2}u_n(r) & \text{in } (0, \tau R], \\ -\psi_1''(r) + \psi_1'(r) = \frac{\mu}{\tau^2}\psi_1(r) & \text{in } [0, \tau R], \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

with $u_n'(0) = u_n(\tau R) = 0$, $\psi_1'(0) = \psi_1(\tau R) = 0$.

Assume that $\lambda \leq \mu$. Since $u_n' < 0$ in $(0, \tau R]$ and $u_n \geq 0$, one obtains

$$\begin{cases} -u_n''(r) + u_n'(r) \leq \frac{\mu}{\tau^2}u_n(r) & \text{in } [0, \tau R], \\ -\psi_1''(r) + \psi_1'(r) = \frac{\mu}{\tau^2}\psi_1(r) & \text{in } [0, \tau R]. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

Since $\psi_1'(\tau R) < 0$ by Hopf lemma, while $\psi_1(r) > 0$ in $[0, \tau R)$, $u_n(r) > 0$ in $[0, \tau R)$ and the functions u_n and ψ_1 belong (at least) to $C^1([0, \tau R])$, there exists then $\gamma > 0$ such that $\gamma\psi_1(r) > u_n(r)$ for all $0 \leq r < \tau R$. Define γ^* as the infimum of all the $\gamma > 0$ such that $\gamma\psi_1 > u_n$ in $[0, \tau R)$, observe that $\gamma^* > 0$ and define $z = \gamma^*\psi_1 - u_n$ which is non-negative in $[0, \tau R]$ and satisfies

$$-z''(r) + z'(r) - \frac{\mu}{\tau^2}z(r) \geq 0 \quad (4.3)$$

for all $0 \leq r \leq \tau R$ and $z(\tau R) = 0$.

Assume that there exists $0 < r < \tau R$ such that $z(r) = 0$. The strong maximum principle shows that z is identically zero in $[0, \tau R]$, which means that $\gamma^*\psi_1 = u_n$ in $[0, \tau R]$, and even that $\psi_1 = u_n$ because $\psi_1(0) = u_n(0) = 1$. But this is impossible according to (4.1) and (4.2).

Thus, $z > 0$ in $(0, \tau R)$. Furthermore, $z'(0) = 0$, hence $z(0) > 0$ from Hopf lemma. Another application of Hopf lemma shows that $z'(\tau R) < 0$. Therefore, there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that $z > \kappa u_n$ in $[0, \tau R)$, whence

$$\frac{\gamma^*}{1 + \kappa}\psi_1 > u_n \quad \text{in } [0, \tau R),$$

which is a contradiction with the definition of γ^* .

Finally, we have obtained that $\mu < \lambda$, which means that $F_n(m, \tau) > F_1(2R, \tau)$.

We look for a reverse inequality. To that purpose, let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that $\frac{n-1}{R_0} < \varepsilon$. In the following computations, we always assume that $\tau R > R_0$. Define u_n and λ as before. Let

$$\mu' = \Delta \left(\left(- \left(R - \frac{R_0}{\tau} \right), \left(R - \frac{R_0}{\tau} \right) \right), \tau(1 - \varepsilon) \right)$$

and w the normalized corresponding eigenfunction, so that

$$\begin{cases} -w''(r) + \tau(1 - \varepsilon)w'(r) = \mu'w(r) & \text{in } \left[0, R - \frac{R_0}{\tau} \right], \\ w'(0) = 0, \quad w > 0 & \text{in } \left[0, R - \frac{R_0}{\tau} \right), \quad w \left(R - \frac{R_0}{\tau} \right) = 0. \end{cases}$$

For all $R_0 \leq x \leq \tau R$, define $v(x) = w\left(\frac{x - R_0}{\tau}\right)$, which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -v''(r) + (1 - \varepsilon)v'(r) = \frac{\mu'}{\tau^2}v(r) & \text{in } [R_0, \tau R], \\ v'(R_0) = 0, v > 0 \text{ in } [R_0, \tau R), v(\tau R) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Assume that $\lambda \geq \mu'$. Since $(n - 1)/R_0 < \varepsilon$ and $u'_n(r) < 0$ in $(0, \tau R]$, one therefore has

$$\begin{cases} -u''_n(r) + (1 - \varepsilon)u'_n(r) \geq \frac{\mu'}{\tau^2}u_n(r) & \text{in } [R_0, \tau R], \\ -v''(r) + (1 - \varepsilon)v'(r) = \frac{\mu'}{\tau^2}v(r) & \text{in } [R_0, \tau R]. \end{cases}$$

Arguing as before, we see that there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\gamma u_n > v$ in $[R_0, \tau R)$. Define γ^* (> 0) as the infimum of all such γ 's and define $z = \gamma^* u_n - v$, which is nonnegative in $[R_0, \tau R]$ and satisfies $-z'' + (1 - \varepsilon)z' - (\mu'/\tau^2)z \geq 0$ in $[R_0, \tau R]$.

Assume that $z(r) = 0$ for some $r \in (R_0, \tau R)$. The strong maximum principle ensures that z is 0 in $[R_0, \tau R]$, which means that $u_n = v$ in $[R_0, \tau R]$, which is impossible because $u'_n(R_0) < 0 = v'(R_0)$.

Therefore, $z > 0$ everywhere in $(R_0, \tau R)$. Furthermore, $z'(R_0) < 0$, thus $z(R_0) > 0$. On the other hand, by Hopf lemma, $z'(\tau R) < 0$. Thus, there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that $z > \kappa v$ in $[R_0, \tau R)$, whence $(\gamma^*/(1 + \kappa))u_n > v$ in $[R_0, \tau R)$. This contradicts the definition of γ^* .

Thus, we have established that $\lambda < \mu'$. Straightforward computations (similar to those of the proof of (1.5)) show that

$$\lambda < \mu' = \frac{\tau^2}{4} \left(1 - \varepsilon + \sqrt{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 - \frac{4\mu'}{\tau^2}} \right)^2 e^{-\sqrt{(1 - \varepsilon)^2 - \frac{4\mu'}{\tau^2}}(\tau R - R_0)},$$

and, since $\lambda > F_1(2R, \tau)$, formula (1.5) and the fact that $m = \alpha_n R^n$ end the proof of (1.6). \square

4.2 Proof of Proposition 1.8

Let $m > 0$ be fixed. For any $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ and any $v \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, one has the following min-max characterization of $\lambda_1(\Omega, v)$ (see [11]):

$$\lambda_1(\Omega, v) = \sup_{\varphi} \inf_{\Omega} \left(\frac{-\Delta\varphi + v \cdot \nabla\varphi}{\varphi} \right), \quad (4.4)$$

where the supremum is taken over all functions $\varphi \in W_{loc}^{2,n}(\Omega)$ which are positive in Ω . For $\varepsilon > 0$, consider a domain $\Omega_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}$ included in $\{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n; \varepsilon < x_1 < 2\varepsilon\}$ and satisfying $|\Omega_\varepsilon| = m$, and let v be any field in $L^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\|v\|_\infty \leq \tau$. Define, for all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Omega_\varepsilon$,

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(x) = \sin\left(\frac{\pi x_1}{3\varepsilon}\right).$$

Then, for all $x \in \Omega_\varepsilon$,

$$-\frac{\Delta\varphi_\varepsilon(x)}{\varphi_\varepsilon(x)} = \frac{\pi^2}{9\varepsilon^2}, \quad \frac{v \cdot \nabla\varphi_\varepsilon(x)}{\varphi_\varepsilon(x)} \geq -\frac{2\tau\pi}{3\sqrt{3}\varepsilon}$$

and thus

$$\lambda_1(\Omega_\varepsilon, v) \geq \frac{\pi^2}{9\varepsilon^2} - \frac{2\tau\pi}{3\sqrt{3}\varepsilon}.$$

This shows that

$$\sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}, |\Omega|=m} \lambda(\Omega, \tau) \geq \frac{\pi^2}{9\varepsilon^2} - \frac{2\tau\pi}{3\sqrt{3}\varepsilon},$$

and, since this is true for all $\varepsilon > 0$, the assertion (1.11) follows. \square

References

- [1] S. AGMON, A. DOUGLIS and L. NIRENBERG, Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions I, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* **12** (1959), 623-727.
- [2] M.S. ASHBAUGH and R.D. BENGURIA, A sharp bound for the ratio of the first two eigenvalues of Dirichlet Laplacians and extensions, *Annals of Math.* **135** (1992), 601-628.
- [3] M.S. ASHBAUGH and R.D. BENGURIA, Eigenvalue ratios for Sturm-Liouville operators, *J. Diff. Eqs.* **103** (1993), 205-219.
- [4] M.S. ASHBAUGH and R.D. BENGURIA, Isoperimetric bounds for higher eigenvalue ratios for the n -dimensional fixed membrane problem, *Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh A* **123** (1993), 977-985.
- [5] M.S. ASHBAUGH and R.D. BENGURIA, On Rayleigh's conjecture for the clamped plate and its generalization to three dimensions, *Duke Math. J.* **78** (1995), 1-17.
- [6] M.S. ASHBAUGH, E.M. HARRELL and R. SVIRSKY, On minimal and maximal eigenvalue gaps and their causes, *Pacific J. Math.* **147** (1991), 1-24.
- [7] C. BANDLE, Isoperimetric inequality for some eigenvalues of an inhomogeneous, free membrane, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **22** (1972), 142-147.
- [8] C. BANDLE, *Isoperimetric inequalities and applications*, Pitman Monographs and Studies in Math. **7**, Boston, 1980.
- [9] D.C. BARNES, Extremal problems for eigenvalues with applications to buckling, vibration and sloshing, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **16** (1985), 341-357.
- [10] H. BERESTYCKI, F. HAMEL and N. NADIRASHVILI, Elliptic eigenvalue problems with large drift and applications to nonlinear propagation phenomena, *Commun. Math. Phys.* (2004), in press.

- [11] H. BERESTYCKI, L. NIRENBERG and S.R.S. VARADHAN, The principal eigenvalue and maximum principle for second-order elliptic operators in general domains, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **47** (1994), 47-92.
- [12] M. H. BOSSEL, Membranes élastiquement liées: extensions du théorème de Rayleigh-Faber-Krahn et de l'inégalité de Cheeger, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **302** (1986), 47-50.
- [13] F. BROCK, An isoperimetric inequality for eigenvalues of the Stekloff problem, *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **81** (2001), 69-71.
- [14] D. BUCUR and A. HENROT, Minimization of the third eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A* **456** (2000), 985-996.
- [15] S.-Y. CHENG and K. ODEN, Isoperimetric inequalities and the gap between the first and second eigenvalues of an Euclidean domain, *J. Geom. Anal.* **7** (1997), 217-239.
- [16] G. FABER, Beweis, dass unter allen homogenen Membranen von gleicher Fläche und gleicher Spannung die kreisförmige den tiefsten Grundton gibt, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-physikalischen Klasse der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München Jahrgang, 1923*, pp. 169-172.
- [17] A. FRIEDMAN, The asymptotic behavior of the first real eigenvalue of a second order elliptic operator with a small parameter in the highest derivatives, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **22** (1972/1973), 1005-1015.
- [18] D. GILBARG and N. TRUDINGER, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Springer Verlag, 1977.
- [19] A. HENROT, Minimization problems for eigenvalues of the Laplacian, *J. Evol. Eq.* **3** (2003), 443-461.
- [20] C.J. HOLLAND, A minimum principle for the principal eigenvalue for second-order linear elliptic equations with natural boundary conditions, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978), 509-519.
- [21] S. KARAA, Extremal eigenvalue gaps for the Schrödinger operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions, *J. Math. Physics* **39** (1998), 2325-2332.
- [22] S. KARAA, Sharp estimates for the eigenvalues of some differential equations, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **29** (1998), 1279-1300.
- [23] E. KRAHN, Über eine von Rayleigh formulierte Minimaleigenschaft des Kreises, *Math. Ann.* **94** (1925), 97-100.
- [24] E. KRAHN, Über Minimaleigenschaft der Kugel in drei und mehr Dimensionen, *Acta Comm. Univ. Tartu (Dorpat)* **A9** (1926), 1-44.
- [25] Ü. LUMISTE and J. PEETRE, *Edgar Krahn, 1894-1961, A Centenary Volume.*, IOS Press, Amsterdam, 1994.

- [26] P. LI and S.T. YAU, On the Schrödinger equation and the eigenvalue problem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **88** (1983), 309-318.
- [27] P. MARCELLINI, Bounds for the third membrane eigenvalue, *J. Diff. Eqs.* **37** (1980), 438-443.
- [28] N.S. NADIRASHVILI, Rayleigh's conjecture on the principal frequency of the clamped plate, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **129** (1995), 1-10.
- [29] R. OSSERMAN, The isoperimetric inequality, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **84** (1978), 1182-1238.
- [30] L.E. PAYNE, G. PÓLYA and H.F. WEINBERGER, On the ratio of consecutive eigenvalues, *J. Math. Phys.* **35** (1956), 289-298.
- [31] G. PÓLYA, On the characteristic frequencies of a symmetric membrane, *Math. Z.* **63** (1955), 331-337.
- [32] G. PÓLYA, On the eigenvalues of vibrating membranes, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **11** (1961), 419-433.
- [33] G. PÓLYA and G. SZEGÖ, *Isoperimetric Inequalities in Mathematical Physics*, *Annals of Mathematics Studies* **27**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1951.
- [34] J.W.S. RAYLEIGH, *The Theory of Sound*, 2nd ed. revised and enlarged (in 2 vols.), Dover Publications, New York, 1945 (republication of the 1894/1896 edition).
- [35] J. SOUČEK and V. SOUČEK, Morse-Sard theorem for real-analytic functions, *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae* **13** (1972), 45-51.
- [36] G. SZEGÖ, Inequalities for certain eigenvalues of a membrane of given area, *J. Rational Mech. Anal.* **3** (1954), 343-356.
- [37] A.D. VENTCEL, The asymptotic behavior of the largest eigenvalue of a second order elliptic differential operator with a small parameter multiplying the highest derivatives, *Soviet Math.* **13** (1972), 13-17.
- [38] H.F. WEINBERGER, An isoperimetric inequality for the N -dimensional free membrane problem, *J. Rational Mech. Anal.* **5** (1956), 633-636.
- [39] S.A. WOLF and J.B. KELLER, Range of the first two eigenvalues of the Laplacian, *Proc. Royal Soc. London Ser. A* **447** (1994), 397-412.