# Math 595: Geometric Analysis

Jacob Reznikov

September 10, 2023

#### Abstract

My course notes for the Geometric Analysis course.

## 1 ABP and Basic Geometry

### 1.1 Classic Isoperimetric inequality

The classic Isoperimetric inequality states that for any domain  $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have

$$\frac{|\partial\Omega|^n}{|\Omega|^{n-1}} \ge \frac{|\partial B|^n}{|B|^{n-1}}$$

where B is the unit ball. We want to prove this inequality using the help of PDEs, we thus set up the following PDE

$$\Delta u = c \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial u} = 1$$
 on  $\partial \Omega$ 

If this is true then by divergence theorem we have

$$|\partial\Omega| = \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial u}{\partial\nu} = \int_{\Omega} \Delta u = \int_{\Omega} c = c|\Omega|$$

and so we set  $c = \frac{|\partial\Omega|}{|\Omega|}$ .

For such a map we set  $T = \nabla u$  to be the gradient map  $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ . We now want a characterization of the 'extremal' points of u as a graph, we define

$$\Gamma_u^- = \left\{ x \in \Omega : u(y) \geq u(x) + \nabla u(x) \cdot (y-x) \forall y \in \Omega \right\}.$$

In other words  $\Gamma_u^-$  are the points of  $\Omega$  where the tangent plane lies entirely below the graph of u.

This set is called the 'contact' set.

**Remark 1.1.1.** For any point x in the contact set we have  $\nabla^2 u(x) \geq 0$  where  $\nabla^2$  is the Hessian, if some eigenvalue of the Hessian was negative then in a small enough neighborhood the condition for being in the contact set would be violated.

Claim 1.1.2 (ABP). For a solution u of the PDE above, we have  $T(\Gamma_u^-)$  (the collection of all gradients at all contact points) contains  $B_1 \setminus \partial B_1$ 

*Proof.* Take a vector  $v \in B_1 \setminus \partial B_1$  and consider the function  $\tilde{u} = u - v \cdot x$ . We have that since  $\frac{\partial \tilde{u}}{\partial \nu} > 1 - |v| > 0$  and so  $\tilde{u}$  cannot attain its minimum on the boundary. Thus it attains it on its interior where then must have  $\nabla \tilde{u}(x) = 0$  and so  $\nabla u(x) = v$ .

To see that x is a contact point we calculate

$$\tilde{u}(y) \geq \tilde{u}(x) \implies u(y) - v \cdot y \geq u(x) - v \cdot x \implies u(y) \geq u(x) + v \cdot (y - x)$$

Claim 1.1.3. If a solution u to the above PDE exists then we have

$$\frac{|\partial\Omega|^n}{|\Omega|^{n-1}} \ge \frac{|\partial B|^n}{|B|^{n-1}}$$

*Proof.* Then

$$|B_{1}| \leq |T(\Gamma_{u}^{-})| \leq \int_{\Gamma_{u}^{-}} J_{T} = \int_{\Gamma_{u}^{-}} \det(\nabla^{2}u)$$

$$= \int_{\Gamma_{u}^{-}} \lambda_{1} \lambda_{2} \cdots \lambda_{n}$$

$$\leq \int_{\Gamma_{u}^{-}} \left(\frac{\lambda_{1} + \cdots + \lambda_{n}}{n}\right)^{n} \quad \text{Since all the eigenvalues are positive.}$$

$$\leq \int_{\Gamma_{u}^{-}} \left(\frac{\Delta u}{n}\right)^{n}$$

$$\leq \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{\Delta u}{n}\right)^{n}$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{|\partial \Omega|}{n|\Omega|}\right)^{n} |\Omega| = \frac{|\partial \Omega|^{n}}{n^{n}|\Omega|^{n-1}}$$

and since  $|B| = \frac{1}{n} |\partial B|$  we get the desired result.

We now want to show existence of a solution to the PDE above. Let us consider the general linear PDE

$$\Delta u = f \quad \text{in } \Omega$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = h \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega$$

then a necessary condition for existence is

$$\int_{\Omega} f = \int_{\Omega} \Delta u = \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = \int_{\partial \Omega} h.$$

#### Claim 1.1.4. The above condition is sufficient.

*Proof.* Assume first that h=0. Thus the condition above becomes  $\int_{\Omega} F=0$ . Then take the positive definite symmetric bilinear form  $B(u,v)=\int_{\Omega} \nabla u \nabla v$  and notice

$$B(u, v) = (Lu, v)$$

and so L is a self-adjoint operator. Now in  $W^{2,1}(\Omega)$  we know that the range of a self-adjoint operator is orthogonal to its kernel, so the PDE is solvable iff  $F \perp \ker L$ .

Now we know that for any q in the kernel we have by our boundary conditions

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} gLg = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla g|^2$$

and so g is a constant function.

Thus we have a solution if and only if

$$\int_{\Omega} F = 0$$

Now for  $h \neq 0$  assume that  $\partial\Omega$  is  $C^2$  then  $\rho(x) = d(x,\partial\Omega)$  is  $C^2$  in  $\Omega$  near  $\partial\Omega$ , we then choose a cutoff function  $\eta$  satisfying  $\eta(x) = 1$  if  $\rho(x) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$  and  $\eta(x) = 0$  if  $\rho(x) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . Then  $\gamma = \eta \cdot \rho$  is  $C^2$  everywhere on  $\Omega$  and as we approach the boundary we will have  $\frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \nu} = -1$ . Now define  $U(x) := u(x) + h(x)\gamma(x)$ , we have  $\frac{\partial U}{\partial \nu} = 0$  and  $\Delta U = \Delta u + \Delta(h\gamma)$ . We then see that a solution for U exists if and only if

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} \Delta U = \int_{\Omega} \Delta u + \Delta (h\gamma) = \int_{\Omega} f + \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial (h\gamma)}{\partial \nu} = \int_{\Omega} f - \int_{\partial \Omega} h$$

and so we get our desired result.

### 1.2 Deeper into ABP

Last class we used ABP method to prove

$$\frac{|\Omega|^{n-1}}{|\partial\Omega|^n} \le \frac{|B|^{n-1}}{|\partial B|^n}$$

Now we study ABP further, if  $u \in C(\Omega)$  then we set

$$\Gamma_u^+ = \{ x \in \Omega | u(y) \le u(x) + P \cdot (y - x) | \exists P \in \mathbb{R}^n, \forall y \in \Omega \},$$

we call this the 'upper contact' set, notice that we no longer require u to be differentiable. In conjuction with the upper contact set we have generalized gradient map given by

$$T_u(x) = \{ p \in \mathbb{R}^n | u(y) \le u(x) + p \cdot (y - x), \forall x \in \Omega \}.$$

Essentially it is the set of gradients of hyperplanes that touch our function from above.

**Remark 1.2.1.** If  $u \in C^1$  then we can only have  $T_u(x) = \nabla u$ .

**Remark 1.2.2.** If  $u \in C^2$  and  $x \in \Gamma_u^+$  then  $\nabla^2 u(x) \leq 0$ .

**Example 1.2.3.**  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , R > 0, a > 0 then  $u(x) = a(1 - \frac{|x-z|}{R})$ . This is the graph of a cone in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ .

We then have for all  $x \neq z$  that the function is differentiable and so

$$T_u(x) = \nabla u(x) = -\frac{a}{R} \frac{x-z}{|x-z|}.$$

For x = z we have

$$u(y) \le u(z) + P \cdot (y - z)$$

$$a\left(1 - \frac{|y - z|}{R}\right) \le a + P \cdot (y - z)$$

$$-\frac{a}{R} \le P \cdot \frac{y - z}{|y - z|}$$

But we know that  $\frac{y-z}{|y-z|}$  is a unit vector and so this is equivalent to

$$|P| \le \frac{a}{B}$$

and so

$$T_u(x) = B_{a/R}(0)$$

Now let us assume  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$ .

#### Lemma 1.2.4.

$$\sup_{\Omega} u \leq \sup_{\partial \Omega} + \frac{d(\Omega)}{\omega_n^{1/n}} \left( \int_{\Gamma_n^+} |\det(\nabla^2)| \right)^{1/n}$$

*Proof.* Set  $v = u - \sup_{\partial\Omega} u$  and suppose  $\max_{\overline{\Omega}} v = v(x_0)$  with  $v(x_0) \ge 0$  (if  $v(x_0) < 0$  then the statement follows trivially).

Now consider  $\Gamma_v^+$ , we have

$$T(\Gamma_v^+) \le \int_{\Gamma_v^+} |J_{\nabla v}| = \int_{\Gamma_v^+} |\det(\nabla^2 v)|.$$

Now let h(x) be defined of  $\Omega$  such that (x, h(x)) be the cone with vertex at  $(x_0, v(x_0))$  and base  $\partial\Omega$ . Then we must have  $T_v(\Omega) \supseteq T_h(\Omega)$ , to see this take a hyperplane P given by a function l(x) that touches this cone, then it is easy to see that it must touch it at  $(x, v(x_0))$ , it is easy to see that on the boundary we have  $v(x) = h(x) \le l(x)$ . We then have  $v(x) - l(x) \le 0$  on the boundary.

On the other hand we have  $\nabla(v-l)(x_0) \neq 0$  so v-l must be positive at some point close to  $x_0$ , thus v-l must achieve its maximum somewhere on the interior of  $\Omega$  where we would then have  $\nabla v = \nabla l$ .

Next we have  $T_h(\Omega) \supseteq T_{\tilde{h}}(B_d(x_0))$  where  $\tilde{h}$  is given by

$$\tilde{h}(x) = v(x_0) \left( 1 - \frac{x - x_0}{d} \right).$$

We can see this because  $\tilde{h}$  is just a cone with a wider base than h and thus its supporting hyperplanes must have smaller gradients.

But we know from the example above that

$$T_{\tilde{h}}(B_d(x_0)) = \left(\frac{v(x_0)}{d}\right)^n \omega_n$$

and so we get

$$|T_v(\Omega)| \ge |T_{\tilde{h}}(B_d(x_0))| = \left(\frac{v(x_0)}{d}\right)^n \omega_n$$

which then gives us

$$\left(\frac{v(x_0)}{d}\right)\omega_n^{1/n} \le |T_v(\Gamma_v^+)|^{\frac{1}{n}} \le \left(\int_{\Gamma_v^+} |\det(\nabla^2 u)|\right)^{1/n}$$

Now we move on to more general elliptic equations, lets say we have  $\lambda I \leq a_{ij}(x) \leq \Lambda I$  with  $0 < \lambda < \Lambda < \infty$  and

$$Lu = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(x)u_{ij}(x) \ge f$$
 in  $\Omega$ 

**Lemma 1.2.5.** Suppose  $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap C^2(\Omega)$  and satisfies the above, then

$$u(x) \le \sup_{\partial \Omega} u + \frac{d(\Omega)}{n\omega_n^{1/n}} \left( \int_{\Gamma_u^+} \left( \frac{-f}{\det^{1/n}(a_{ij})} \right)^n \right)^{1/n}$$

**Remark 1.2.6.** If  $x \in \Gamma_u^+$  then  $-(\nabla^2 u) \ge 0$  and so  $0 \le -Lu \le -f$ .

We need a small linear algebra lemma to prove the results.

**Lemma 1.2.7.** For symmetric positive matrices A, B we have

$$\det(A)\det(B) \le \left(\frac{\operatorname{tr}(AB)}{n}\right)^n$$

*Proof.* Left side is equal to product of all eigenvalues,  $\lambda_1 \tilde{\lambda}_1 \cdots \lambda_n \tilde{\lambda}_n$ .  $\operatorname{tr}(AB)$  is equal to sum of products of eigenvalues,  $\lambda_1 \tilde{\lambda}_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n \tilde{\lambda}_n$ . Then by arithmetic-geometric mean inequality we get the desired result.

*Proof.* Now to prove the main lemma, set  $B = -\nabla^2 u \ge 0$  and  $A = (a_i j) > 0$  then

$$-f = -Lu = \operatorname{tr}(AB) \ge n(\det(A))^{\frac{1}{n}}(\det(B))^{\frac{1}{n}} = n(\det(a_i j))^{1/n}(\det(-\nabla^2 u))^{1/n}$$

which then gives us

$$\det(-\nabla^2 u) \le \frac{-f}{\det^{1/n}(a_{ij})}$$

which together with the lemma before that gives us the desired result.

This lemma is sometimes called the weak maximum principle.

Remark 1.2.8. There is a more general result with more general elliptic operators

$$Lu = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}(x)u_{ij}(x) + \sum_{k} b_{k}(x)u_{k}(x) + c(x)u(x)$$

the only thing that changes is that the constant in front of the integral now depends on the coefficients  $b_k$  and c.