

# Symmetry of Singular Solutions of Degenerate Quasilinear Elliptic Equations

GIOVANNI ALESSANDRINI AND EDI ROSSET (\*)

*In ricordo di Fabio*

SUMMARY. - *We prove radial symmetry of singular solutions to an overdetermined boundary value problem for a class of degenerate quasilinear elliptic equations.*

## 1. Introduction

We consider solutions  $u$  to

$$\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = 0, \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \{O\}, \quad (1)$$

which vanish on  $\partial\Omega$

$$u = 0, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (2)$$

and have a positive singularity at the origin  $O$

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow O} u(x) = M \in (0, +\infty]. \quad (3)$$

We prove that if  $u$  satisfies the overdetermined boundary condition

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = -c, \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad (4)$$

---

(\*) Work supported in part by MiUR, PRIN no. 2006014115.

Authors' addresses: Giovanni Alessandrini and Edi Rosset, DMI, Università di Trieste, via A. Valerio 12/1, 34127 Trieste, Italy; E-mail: [alessang@univ.trieste.it](mailto:alessang@univ.trieste.it), [rossedi@univ.trieste.it](mailto:rossedi@univ.trieste.it)

Keywords: Symmetry, singular solutions, moving planes,  $p$ -laplacian.

AMS Subject Classification: 35J60, 35J70, 35R35.

with  $c > 0$  constant, then  $\Omega$  is a ball centered at  $O$  and  $u$  is radially symmetric.

To be more specific, we shall assume  $\Omega$  to be a bounded connected open set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , containing the origin  $O$ , and with  $C^{2,\alpha}$ -smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega$ . The nonlinearity  $a$  is assumed to be a  $C^1$  function from  $(0, +\infty)$  to  $(0, +\infty)$  and satisfying the degenerate ellipticity condition

$$0 < \lambda \leq 1 + \frac{sa'(s)}{a(s)} \leq \Lambda, \quad \text{for every } s > 0, \quad (5)$$

for some positive constants  $\lambda, \Lambda$ .

Such a class of quasilinear degenerate elliptic equations, which strictly contains the one of  $p$ -Laplacian type equations, was introduced by Lieberman [5] and independently, in the two dimensional case, by Alessandrini, Lupo and Rosset [3].

With such assumptions the main result of this note is the following.

**THEOREM 1.1.** *Let  $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \{O\})$  be a weak solution to (1), satisfying the conditions (2), (3). If, in addition,  $u$  satisfies (4) then  $\Omega$  is a ball centered at the origin  $O$  and  $u$  is radially symmetric.*

Let us observe that in view of the regularity results by Lieberman [5] it is reasonable to treat solutions in the  $C^{1,\alpha}$ -class.

Note also that for singular solutions satisfying (1)–(3) the limit  $M$  in (3) may be finite or infinite depending on the nonlinearity  $a$ . This fact is particularly evident in the special case when  $a(t) = t^{p-2}$ ,  $p > 1$ . One readily sees that when  $p \leq n$  then we have  $M = +\infty$ , whereas for  $p > n$  one must have  $M < +\infty$ . See in this respect Kichenassamy and Veron [4] and, for a detailed study of singular solutions in two variables we refer to Rosset [6].

Our proof is based on an adaptation of the well-known method of moving planes by Alexandrov and Serrin. The adaptation of the method to degenerate equations was initiated in [2]. Here we refer mostly to arguments introduced in [1], however, the presence of the singularity adds a little further difficulty, since it may appear, at a first glance, that the method of moving planes cannot be used after the moving plane has crossed the singularity. We shall show that

if this is the case for a certain direction  $\xi$ , then for the opposite direction  $-\xi$  the problem of “hitting the singularity” cannot occur.

REMARK 1.2. *We take this opportunity to point out that an erratum is in order in [1]. In fact, it is improperly stated there that the nonlinearity  $a$  may depend on  $|\nabla u|$  and also on  $u$ . This is not correct, in fact one should assume  $a = a(|\nabla u|)$  and with this proviso all the statements there are correct.*

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We recall some basic properties of solutions to equation (1) that we shall use repeatedly in our arguments. Local solutions to the equation

$$\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = 0, \quad (6)$$

are obtained as limits in  $C^{1,\alpha}$  of solutions  $u_\epsilon$  to regularized equations

$$\operatorname{div}(a_\epsilon(|\nabla u_\epsilon|)\nabla u_\epsilon) = 0, \quad (7)$$

where  $a_\epsilon$  satisfies the same conditions as  $a$  and in addition is  $C^\infty$  and  $a_\epsilon \geq \epsilon > 0$  everywhere. Consequently  $u_\epsilon$  can also be seen as a strong solution to the non-divergence uniformly elliptic equation

$$\sum_{i,j} \left( \delta_{ij} + \frac{a'_\epsilon(|\nabla u_\epsilon|)}{|\nabla u_\epsilon|^2 a_\epsilon(|\nabla u_\epsilon|)} \frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial u_\epsilon}{\partial x_j} \right) \frac{\partial^2 u_\epsilon}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = 0. \quad (8)$$

Consequently solutions to (6) inherit some properties of strong solutions to uniformly elliptic equations.

We quote, in particular, the *Harnack inequality*, that is, there exists  $C = C(\lambda, \Lambda)$  such that: if  $u$  solves (6) in  $B_R(x_0)$  and  $u \geq 0$  then

$$\max_{B_{R/2}(x_0)} u \leq C \min_{B_{R/2}(x_0)} u. \quad (9)$$

A further consequence of the use of the regularized solutions is that solutions to (6) satisfy the comparison principle in the weak form. That is, if  $v, u$  solve (6) in a domain  $G$  and  $v \leq u$  on  $\partial G$  then  $v \leq u$  also inside. In addition, if  $|\nabla u| + |\nabla v| > 0$  in  $\overline{G}$  then the strong version of the comparison principle holds, that is if  $v \leq u$  on  $\partial G$  then either  $v \equiv u$  or  $v < u$  in  $G$ .

Let us also observe that, if  $u$  is a solution to (6), then for every constant  $C$ , also  $C - u$  is a solution. Hence, by the Harnack inequality, one readily obtains that the solution to (1)–(3) satisfies

$$0 < u(x) < M, \quad \text{for every } x \in \Omega \setminus \{O\}. \quad (10)$$

Let us now introduce the moving plane apparatus. For any direction  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $|\xi| = 1$ , and for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define the hyperplane

$$\Pi_t^\xi = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \cdot \xi = t\}.$$

We denote by  $R_t^\xi$  the reflection in  $\Pi_t^\xi$ , that is

$$R_t^\xi x = 2(t - x \cdot \xi)\xi + x.$$

We shall denote

$$\left(R_t^\xi u\right)(x) = u\left(R_t^\xi x\right).$$

If we agree to say that if  $x \cdot \xi < t$ ,  $x$  is on the *left hand side* of  $\Pi_t^\xi$ , and conversely  $x$  is on the *right hand side* of  $\Pi_t^\xi$  if  $x \cdot \xi > t$ , we denote by  $R_t^\xi \Omega$  the reflection of the part of  $\Omega$  which is on the left hand side of  $\Pi_t^\xi$ , that is

$$R_t^\xi \Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \cdot \xi > t, R_t^\xi x \in \Omega\}.$$

Given  $\xi$ , we fix  $\bar{t}$  such that  $R_{\bar{t}}^\xi \Omega = \emptyset$ . Letting  $t > \bar{t}$  increase, we denote by  $t(\xi)$  the largest number such that

$$R_t^\xi \Omega \subset \Omega, \quad \text{for every } t \in (\bar{t}, t(\xi)).$$

As is well-known since Serrin [7], when  $t = t(\xi)$  one of the following two cases is satisfied

- (i)  $\partial(R_{t(\xi)}^\xi \Omega)$  is tangent to  $\partial\Omega$  at a point  $P \notin \Pi_{t(\xi)}^\xi$ ,
- (ii)  $\partial(R_{t(\xi)}^\xi \Omega)$  is tangent to  $\partial\Omega$  at a point  $P \in \Pi_{t(\xi)}^\xi$ .

Let us consider the family of moving planes associated to the opposite direction  $-\xi$  and the corresponding reflections. One can easily verify that

$$\Pi_t^\xi = \Pi_{-t}^{-\xi}, \quad \text{for every } t,$$

and also

$$R_t^\xi = R_{-t}^{-\xi}, \quad \text{for every } t.$$

Now we observe that for every  $s < t(\xi)$  we also have  $-s > t(-\xi)$ . In fact

$$R_s^\xi \Omega \subsetneq \Omega \cap \{x \cdot \xi > s\}$$

and therefore, applying  $R_{-s}^{-\xi}$  to both sides,

$$\Omega \cap \{x \cdot \xi < s\} \subsetneq R_{-s}^{-\xi} \Omega,$$

that is  $R_{-s}^{-\xi} \Omega$  is *not* contained in  $\Omega$  and hence  $-s > t(-\xi)$ .

Hence, letting  $s$  increase to  $t(\xi)$ , we obtain

$$t(\xi) + t(-\xi) \leq 0 \tag{11}$$

Consequently either  $t(\xi) = t(-\xi) = 0$  or one of the two numbers  $t(\xi)$ ,  $t(-\xi)$  is strictly negative.

If  $t(\xi) = t(-\xi) = 0$  then, obviously,  $\Omega$  is symmetric in  $\Pi_0^\xi = \Pi_0^{-\xi}$ .

Assume now  $t(\xi) < 0$  (the other case  $t(-\xi) < 0$  being equivalent).

We simplify our notation by posing

$$\Pi = \Pi_{t(\xi)}^\xi, \quad R = R_{t(\xi)}^\xi, \quad G = R_{t(\xi)}^\xi \Omega, \quad v = R_{t(\xi)}^\xi u.$$

Since the origin  $O$  is on the right hand side of  $\Pi$ , by (10), we have that there exists  $N$ ,  $0 < N < M$  such that the level set

$$E = \{x \in \Omega \setminus \{O\} \mid u(x) \geq N\}$$

is strictly on the right hand side of  $\Pi$ .

Consequently, on  $\overline{G}$ ,  $v = R_{t(\xi)}^\xi u < N$ . Now we observe that on  $\partial(G \setminus E)$  we have  $v \leq u$ , in fact  $\partial(G \setminus E)$  can be decomposed as

$$\partial(G \setminus E) = (\partial G \cap \Pi) \cup (\partial G \setminus (E \cup \Pi)) \cup (\partial E \cap G)$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} v &= u, & \text{on } \partial G \cap \Pi, \\ v &= 0 \leq u, & \text{on } \partial G \setminus (E \cup \Pi), \\ v &< N \leq u, & \text{on } \partial E \cap G. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the weak comparison principle,

$$v \leq u, \quad \text{in } G \setminus E,$$

and also, trivially,

$$v < N \leq u, \quad \text{in } G \cap E.$$

Consequently

$$v \leq u \quad \text{in } G. \tag{12}$$

From now on we rephrase arguments in [1] to prove that  $\Pi$  is a plane of symmetry for  $\Omega$ .

Let  $U$  be an  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega$  in  $\Omega$ , with  $\epsilon$  small enough to have  $|\nabla u| > 0$  in  $U$  and  $O \notin U$ . Let  $A$  be the connected component of  $(RU) \cap U$  such that  $P \in \partial A$ . In view of the boundary conditions (2), (4), we have

$$(u - v)(P) = 0, \quad \nabla(u - v)(P) = 0.$$

Moreover, when case II) occurs, by applying the arguments in [7] to equation (6) we also have that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta^2}(u - v)(P) = 0,$$

for every direction  $\eta$ . Since  $A \subset G \cap U$ ,  $u - v$  is a non-negative solution of a uniformly elliptic equation in  $A$ . By using the Hopf lemma when case I) occurs and its variant due to Serrin [7, Lemma 2] when case II) occurs and by the strong comparison principle, it follows that

$$u = v, \quad \text{in } \overline{A}. \tag{13}$$

Now, let us prove that  $R(\partial\Omega) \subset \partial\Omega$ , obtaining that  $\Pi$  is a plane of symmetry of  $\Omega$ . Assume, by contradiction, that there exists a point  $Q \in R(\partial\Omega) \setminus \partial\Omega$ . Let  $\gamma$  be an arc in  $R(\partial\Omega)$  joining  $Q$  with  $P$ . One can find a subarc  $\gamma'$  in  $\gamma \cap (U \cup \partial\Omega)$  having as endpoints  $P$  and a point  $R \in U$ . Since in any neighborhood of  $\gamma'$  one can find points of  $RU \cap U$ , which can be joined to  $P$  through paths inside  $RU \cap U$ , it follows that  $\gamma' \subset \partial A$ . Therefore the set  $R(\partial\Omega) \cap U \cap \partial A$  is non-empty and on such a set  $v = 0 < u$ , contradicting (13).

We have therefore proved that for any direction  $\xi$  there exists a plane  $\Pi$  orthogonal to  $\xi$  which is a plane of symmetry for  $\Omega$ . Hence  $\Omega$  is a ball  $B_R(x_0)$ . It remains to prove that  $x_0 = O$  and that  $u$  is radially symmetric.

Let  $b = b(s)$  be the inverse function to  $ta(t)$ , let  $K = R^{n-1}c a(c)$  and set

$$v(r) = \int_r^R b(K\rho^{1-n})d\rho, \quad 0 < r \leq R.$$

One can easily verify that  $v(|x - x_0|)$  solves

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla v|)\nabla v) = 0, & \text{in } B_R(x_0) \setminus \{x_0\}, \\ v = 0, & \text{on } \partial B_R(x_0), \\ \frac{\partial v}{\partial \nu} = -c, & \text{on } \partial B_R(x_0). \end{cases}$$

Now, in  $B_R(x_0) \setminus \{O, x_0\}$ ,  $u(x)$  and  $v(|x - x_0|)$  satisfy the same elliptic equation and have the same Cauchy data on  $\partial B_R(x_0)$ .

We recall that for such an equation the unique continuation property holds as long as one of the two solutions has non-vanishing gradient. It follows from a standard continuity argument that  $u(x) = v(|x - x_0|)$  for every  $x \neq O, x_0$ .

Consequently  $u$  and  $v$  must have the same singular point, that is  $x_0 = O$  and finally  $u(x) = v(|x|)$ . We conclude the proof observing that the singular value  $M$  can be computed as follows

$$M = \int_0^R b\left(\left(\frac{R}{\rho}\right)^{n-1} c a(c)\right) d\rho.$$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. ALESSANDRINI, *A symmetry theorem for condensers*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **15**, no. 5 (1992) 315–320.
- [2] G. ALESSANDRINI AND N. GAROFALO, *Symmetry for degenerate parabolic equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **108**, no. 2 (1989) 161–174.
- [3] G. ALESSANDRINI, D. LUPO AND E. ROSSET, *Local behavior and geometric properties of solutions to degenerate quasilinear elliptic equations in the plane*, Appl. Anal. **50**, no. 3-4 (1993) 191–215.

- [4] S. KICHENASSAMY AND L. VÉRON, *Singular solutions of the  $p$ -Laplace equation*, Math. Ann. **275**, no. 4 (1986) 599–615.
- [5] G.M. LIEBERMAN, *The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva for elliptic equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **16**, no. 2-3 (1991) 311–361.
- [6] E. ROSSET, *Isolated singularities of solutions to the equation  $\operatorname{div}(a(|Du|)Du) = 0$  in the plane*, Complex Variables Theory Appl. **25**, no. 1 (1994) 69–96.
- [7] J. SERRIN, *A symmetry problem in potential theory*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **43** (1971), 304–318.

Received November 14, 2007.